Your Local Media Arts Organization:

The Intersection of Media Arts, Organizational Mission, and Community Development

Brettany Shannon
David C. Sloane

Price School of Public Policy
University of Southern California

(working paper)

This project was supported in part or in whole by an award from the *Research: Art Works* program at the National Endowment for the Arts: Grant# 15-3800-7007.

Your Local Media Arts Organization:
The Intersection of Media Arts, Organizational Mission, and Community Development

Brettany Shannon
David C. Sloane
Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California

This paper enters the increasingly complicated literature examining art's relationship with neighborhood change, adding to it a specific look at the peculiarly information and communication technology-based artistic genre, media arts, *vis-a-vis* community media arts organizations (MAOs). Using the National Alliance for Media Arts and Culture's (NAMAC) 2010 Mapping the Field Arts survey, we conduct a mixed methods research design, encompassing qualitative and quantitative analysis, with GIS-recovered Census and American Community Survey data in support, to determine what relationship, if any, exists between an MAO and its surrounding community, and to what extent an MAO's organizational mission affects this relation.

In service of these questions, we address two gaps we perceive in the literature. First, rather than rely on arbitrary and potentially misleading timeframes, we identified the *exact* move-in year for each of the project's 114 arts organizations to calculate discrete neighborhood changes in the five years before and after an MAO's arrival in a neighborhood. Second, we hypothesize that in addition to art form and industrial sector, organizational mission has directive and predictive power over an MAO's community outreach and effect on/attitude towards neighborhood change.

Our evidence suggests media arts organizations do not directly contribute to neighborhood change; more likely they either follow or reinforce development processes already underway. However, we do find not all media arts organizations are the same: organizational missions often predict the distinctive relations media arts organizations will share with their surrounding communities, reminding us of the great consequence initiating institutional agenda and convention can have on urban development.

Research support: This research was supported by grant number 13-3800-7007 from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Keywords: media arts, organizational mission, neighborhood change, community development

INTRODUCTION

The 1990s were fraught with scholars lamenting capital's successful articulation/capitulation of artistic and cultural integrity for urban development (Deutsche 1998; Miles 1997; Smith 1996; Zukin 1995). Halfway through the decade artist and theorist Suzanne Lacy named media artists — individuals working in the wide range of media-based art practices including everything from film/video and photography to radio and digital art — as among the "vanguard groups" (1994, p. 25) capable of wresting back art from capital interests for the advancement of progressive politics and community advocacy.

Nearly twenty years later and wholly embedded in the network society (Castells 1996, 1997, 1998), media artists dwell less on the fringe than they do in the fray. We live in an information society and whichever theory you hold truest to explain its social, economic, and political impacts (Webster 1992), these reverberations are nonetheless complete. This complete information and communication technology (ICT)-based digital-cultural transition begs the question: what of the media artist's relationship with art and urban development? Have the once "vanguard" media artists entered the ranks of art's "shock troops of gentrification" (Deutsche 1998) "urban pioneers" (Smith 1996), perfecting the "fine art of gentrification" (Deutsche and Ryan 1984)? Or have they stemmed the consumption-driven symbolic economy cum urban development tide and contributed to positive neighborhood change (Markusen and Johnson 2006; Seifert and Stern 2010; Wherry 2011)?

In asking this question, this paper enters the increasingly complicated literature examining art's relationship with neighborhood change, and adds to it the peculiarly ICT-based artistic genre *vis-a-vis* media arts organizations (MAOs) and community development. That is, while ICT- (Apostol, Antoniadis, and Banerjee 2012; Castells 1989, 1996, 1997, 1998; Dourish and Bell 2007; Graham and Marvin 2001; Jenkins 2006; Mandarano, Meenar and Steins 2010; Mitchell 1999, 2003; Servon 2002) and cultural economy-concerned (Deutsche 1998; Deutsche and Ryan 1984; Grodach 2011; Grodach, Foster and Murdoch 2014; Ley 2003; Lloyd 2005; Markusen and Gadwa 2010; Markusen and Johnson 2006; Smith 1996; Stern and Seifert 2010; Wherry 2011; Zukin 1989, 1995, 2010) scholars produce nuanced and complex research, these productive streams of literature have thus far remained separate despite their

consolidation in media arts organizations (MAOs). MAOs engage with any of the creative media processes, including film, video, and digital technology; can be for- or non-profit; and undertake everything from production to distribution to cultural policy advocacy. They are distinct in the arts for using all, airwaves, cyberspace, and the built environment to reach their audiences, and yet there is no literature about these organizations and how they might relate to urban planning.

Using a 2010 survey conducted by the United States' premier media arts advocacy group, the National Alliance for Media Arts and Culture (NAMAC), this paper investigates what relationships exist between media arts organizations, their stated missions, and their surrounding communities. First in the paper, we provide a literature review briefly explaining media arts' notable history, the current state of arts and gentrification scholarship, and how looking at organizational mission is a solid next step in the literature. Next, we explain the study's data and research methods we use to better understand what relationships media arts organizations and their overarching missions have with their local communities. Finally, we consider what these findings means for urban planning practice and scholarship, as well as propose future research.

Our evidence suggests media arts organizations do not directly contribute to neighborhood change, and that it is more likely they either follow or reinforce development processes already underway. However, not all media arts organizations are the same. Their organizational missions often predict the distinctive relations media arts organizations will share with their surrounding communities, reminding us of the great consequence initiating institutional agenda and convention can have on urban development. In addition, we submit further qualitative research exploring organizations' placement within institutional systems, among other things, will shed even more light on the critical issue of art's intersection with neighborhood change.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Media arts emerge from the unification of two incongruous worlds, community-interested art and informationalism. Philosophically, they reflect the utopian tendencies of poststructuralism, feminism, the

happening, Duchampian conceptualism, Situationism, and performance art (Grau 2007; Lovejoy, Paul & Vesna 2011; Rush 2005; Tribe, Jana, & Grosenick 2006). With Nam June Paik's 1965 "discovery" of the consumer-grade Sony Portapak (Rush 2005), media arts have been among the more "democratic" art forms, often used to champion the causes of underserved groups and places. Given their relative ease of production and circulation, art theorists like Suzanne Lacy have historically held up media arts as the peaceful soldier's creative weaponry in the war for social justice (Grau 2007; Rush 2005; Tribe, Jana, & Grosenick 2006). Practically, they articulate and impel advances in ICTs (Grau 2007; Lovejoy, Paul & Vesna 2011) and thus share a close relationship with informationalism and informational development (Castells 1989). Today new media provide the architecture for global communication networks (Galperin 2007), as well as for our daily participatory (Jenkins 2006) and phenomenological (Manovich 2007) practices. The cultural producers responsible for new media's design and user experience constitute the knowledge worker-rich forces of late capitalism (Currid 2009; Florida 2002; Lloyd 2005). Thus, perhaps more often representing early and mid-twentieth century utopianism, commercially employed digital artists embody the forces of gentrification (Lloyd 2005).

At first glance, media arts' primary function in the cultural economy undermines any media arts as paladin for justice narrative, but just as we know from the multivalent findings regarding art's relation with gentrification, no story is so easily understood. Within the literature, there exist two strands of findings, critical and hopeful. The former implicates the cultural economy's "artistic mode of production" (Zukin 1989) in wreaking late capitalism's global havoc at the local level (Smith 1986; Deutsche and Ryan 1984; Ley 2003; Lloyd 2005; Mommaas 2004; Smith 1996; Zukin 1989, 1995, 2010). The latter by turns acknowledges the artistic dividend (Markusen and Schrock 2006) for neighborhood revitalization benefiting local constituencies and ethnic groups (Stern and Seifert 2010; Wherry 2011), shows art's advantage to the local economy (Markusen and Schrock 2006; Wherry 2011), heralds local outreach efforts and social networking (Grodach 2011; Wherry 2011; Stern and Seifert 2010), and identifies spaces or "artists centers" (Markusen and Johnson 2006) for artists and the general public to build skills and engage in peer review (Grodach 2011; Markusen and Johnson 2006; Stern and Seifert 2010).

Of course both sides are right. So to better understand this complicated relationship between the arts and their local communities, recent research has sought to tease out specific conditions that correlate with positive and negative socioeconomic change in local communities. Grodach, Foster, and Murdoch (2014), for example, find fine arts associate more often with positive neighborhood revitalization, while commercial arts more often with gentrification. Here Grodach et al focus on industrial sector (namely, non- or for-profit) as the independent variable. However, in their piece repairing the lost historical connection between planning and community arts, urban planner Karen Chapple and performance studies Shannon Jackson (2010) introduce performance studies' view of social instrumentalization to suggest another level of analysis beyond sector: intent. They ask, is art instrumentalized when it intensifies a retail district's commercial viability? Or when its themes advocate a certain social program? And what about the artists' own interests and intended outcomes? Even a benign project to elicit smiles from passersby takes on new significance whether that smile is meant to enhance a locality's social use value or its valorization in the symbolic economy. In other words, interest and intended outcome signify a project's meaning beyond what the art form or its sector alone conveys.

All this recalls Suzanne Lacy's 1994 exhortation of contemporary art critics to emphasize meaning over mechanism in their art analysis. Writing about new genre public art, she calls readers to distinguish between "interests" (*ibid*, p. 25) and "media-specific concerns" (*ibid*) when discussing artists and their public artworks, arguing contemporary art critics' formalism precluded them from seeing "the broader implications for both art and society" (*ibid*). Had they considered artistic works through the artists' interests — namely "leftist politics, social activism, redefined audiences, relevance for communities (particularly marginalized ones), and collaborative methodology" (*ibid*), art critics might have learned more about artistic practices of the time. Lacy, Chapple and Jackson, and Grodach et al each remind us that taking art at (literal) face value subverts opportunities to better comprehend contemporary art and urban development. Artists and their allied organizations inhabit myriad social fields (Bourdieu 1989) that inform a range of on-the-ground objectives — art itself, social work, social critique, even prestige and riches (Becker 2008; Thornton 2009).

Returning to media arts, their aforementioned paradoxical role in our society brings into stark relief how meaning predominates over mechanism. The very fact that the same ICTs used for commercial purposes are also deployed for social movements (Castells 2009) indicates how important *intent* is, in addition to agent (Markusen and Schrock 2006; Zukin 1989) and industrial sector (Grodach, Foster and Murdoch 2014). So while media arts organizations may share artist and sector type as a group, their institutional agendas and consequent operations vary. From a neoinstitutionalist perspective, this makes sense. Institutions are not concretized superstructures, but constantly shifting social constructions (Jepperson 1991), "symbolically grounded, organizationally structured, politically defended, and technically and materially constrained" (Friedland and Alford 1991, pp. 248-9). Therefore, within the media arts organization universe, we should expect smaller galaxies to be governed by and expressive of different organizational mission types. However, no scholarship has addressed institutional intent to this point. This project aims to repair that omission to construe how organizations' missions coincide with MAOs' community outreach and neighborhood change.

A second gap in the research, a methodological one, relates to time-based analysis. In most cases, when research is longitudinal, it is generally a case study and thus contextual. In other cases with larger sample sizes, the before and after dates are arbitrary and unrelated to when arts organizations actually entered their respective communities. Introducing these two levels of analysis, organizational mission and relevant time analysis offers more detailed and salient information about art organizations' relations with their local communities, necessary for planners and policymakers as they set their arts-based redevelopment agendas.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Well over a thousand independent MAOs operate throughout the country. Many of them function as private, inwardly focused organizations, without discrete links to their surrounding neighborhoods. Many others, however, operate expressly for and within their adult and youth communities, doing such things as opening their doors to provide production facilities, teaching classes and workshops, leasing equipment,

and exhibiting and screening amateur and professional works. These MAOs typify Markusen and Johnson's (2006) "artists' centers," and are the subject of this research. This project seeks to understand the urban development connections these small, independent media arts organizations have with their local communities. To that end and using NAMAC's 2010 "Mapping the Field" survey, we propose the following research questions and hypotheses:

Research Q1:

Can we find a typology of overarching organizational missions within the NAMAC's survey respondents' answers?

H1: Yes. Using the survey's mission options[1] as a guide and then conducting a qualitative analysis of the stated missions on each organization's website, we posit the three main overarching goals are: *Art*, *Art Community Building*, and *Community Building*.

Research Q2:

What variations exist among these groups, controlling for targeted emphases (e.g. audience age, race ethnicity, scope of area targeted, whether rural or urban, etc.)?

H2: Organizational missions do have specific relationships with targeted audiences and scope of area targeted. We hypothesize:

- *Art* organizations seek primarily to promote art and use the term "community" to refer to the art world (i.e. artists, art organizations, art events, etc.) at large.
- *Art Community Building* organizations also privilege the art world, but manifest this agenda at the geographically local level.

[1] The survey's possible missions: (1) encouraging artistic expression, (2) nurturing independent artists, (3) nurturing emerging artists, (4) education, promoting media literacy, (5) media advocacy, (6) community building, serving as a meeting place for the media arts, (7) serving geographic communities and their issues, (8) serving social justice issues, (9) preserving cultural heritage, and (10) encouraging economic and workforce development.

- *Community Building* organizations emphasize empowering local constituencies with the power of the media, one's artist status/self-identification notwithstanding.

Therefore, we argue, for example, that *Art* organizations will report seeking national and international audiences, whereas *Community Building* organizations will not, instead aiming their efforts towards local and marginalized audiences. *Art Community Building* organizations will emphasize localities but not target marginalized groups, focusing instead on the arts community.

Research Q3:

What relationship can we find between an MAO's presence at a particular location and the surrounding community?

H3: We expect to find that MAO presence correlates with neighborhood change. We further argue that such change will look differently for each of the MAO goal types. That is, neighborhoods with *Art Community Building* MAOs will show sharper rates of population displacement along with improvement of place (gentrification), whereas *Community Building* organization-adjacent areas will observe more improvement of place and less population displacement (positive neighborhood change).

Research Q4:

The Mapping the Field survey had a 36% response rate. Is there a systematic difference between those organizations that did and did not respond to the survey that might complicate the findings in Research Questions 1 through 3?

H4: No, there is no systematic difference between these groups.

ANALYTIC STRATEGY: USING GIS AND CENSUS INFORMATION FOR ORGANIZATION-NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONSHIP

About the Dataset

Since NAMAC's founding in 1980, it has sought to increase and reinforce both the culture and industry of independent media arts. In June 2010, NAMAC surveyed 1,170 organizations via Survey Monkey (from its own member database and through snowball sampling). From 424 responses (a 36% response rate), NAMAC culled information about organizational types, primary media output, workforce demographics, revenue and expense streams, and so on. While the subsequent report provided constructive insight into the media arts sector, other questions within the 106-unit survey offer rich opportunity to learn how the arts organizations interrelate with their localities. (See Table 1.)

Table 1 Here

To develop the questionnaire, NAMAC collaborated with the Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology at Iowa State University and five intermediary organizations (i.e. University Film/Video Association [UFVA], CTCNet, Dance/USA, Grantmakers in Film and Electronic Communication [GFEM], and the National Federation of Community Broadcasters) to create a 106-question survey for its membership base. NAMAC member MAOs comprise:

> "…community-based media production centers and facilities, university-based programs, museums, media presenters and exhibitors, film festivals, distributors, film archives, youth media programs, community access television, digital arts and online groups, and policy-related centers" (NAMAC 2009).

Given that the answers in the Mapping the Field survey emerge from objective inquiries, and that NAMAC did conduct a beta test with five organizations prior to full release, we feel comfortable characterizing them as valid. In addition, the majority of individuals answering the surveys reported holding senior positions on the executive, marketing, or development teams — positions of deep organizational knowledge — and so we take their answers as also reliable. The dataset, however, does contain some bias in that it derives from a membership and snowball sample.

Methodology

The entire project called for a mixed methods research design, encompassing qualitative and quantitative analysis, with GIS-recovered data in support. In the following portion, we outline the

research steps, with particular attention to variables of interest, justifications for particular approaches, acknowledgements of limitations, and plans for addressing them.

Preparing the Datasets

Per above, the project has two lines of inquiry. The principal analysis, derived from the 424 responses, investigates the relations independent MAOs share with their local communities. The secondary research shows to what extent the 36% responding organizations differ from the 64% that did not. To these ends, NAMAC provided us with the completed surveys and organizational information for the 424-organization "Respondent" list, as well as limited contact information for the 746-unit "Nonrespondent"[2] list.

Our first step was to clean the Respondent and Nonrespondent lists. We removed from the project entirely of any MAOs either campus-located, civic/government-run, in-list duplicates, virtual addresses (e.g. organizations run from individuals' homes), defunct organizations, or those too old (i.e. opened in 1967) or too new (i.e. opened in 2008) for Census-based comparison analysis (see section "Quantitative Methods: Using GIS and the Census for the MAO Artists' Center Research"). We eliminated educational and civic MAOs because their locations invariably already experience strong campus and city hall development effects that would muddy any research findings. From the Respondent list, we disqualified any organization we deemed to fall outside Markusen and Johnson's *Artists' Centers: Evolution and Impact on Careers, Neighborhood and Economies* (2006) report definition of "artists' center." The authors provide a slew of parameters, but name these two as essential for consideration as an artists' center:

[2] NAMAC had only email addresses, contact names, and *some* organization names. To fill in our survey, we followed these steps for all organizations: (1) Checked domain name (@orgname.org) against its own and Respondent list for internal and external duplications, respectively. (2) Google searched full email name (contact@orgname.org) to find organization website and physical address. (In our experience, even defunct email addresses lead to correct MAO websites.) When organizations list PO Box addresses, we searched using Google Maps, by phone numbers, and/or social media sites. (3) As with the Respondent organizations, we removed all MAOs affiliated with or located on educational campuses, as well as civic/government entities. For the rest, we looked to website for organizational mission and age, generally on the same webpage.

> "…[having a] space dedicated to an artistic medium or a geographical or affinity community, accessible to all without a fee to walk in the door" and "[g]eneral membership at an affordable rate without screening requirements, though certain services may be restricted to those who meet criteria or successfully compete for them" (*ibid*, 11).

According to Markusen and Johnson, additional offerings include newsletters, classes for various experience levels, equipment for share or rental, meeting space for gatherings, competitions for grants/awards, opportunities for exhibitions/performances, training and feedback, connections to human and information resources, and teaching opportunities. Following these guidelines, we eliminated a total of 135 organizations without dedicated onsite programming (e.g. film festivals, mobile organizations, policy centers, etc.) to ensure we measured not administrative office presences by direct community engagement.

Qualitative Methods: Finding Organizational Information

In the end we designated 114 MAO Artists' Centers (ACs) from the Respondents list for the project's principal research, and 249 Respondents and 281 Nonrespondents to statistically test against each other for systematic differences. We sought organizational mission and age of *all* Respondents and Nonrespondents for later comparison, as well as each AC's tenure at its respective location for the project's neighborhood change evaluation. While NAMAC's survey did ask for MAOs' primary organizational missions, the specific survey design hampered useful cluster analysis[3]. Therefore, to answer Research Q1, we conducted a constant comparative method-driven content analysis pilot project with a randomly selected group of Respondents and Nonrespondents' web-published mission statements to discern three primary organizational goals. Conveniently, all MAOs have websites, where they feature

[3] In the survey, Questions 8 and 9 both list possible organizational missions. Question 8 is inclusive, asking respondents to check "all that apply" (NAMAC 2010), and Question 9 asks respondents to "select the primary or one best descriptor of your organization's overall mission (only one)" (*ibid*). While we hoped to run a cluster analysis, the inclusive-exclusive design resulted in statistical noise. We found running frequencies from the second question and comparing against their presence in the first did not condense the ten options into valid categories. Instead, only two relevant categories emerged, emphasizing the arts and community building, with a third much larger one comprising no real unifying characteristics. That is, the first two appeared cohesive and small, while the third was large and unwieldy. Members in this third category had just *not* exclusively selected the missions of the first two.

their mission statements and founding dates. Less frequently, however, do MAOs include their tenure on their websites, therefore we called and/or emailed ACs directly for tenure information.[4] From the number of years at a given location we can calculate values to make before and after move-in comparisons (detailed in next section). In some cases, ACs moved to their current locations after 2010, rendering a before and after Census comparison impossible (see next section). In these cases, we contacted the ACs for their *previous* addresses and tenures.

Quantitative Methods: Using GIS and the Census for the MAO Artists' Center Research

To capture the 114 ACs' potential neighborhood change effects, we chose the quarter-mile radial catchment surrounding each MAO AC as the unit of analysis. The benefit of the quarter-mile distance is that it abides by the widely accepted axiom that people will walk one quarter-mile from any initial distance, and so it allows us to test the neighborhood change hypothesis with more confidence. While the ideal unit of analysis is the census block, our oldest ACs date back to 1976, and the earlier Census years simply do not have that micro-geographic information. Also, and critically, collecting any other Census year information not directly related to an AC's move-in date (i.e. comparing 1990 and 2000 Census data when an AC moved in in 1978) reveals correlative, at best, and spurious, at worst, relationships. In this design, we wanted to use census data to estimate the social and spatial characteristics of an AC at date of move-in, five years prior, and five years after to measure neighborhood change. The census tract level is the only and best way to capture such data, therefore we used it knowing it would give us consistent census-based dependent variables (see Table 2) from Census years 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, and the 2008-2012 ACS. (The diminution of the 2010 Census variable offerings required that we use the American Community Survey for more recently tenured MAOs).

Using U.S. Census TIGER/Line Shapefiles and GIS, we retrieved both census tract numbers (based on the 2010 Census tract boundaries) and the respective area ratio of each census tract within a given AC's quarter-mile catchment. We first downloaded the 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Census years' data

[4] We called/emailed all MAOs for which we had missing information, not just tenure data.

from the Neighborhood Change Database (NCDB), a simple source for collecting and comparing census variables over time. Notably, as the redrawing of census tract boundaries has consistently proven a major barrier in census-based longitudinal analysis, we applied the Longitudinal Tract Database (LTDB)[5] open-source crosswalk interpolation formula to create estimates within the 2010 tract boundaries for all Census years 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000. We collected the 2008-2012 ACS variables through Social Explorer. Next, equipped with the appropriate, interpolated values for earlier Census years and raw ACS estimates, we multiplied them by each AC's quarter-mile catchment area ratio, and used this formula to approximate values for move-in, five years before, and five years after:

Year Value Estimate Formula (for move-in year 1993):
Move-in est.: 1993 value = 1990 value + [(2000 value - 1990 value)/10*3]
5 years prior est.: 1988 value = 1980 value + [(1990 value - 1980 value)/10*8]
5 years after est.: 1998 value = 1990 value + [(2000 value - 1990 value)/10*8]

Though this formula works less perfectly for the 2008-2012 ACS data, we figure since the ACS is itself an estimate derived from smaller samples and the project formula assumes an amortized change in value between census years, we thought the resulting approximations would not be too far from reality. Finally, only after figuring the three relevant years' estimates did we add up (or average, in the case of household income) each AC's census tract values to shrink the list back to one value per MAO AC.

Table 2 Here

Per Table 3, we selected the study's dependent variables based on previous application in the gentrification and revitalization literature (Freeman 2005; Grodach, Foster and Murdoch 2014; Ley 1986; Sands and Reese 2013), as well as consistent availability across the Census years. We looked at: average household income, educational attainment (i.e. bachelor's degree and higher), ethnicity (particularly presence of a White population), population density, and unemployment rate. Additional spatial characteristics include occupancy, owner-occupancy, and mode of transit to work.

[5] This relatively new open-source programming code has quickly become the gold standard for valid longitudinal analysis.

In addition to the Census variables, we devised a few project-specific variables in addition to organizational mission typology. To create a stratified sample, we looked up each AC's home city's population as of the 2010 Census and assigned it to one of three categories depending on its size:[6] rurality (< 10,000 residents), CBSA (10,000 to 50,000 residents) MSA, CBSA, or rurality. We also divided the longest age and tenure ranges (47 and 34 years, respectively) by three each to transform the numeric variables into categorical ones for better analysis. Finally, since respondents were asked to "select all that apply," we collapsed some of the original Mapping the Field (See Table 3).

Table 3 Here

To understand our current 114-MAO AC list and determine the effect of organizational mission, we split the list into organizational missions and looked for relationships with specific social groups and geographies the ACs claimed to target: ages, ethnicities, and marginalized groups, and rural/urban, neighborhoods/regions. Again using organizational mission, we looked for relationships with the following Census variables: race group, educational attainment, employment status, household income, housing occupancy, and owner-occupancy. We completed the same two analytical steps, still by organizational mission, after splitting in the MSA, CBSA, and rurality categories.

In reality, there might be no statistically significant relationship between an AC and its local community. Therefore, before collecting a full 114-unit control group via GIS, we randomly selected a group of 24 from the AC treatment group for a neighborhood change pilot project. Using a random integer set generator,[7] we selected six each for the following variables: town type (i.e. MSA, CBSA, rurality), tenure, age, and organizational mission. With the resulting 24 ACs, we used GIS to select census tracts beyond each AC's half-mile catchment and calculated move-in estimates for these categories frequently associated with gentrification (Grodach, Foster and Murdoch 2014): White population, bachelor's degree and higher, unemployment, and occupancy rate. From the possible nearby census tracts,

[6] We use the Federal Register Office of Management and Budget's 2010 Standards for Delineating Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas for these definitions.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/fedreg_2010/06282010_metro_standards-Complete.pdf
[7] We used the random integer set generator from http://www.random.org/integer-sets/.

we selected those that came within 5% of at least three of the four variables for a final difference-in-difference analysis. A difference-in-difference test goes beyond simply determining whether neighborhood change has occurred and establishes if that change can be attributed specifically to a treatment group, here MAO Artists Centers. We compare the same variables as in the 114-unit Artists Center group but population density.

Quantitative Methods: Using GIS and the Census to Compare Respondent and Nonrespondent Lists

For this group, we followed largely the same process as with the ACs, only we used just the 2008-2012 ACS values for current-day media art organization comparison. Our interest here was finding out whether and to what extent the Respondent organizations are statistically significantly different from the Nonrespondents. We use the same organizational mission, age, and Census variables as in the AC portion.

FINDINGS

Organizational Mission Typology

For organizational mission, we found our three proposed types — Art, Art Community Building, and Community Building — covered the media arts organization landscape well. Per above, each MAO's website contains the organization's mission statement, which states plainly its primary focus and definition of community. Among the 114 MAOs, Community Building is the most common organizational goal, with 74 (65%) of the sample. Art Community Building is a distant second with 24 (21%), followed by Art, which accounts for just 16 (14%) of the Artists Center organizations. Again, the distinguishing language is unambiguous.

Founded in 1997, New York City-based Eyebeam typifies the Art MAO. Its mission refers only to art and art technology, intimates its "community" includes artists and other practitioners, welcomes but distinguishes a non-art "public," and gives no geographic parameters:

> "Eyebeam is an art and technology center that provides a fertile context and state-of-the art tools for digital research and experimentation. It is a lively incubator of creativity and though, where artists and technologists actively engage with culture, addressing the issues and concerns of our time. Eyebeam challenges conventions, celebrates the hack, educates the next generation, encourages collaboration, freely offers its contribution to the community, and invites the public to share in a spirit of openness: open source, open content and open distribution" (Eyebeam n.d.).

Other Art MAOs echo this overarching sentiment. Facets (2015), a film and new media organization operating since 1975 considers itself "a leading national media arts organization" (Facets 2015), with a "mission…to transform lives through the power of the world, classic, and independent film" (*ibid*). And while Aurora Picture Show hails its Houston provenance, it collaborates with arts institutions as far afield as Minneapolis' Walker Art Center, and its Houston-ness is conspicuously absent from its self-definition. "Aurora Picture Show is a non-profit media arts center than presents artist-made, non-commercial film and video. We are dedicated to expanding the cinematic experience and promoting the understanding and appreciation of moving image art" (Aurora Picture Show 2015). For these and the other Art MAOs, art constitutes the organizational focal point and "community," whether explicit or implicit, refers to an amorphous art-going world, rather than one geographically defined. That is, they prioritize the production and exhibition of art — or art for art's sake (Bourdieu 1993) — and their conception of "community" is specific to the art world (Thornton 2009).

Art Community Building organizations, meanwhile, privilege art and the art world, but manifest this agenda at the local/regional level. In this way, they associate Bourdieu's (1993) restricted production with a particular locale (Markusen 2006). For example, the Philadelphia Independent Film and Video Association (PIFVA) "is a membership organization started by filmmakers whose mission is to connect, support, sustain, and showcase Philadelphia regions' independent media arts community" (n.d.). However, not every Art Community Building MAOs states its art- and geographic-emphasis together within the mission statement, but elsewhere on the same "About" webpage. The Southwest Alternate Media Project (SWAMP)'s mission statement explains it, "promotes the creation and appreciation of film, video, and new media as art forms of a multicultural community" (2014). This apparently art-only interest is refined under its "Philosophy" subheading: "SWAMP is a Texas-based media arts center committed to

the film and video art of this region, the artists producing independent images, and to the cultivation of an engaged audience" (*ibid*). Likewise, *before* resolving, "to foster the communication of arts, ideas, and information to diverse audiences through audio media" in its mission statement, Jack Straw Cultural Center identifies itself as, "[a] community-based resource…unlike any other in the [Northwest] region for local artists who work creatively with sound" (2014). Common to all is the sense that Art Community Building MAOs have a multivalent appreciation for the term "community." They place their work within the larger media arts world (Thornton 2009), and at the same time verify their geographic milieus as both central to and the inspiration for said work (Lloyd 2005).

Community Building MAOs step back from "art" *per se* and instead report a desire to bring geographic communities together by imparting the critical (Buckingham 2000) and participatory (Jenkins 2006; Jenkins et al 2009) literacies specific to media education. This group, more than Art or Art Community Building, has the most internal variation. Though all MAOs foreground a social purpose, some serve particular constituencies. Chicago's Street-Level Youth Media teaches local "urban youth in media arts and emerging technologies for use in self-expression, communication, and social change" (2014). Its mission statement continues, stating Street-Level "programs build critical thinking skills in youth who have been historically neglected by policy-makers and mass media" (*ibid*). Other Community Building MAOs reach out broadly to foster community development. Michigan's Greater Grand Rapids Community Media Center (CMC) aims "to effectively use technology and media to:

- Tell share and preserve our own stories
- Better understand our differences
- Discuss our challenges and develop solutions
- Encourage and exercise the free exchange of ideas
- Practice inclusiveness and empowerment
- Promote and enable social change
- Build collaborations and partnerships in pursuit of a better community" (CMC 2015)

Finally, and not quite "artistic" are the Community Building community television stations. To curry favor for the history making Cable Communications Act of 1984, federal legislators included a provision that newly liberalized cable companies could — not must — set aside up to 5% of their profits for municipalities to institute autonomous public, education, and governmental (PEG) channels (Geller,

Ciamporcero & Lampert 1987). This legislation possibly explains Television's primacy within the primary media types, with resultant organizations including such examples as Waycross in Forest Park, Ohio. Presiding over ten public, education, and government channels in the region, Waycross desires "[t]o bring local residents, schools, governments, churches, service groups, and businesses together with constructive, prudent uses of communication technologies to build and enhance Community" (2015). Waycross expands, defining "Community" in Aristotelian terms: "…the ideal of public life where residents respect and encourage one another to grow and develop as individuals, actively participating in their democratic government and share the sense of responsibility for the common good" (*ibid*). Waycross sets itself apart by using such frank language about the public good, but even with the comparative diversity within the Community Building group, the group members remain cohesive by using media communications for community empowerment and engagement.

Media Art Organizations Artists Centers: "Mapping the Field" Survey Results

Not surprisingly, given the three organizational goal typologies and the large amount of internal difference within just the Community Building group, the 114-unit Artists Center group exhibits a great deal of variation. The MAOs are as young as four and old as 51 years, and their tenures range from three to 37 years. Per Table 4, the mean age and tenure of the ACs is 24.5 and 15.5 years, respectively. Per Table 3, we collapsed the numeric Age and Tenure variables into thirds to identify MAOs as "Mature/Long," "Middle-aged/Medium," or "New/Short." The MAOs' age distribution makes a near-perfect bell curve: 23% are New (15 years and younger), 53% are Middle-aged, and 25% qualify as Mature (31 to 47 years). The distribution of tenure, notably, indicates MAOs do relocate: 35% and 46% have Short and Medium tenures, respectively, whereas just 18% claim Long incumbencies.

Table 4 Here

In terms of location, ACs are overwhelmingly urban: 65% are located in MSAs, followed by 19% in CBSAs and 16% in ruralities. Likewise, the majority (47%) name Television as their primary media type, with Film and Video as the second most common primary media type (29%). Together, the "newer"

digital media categories, Multimedia, and Digital and New Media together account for 18% of the Artists Centers. Radio and Sound Audio, generally regional radio stations, comprise 7% of the MAOs. Please note, *no* MAO chose either Web or Gaming as its primary media; therefore, these categories were eliminated altogether rather than bundled into another category.

Artists Center member organizations tend *not* to target particular age or race groups, or specific geographic areas, but do privilege urban areas and marginalized groups (44%), broadly defined. For example, a full 80% of ACs reported focusing on no age group, followed distantly by 12% who reported to host youth and young adult programs. And while 23% of ACs report focusing on multiple minority races and ethnicities, 65% of ACs have no race/ethnicity focus. The geographic foci, meanwhile, signal the MAOs' overarching urban-ness. While 49% of organizations report having no urban, suburban, or rural focus, 27% do seek out urban populations. Similarly, the 37% of MAOs naming "City to County" as their targeted geography ties with the proportion claiming to have no area emphasis at all. After this, 16% have regional scopes, serving multiple cities and states, and a full 10% serve their local neighborhoods. Just 1% seeks national and international audiences.

Organizational Missions and Mapping the Field Survey Relationships

In the Mapping the Field survey, NAMAC asked its respondents, "please indicate whether your organization's mission targets or includes an emphasis on any of the following types of audiences or constituencies (all that apply)" (NAMAC 2010). We proposed that the three hypothesized organizational missions would have peculiar answers to NAMAC's queries. Namely, Art organizations would report seeking national and international audiences, whereas Community Building organizations would not, instead directing their efforts towards local and marginalized audiences. Art Community Building organizations, meanwhile, would emphasize localities, but not necessarily marginalized or age groups. (See Table 5 for all row percentages.)

Town Type: We find that a statistically significant higher percentage of Art ($4.91>|t|3.30$ ($p<.001$)) and Art Community Building ($3.2>|t|2.58$ ($p<.01$)) MAOs are in large MSAs than Community Building

organizations. Conversely, a statistically significant higher percentage of Community Building organizations inhabit smaller CBSAs than both Art (-5.42>|t|3.30 (p<.001)) and Art Community Building (-3.64>|t|3.30 (p<.001)) MAOs. Interestingly, there exist no statistically significant relationships at the rural level. Rather, we find that the art-leaning MAOs locate in large urban centers, whereas community builders predominate in smaller, suburban cities.

Table 5 Here

Age of Targeted Audience: In no instance is there a statistically significant relationship among goal typologies and their named targeted age groups. Instead, the three organizational missions share an overwhelming preference *not* to seek out specific age cohorts.

Type of Media: NAMAC asked MAOs to identify their primary medium; it is here that we observe the perhaps the starkest differentiation between the art-leaning Art and Art Community Building, and the art-ambiguous Community Building mission types. That is, Community Building MAOs easily and significantly outweigh Art and Art Community Builders in the Television media category (-13.23>|t|3.30 (p<.001), both). In fact, *no* arts-centric mission MAOs pointed to television as its primary medium. Further, while Community Building organizations do not have a statistically significant higher percentage of Radio ACs than do Art Community Building MAOs, the t-value of 1.85 suggests it is close to being so. Again, no Art organization claimed Radio as its primary medium, making Community Building organizations' higher percentage of Radio outlets significantly higher (-2.55>|t|1.96 (p<.05). Meanwhile, Art (3.17>|t|2.58 (p<.01)) and Art Community Building (3.58>|t|3.30 (p<.001)) dominate the art form media, with statistically significant higher percentages of Film & Video ACs than Community Builders. Art and Art Community Building MAOs split the remaining arts-focused media types. For Multimedia ACs, organizations featuring two forms of media at the same strength, Art Community Building MAOs have a statistically significant higher percentage than do Community Builders (2.13>|t|1.96 (p<.05)). And Art MAOs outpace Community Building Digital/New Media organizations (2.16>|t|1.96 (p<.05)). In sum, Art and Art Community Building's shared tendency toward the same sorts of media underscore how they privilege the art form and art production, whereas the Community Building MAOs' preferences signal

their preoccupation with communication.

Targeted Marginalized Groups: Both Art (2.5>|t|1.96 (p<.05)) and Community Building (3.82>|t|3.30 (p<.001)) MAOs have statistically significant higher percentages of targeting marginalized groups than Art Community Building organizations. Intriguingly, while Community Building organizations do have a higher percentage of targeted marginalized groups than Art MAOs, this relationship is quite weak (t-value, 0.18). We wonder if the Arts MAOs' focus on marginalized groups is not bound up with fundraising obligations. Institutional arts donors often prioritize education and outreach efforts to underserved communities, and though we do not suggest contributed income is *the* reason for the Arts group's tendency — socially engaged art is a rich and growing practice (Helguera 2011) — it may be a factor.

Race of audience: As with Age of Targeted Audience, we find no statistically significant relationship among goal typologies and particular racial or ethnic groups. Community Building MAOs have a stronger tendency *away* from seeking out specified minority groups that either the arts-centric organizations, but the largest t-value in the No Race/Ethnicity Target, describing the difference between Art Community Building and Community Building organizations, is just -1.52.

Location of audience: Location of Audience refers to whether and to what extent MAOs emphasize rural, urban, or suburban audiences. Within the projects Artists' Center group, we find Art and Art Community Building organizations have equally statistically significant lower percentages of targeting Suburban audiences than Community Building organizations (-3.71>|t|3.30 (p<.001, both). Otherwise, however, Art MAOs lack significant relationships with any of the audience locations. By contrast, Art Community Building organizations do, with a have higher percentage seeking Urban audiences than Community Building MAOs (3.17>|t|3.30 (p<.001)), and a lower percentage than the same group in the None category (-2.22>|t|1.96 (p<.05)). In this question we find another dimension to the art-city connection. That is, while the arts-centric organizations lack significant relationships to Urban audiences, their perceived distance from strictly Suburban audiences suggests a pull toward the city. In addition, where Community Building MAOs have the largest proportion choosing No Audience Location, the Arts

Community Building organizations demonstrate a consistent disposition to specify, specifically toward the Urban and away from the Suburban.

Scope of area targeted: Where Location of Audience parses out by urban- or rural-ness, Scope of Area conveys types of geographies, such as neighborhood, region, and nation. In this group, the Arts group has the most striking relationships to targeted geographies. Namely, these MAOs statistically significant lower percentages aiming for City/County than both Arts Community Building ($-2.37>|t|1.96$ ($p<.05$)) and Community Building MAOs ($-4.57>|t|3.30$ ($p<.001$)). At the same time, they have significantly higher percentages naming No Scope than Arts Community Building ($2.65>|t|2.58$ ($p<.01$)) and Community Building ($2.84>|t|2.58$ ($p<.01$)) organizations. Otherwise, there are no statistically significant relationships in Scope of Area. These results underscore how Arts MAOs situate themselves and their work less in terms of their local communities than in terms of a larger, non-geographic arts community.

Overall, we find our hypotheses correctly predicted organizational goals' relationships with the Mapping the Field questions, with the clear exception being that Art MAOs, like Community Building organizations, endeavor to reach marginalized communities. Art MAOs uphold art form and urban-ness but target fewer Urban audiences because, as we see in Location of Audience and Scope of Area targeted, Art organizations express indifference to place-based considerations. They define "community" as social and creative, but not geographic. Art Community Building organizations, like Art MAOs, champion the arts, but are consistently and explicitly more grounded and urban (see Town Type, Location of Audience, and Scope of Area), likely because this is where their cultural producers live and work. Finally, Community Building MAOs disregard the "higher" art forms in favor of mainstream television and radio communication technologies that inhabit smaller (perhaps suburban) cities. Their preference for TV and radio, and affiliation toward Suburban audiences may reflect a majority share of PEG cable access channels in this particular category. Throughout, however, we find "art" and "community" share steady definitions — the former refers to media arts' creative potential above and beyond conventional communication modes, and the latter affirms geography's significance. These definitions accurately

predict the organizational missions' relations with the Mapping the Field survey questions.

Media Arts Organizations and their Local Communities

Viewed as a group, there is no striking relationship between a media arts organization's placement in a community and that community's change over time. Per Table 6, we calculated the average values and percentages of select census variables within the study's ACs' quarter-mile catchments at three points in time: five years prior to move-in (hereafter "Minus 5"), move-in (hereafter "Move-In"), and five years after move-in (hereafter "Plus 5"). Please note we look at only 112 of the Artists Centers because two MAOs' move-in dates predate available census tract information. Of all variables, only the Bachelor's Degree and Higher and Household Income variables seem to experience jumps of any interest, but those jumps are uniform along the Minus 5 to Move-In to Plus 5 continuum, thereby making the connection between an MAO's arrival to a neighborhood and that neighborhood's change less clear.

Table 6 Here

Just comparing percentages, the study's control group (see Table 7) indicates a flat relationship between MAO and neighborhood change. Comparing Table 6 and Table 7's control group of 24 MAOs, we find that almost all the treatment and control groups' corresponding variable values are and remain within five percentage points of one another over the ten-year period.[8] The exceptions here are the proportions of Whites and, echoing the 114-unit AC list, people with Bachelor's Degrees and Higher, and average Household Incomes. For Whites, we find a larger than five percentage point gap between the groups through time. Both the treatment and control groups' White proportions decrease from Minus 5 to Plus 5, but the control group lost the proportion of Whites at greater rate, resulting in an eight-point gap by the Plus 5 year. The control group starts with a lower Bachelor's Degree and Higher percentage, a gap widening even more between Move-In and Plus 5. Finally, though the control group's Household Income, which starts at approximately $4,000 fewer dollars per years, increases between Minus 5 and Move-In, it

[8] NB: The population density measurement provides no insights. For one, we lacked land area measurements necessary to calculate the control group's population density. For another, as the control groups comprise full census tracts, they invariably have larger populations than the treatment groups' quarter-mile catchments.

decreases again by Plus 5. Meanwhile, the treatment group experiences a steady upward trend over the ten year time period.

Table 7 Here

Accepting that looking at the group as a whole likely obscures nuances within overall change, we decided to dissect the 112-unit Artists' Center dataset into parts for analysis. To that end, we created summary statistics tables for the following variables commonly used in gentrification analyses: White populations (since they have the strongest correlation with neighborhood change), educational attainment, unemployment, household income, and owner occupancy. We looked at all variables at the Minus 5, Move-In, and Plus 5 time periods, and in relation to the following conditions: length of tenure at a particular location, age, organizational mission, town type, and media type. In addition, we performed analyses of variance (ANOVA)[9] to determine what, if any, variables[10] within those conditions register statistically significant changes over time.

Tenure: Research Question 3 asks, "What relationship can we find between an MAO's tenure at a particular location and the surrounding community?" Based on our findings, the relationships are limited. Tables 8.1 through 8.5 show summary statistics for MAO tenures in the three time periods. All variables show change in some direction, but only the White populations and educational attainment exhibit any statistically significant differences. Per Table 8.1.1, there is a significantly different White population between the Move-In and Plus 5 years ($f(2,109)=5.63$, $p<.005$), which a Bonferroni post-hoc test narrows to the Long- and Short-tenured MAOs, specifically ($f(2,109)=174.83$, $p<.005$). Results from the same table also tell us there are statistically significant different rates of White population change between the Long and Short tenure, as well as Medium and Short tenure MAOs in all comparison timeframes, Minus 5 to Move-In, Move-In to Plus 5, and Minus 5 to Plus 5.

Table 8.1 Here

[9] We used Stata for the ANOVA and all other statistical analyses in this report.

[10] We also created ANOVA tables for population density, but do not include them or their summary statistics tables because they were consistently insignificant.

Table 8.1.1. Here

Table 8.2 Here

Table 8.2.1 Here

Tenure also relates to educational attainment (see Table 8.2.1). In the rates of change for both Some College and Bachelor's Degree and Higher, we see significant differences in all three timeframes and for nearly all tenure comparisons. In Some College's population terms, only the difference between Medium and Short tenure MAOs is significant in the Minus 5 to Move-In ($f(2,109)=23.03$, $p<.05$) and Minus 5 to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=48.84$, $p<.05$) time periods. Interestingly, there are no significant population changes in Bachelor's Degree and Higher, though rates of change are significant throughout all timeframes. Like Some College, the post-hoc test places significance at the Minus 5 to Move-In and Minus 5 to Plus 5 time periods, and only for the differences between Long and Short ($f(2,109)=0.026$, $p<.05$, Minus 5 to Move-In; $f(2,109)=0.030$, $p<.005$, Minus 5 to Plus 5) and Medium and Short ($f(2,109)=0.045$, $p<.05$, Minus 5 to Move-In; $f(2,109)=0.047$, $p<.005$, Minus 5 to Plus 5).

Table 8.3. Here

Tables 8.4. Here

Table 8.4.1 Here

Table 8.5 Here

Finally, we find average household incomes are statistically different only in the Minus 5 to Move-In timeframe, and between the Medium and Short tenure MAOs ($f(2,109)=-6.288.96$, $p<.05$; see Table 8.4.1). In this case, the Medium tenure organizations observe the greatest increase in household income. Taking this with our previous findings regarding changes in White populations and educational attainment, we might assume that Artists Centers (re)locating in the last few years have moved into already "improving" neighborhoods, rather than influencing those changes.

Age: Looking beyond tenure and into organizational age, we again found statistically significant differences for White population change and educational attainment. Per Table 9.1.1, Middle-aged and New MAOs have significantly different White population rate changes in the Move-In to Plus 5

($f(2,109)=0.031$, $p<.05$) and Minus 5 to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.049$, $p<.05$) timeframes. Per Table 9.1, Middle-aged MAOs observe a four percent decrease in their White populations, whereas the New MAOs exhibit a very small one percent increase over the ten-year period.

Table 9.1 Here

Table 9.1.1. Here

Table 9.2 Here

Table 9.2.1 Here

Differences in educational attainment are more spread out. Per Table 9.2, percentages of people getting Some College and Bachelor's Degree and Higher increase consistently over ten years. ANOVA analysis (see Table 9.2.1) shows the significant differences in advanced education exist between mostly between the Mature and other MAO ages. For example, where Mature MAOs show a relatively flat increase for Some College over the ten years, New MAOs jump nearly five percentage points ($f(2,109)=0.041$, $p<.005$). Meanwhile, Mature MAOs' Bachelor's Degree and Higher proportions rise significantly faster than Middle-aged MAOs' ($f(2,109)=-0.046$, $p<.01$) in the same time period. That the majority of these shifts occur over the ten-year period, rather than between the Move-In to Plus 5 period, suggests these neighborhood changes were underway, and that MAO age has little direct relation to those demographic shifts.

Table 9.3 Here

Table 9.4 Here

Table 9.5 Here

Organizational Mission: The summary statistics for organizational mission (see Tables 10.1 through 10.5) indicate that Community Building MAOs are less embedded in neighborhoods at risk of displacement then they are ensconced in already White (see Table 10.1), educated (see Table 10.2), and wealthy communities (see Table 10.4) with high owner occupancy (see Table 10.5). Statistically, any differences exist at the now-familiar educational attainment level, as well as owner occupancy. As a whole, the increase of populations with Bachelor's Degree and Higher is significant by organizational

mission in all timeframes: Minus 5 and Move-In ($f(2,109)=6.23$, $p<.005$), Move-In and Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=5.08$, $p<.01$), and Minus 5 and Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=5.69$, $p<.005$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test establishes these differences are consistent between Art and Community Building MAOs, such as the time period between Minus 5 and Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=-299.63$, $p<.005$). In addition, the significance for *rate* of change in educational attainment between the two organizational mission types is highest between the Minus 5 and Plus 5 years ($f(2,109)=-0.60$, $p<.005$). Overall, while all organizational missions observe upward trends in educational attainment, Art MAOs exhibit the sharpest incline, but evenly over the ten years. Therefore, we might infer Art MAOs *do* cater to better-educated populations, but we cannot assume those MAOs directly impact that aspect of neighborhood change.

Table 10.1 Here

Table 10.2 Here

Table 10.2.1 Here

Results also tell us that some population changes in Owner Occupancy are statistically significant by organizational mission. However, relationships here share fewer consistencies than in educational attainment. That is, while the Move-In to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.032$, $p<.05$) and Minus 5 to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.048$, $p<.05$) time periods have generally significant population shifts, post-hoc tests demonstrate the only significant difference exists between Art and Community Building organizations from Move-In to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=-62.24$, $p<.05$). Per Table 10.5, Owner Occupancy among Art MAOs both trails the Community Building organizations, as well as suffers a percentage point loss while the latter group continues its incremental climb upward. From this, we might infer this reflects the Art and Community Building organizations' urban and suburban (thus, probable home-owning) tendencies, respectively.

Table 10.3 Here

Table 10.4 Here

Table 10.5 Here

Table 10.5.1 Here

Town Type: Results tell us highly educated (Bachelor's Degree and Higher) populations in all time periods, Minus 5 to Move-In ($f(2,109)=0.0094$, $p<.01$), Move-In to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.0051$, $p<.01$), and Minus 5 to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.0064$, $p<.01$), are significantly different by town type. In addition, rates of change are statistically significant by town type in the Move-In to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.0161$, $p<.05$) and Minus 5 to Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=0.0153$, $p<.05$) timeframes. Bonferroni post-hoc tests show these differences are most likely to occur between the MSAs and CBSAs. For example, changes in population between Minus 5 and Plus 5 ($f(2,109)=202.7$, $p<.05$) *and* rates of change ($f(2,109)=0.045$, $p<.05$) are significantly different between the MSA and CBSA town types. Considering the strong link between the Art and Community Building organizational missions and MSA and CBSA town types, respectively, these findings possibly restate the aforementioned connection between Art MAOs and their localities, as well as hint at an overarching urban renaissance where NAMAC's MSA-based Artists Centers become better educated, faster, than the other town types' ACs.

Table 11.1 Here

Table 11.2 Here

Table 11.2.1 Here

Table 11.3 Here

Table 11.4 Here

Table 11.5 Here

Type of Media: Finally, we analyzed type of media's relation and again found statistically significant differences in the White and Bachelor's Degree and Higher-attaining populations. For the former, only between the TV and Film & Video media types do we observe any significant changes, and primarily in rate of population change. For example, the rate of change between the exclusively Community Building (i.e. TV) and equally Art and Art Community Building-based (i.e. Film & Video) MAOs is significant within the Move-In to Plus 5 timeframe ($f(2,109)=0.040$, $p<.01$). In this case, we might construe the White population decrease in TV (i.e. Community Building) MAOs as typical of contemporary demographic shifts, and that the negligible change of the Film & Video MAOs intimates (assuming any

change exists) MAOs move into communities post-neighborhood change.

Table 12.1 Here

Table 12.1.1 Here

Table 12.2 Here

Table 12.2.1 Here

Table 12.3 Here

Table 12.4 Here

Table 12.5 Here

Difference-In-Difference Analysis

Not surprisingly, our difference-in-difference analyses showed no statistically significant variations between the treatment and control groups. Even looking at changes in White and Bachelor's Degree and Higher-attaining populations, where we observed regular variation in the ANOVA analyses, we still find no significant relationships between the Move-In and Plus 5 time period (see Table 13). Therefore, based on these data, we cannot claim any causal relationship between media arts organizations and neighborhood change.

Table 13 Here

Comparing the Respondent and Nonrespondent Lists

Lastly, we wanted to know whether to what extent the Respondent and Nonrespondent groups were different. For this, we looked at organizational mission, age of MAO, ethnicity, educational attainment, unemployment, vacancy, owner occupancy, and mode of transit to work (specifically, car, truck, and van usage against public transportation ridership). We found significant differences only in two areas. First, using a chi-square test, we discovered there are significantly more Community Building MAOs in the Nonrespondent group (see Table 14). While we did not track frequency, there did appear to be an even larger proportion of cable access channels (perhaps PEG-initiated) in the Nonrespondent group than in the

Respondent group, which might explain the difference. Second, we learned the Respondent group's mean of Some High School was significantly higher than the Nonrespondent group's mean (see Table 15). We propose this reflects the larger proportion of Community Building organizations within the Nonrespondent group. Per Table 10.2, Community Building MAOs consistently have the lowest proportion of Some High School of all organizational missions.

Table 14 Here

Table 15 Here

Otherwise, there are no statistically meaningful differences between the two groups. In fact, in addition to having similar enough social characteristics, the Respondent and Nonrespondent MAOs also share like average ages (see Table 16).

Table 16 Here

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The primary goal of this research project was to discover what connection(s) we might find between the presence of a media arts organization and its local community. Simply, we find the null hypothesis is true, and so we cannot say MAOs either contribute to or directly cause neighborhood change. We also sought to establish an organizational mission typology and test how the consequent missions intersected with various dimensions covered within the NAMAC Mapping the Field survey, as well as census-based social characteristics. It is from this portion of the research that we culled slightly unexpected results we perceive as useful for the framing and formation of both future research projects and arts-based policies.

In this project, we addressed two gaps: one based in methodology and the other based in institutional agenda. For the former, we confirmed using tenure / move-in information and corresponding census information was an essential step toward capturing precise effect measurement, as opposed to some researches that use census years convenient for analysis. As we saw in some of the ANOVA analyses' Minus 5 to Plus 5 changes, such projects finding positive relationships between art organization and

neighborhood change conceivably reveal fewer truths about the cause of neighborhood change than they do the effects of the nationwide urban renaissance. The rare statistically significant relationship in our ten-year timeframes signals MAOs are neither neighborhood changers, nor even canaries in the coalmine. What if MAOs are latecomers and/or rote instruments for urban development, the sorts of institutions that punctuate local urban renaissance efforts, rather than driving them?

As Hwang and Sampson (2014) explain in their vital mixed-methods gentrification study, "Divergent Pathways of Gentrification: Racial Inequality and the Social Order of Renewal in Chicago Neighborhoods," researchers' varied neighborhood change results likely derive from still imperfect methodologies. On the one hand, they write, single neighborhood analyses impart rich, multi-dimensional qualitative stories about the effects on those certain locations, but cannot reasonably generalize. On the other hand, large dataset researches relying on census and administrative information, "cannot distinguish gentrification from other forms of neighborhood change and typically do not capture important qualitative or visible aspects of reinvestment, neighborhood upgrading, and hence renewal" (*ibid*, 6). For this report, the latter methodological misgiving is well taken. That is, while it seems unlikely the *same* resident groups in the MAO AC communities became that much better educated in the space of a decade, we cannot say for sure without residential tenure information, something unavailable at the census tract level.

Not only do we lack residential tenure for the studied Artists Center neighborhoods, we have insufficient information about other factors Hwang and Sampson identify as external to changing communities, yet deeply implicated in their transformations. Namely, proximity to job opportunities in growing institutions, the presence of public physical amenities such as transit and parks, and the degree of state investment, direct or indirect. Unsurprisingly, qualitative analysis can capture all three external dimensions. Perhaps more surprising is how these topics jump out in the most initial web- and interview-based research, and what they reveal about how and why MAOs move within their home cities. Eyebeam, for example, moved to an already gallery-rich Chelsea, New York City in 2001 (Cascone 2013), supporting Hwang and Sampson's nod to job opportunities and public amenities, as well as Molotch and Treskon's (2009) view that organizations do seek out, even endure rising rents in, "sticky"

neighborhoods. And in late 2013, it announced plans to relocate to the Brooklyn Academy of Music cultural district as a ground-floor anchor cultural institution in a new, upscale condominium development. This and several other adjacent long-term projects are direct beneficiaries of the City's 2000 determination and subsequent municipally supported campaign to transform downtown Brooklyn into a cultural destination (Cascone 2013).

We found institutional investment's effects at all scales. The Austin Film Society, spearheaded by director Richard Linklater, has benefited from major state support twice — first in 2000 to create 100,000 square foot of production space, and again in 2012, via a Creative Placemaking bond package to support the conversation of the city's erstwhile National Guard Building into a "Creative Media Hub that consolidates many of the small business tenant and AFS office spaces under one roof" (Austin Film Society, 2012). Buffalo's Squeaky Wheel microcinema, a tool and eventual victim of the city's first round of creative peacemaking initiatives (interview, 2012) has relocated a block away to be one developer's ground floor tenants / amenities in a building dedicated to similar organizations. Per the local developer, "Squeaky Wheel moving in was a slam dunk on our part. It met our mission and fits the theme of the building that houses other non-profits and creative businesses" (Dabkowski, 2014). Critically, the media arts organizations here are not neighborhood changers, *per se*, but reinforcing instruments in urban development initiatives already underway. These examples underscore Hwang and Sampson's point. Yes, researchers should widen their analytical scope and include even more exogenous variables to better appreciate how MAOs interrelate with their neighborhoods.

Our research finds the *endogenous* variable, organizational mission, also matters significantly. For research purposes, we can construe organizational mission to be at least correlated – and sometimes a proxy – for other variables. And for policymaking purposes, we see that even within the apparently niche category, "nonprofit media arts organization," we find considerable variation largely contingent on organizational mission/institutional agenda. While Art and Art Community Building MAOs are both more urban and likely to engage in *avant-garde* media practices, they differ in important respects. Art organizations locate in ruralities, in areas with higher wealth and lower unemployment, and seek out

marginalized communities more often than Art Community Building MAOs. We do not know the motivation for the Art organizations' outreach to marginalized communities, but we see Art Community Building organizations tend to skip outreach altogether. This prompts the question whether they have any more non-artist interest for settling in a given neighborhood than the explicitly non-geographically bound Art MAOs, and to what extent creative placemaking initiatives supporting these organizations can assume non-mandated community outreach.

Our Community Building findings suggest yet another level for analysis. In our hypotheses, we anticipated this group would represent and serve underserved communities. Instead we find this group tends to be the most secure, comprising well educated, homeowning suburbanites. So perhaps Community Building MAOs *do* seek to empower local communities via the power of the media, artist status notwithstanding, their efforts are less on behalf of at-risk populations than their largely suburban, White, upper-middle class constituencies. But of course this group's apparent stability might shift significantly were we to extract out the Television MAOs. If, as we suspect, the category constitutes suburban, politically empowered groups able to enact the socially weak Cable Communications Act of 1984 policy, we recognize how an MAO's *initiating agency* colors its day-to-day operations as much as by its organizational mission.

We speculate we would find even more relevant variation among the three organizational missions after parsing out exactly what or who founded the organization. Did the MAO emerge from legislated support? Or was it the project of independent actors? Was it a state- or developer-supported urban development effort (or a combination of both as we see in the Austin, New York, and Buffalo examples)? Just as comprehending organizational mission helps us predict how an MAO will interrelate with its surrounding neighborhood, so might closer inspection of its initiating agency's institutional configurations and motivations. All of this advises we need to think more critically about what arts organizations are when we research them. Beyond their particular art forms and industrial sectors, arts organizations constitute operating organizational missions, possibly prefigured by their founding

initiators' institutional agendas. Further research, therefore, is needed to explore these endogenous factors to create specific policies appropriate for the deeply variegated art world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to the National Alliance for Media Arts and Culture (NAMAC) for sharing its 2010 Mapping the Field Arts Field survey data. In particular, we extend grateful thanks to NAMAC's former Executive Director Jack Walsh for his great stewardship and support in the shaping of this research project. In addition, we wish to recognize Sarah Mawhorter, Zhi Li, and Jihye Lee for their excellent research assistance.

REFERENCES

Apostol, Ileana, Panayotis Antoniadis, and Tridib Banerjee. "*Flânerie* Between Net And Place: Promises And Possibilities For Participation In Planning." *Journal Of Planning Education And Research 33*, 2012. 20-33.

Aurora Picture Show. "Welcome to Aurora Picture Show." *Aurora Picture Show*. Retrieved from http://aurorapictureshow.org/pages/about_aurora_picture_show_86.asp, 2015.

Austin Film Society. "Austin Studios Expansion." *Austin Film Society*. Retrieved from http://www.austinfilm.org/austin-studios/as-expansion, 2012.

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory 71*, 1989. 14-25.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature.* Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Buckingham, David. *The Making of Citizens: Young People, News and Politics*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Cascone, Sarah. “Eyebeam Decamps from Chelsea to Brooklyn.” *Art in America*. 9 October 2013. Retrieved from http://www.artinamericamagazine.com/news-features/news/eyebeam-decamps-from-chelsea-to-brooklyn/, 2013.

Castells, Manuel. *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban-Regional Process*. Oxford and New York: Blackwell Publishers, 1989. Print.

Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, Volume I.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Castells, Manuel. *The Power of Identity: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, Volume II.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.

Castells, Manuel. *End of Millennium: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, Volume III.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.

Castells, Manuel. *Communication Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Chapple, Karen and Shannon Jackson. “Commentary: Arts, Neighborhoods, and Social Practices: Towards and Integrated Epistemology of Community Arts.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research 29*, 2010. 478-490.

CMC. “About the CMC.” *Community Media Center: Building Community through Media*. Retrieved from http://www.grcmc.org/about/about.php, 2015.

Currid, Elizabeth. “Bohemia as Subculture; ‘Bohemia’ as Industry.” *Journal of Planning Literature 23*, 2009. 368-382.

Dabkowski, Colin. “Squeaky Wheel Leaves Behind Speakeasy Vibe in Move to Market Arcade.” 29 November 2014. *Buffalo News*. Retrieved from http://www.buffalonews.com/gusto/art/squeaky-wheel-leaves-behind-speakeasy-vibe-in-move-to-market-arcade-20141129, 2014.

Deutsche, Rosalyn. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998.

Deutsche, Rosalyn and Cara Gendel Ryan. “The Fine Art of Gentrification.” *October*, Winter, 1984. 91-111.

Dourish, Paul and Genevieve Bell. "The Infrastructure of Experience and the Experience of Infrastructure: Meaning and Structure in Everyday Encounters with Space." *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design 34*, 2007. 414-430.

Eyebeam. "About" *Eyebeam.* Retrieved from http://eyebeam.org/about, n.d.

Facets. "Facets Mission." *Facets*. Retrieved from http://www.facets.org/mission.php, 2015.

Freeman, Lance. "Displacement or Succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods." *Urban Affairs Review 40*, 2005. 463-491.

Friedland, Roger and Robert R. Alford. "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions." *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Eds. Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Galperin, Hernan. *New Television, Old Politics: The Transition to Digital Television in Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Geller, Henry, Alan Ciamporcero, and Donna Lampert. "The Cable Franchise Fee and the First Amendment." *Federal Communications Law Journal 39*(12), 1987. 1-26.

Graham, Steve and Simon Marvin. *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Grau, Oliver, Ed. *MediaArtHistories*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2007.

Grodach, Carl. "Art Spaces in Community and Economic Development: Connections to Neighborhoods, Artists, and the Cultural Economy." *Journal of Education and Planning Research 31*, 2011. 74-85.

Grodach, Carl, Nicole Foster, and James Murdoch III. "Gentrification and the Artistic Dividend: The Role of the Arts in Neighborhood Change." *Journal of the American Planning Association 80*, 2014. 21-35.

Helguera, Pablo. *Education of Socially Engaged Art: A Materials and Techniques Handbook*. New York: Jorge Pinto Books, Inc., 2011.

Hwang, Jackelyn and Robert J. Sampson. “Divergent Pathways of Gentrification: Racial Inequality and the Social Order of Renewal in Chicago Neighborhoods.” *American Sociological Review 79*, 2014. 1-26.

Florida, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life.* New York: Basic Books, 2002.

Jack Straw Cultural Center. “About Jack Straw Cultural Center.” *Jack Straw Cultural Center*. Retrieved from http://www.jackstraw.org/main/about/index.shtml, 2014.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.

Jenkins, Henry, Ravi Purushotma, Margaret Weigel, Katie Clinton, and Alice J. Robison. *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2009.

Jepperson, Ronald L. “Institutions, Institutional Effects, and Institutionalism.” *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Eds. Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Lacy, Suzanne. “Introduction: Cultural Pilgrimages and Metaphoric Journeys.” *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre in Public Art*. Ed. Suzanne Lacy. Seattle: Bay Press, 1994. 19-30.

Ley, David. “Alternative Explanations for Inner-City Gentrification: A Canadian Assessment.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers 76*, 1986. 521-535.

Ley, David. “Artists, Aestheticisation and the Field of Gentrification.” *Urban Studies 40*, 2003. 2527-2544.

Lloyd, Richard. *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City.* Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2005.

Lovejoy, Margo, Christiane Paul, and Victoria Vesna, Eds.*Context Providers: Conditions of Meaning in Media Arts*. Bristol and Chicago: intellect, 2011.

Mandarano, Lynn, Mahbubur Meenar, and Christopher Steins. "Building Social Capital in the Digital Age of Civic Engagement." *Journal of Planning Literature 25*, 2011. 123-135.

Manovich, Lev. "The Poetics of Augmented Space: The Art of Our Time." *Space Time Play: Computer Games, Architecture and Urbanism: The Next Level.* Eds. Friedrich von Borries, Steffen P. Walz, and Matthias Böttger. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2007. 251-255.

Markusen, Ann. "Urban Development and the Politics of a Creative Class: Evidence from a Study of Artists." *Environment and Planning A 38*(10), 2006. 1921-1940.

Markusen, Ann and Anne Gadwa. "Arts and Culture in Urban or Regional Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research 29*, 2010. 379-391.

Markusen, Ann and Amanda Johnson. *Artists' Centers: Evolution and Impact on Careers, Neighborhoods and Economies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2006.

Markusen, Ann and Greg Schrock. "The Artistic Dividend: Urban Artistic Specialisation and Economic Development Implications." *Urban Studies 43*, 2006. 1661-1686.

Miles, Malcolm. *Art, Space, and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Mitchell, William J. *E-topia.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000.

Molotch, Harvey and Mark Treskon. "Changing Art: SoHo, Chelsea and the Dynamic Geography of Galleries in New York City." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 33*, 2009. 517-541.

Mommaas, Hans. "Cultural Clusters and the Post-Industrial City: Towards the Remapping of Urban Cultural Policy." *Urban Studies 41*, 2004. 507-532.

NAMAC. "What is NAMAC?" *National Alliance for Media Arts and Culture.* Retrieved from http://www.namac.org/what-is-namac, 2009.

NAMAC. "Mapping the Field." Survey, 2010.

PIFVA. "Mission." *Philadelphia Independent Film & Video Association: The Independent Filmmaking Hub of the Philadelphia Region*. Retrieved from http://www.pifva.org/mission, n.d.

Rush, Michael, Ed.*New Media in Art*, 2nd edition. London: Thames of London, 2005.

Sands, Gary and Laura A. Reese. “Fair Weather Friends? The Impact of the Creative Class on the Economic Health of Mid-sized US Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2009.” *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 6*, 2013. 71-91.

Servon, Lisa J. *Bridging the Digital Divide: Technology, Community, and Public Policy.* Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

Smith, Neil. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Stern, Mark J. and Susan C. Seifert. “Cultural Clusters: The Implications of Cultural Assets Agglomeration for Neighborhood Revitalization.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research 29*, 2010. 262-279.

Street-Level Youth Media. “Our Mission.” *Street-Level Youth Media*. Retrieved from http://www.street-level.org/missionandimpact/, 2014.

SWAMP. “About. Mission.” *SWAMP*. Retrieved from http://www.swamp.org/about/mission/, 2014.

Thornton, Sarah. *Seven Days in the Art World*. London: Granta Publications, 2009.

Tribe, Mark, Reena Jana, and Uta Grosenick, Eds. *New Media Art*. Cologne: TASCHEN GmbH, 2006.

Waycross. “Community Building Mission of the Community Programming Board.” *Waycross: Building Community through Communications*. Retrieved from http://www.waycross.tv/Mission_Statement.html, 2015.

Webster, Frank. *Theories of the Information Society*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Wherry, Frederick F. *The Philadelphia Barrio: The Arts, Branding, and Neighborhood Transformation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Zukin, Sharon. *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

Zukin, Sharon. *The Cultures of Cities*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

Zukin, Sharon. *The Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Spaces*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

APPENDIX

Table 1. NAMAC "Mapping the Field" Organizational Indicators[1]

Variable	Details	
Year established	Numeric	
Number of years at current location	Numeric	
Type of Media	Television Radio Film Video Sound/Audio	Multimedia Web Digital Arts Gaming New Media Other
Audience age emphasis	3-12 13-17 18-29	30-45 Over 65 No specific age
Audience race/ethnicity emphasis	Asian American/Pacific Islander Black/African American Latino/Hispanic Native American	Multi-cultural groups No specific racial or ethnic emphasis Other (please specify)
Rural/urban emphasis	Rural emphasis Urban emphasis	Suburban emphasis No specific rural or urban emphasis
Scope of area targeted	Neighborhood City/town County Multi-city State	Multi-state National International No specific area emphasis
Targeted marginalized groups	Women Low income People with disabilities Immigrant populations	LGBT No other targeted groups or emphases Other (please specify)

[1] Organizations were asked to select all that apply in multiple-choice questions.

Table 2. Census Variables: Social and Spatial Indicators of Neighborhood Change:MAO AC List1

Variable	Description
Population Density	Number of people per square mile[2]
Average Household Income	Average household income
Bachelor's degree or higher	Percentage of residents with bachelor's or higher degrees
Unemployment	Percentage of residents not working in civilian labor force
Black/African American	Percentage of Black/African American residents
Latino	Percentage of Latino residents
White	Percentage of White residents
American Indian / AK Native	Percentage of Native American, Alaskan Native residents
Asian	Percentage of all Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pac. Islander residents
Other / Multiracial	Percentage of Multiracial and "Other"-identified residents
Occupancy	Percentage of occupied housing units
Drive to work	Percentage of civilian labor force driving to work
Walk to work	Percentage of civilian labor force walking to work

[1] Sources: U.S. Census Years, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, and the 2008-2012 American Community Survey.
[2] Population densities only for the 114-unit Artists Center group members.

Table 3. NAMAC "Mapping the Field" Organizational Indicators, Collapsed for Analysis

Variable	Details	
Age	New (15 years and younger) Middle-aged (16 to 30 years) Mature (31 to 47 years)	
Tenure	Short (10 years and under) Medium (11 to 22 years) Long (23 to 34 years)	
Type of Media	TV Radio and sound audio Film and video Multimedia Digital and new media	
Audience age emphasis	Youth and young adult Adult and senior Youth and senior No age focus	
Audience race/ethnicity emphasis	Asian American/Pacific Islander Black/African American Latino/Hispanic Black and Latino	Multicultural groups No specific racial or ethnic emphasis
Rural/urban emphasis	Rural Urban	Suburban Urban / Suburban No targeted audience location
Scope of area targeted	Neighborhood City to county Regional: multicity to multistate	National to international No specific area emphasis
Targeted marginalized groups[1]	Yes	No

[1] Marginalized groups include: women, low-income individuals, people with disabilities, immigrants, and LGBT populations.

Table 4. Univariate Descriptive Statistics – "Mapping the Field" Survey: MAO ACs (N= 114)

	%/Mean(SD)	Range
Age of MAO	24.5 (10.6)	4, 51
Tenure	15.5(8.1)	3, 37
Population in 2010	948,628.3 (2115514)	1351, 8175133
	Frequency(n)	**Proportion(%)**
Age	Missing – 0	0.0
New	26	22.8
Middle-aged	60	52.6
Mature	28	24.6
Tenure	Missing – 0	0.0
Short	40	35.1
Medium	53	46.5
Long	21	18.4
Type of Town	Missing – 0	0.0
MSA	74	64.9
CBSA	22	19.3
Rurality	18	15.8
Organizational Mission	Missing – 0	0.0
Art	16	14.0
Art Community Building	24	21.1
Community Building	74	64.9
Type of Media	Missing – 0	0.0
Television	53	46.5
Radio and Sound Audio	8	7.0
Film and Video	33	29.0
Multimedia	13	11.4
Digital and new media	7	6.1
Age of Audience	Missing – 0	0.0
Youth and Young adult	14	12.3
Adult and Senior	5	4.4.
Youth and Senior	3	2.6
No age focus	92	80.7

Table 4. Univariate Descriptive Statistics – "Mapping the Field" Survey: MAO ACs (cont.)

	Frequency(n)	Proportion(%)
Race of Audience	Missing – 0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	2.6
Black/African American	3	2.6
Latino	4	3.5
Black and Latino	2	1.8
Multicultural groups	27	23.7
No race/ethnicity focus	75	65.8
Location of Audience	Missing – 0	0.0
Rural	10	8.8
Urban	32	28.1
Suburban	9	7.9
Urban and Suburban	5	4.4
No Targeted Audience Location	58	50.9
Scope of Area Targeted	Missing – 0	0.0
Neighborhood	11	9.7
City to County	42	36.8
Regional: Multicity to Multistate	18	15.8
National to International	1	0.9
No Area Emphasis	42	36.8
Targeted Marginalized Groups[1]	Missing – 0	0.0
Yes	50	43.9
No	64	56.1

[1] Marginalized groups include: women, low-income individuals, people with disabilities, immigrants, and LGBT populations.

Table 5. Summary Statistics – Mapping the Field Survey Answers by Organizational Mission (N=114)

Org. Mission	Type of Town				Age of Targeted Audience				
	MSA	CBSA	Rurality	Total	Young/ Young Adult	Adult/ Senior	Youth/ Senior	No age target	Total
Art	15	0	1	16	2	2	0	12	16
	93.8%	*0.0%*	*6.3%*	*100%*	*12.5%*	*12.5%*	*0.0%*	*75.0%*	*100%*
Art Community Building	20	1	3	24	4	1	1	18	24
	83.3%	*4.2%*	*12.5%*	*100%*	*16.7%*	*4.2%*	*4.2%*	*75.0%*	*100%*
Community Building	39	21	14	74	8	2	2	62	74
	52.7%	*28.4%*	*18.9%*	*100%*	*10.8%*	*2.7%*	*2.7%*	*83.8%*	*100%*
Total	74	22	18	114	14	5	3	92	114
	64.9%	*19.3%*	*15.8%*	*100%*	*12.28%*	*4.4%*	*2.6%*	*80.7%*	*100%*

Org. Mission	Type of Media						Targeted Marginalized Groups		
	TV	Radio/Sound Audio	Film/ Video	Multi-media	Digital/ New Media	Total	Yes	No	Total
Art	0	0	9	3	4	16	10	6	16
	0.0%	*0.0%*	*56.3%*	*18.8%*	*25.0%*	*100%*	*62.5%*	*37.5%*	*100%*
Art Community Building	0	3	13	6	2	24	6	18	24
	0.0%	*12.5%*	*54.2%*	*25.0%*	*8.3%*	*100%*	*25.0%*	*75.0%*	*100%*
Community Building	52	6	11	4	1	74	48	26	74
	70.3%	*8.1%*	*14.9%*	*5.4%*	*1.4%*	*100%*	*64.9%*	*35.1%*	*100%*
Total	52	9	33	13	7	114	64	50	114
	46.0%	*7.9%*	*29.0%*	*11.4%*	*6.1%*	*100%*	*56.1%*	*43.9%*	*100%*

Table 5. Summary Statistics – Mapping the Field Survey Answers by Organizational Mission (cont.)

	Race of Audience						
Org. Mission	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black/ African American	Latino	Black and Latino	Multiple Ethnicities	No Race/ Ethnicity Target	Total
Art	1	0	1	0	5	9	16
	6.3%	*0.0%*	*6.3%*	*0.0%*	*31.3%*	*56.3%*	*100%*
Art Community Building	1	1	0	2	7	13	24
	4.2%	*4.2%*	*0.0%*	*8.3%*	*29.2%*	*54.2%*	*100%*
Community Building	1	2	3	0	15	53	74
	1.4%	*2.7%*	*4.1%*	*0.0%*	*20.3%*	*71.6%*	*100%*
Total	3	3	4	2	27	75	114
	2.6%	*2.6%*	*3.5%*	*1.8%*	*23.7%*	*65.8%*	*100%*

	Location of Audience						Scope of Area					
Org. Mission	Rural	Urban	Sub-urban	Urban/ Suburban	No Audience Location	Total	Neigh-borhood	City/ County	Regional	National to Inter-national	No Scope	Total
Art	1	5	0	3	7	16	1	1	2	1	11	16
	6.3%	*31.3%*	*0.0%*	*18.8%*	*43.8%*	*100%*	*6.3%*	*6.3%*	*12.5%*	*6.3%*	*68.8%*	*100%*
Art Community Building	1	13	0	2	8	24	2	8	7	0	7	24
	4.2%	*54.2%*	*0.0%*	*8.3%*	*33.3%*	*100%*	*8.3%*	*33.3%*	*29.2%*	*0.0%*	*29.2%*	*100%*
Community Building	8	14	9	0	43	74	8	33	9	0	24	74
	10.8%	*18.9%*	*12.2%*	*0.0%*	*58.11%*	*100%*	*10.8%*	*44.6%*	*12.2%*	*0.0%*	*32.4%*	*100%*
Total	10	32	9	5	58	114	11	42	18	1	42	114
	8.8%	*28.1%*	*7.9%*	*4.4%*	*50.9%*	*100%*	*9.7%*	*36.8%*	*15.8%*	*0.9%*	*36.8%*	*100%*

Table 6. Univariate Descriptive Statistics – MAO Artists' Center Group (N= 112)[1]

	Mean(SD)		
	Minus 5	**Move-In**	**Plus 5**
Total Population			
Total population	1673.5(2505.3)	1691.0(2533.2)	1711.1(2571.6)
Population Density	33.3(49.9)	33.7(50.4)	34.1(51.2)
Age Group Population			
15-17	223.9(396.0)	205.4(351.1)	181.7(281.9)
15-17% of Total	*14.0%*	*13.2%*	*12.4%*
18-24	364.7(500.9)	248.8(390.7)	259.8(429.3)
18-24 % of Total	*15.9%*	*14.0%*	*14.1%*
25-64	919.9(1521.5)	962.1(1605.3)	1004.7(1684.6)
25-64 % of Total	*54.3%*	*55.6%*	*56.7%*
65+	190.6(274.9)	185.5(271.0)	181.5(269.9)
65+ % of Total	*13.3%*	*13.1%*	*12.8%*
Race Group Population			
Black	263.9(612.1)	242.8(537.5)	222.3(458.3)
Black % of Total	*11.0%*	*10.4%*	*9.7%*
Latino	399.0(1151.4)	388.7(1046.7)	361.8(884.8)
Latino % of Total	*9.0%*	*9.7%*	*10.3%*
White	1072.6(1655.7)	1114.2(1716.7)	1135.7(1794.4)
White % of Total	*68.1%*	*66.5%*	*65.5%*
American Indian/AK Native	12.3(22.3)	13.3(20.7)	13.0(18.9)
American Indian/AK % of Total	*0.9%*	*0.8%*	*0.8%*
Asian	110.7(256.1)	136.8(313.8)	164.0(368.1)
Asian % of Total	*5.5%*	*6.2%*	*7.0%*
Other/Multiracial	239.1(751.2)	231.7(632.5)	205.3(456.3)
Other/Multiracial % of Total	*5.5%*	*6.3%*	*6.8%*

Table 6. Univariate Descriptive Statistics – MAO Artists' Center Group (cont.)[1]

	Mean(SD)		
	Minus 5	**Move-In**	**Plus 5**
Education Attainment			
Some High School	158.4(255.4)	152.3(257.0)	153.8(287.8)
Some HS % of Total	*13.1%*	*12.3%*	*11.9%*
High School Diploma	226.9(305.6)	216.8(289.5)	209.0(280.3)
HS Diploma % of Total	*24.5%*	*23.0%*	*21.6%*
Some College	169.4(244.9)	185.2(257.8)	205.6(277.9)
Some College % of Total	*18.0%*	*19.4%*	*21.0%*
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	341.0(764.5)	417.7(913.3)	502.4(1061.3)
Bachelor's or Higher % of Total	*28.3%*	*32.7%*	*37.3%*
Employment Status			
Employed	787.2(1280.7)	836.0(1383.8)	893.5(1486.2)
Employed % of Total	*91.8%*	*91.6%*	*91.2%*
Unemployed	79.0(136.1)	81.0(132.2)	84.4(129.2)
Unemployed % of Total	*8.2%*	*8.4%*	*8.8%*
Income (inflated to $2013)			
Average Household Income	$68,721.8	$73,686.6	$76,797.0
Housing			
# of Housing Unit	784.4(1254.9)	822.9(1320.4)	867.1(1386.3)
Occupied	718.2(1170.4)	747.6(1221.6)	778.9(1278.0)
Occupied % of Total	*90.6%*	*89.9%*	*88.9%*
Owner	155.7(161.9)	173.0(201.4)	192.9(239.8)
Owner % of Total	*40.8%*	*40.7%*	*41.1%*
Transportation			
Car	317.9(291.4)	333.3(302.3)	348.8(316.6)
Car % of Total	*61.2%*	*61.0%*	*60.5%*
Transit	249.5(682.9)	264.8(740.3)	287.1(804.5)
Transit % of Total	*12.6%*	*12.4%*	*12.3%*
Walk	168.2(391.8)	178.3(428.5)	184.5(456.1)
Walk % of Total	*13.1%*	*12.5%*	*11.7%*

[1] Owing to their pre-1970 move-in dates, census data was unavailable for two media arts organizations.

Table 7. Univariate Descriptive Statistics – Control Group Census Tracts (N=24)

	Mean(SD)		
	Minus 5	**Move-In**	**Plus 5**
Total Population			
Total population	4349.9(1553.2)	4495.1(1632.7)	4512.6(1750.0)
Age Group Population			
15-17	666.5(397.1)	673.8(406.7)	637.3(397.3)
15-17% of Total	*14.5%*	*14.1%*	*13.2%*
18-24	485.7(230.0)	468.7(221.0)	433.2(219.5)
18-24 % of Total	*11.2%*	*10.7%*	*10.0%*
25-64	2378.8(924.1)	2518.9(1006.9)	2578.0(1089.8)
25-64 % of Total	*55.4%*	*56.8%*	*58.2%*
65+	526.6(275.1)	553.3(307.5)	601.4(369.4)
65+ % of Total	*12.9%*	*12.9%*	*13.3%*
Race Group Population			
Black	449.6(736.7)	469.9(783.9)	454.5(769.1)
Black % of Total	*10.9%*	*10.8%*	*9.9%*
Latino	694.8(1022.7)	794.1(1117.3)	795.8(1032.4)
Latino % of Total	*13.3%*	*15.4%*	*14.9%*
White	3045.8(1996.8)	3003.8(1940.7)	2976.8(1871.2)
White % of Total	*62.0%*	*60.8%*	*57.5%*
American Indian/AK Native	22.5(31.5)	22.9(29.8)	31.6(43.0)
American Indian/AK % of Total	*0.18%*	*0.14%*	*0.23%*
Asian	513.5(1085.1)	526.6(1145.7)	657.2(1336.0)
Asian % of Total	*10.4%*	*10.2%*	*11.2%*
Other/Multiracial	156.8(296.2)	104.3(111.4)	296.4(419.7)
Other/Multiracial % of Total	*2.9%*	*2.5%*	*5.9%*

Table 7. Univariate Descriptive Statistics – Control Group Census Tracts (cont.)

	Mean(SD)		
	Minus 5	**Move-In**	**Plus 5**
Education Attainment			
Some High School	391.1(217.5)	384.3(248.2)	419.6(323.2)
Some HS % of Total	*14.5%*	*13.4%*	*14.2%*
HS Diploma	704.2(335.7)	732.6(371.5)	745.0(432.0)
HS Diploma % of Total	*24.2%*	*23.7%*	*23.1%*
Some College	516.6(263.5)	583.5(284.4)	666.7(368.8)
Some College % of Total	*17.8%*	*19.2%*	*20.8%*
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	758.2(787.2)	876.1(859.8)	1009.0(921.7)
Bachelor's or Higher % of Total	*24.3%*	*27.4%*	*31.2%*
Employment Status			
Employed	2138.8(939.8)	2198.6(979.2)	2197.4(1072.8)
Employed % of Total	*92.1%*	*92.1%*	*92.0%*
Unemployed	167.3(134.2)	189.2(221.4)	204.0(214.0)
Unemployed % of Total	*8.0%*	*8.4%*	*9.3%*
Income			
Average Household Income	$64,310.4	$69,507.7	$67,178.7
Housing			
# of Housing Unit	1891.6(871.3)	1956.1(879.9)	2031.0(900.8)
Occupied	1729.3(819.6)	1783.3(834.0)	1825.9(856.8)
Occupied % of Total	*91.6%*	*91.0%*	*89.4%*
Owner	755.2(501.3)	805.1(516.6)	836.8(540.1)
Owner % of Total	*43.4%*	*44.8%*	*45.3%*
Transportation			
Car	1532.4(878.2)	1559.5(876.7)	1524.2(899.4)
Car % of Total	*60.3%*	*62.0%*	*63.2%*
Transit	293.3(326.5)	308.9(345.2)	327.5(378.2)
Transit % of Total	*13.7%*	*13.9%*	*14.7%*
Walk	200.9(171.7)	194.0(190.8)	165.9(207.1)
Walk % of Total	*10.0%*	*8.7%*	*6.8%*

Table 8.1. Summary Statistics – White Population Changes by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Long (>23 yrs)	2055.3(3058.5)	2091.9(3092.5)	2005.3(3179.7)
	76.4%	73.7%	69.8%
Medium (11-22 yrs)	945.2(1240.8)	962.4(1298.3)	972.4(1352.2)
	69.0%	66.4%	64.8%
Short (<10 yrs)	774.6(921.4)	850.8(1076.2)	939.0(1271.0)
	62.9%	63.1%	64.4%

Table 8.1.1. ANOVA Test – White Population Changes by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In (% Δ)	Move-In to Plus 5 (% Δ)	Minus 5 to Plus 5 (% Δ)
Long vs. Medium	--	96.53(NS)	77.13(NS)	0.00079(NS)	0.023(NS)	0.024(NS)
Long vs. Short	--	174.83***	214.38[a]	0.029*	0.052***	0.081***
Medium vs. Short	--	78.30(NS)	137.25(NS)	0.028***	0.028*	0.057***
F(2,109)	0.94	5.63	3.55	6.26	7.84	8.12
p value	0.39(NS)	0.0047***	0.032*	0.0027***	0.0007***	0.0005***
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005; [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 8.2. Summary Statistics – Educational Attainment by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Some HS Minus 5	Some HS Move-In	Some HS Plus 5	HS Diploma Minus 5	HS Diploma Move-In	HS Diploma Plus 5
Long (>23 yrs)	209.5(302.2)	199.2(291.7)	187.4(275.3)	332.6(453.4)	309.8(412.5)	299.8(404.0)
	14.8%	14.2%	13.1%	24.9%	23.6%	22.2%
Medium (11-22 yrs)	151.1(224.0)	139.6(208.1)	141.4(227.1)	222.0(263.4)	212.0(255.2)	203.7(254.3)
	12.3%	11.4%	11.2%	26.0%	24.5%	23.1%
Short (<10 yrs)	143.7(274.0)	147.0(299.5)	154.4(362.4)	183.2(266.6)	179.1(259.9)	172.8(238.2)
	13.4%	12.7%	12.4%	22.3%	20.8%	19.3%

Tenure of MAO	Some College Minus 5	Some College Move-In	Some College Plus 5	Bachelor's + Minus 5	Bachelor's + Move-In	Bachelor's + Plus 5
Long (>23 yrs)	244.9(433.6)	259.9(447.3)	264.2(429.0)	631.8(1402.8)	746.9(1659.6)	864.2(1898.0)
	15.3%	16.7%	17.3%	24.1%	27.7%	31.6%
Medium (11-22 yrs)	163.2(207.8)	169.3(209.5)	181.8(223.5)	309.7(655.1)	371.0(788.1)	436.3(909.9)
	17.9%	18.4%	19.4%	28.0%	31.2%	35.3%
Short (<10 yrs)	141.9(150.7)	170.9(187.2)	209.4(256.5)	244.3(361.4)	323.3(458.3)	418.2(601.7)
	19.5%	22.1%	24.9%	30.7%	36.9%	42.7%

Table 8.2.1. ANOVA Test – Educational Attainment Changes by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Some High School			Some High School (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Long vs. Medium	--	--	--	--	--	--
Long vs. Short	--	--	--	--	--	--
Medium vs. Short	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	1.95	0.75	1.10	0.25	0.80	0.15
p value	0.15(NS)	0.48(NS)	0.34(NS)	0.78(NS)	0.45(NS)	0.86(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

Tenure of MAO	High School Diploma			High School Diploma (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Long vs. Medium	--	--	--	--	--	--
Long vs. Short	--	--	--	--	--	--
Medium vs. Short	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	1.26	0.11	0.75	0.17	0.04	0.06
p value	0.29(NS)	0.89(NS)	0.47(NS)	0.85(NS)	0.96(NS)	0.94(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Tenure of MAO	**Some College**			**Some College (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Long vs. Medium	-9.01(NS)	8.25(NS)	-0.75(NS)	-0.0095(NS)	0.0048(NS)	-0.0047(NS)
Long vs. Short	14.03(NS)	34.14(NS)	48.19(NS)	0.012(NS)	0.022**	0.033*
Medium vs. Short	23.03*	25.91(NS)	48.94*	0.021***	0.017**	0.038***
F(2,109)	4.38	3.35	3.75	11.63	6.56	10.06
p value	0.015*	0.039*	0.027*	0.00001***	0.0020***	0.0001***
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Tenure of MAO	**Bachelor's +**			**Bachelor's + (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Long vs. Medium	--	--	--	-0.0034(NS)	0.0016(NS)	-0.0018(NS)
Long vs. Short	--	--	--	0.026*	0.019(NS)	0.045*
Medium vs. Short	--	--	--	0.030***	0.017(NS)	0.047***
F(2,109)	0.74	0.73	0.73	9.33	3.17	6.93
p value	0.48(NS)	0.48(NS)	0.48(NS)	0.0002***	0.046*	0.0015***
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 8.3. Summary Statistics – Unemployment by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Long (>23 yrs)	104.9(200.7)	110.5(198.0)	117.5(194.1)
	7.4%	7.8%	8.3%
Medium (11-22 yrs)	78.1(118.7)	75.5(113.5)	75.6(114.8)
	7.7%	7.5%	7.7%
Short (<10 yrs)	67.9(122.0)	74.4(118.1)	80.4(109.0)
	9.2%	9.9%	10.5%

Table 8.4. Summary Statistics – Household Income Changes by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Long (>23 yrs)	$49,499.9(21712.9)	$51,748.9(20954.2)	$57,406.2(20784.9)
Medium (11-22 yrs)	$72,237.5(50290.2)	$80,462.0(55969.5)	$84,075.4(49749.7)
Short (<10 yrs)	$73,193.9(39681.3)	$75,129.4(39599.6)	$76,363.6(41108.9)

Table 8.4.1. ANOVA Test – Average Household Income Changes by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Long vs. Medium	5975.58(NS)	--	--
Long vs. Short	-313.39(NS)	--	--
Medium vs. Short	-6288.96*	--	--
F(2,109)	5.16	1.09	2.72
p value	0.0072**	0.34(NS)	0.071(NS)
n	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 8.5. Summary Statistics – Owner Occupancy by Tenure (N=112)

Tenure of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Long (>23 yrs)	191.4(175.1)	213.2(257.1)	237.8(322.2)
	35.5%	33.5%	32.5%
Medium (11-22 yrs)	152.1(162.7)	166.0(194.1)	181.2(224.1)
	45.3%	45.9%	46.7%
Short (<10 yrs)	143.5(156.2)	163.2(183.6)	186.9(218.2)
	37.4%	37.4%	37.8%

Table 9.1. Summary Statistics – White Population by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Mature (>31 yrs)	1690.0(2105.0)	1710.3(2250.1)	1719.4(2257.7)
	62.5%	61.1%	60.0%
Middle-aged (16-30 yrs)	936.0(1596.0)	972.0(1581.8)	971.4(1661.0)
	71.5%	69.3%	67.4%
New (<15 yrs)	770.4(1092.6)	846.0(1274.5)	931.3(1491.6)
	65.8%	65.4%	66.6%

Table 9.1.1 ANOVA Test – White Population Changes by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In (% Δ)	Move-In to Plus 5 (% Δ)	Minus 5 to Plus 5 (% Δ)
Mature vs. Middle-aged	--	--	--	--	-0.008(NS)	-0.016(NS)
Mature vs. New	--	--	--	--	0.023(NS)	0.033(NS)
Middle-aged vs. New	--	--	--	--	0.031*	0.049*
F(2,109)	0.51	1.80	1.54	1.69	3.39	2.29
p value	0.60(NS)	0.17(NS)	0.22(NS)	0.19(NS)	0.037*	0.055[a]
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005; [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05

Table 9.2. Summary Statistics – Educational Attainment by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	Some HS Minus 5	Some HS Move-In	Some HS Plus 5	HS Diploma Minus 5	HS Diploma Move-In	HS Diploma Plus 5
Mature (>31 yrs)	231.3(211.9) 14.8%	204.3(193.8) 13.2%	187.6(179.0) 12.4%	321.2(283.7) 23.0%	294.5(279.8) 20.9%	273.1(270.4) 18.9%
Middle-aged (16-30 yrs)	134.4(238.1) 12.7%	129.7(224.6) 12.0%	132.5(236.8) 11.9%	206.4(303.3) 26.2%	198.8(277.1) 24.8%	195.0(274.9) 23.7%
New (<15 yrs)	140.8(322.0) 12.5%	152.6(364.3) 12.1%	169.3(448.3) 11.7%	179.9(323.5) 22.0%	180.9(323.1) 20.9%	177.2(302.7) 19.7%
Age of MAO	**Some College Minus 5**	**Some College Move-In**	**Some College Plus 5**	**Bachelor's + Minus 5**	**Bachelor's + Move-In**	**Bachelor's + Plus 5**
Mature (>31 yrs)	252.5(273.4) 16.8%	257.5(272.7) 17.7%	261.4(266.4) 17.9%	551.3(1026.4) 28.8%	664.0(1202.4) 34.7%	798.3(1382.5) 40.7%
Middle-aged (16-30 yrs)	149.8(252.1) 18.4%	165.1(259.8) 19.6%	183.1(259.7) 21.2%	286.7(742.6) 26.5%	353.5(898.3) 30.0%	420.4(1039.2) 33.8%
New (<15 yrs)	131.7(178.4) 18.4%	159.4(233.2) 20.8%	201.8(329.1) 23.6%	255.9(423.1) 31.9%	319.5(520.3) 36.8%	395.7(649.6) 42.0%

Table 9.2.1. ANOVA Test – Educational Attainment Changes by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	**Some High School**			**Some High School (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
Mature vs. Middle-aged	22.26*	--	41.88(NS)	--	--	--
Mature vs. New	38.73***	--	72.21***	--	--	--
Middle-aged vs. New	16.47(NS)	--	30.33(NS)	--	--	--
F(2,109)	7.82	2.41	4.86	2.65	0.62	1.52
p value	0.0007***	0.095(NS)	0.0095***	0.075(NS)	0.54(NS)	0.22(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Age of MAO	**High School Diploma**			**High School Diploma (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
Mature vs. Middle-aged	19.17(NS)	17.56*	36.73*	--	--	--
Mature vs. New	27.74[a]	17.67(NS)	45.41*	--	--	--
Middle-aged vs. New	8.57(NS)	0.11(NS)	8.68(NS)	--	--	--
F(2,109)	3.10	3.80	3.96	1.93	2.12	2.49
p value	0.049*	0.025*	0.022*	0.15(NS)	0.13(NS)	0.088(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Age of MAO	**Some College**			**Some College (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
Mature vs. Middle-aged	--	14.22(NS)	24.53(NS)	0.0038(NS)	0.014(NS)	0.018(NS)
Mature vs. New	--	38.61*	61.28*	0.016*	0.026**	0.041***
Middle-aged vs. New	--	24.39(NS)	36.75(NS)	0.012(NS)	0.012(NS)	0.024(NS)
F(2,109)	2.34	3.16	3.02	3.59	6.43	6.00
p value	0.10(NS)	0.046*	0.053[a]	0.030*	0.0023***	0.0034***
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

Age of MAO	Bachelor's +			Bachelor's + (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Mature vs. Middle-aged	--	--	--	-0.024*	-0.023*	-0.046**
Mature vs. New	--	--	--	-0.0098(NS)	-0.0082(NS)	-0.018(NS)
Middle-aged vs. New	--	--	--	0.014(NS)	0.014(NS)	0.028(NS)
F(2,109)	0.80	1.43	1.10	4.50	4.03	5.17
p value	0.45(NS)	0.24(NS)	0.34(NS)	0.013*	0.021*	0.0071**
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 9.3. Summary Statistics – Unemployment by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Mature (>31 yrs)	114.4(120.2) 9.7%	125.5(139.7) 10.2%	134.0(143.1) 10.8%
Middle-aged (16-30 yrs)	67.5(136.6) 7.7%	66.2(123.2) 7.7%	70.8(124.9) 8.1%
New (<15 yrs)	70.2(148.4) 7.7%	70.8(139.8) 8.2%	66.3(115.8) 8.6%

Table 9.4. Summary Statistics – Household Income Changes by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Mature (>31 yrs)	$54,032.7(20240.1)	$57,813.9(22781.0)	$63,548.0(26980.0)
Middle-aged (16-30 yrs)	$70,246.7(48354.3)	$76,637.2(54135.4)	$78,822.9(48935.4)
New (<15 yrs)	$79,892.1(45912.4)	$82,750.0(44056.6)	$85,370.7(42960.5)

Table 9.5. Summary Statistics – Owner Occupancy by Age (N=112)

Age of MAO	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Mature (>31 yrs)	201.7(188.6)	227.4(270.0)	258.7(339.3)
	29.0%	27.3%	27.2%
Middle-aged (16-30 yrs)	141.6(151.4)	156.1(175.4)	171.3(199.5)
	43.3%	43.7%	44.3%
New (<15 yrs)	141.9(154.5)	157.6(174.7)	176.7(201.1)
	47.1%	47.2%	47.5%

Table 10.1. Summary Statistics – White Population by Organizational Mission (N=112)

Org. Mission	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Art	2479.7(3402.0)	2493.2(3412.0)	2542.0(3471.3)
	66.1%	65.9%	65.7%
Art Community Building	1243.9(1095.9)	1286.8(1260.6)	1358.3(1484.8)
	53.4%	51.9%	52.9%
Community Building	710.2(930.5)	757.5(1035.1)	757.4(1086.0)
	73.1%	71.2%	73.1%

Table 10.2. Summary Statistics – Educational Attainment by Organizational Mission (N=114)

Org. Mission	Some HS Minus 5	Some HS Move-In	Some HS Plus 5	HS Diploma Minus 5	HS Diploma Move-In	HS Diploma Plus 5
Art	247.5(332.4) 13.1%	234.6(318.8) 11.3%	221.2(297.7) 10.3%	363.4(514.6) 18.7%	339.5(457.6) 17.6%	325.4(441.5) 16.4%
Art Community Building	267.3(341.6) 15.6%	262.7(377.4) 14.7%	272.5(462.9) 14.6%	350.8(326.4) 24.3%	327.8(326.2) 22.5%	305.3(306.6) 20.7%
Community Building	104.5(182.8) 12.4%	99.5(170.1) 11.8%	101.7(188.5) 11.5%	158.0(206.0) 25.8%	155.0(204.8) 24.4%	153.1(206.6) 23.0%
Org. Mission	**Some College Minus 5**	**Some College Move-In**	**Some College Plus 5**	**Bachelor's + Minus 5**	**Bachelor's + Move-In**	**Bachelor's + Plus 5**
Art	334.3(490.4) 16.4%	354.1(498.3) 17.6%	362.8(473.0) 18.0%	1031.6(1572.6) 33.7%	1234.8(1835.2) 41.0%	1434.7(2074.1) 47.3%
Art Community Building	254.8(187.3) 18.9%	283.1(234.8) 20.4%	327.7(327.3) 22.5%	320.0(230.5) 25.4%	397.8(333.3) 29.7%	497.4(480.1) 35.3%
Community Building	106.4(138.6) 18.1%	117.4(140.9) 19.5%	132.7(155.2) 21.2%	196.2(492.0) 28.1%	244.9(609.7) 31.8%	299.7(731.3) 35.7%

Table 10.2.1. ANOVA Test – Educational Attainment Changes by Goal Typology (N=112)

Goal Typology	**High School Diploma**			**High School Diploma (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
Art vs. Art Comm. Bldg.	--	--	--	--	--	--
Art Comm. Bldg. vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	--	--	--	--	--
Art vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	0.30	0.82	0.65	2.14	0.58	1.36
p value	0.74(NS)	0.44(NS)	0.52(NS)	0.12(NS)	0.56(NS)	0.26(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Goal Typology	**High School Diploma**			**High School Diploma (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
Art vs. Art Comm. Bldg.	--	-8.48(NS)	-7.67(NS)	--	--	--
Art Comm. Bldg. vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	20.6**	40.62*	--	--	--
Art vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	12.1(NS)	32.95(NS)	--	--	--
F(2,109)	3.02	5.11	4.49	0.84	0.62	0.91
p value	0.53[a]	0.008**	0.013*	0.43(NS)	0.54(NS)	0.41(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Goal Typology	**Some College**			**Some College (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
Art vs. Art Comm. Bldg.	--	--	--	--	--	--
Art Comm. Bldg. vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	--	--	--	--	--
Art vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	1.92	2.74	2.34	0.11	2.25	1.09
p value	0.15(NS)	0.069[a]	0.10(NS)	0.89(NS)	0.11(NS)	0.34(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

Goal Typology	Bachelor's +			Bachelor's + (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Art vs. Art Comm. Bldg.	-125.4[a]	-100.20(NS)	-225.58(NS)	-0.031*	-0.0068(NS)	-0.037(NS)
Art Comm. Bldg. vs. Comm. Bldg.	-29.17(NS)	-44.88(NS)	-74.05(NS)	-0.005(NS)	-0.018(NS)	-0.023(NS)
Art vs. Comm. Bldg.	-154.56**	-145.07**	-299.63***	-0.036**	-0.024*	-0.60***
F(2,109)	6.23	5.08	5.69	6.95	4.28	6.05
p value	0.0028***	0.0078**	0.0045***	0.0014***	0.016*	0.032***
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 10.3. Summary Statistics – Unemployment by Organizational Mission (N=112)

Org. Mission	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Art	138.9(219.7) 7.9%	142.8(212.9) 7.9%	149.7(206.9) 7.9%
Art Community Building	131.5(154.3) 11.6%	137.7(152.3) 11.9%	133.8(134.2) 11.6%
Community Building	49.3(93.0) 7.1%	49.7(86.8) 7.4%	54.6(93.2) 8.2%

Table 10.4. Summary Statistics – Household Income Changes by Organizational Mission (N=112)

Org. Mission	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Art	$71,033.6(19041.3)	$76,687.6(20000.2)	$84,748.6(25188.3)
Art Community Building	$52,970.2(25454.5)	$55,857.4(27226.2)	$58,701.9(29598.9)
Community Building	$73,178.0(50408)	$78,646.2(54269.9)	$80,755.3(49141.0)

Table 10.5. Summary Statistics – Owner Occupancy by Organizational Mission (N=112)

Org. Mission	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
Art	265.5(262.7)	330.7(350.8)	391.5(421.8)
	32.6%	30.5%	31.3%
Art Community Building	161.3(96.3)	165.6(100.8)	180.1(119.5)
	24.7%	24.3%	24.6%
Community Building	129.8(140.9)	140.8(164.9)	153.3(191.9)
	47.7%	48.1%	48.4%

Table 10.5.1. ANOVA Test – Owner Occupancy Changes by Goal Typology (N=112)

Goal Typology	Owner Occupancy			Owner Occupancy (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
Art vs. Art Comm. Bldg.	--	-63.21[a]	-119.73(NS)	--	--	--
Art Comm. Bldg. vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	0.97(NS)	5.35(NS)	--	--	--
Art vs. Comm. Bldg.	--	-62.24*	-114.37[a]	--	--	--
F(2,109)	2.54	3.57	3.11	0.25	1.95	0.92
p value	0.083[a]	0.032*	0.048*	0.78(NS)	0.15(NS)	0.40(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005; [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05

Table 11.1. Summary Statistics – White Population by Town Type (N=112)

Town Type	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
MSA	1450.3(1916.8)	1505.5(1985.7)	1545.5(2080.5)
	59.1%	57.7%	57.3%
CBSA	471.7(399.6)	493.4(444.7)	468.6(391.5)
	83.8%	81.7%	79.3%
Rurality	151.9(213.8)	157.6(214.6)	157.5(213.7)
	87.9%	85.8%	84.1%

Table 11.2. Summary Statistics – Educational Attainment by Town Type (N=112)

Town Type	Some HS Minus 5	Some HS Move-In	Some HS Plus 5	HS Diploma Minus 5	HS Diploma Move-In	HS Diploma Plus 5
MSA	225.5(291.1)	215.9(295.1)	217.2(335.0)	307.8(344.0)	293.3(325.7)	282.1(315.8)
	14.9%	14.0%	13.5%	22.6%	21.2%	20.0%
CBSA	41.0(54.0)	42.4(61.8)	45.9(74.4)	100.7(107.4)	97.6(104.7)	95.1(102.3)
	10.0%	9.7%	9.8%	27.9%	26.4%	24.7%
Rurality	9.3(10.8)	9.3(10.7)	9.3(10.5)	26.5(28.6)	27.2(29.7)	27.2(30.3)
	9.2%	8.3%	7.9%	28.4%	26.7%	20.0%
Town Type	**Some College Minus 5**	**Some College Move-In**	**Some College Plus 5**	**Bachelor's + Minus 5**	**Bachelor's + Move-In**	**Bachelor's + Plus 5**
MSA	233.8(278.5)	254.3(291.8)	281.0(313.1)	475.1(910.0)	585.7(1084.3)	707.8(1255.4)
	17.9%	19.2%	20.6%	27.1%	32.0%	37.3%
CBSA	61.9(55.9)	70.8(65.0)	81.9(79.6)	105.0(130.9)	118.6(148.8)	135.0(168.0)
	17.6%	19.0%	20. %	31.8%	34.5%	37.4%
Rurality	19.5(21.1)	23.0(25.7)	27.1(32.5)	45.3(80.9)	52.1(86.6)	57.8(91.0)
	19.4%	21.0%	23.4%	29.2%	33.2%	37.1%

Table 11.2.1. ANOVA test – Educational Attainment Changes by Town Type (N=112)

Type of Town	**Some High School**			**Some High School (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
MSA vs. CBSA	--	--	--	--	--	--
CBSA vs. Rurality	--	--	--	--	--	--
MSA vs. Rurality	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	0.96	0.02	0.22	0.82	0.48	0.77
p value	0.3874(NS)	0.9812(NS)	0.8062(NS)	0.4446(NS)	0.6176(NS)	0.4643(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Type of Town	**High School Diploma**			**High School Diploma (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
MSA vs. CBSA	--	--	--	--	--	--
CBSA vs. Rurality	--	--	--	--	--	--
MSA vs. Rurality	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	1.23	1.43	1.58	0.17	0.57	0.42
p value	0.2960(NS)	0.2444(NS)	0.2117(NS)	0.8452(NS)	0.5669(NS)	0.6556(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Type of Town	**Some College**			**Some College (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
MSA vs. CBSA	--	--	--	--	--	--
CBSA vs. Rurality	--	--	--	--	--	--
MSA vs. Rurality	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(2,109)	1.77	1.38	1.64	0.10	1.00	0.57
p value	0.1758(NS)	0.2559(NS)	0.1986(NS)	0.9094(NS)	0.3730(NS)	0.5682(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

Type of Town	Bachelor's +			Bachelor's + (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
MSA vs. CBSA	96.9*	105.7*	202.7*	0.02[a]	0.024*	0.045*
CBSA vs. Rurality	-6.9(NS)	-10.7(NS)	-17.6(NS)	0.01(NS)	0.0098(NS)	0.022(NS)
MSA vs. Rurality	-103.9[a]	-116.4*	-220.3*	-.009(NS)	-0.014(NS)	-0.023(NS)
F(2,109)	4.87	5.54	5.29	2.98	4.29	4.34
p value	0.0094**	0.0051**	0.0064**	0.0551[a]	0.0161*	0.0153*
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 11.3. Summary Statistics – Unemployment by Town Type (N=112)

Town Type	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
MSA	113.7(156.3) 9.6%	115.7(151.0) 9.7%	119.6(146.4) 9.9%
CBSA	17.0(19.5) 5.4%	20.1(22.8) 6.1%	23.3(26.3) 7.1%
Rurality	3.7(5.3) 5.3%	4.5(6.4) 5.5%	5.9(8.9) 6.2%

Table 11.4. Summary Statistics – Household Income Changes by Town Type (N=112)

Town Type	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
MSA	$58,257.3(20526.0)	$63,078.6(24319.7)	$67,132.7(27936.2)
CBSA	$89,021.8(77095.8)	$95,551.3(84416.9)	$99,300.1(73050.5)
Rurality	$89,208.1(45037.0)	$92,684.4(41768.9)	$90,552.6(38497.3)

Table 11.5. Summary Statistics – Owner Occupancy by Town Type (N=112)

Town Type	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
MSA	193.8(176.2)	218.1(225.4)	246.1(271.6)
	28.9%	28.7%	29.4%
CBSA	111.7(105.6)	116.1(110.0)	122.1(116.0)
	61.9%	62.3%	62.5%
Rurality	39.9(54.7)	42.8(54.7)	43.9(52.9)
	66.9%	66.5%	65.7%

Table 12.1. Summary Statistics – White Population by Type of Media (N=112)

Type of Media	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
TV	613.1(951.0)	654.7(1068.3)	634.5(1093.2)
	76.2%	73.7%	71.2%
Radio & Sound Audio	783.1(963.0)	831.0(998.8)	906.1(1123.7)
	75.3%	74.4%	73.7%
Film & Video	1519.7(2129.8)	1583.5(2084.6)	1688.1(2257.8)
	56.2%	56.0%	57.4%
Multimedia	1356.9(898.5)	1280.1(826.1)	1251.2(801.0)
	58.9%	57.2%	57.1%
Digital & New Media	2245.3(3479.8)	2397.3(3840.2)	2381.3(3821.0)
	70.8%	68.5%	66.3%

Table 12.1.1. ANOVA test –for White Population Changes (N=112)

Type of Media	White population			White Population (% Δ)		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Move-In	Move-In to Plus 5	Minus 5 to Plus 5
TV vs. Radio & Sound Audio	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Film & Video	--	124.79*	--	--	0.040**	0.062*
TV vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio & Sound Audio vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Digital and New Media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Multimedia vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(4,107)	1.72	2.54	2.16	1.58	3.16	2.80
p value	0.15(NS)	0.044*	0.79(NS)	0.18(NS)	0.017*	0.030*
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005

Table 12.2. Summary Statistics – Educational Attainment by Type of Media (N=112)

Type of Media	Some HS Minus 5	Some HS Move-In	Some HS Plus 5	HS Diploma Minus 5	HS Diploma Move-In	HS Diploma Plus 5
TV	68.3(100.8)	65.8(93.8)	64.9(91.5)	128.1(165.9)	124.9(157.5)	121.8(149.6)
	12.1%	11.5%	11.1%	26.5%	25.2%	23.8%
Radio & Sound Audio	92.8(163.1)	96.0(181.8)	113.6(233.2)	129.4(137.8)	125.6(148.5)	130.3(166.8)
	10.7%	9.7%	9.5%	26.0%	24.5%	23.5%
Film & Video	286.8(387.6)	279.1(398.5)	288.9(464.7)	366.7(449.4)	350.9(416.5)	341.3(402.5)
	14.9%	13.7%	13.3%	22.3%	21.0%	19.8%
Multimedia	241.9(173.7)	214.3(147.8)	195.1(132.3)	306.8(176.7)	273.4(153.1)	246.3(137.8)
	17.8%	16.6%	15.6%	24.5%	22.4%	20.6%
Digital & New Media	159.9(271.4)	164.6(284.8)	166.6(274.3)	285.2(383.5)	286.4(422.1)	272.3(425.4)
	7.1%	7.3%	8.1%	17.3%	15.4%	13.4%
Type of Media	**Some College Minus 5**	**Some College Move-In**	**Some College Plus 5**	**Bachelor's + Minus 5**	**Bachelor's + Move-In**	**Bachelor's + Plus 5**
TV	84.6(121.8)	93.4(123.7)	105.0(132.9)	175.9(559.1)	212.6(682.6)	250.2(790.6)
	18.3%	19.5%	20.9%	28.0%	31.4%	34.9%
Radio & Sound Audio	123.9(110.6)	138.3(116.9)	160.2(137.2)	150.9(243.1)	179.5(265.5)	217.0(294.0)
	22.3%	24.7%	27.1%	24.5%	28.7%	32.5%
Film & Video	281.3(357.2)	307.8(378.0)	341.0(410.9)	533.5(868.1)	671.8(1032.2)	823.6(1207.0)
	17.3%	18.6%	19.7%	29.3%	35.0%	41.4%
Multimedia	187.8(109.8)	205.6(105.7)	227.2(101.6)	231.4(171.5)	299.3(244.4)	395.2(353.8)
	16.2%	18.6%	21.3%	20.2%	25.3%	31.2%
Digital & New Media	306.8(361.8)	322.9(379.2)	346.2(388.7)	1107.8(1714.4)	1272.2(2024.5)	1433.2(2323.7)
	18.1%	18.8%	20.1%	46.1%	49.5%	53.1%

Table 12.2.1. ANOVA test for – Educational Attainment Changes (N=112)

Type of Media	**Some High School**			**Some High School (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
TV vs. Radio & Sound Audio	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio & Sound Audio vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Digital and New Media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Multimedia vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(4,107)	1.49	0.80	1.02	1.05	0.64	0.82
p value	0.21(NS)	0.53(NS)	0.40(NS)	0.38(NS)	0.63(NS)	0.51(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Type of Media	**High School Diploma**			**High School Diploma (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
TV vs. Radio & Sound Audio	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio & Sound Audio vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Digital and New Media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Multimedia vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--

F(4,107)	1.66	2.35	2.14	0.52	0.39	0.52
p value	0.16	0.59[a]	0.081(NS)	0.729(NS)	0.82(NS)	0.72(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Type of Media	**Some College**			**Some College (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
TV vs. Radio & Sound Audio	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio & Sound Audio vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Digital and New Media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Multimedia vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(4,107)	1.08	0.70	0.90	1.31	1.00	1.36
p value	0.37(NS)	0.59(NS)	0.47(NS)	0.27(NS)	0.41(NS)	0.25(NS)
n	112	112	112	112	112	112
Type of Media	**Bachelor's +**			**Bachelor's + (% Δ)**		
	Minus 5 to Move-In	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Move-In**	**Move-In to Plus 5**	**Minus 5 to Plus 5**
TV vs. Radio & Sound Audio	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Film & Video	101.75[a]	114.17*	215.92*	0.024*	0.028**	0.052**
TV vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
TV vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio & Sound Audio vs. Film & Video	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--
Radio vs. Digital and New Media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Film & Video vs. Multimedia	--	--	--	--	--	--

Film & Video vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
Multimedia vs. Digital & New media	--	--	--	--	--	--
F(4,107)	2.68	2.85	2.79	2.52	3.89	3.85
p value	0.036*	0.027*	0.030*	0.046*	0.0055**	0.0058**
n	112	112	112	112	112	112

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05; post-hoc test – Bonferroni

Table 12.3. Summary Statistics – Unemployment by Type of Media (N=112)

TV	31.1(51.5)	33.8(55.1)	37.3(60.1)
	7.1%	7.2%	7.8%
Radio & Sound	78.0(131.2)	69.1(100.0)	79.9(105.3)
	8.0%	8.5%	9.5%
Film & Video	145.3(206.0)	148.0(193.6)	150.5(182.0)
	9.5%	10.0%	10.2%
Multimedia	97.4(71.3)	92.5(58.1)	86.9(45.9)
	11.0%	10.4%	9.8%
Digital & New Media	98.4(161.4)	118.3(200.4)	132.7(210.4)
	5.0%	6.1%	7.5%

Table 12.4. Summary Statistics – Household Income Changes by Type of Media (N=112)

Type of Media	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
TV	$75,568.4(57399.0)	$80,774.6(61869.7)	$82,394.9(54649.2)
Radio & Sound	$61,114.4(14304.3)	$64,251.9(16052.8)	$65,629.8(17764.8)
Film & Video	$63,532.9(27796.8)	$67,362.7(30219.2)	$71,812.6(34143.9)
Multimedia	$54,389.0(12715.8)	$59,998.6(15096.3)	$64,456.4(21988.8)
Digital & New Media	$76,895.0(35664.7)	$86,144.9(35166.1)	$93,678.4(37603.6)

Table 12.5. Summary Statistics – Owner Occupancy by Type of Media (N=112)

Type of Media	Minus 5	Move-In	Plus 5
TV	107.7(131.7)	115.4(151.0)	124.4(170.2)
	48.9%	49.3%	49.2%
Radio & Sound	104.3(96.5)	103.0(91.4)	105.8(92.8)
	42.1%	41.4%	40.9%
Film & Video	207.0(181.3)	240.0(231.0)	276.6(280.8)
	34.8%	33.6%	34.3%
Multimedia	175.1(124.7)	181.8(136.3)	202.9(159.1)
	25.3%	25.8%	27.3%
Digital & New media	300.4(251.2)	358.1(366.9)	399.3(459.9)
	35.7%	36.6%	37.2%

Table 13. Difference-in-Difference – White Populations and Bachelor's Degree and Higher Population Change, Move-In to Plus 5

	White Populations			Bachelor's +		
	No MAO	MAO Impact	Diff-in-Diff	No MAO	MAO Impact	Diff-in-Diff
Move-In	3003.83	1114.15	48.59	876.11	417.71	-48.23
Plus 5	2976.79	1135.71		1009.04	502.42	
t			0.09			-0.16
p			0.93(NS)			0.88(NS)

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05

Table 14. Respondent and Nonrespondent Groups Comparison –Goal Typology

	Arts	Arts Community Building	Community Building	Total
Nonrespondent	46	25	209	280
Respondent	63	37	147	247
Total	109	62	356	527
Chi-square		13.76		
p		0.001***		

NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005, [a]not significant but p-value is close to .05

Table 15. Respondent and Nonrespondent Groups Comparison –Educational Attainment

	Some High School	High School Diploma	Some College	Bachelor's +
	Mean(SE)	Mean(SE)	Mean(SE)	Mean(SE)
Nonrespondent	78.59(27.11)	203.94(21.88)	238.73(20.80)	694.83(79.80)
Respondent	166.67(23.21)	193.11(18.41)	236.09(19.90)	660.51(89.43)
t	-1.97	0.37	0.091	0.29
p	0.050*	0.71(NS)	0.93(NS)	0.77(NS)

Nonrespondent number = 280, Respondent = 247; NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005

Table 16. Respondent and Nonrespondent Groups Comparison – Age of Media Arts Organizations

	Age of MAO
	Mean(SE)
Nonrespondent	27.15(1.29)
Respondent	25.68(1.01)
t	0.88
p	0.38(NS)

Nonrespondent number = 280, Respondent = 247; NS = Not Significant, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.005