

**Original citation:**

Belfiore, E. (2006). The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? In: Mirza, M., ed. (2006). Culture Vultures : is UK arts policy damaging the arts?. London : Policy Exchange Limited.

**Permanent WRAP url:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/51721/>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes the work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

warwick**publications**wrap

highlight your research

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications>

# **1 . The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality?**

Eleonora Belfiore

Cultural policy is considered, at least traditionally, the Cinderella of the public policy sphere. As an area of low priority in political discourse, the cultural sector has only ever attracted a modest proportion of public expenditure. Public spending on the arts is still significantly lower, proportionately, to spending on other sectors of the welfare system (education, social and health services, etc.). Nevertheless, there is little doubt that in recent years the arts and culture have gained a much more central role in public policy debate.

A clear sign of the growing interest of politicians and policy-makers in the arts is reflected, for instance, in the developments that have been taking place in the last twenty years or so at the local level. Despite pressure from the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) on local authorities to draw up ‘cultural plans’, cultural provision at

## The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? 21

the local level is statutory only in Scotland and Northern Ireland. This means that, with the significant exception of the Public Library Service, the arts and culture represent areas of discretionary expenditure for local authorities. And yet, local authorities have chosen to get involved in art provision, so much so, that local authorities' spending on the arts exceeded that of central government for the first time in 1988/89; and the spending on the arts by local government is currently larger than that made by the ACE and the Regional Offices, and is only slightly less than that made by the DCMS.

Crucial in this development is the fact that the cultural sector's higher degree of visibility in the political arena has been accompanied by the increased capacity of the sector to tap into other public policy budgets. Clive Gray defines this phenomenon as 'policy attachment'.<sup>1</sup> Attachment, in short, represents a strategy that allows a 'weak' policy sector with limited political clout to attract enough resources to achieve its policy objectives. This is achieved through the sector's 'attachment' to other policy concerns that appear more worthy, or that occupy a more central position in the political discourse of the time. The most obvious (and often high-profile) example of this trend is surely the financing of cultural projects in the context of urban regeneration programmes. As early as the financial year 1993-4, urban regeneration spending was already the third most important source of UK central government support for the cultural sector in England.<sup>2</sup>

Another glaring case of 'attachment' is the cultural sector's involvement in the fight against the plight of social exclusion, a cause that has become the hallmark of New Labour's social policy. One of the first initiatives introduced by the New Labour government after it won the general elections in 1997 was the establishment of a 'Social

## 22 Culture Vultures

Exclusion Unit' (SEU) with the remit of placing the issue of 'inclusion' at the very heart of the processes of governance in this country. The SEU defines social exclusion as "a shorthand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown". The notion of social exclusion, then, has the benefit of conceiving poverty and disadvantage as multidimensional rather than merely in terms of income and expenditure. While material disadvantage is still a primary focus of strategies for social inclusion, they also encompass a growing awareness for the cultural and social dimensions of socio-economic disadvantage.

**The arts and the cause of social inclusion**

In view of such a central role of inclusion strategies in so-called 'third-way' politics and contemporary governance in the UK, it is hardly surprising that the subsidised cultural sector should have 'attached' itself to the inclusion agenda. In many ways, this has been a successful strategy, for it has allowed the cultural sphere an unprecedented visibility and prominence in the public policy discourse. That a process of 'attachment' was taking place was openly acknowledged by the government itself. The Policy Action Team 10 (PAT 10) report in 1999 argued that participation in the arts and sport can, and should, effectively contribute to neighbourhood renewal by improving communities' performance in the four key areas of health, crime, employment and education.<sup>3</sup>

References to the alleged social impacts of the arts still remain an important tool in the advocacy strategy followed by UK cultural

The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? 23

institutions today. It should not come as a surprise, then, that the ‘transformative powers’ of the arts should have pride of place in the current cultural policy discourse. That the belief in the positive social impacts of the arts still holds strong within the British arts funding system appears clearly from this passage from the latest Arts Council of England manifesto entitled *Ambitions for the Arts*, published in February 2003:

We will argue that being involved with the arts can have a lasting and transforming effect on many aspects of people’s lives. This is true not just for individuals, but also for neighbourhoods, communities, regions and entire generations, whose sense of identity and purpose can be changed through art.

As a result of these developments, the subsidised cultural sector is now expected to deliver on the basis of social and economic policy targets that relate to social inclusion and local economic development strategies already in place. After all, we must not forget that the linkage of cultural policies to strategies for social inclusion and neighbourhood renewal has taken place against the backdrop of the growing popularity of what is usually referred to as ‘evidence-based policy making’, and the trend towards what has been dubbed ‘management by measurement’.<sup>4</sup> In this new climate, evidence-collection has increasingly come to be seen as a necessary grounding for decision-making and policy drafting.

Ultimately, this development – and the broader trend towards managerialism in public administration – has meant that the very term ‘subsidy’ has become increasingly unpopular within the cultural policy field, to the point of being supplanted by the now

more appealing alternative of 'investment'.<sup>5</sup> This is a transformation, however, that has gone well beyond the merely rhetorical level of a change in the language of cultural policy. A primary consequence of the attachment of cultural policy to other spheres of public policy-making was the fact that this encouraged expectations that the publicly funded arts and culture *ought* to address the priorities of those other policy areas and *should* actively contribute to achieving their objectives.<sup>6</sup> As I will argue in the following section, this has put the public arts sector under strenuous pressure to deliver on the basis of such expectations and has moved commentators to argue that the British cultural sector is progressively becoming target, rather than process oriented.

### **The social impacts of the arts ... in detail**

One important limitation of the current literature on the social impacts of the arts is the underlying assumption that the same type of impacts will accrue from different types of cultural activities on different types of audiences/participants. Another complication is represented by the fact that the phrase 'social impacts of the arts' is usually employed with reference to a wide group of evaluation methods, ranging from evaluation of the impacts of a single project or organisation all the way to the effects of culture-led urban regeneration.

A further problem is that extant impacts studies seem to focus mainly on community arts projects and programmes, often of a participatory nature, which are a very specific type of cultural activity (and, I would suggest that any type of participatory activity would probably have an empowering effect, whether arts-based or

## The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? 25

not). It is not a matter of course that the social benefits accruing from such cultural activities should be expected of other, more traditional ones (such as, for instance, being part of an audience). Whether sitting amongst the spectators of a theatrical performance can genuinely be a life-changing event is a contention that is much harder to evaluate!

These are just some of the reasons why it is actually very hard (if not even dubious) to talk about the ‘social impacts of the arts’ as a broad group of beneficial social outcomes that can be expected of cultural participation (be it ‘active’ or ‘passive’). This is probably why it is somewhat difficult to deconstruct the claims made in the current literature and come up with a realistic list of possible social impacts. A notable exception is the influential report compiled by Matarasso for the consultancy group Comedia in 1997 and entitled *Use or Ornament?* Here Matarasso identifies no less than fifty distinct social impacts of the arts. However, these alleged impacts are remarkably broad-ranging, if not positively vague. They range from the more plausible claims that participation in the arts can “increase people’s confidence and sense of self-worth”, “encourage adults to take up education and training opportunities” and “provide a route to rehabilitation and integration for offenders”, to decidedly fuzzier ones – such as that the arts can “give people influence over how they are seen by others”, “develop contact between the generations”, “help people extend control over their own lives”, “help community groups raise their vision beyond the immediate” or - equally obscurely - “have a positive impact on how people feel”.

Arguably, not all of these impacts are susceptible to easy measurement by a realistic and feasible evaluation process. And, indeed, the assessment methodology proposed by Matarasso has been subjected to

## 26 Culture Vultures

extensive criticism for being “flawed in its design, execution and conceptual basis”.<sup>7</sup> One of the more crucial problems with the proposed methodology was its lack of internal validity; the twenty-four questions that constituted the main aspect of the evaluation process did not appear to be informed by the hypothesis that the exercise aspired to verify empirically (the aforementioned fifty impacts). Furthermore, the questions were worded in an ambiguous manner that might have induced ‘social desirability biased’ answer in respondents, thus resulting in an on overstatement of the artistic activities’ impacts.<sup>8</sup> Other problematic aspects of the proposed evaluation process were the lack of control groups and of any before/after comparison in the assessment of participants’ emotional state and quality of life.

More generally, the issue was raised about the lack of a longitudinal perspective in the analysis of what were described as life-changing experiences.<sup>9</sup> The five-stage proposed evaluation model could never capture long-term transformation. The five steps of the suggested evaluation method are: planning setting indicators, execution, assessment, and reporting. The report advises us that the assessment stage should take place ‘on completion of the project’, whereas the different stakeholders should all compile reports on the results of the projects ‘shortly after completion’ of the project. However, as one of Comedia’s own working papers clearly explains, long-term impacts ‘will typically take longer to emerge than outputs’, and would not therefore be taken into account by such an assessment process.<sup>10</sup> More importantly, Matarasso fails to establish a convincing causal link between any changes observed in the participants and their involvement in the arts activity. Obviously, such a failure strongly undermines his advocacy that “participatory arts project are different, effective and cost very little in the context of spending on social goals. They represent an insignificant financial risk to public



## The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? 27

services, but can produce impacts (social *and* economic) out of proportion to their cost”.<sup>11</sup> The lack of any opportunity cost analysis to back up such a conclusion makes Matarasso’s claims all the more untenable.

In fairness, it is important to remind ourselves of the pioneering nature of the work carried out by Matarasso and his collaborators. As the report clearly acknowledged, Comedia’s researchers were treading previously uncharted territory. In Matarasso’s own words: “The study is a first stage of an ongoing research programme, not a definitive response to these issues. If it raises more questions as its answers, others may wish to address them in the context of practical work”.<sup>12</sup> In many respects, the most interesting aspect of the popularity and influence of Matarasso’s report in the British and international context is not the fact that the methodology itself has found to be flawed (which is to be expected in what was admittedly only a first step towards the development of an evaluation methodology), but rather the fact that policy-makers and arts administrators accepted the report *in toto* as *the* methodology for social impacts assessment. As a result, a number of alluring statistics from Matarasso’s report were selectively quoted repeatedly and out of context in policy papers and reports, with the result of “establishing a near-consensus among cultural policy-makers”.<sup>13</sup>

A very selective use of the available information and evidence seems to be, however, one of the characterising features of the debates over the social impacts of the arts. Let’s consider, for instance Fred Coalter’s *Realising the potential of cultural services: the case for the arts* (2001), published by the Local Government Association. Here Coalter gives great prominence to some data from a three-year study into the effects of arts education in British schools showing that students who took an arts-related subject (visual arts, music, drama) achieved better GCSE results than students who had taken

## 28 Culture Vultures

no arts subjects at all. However, Coalter barely comments on further findings showing that students who took more than one arts-related subject actually achieved *worse* results than students taking no artistic subject at all, thus failing to deal with what are obviously significant implications for his broader argument on the beneficial educational effects of the arts.<sup>14</sup> Interestingly, the study referred to in Coalter's report is also cited in a recent literature review compiled by Jenny Hughes for The Unit for the Arts and Offenders.<sup>15</sup> Here, unsurprisingly, the positive effects of arts education are listed in some detail, but no mention *at all* is made of the correlation between the choice of more than one art-related subject and poorer exam result.

Similarly, a report produced by Cave and Coutts in 2002 for the South East London Strategic Health Authority, and entitled *Health evidence base for the Mayor's draft cultural strategy* also displays a selective attitude to the choice of the sources of evidence for the social impacts of the arts. So, a note of caution is put forward at the beginning of the document, where the limitations of the extant literature and the existing evidence are pointed out. However, in the small section of the report entitled "Participation in the arts", the argument in favour of the positive effects of arts participation on health is built upon what is evidently a very partial selection of the available literature. As a result, if one were to only read the report in question, the matter of the arts' positive effects on people's quality of life and health would appear a rather uncontroversial matter - a misguided conclusion indeed!

The difficulty of identifying and classifying the supposed positive impacts of the arts is also reflected in the persisting dissatisfaction with current methodologies for impact measurement and evaluation. As I am going to argue in the next section, in the context of the growing trends towards evidence-based policy-making, the question

of whether the cultural sector can provide convincing evidence of the benefits that are assumed to accrue from cultural participation has become, simply, paramount. In other words, do the arts *really* generate positive social impacts?

### **The social impacts of the arts: the evaluation dilemma**

The complex new reality in which the cultural sector now operates has meant that a lot of work has gone, in the last decade, into elaborating methodologies that can convincingly assess the extent to which the claimed social impacts actually follow from participation in the arts. The desperate need to find the holy grail of a reliable evaluation protocol has resulted in a growing body of literature, both empirical and conceptual in nature, discussing the various pitfalls of current methods, or putting forwards yet another toolkit for impact evaluation. A number of exhaustive literature reviews have been published in the last five years, in order to gain a clearer idea of what the impacts of the arts actually are and how they can be measured, with a view to describing the strength and weaknesses of current methods.<sup>16</sup>

Having read through this body of literature reviews, the general feeling that one is left with, is that the quality of the evidence on the social impacts of the arts is generally poor, and that evaluation methodologies are still unsatisfactory. The literature, indeed, seems to corroborate the conclusions presented by the Australian researchers White and Rentschler, who, speaking at the 2005 International Conference on Arts & Cultural Management, have characterised the state of the research field into the impacts of the arts as ‘embryonic’ still.

## 30 Culture Vultures

I would suggest that the main areas where shortcomings in current evaluation procedures can be identified are:

- ***The issue of the causality link:*** Noting that a change has occurred against a predefined indicator after participation in a cultural activity is not enough to argue that the transformation was *caused* by the arts activity itself. For the arts impact argument to hold, it is crucial to establish a causal relation between the transformation observed and the cultural project or activity being evaluated. This might entail a before/after comparison, although assessment of the participants before their involvement in the activity is still rare.
- ***The opportunity cost issue:*** An important basis for spending decisions is evidence of policy effectiveness and cost-efficiency. Therefore, the onus is on the cultural sector to convince the Treasury department that they provide the *most* cost-effective means to tackling social exclusion, health problems and so on, thus performing better at achieving the predefined targets than more traditional and established practices within social and health services. My argument however, is that the sector, is still far from being able to offer funders this type of evidence.
- ***The question of outcome versus outputs:*** One of the points of concern in current methodologies for impact assessment is that evaluation usually happens, soon after the arts activity takes place, so that the alleged life-changing effects of the experience (which, realistically, will take some time to become evident) are likely to be completely missed out in the evaluation process.
- ***The issue of successfully transforming 'anecdotal evidence' into robust qualitative data:*** Another common criticism moved against current methods for impact assessment is that evaluation

## The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? 31

processes tends to rely heavily on anecdotal evidence and participants' declarations. Whilst the discussion and measurement of the transformative power of arts participation cannot elude the collection and analysis of qualitative data, there is a potential risk in equating reported experiences with robust data. A collection of quotes from projects organisers and participants does *not* automatically translate into a solid evaluation report.

- ***The question of the distinction between 'active' and 'passive' participation:*** The highest proportion of extant impacts assessment studies tend to focus on the evaluation of participatory arts projects. This can be explained by the fact that it is ostensibly easier to demonstrate measurable impacts in this area of work than in the more mainstream provision of galleries, museums and the performing arts. However, since the provision of art to audiences (as opposed to the active involvement of participants in an arts project) constitutes by far the largest proportion of the publicly funded cultural sector, this is precisely the area where the effort in developing a satisfactory assessment procedure should concentrate. Ideally, a robust impact evaluation protocol should be able to tackle the assessment of the social impacts of a broader range of culturally diverse artistic experiences.
- ***The issue of artistic quality:*** It is often the case that, in the process of social impacts assessment, the importance attributed to the expected beneficial social outcomes overshadows aesthetic considerations. This could be explained by the fact that cultural projects with explicit social aims are often funded in the context of anti-poverty strategies or urban regeneration programmes. In these cases aesthetic preoccupations are not always the primary reason why the projects were funded in the first place. However, there is no denying that cultural policy

## 32 Culture Vultures

decisions (especially by funding bodies such as the Arts Council) always imply a judgement largely based on aesthetic criteria. A rigorous impact assessment methodology therefore ought to be able to incorporate evaluation criteria that also refer to the aesthetic sphere. The problem here is that finding the way to best evaluate the artistic quality of an arts project is far from being an easy task.

- ***The question of negative impacts:*** This is another important issue that is routinely ignored in the discussion and measurement of the social impacts of the arts. The political and practical reasons for such neglect are obvious, and yet, to the careful observer, the evidence that the arts might actually have a *negative* effect on people is out there. For instance, a recent paper co-authored by the renown scholar of creativity Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (the creator of the ‘theory of flow’) reported the result of a vast empirical research that showed that young people who loved reading for pleasure and spent part of their leisure time reading displayed lesser social skills and lower indicators of happiness than their peers who devoted their free time to playground games.<sup>17</sup> Whilst it would be foolish to suggest that funding to literature programmes should be cut on the basis of this evidence, a serious approach to social impacts assessment ought to at least acknowledge that no guarantees can be made that the impacts of a cultural activity will always and necessarily be positive. Similarly, the negative effects of culture-led regeneration (with regards to phenomena of gentrification) are also well documented. The experience gained in the course of the last two decades - through the consistent use of culture as an important element in the process of urban revival - is that the arts can actually be socially divisive, and lead to what have been described as ‘culture wars’.

For this reason, we need to consider the potential negative consequences of arts activity as well as the beneficial ones.<sup>18</sup>

- **The ethical question:** This is an issue that is often (perhaps conveniently) overlooked. An important exception is represented by Paola Merli who has suggested that the underlying inspiration behind strategies that tackle social exclusion through the arts is the notion that “the poor should be soothed through ‘therapeutic’ artistic activities”. In the mid-‘90s, US political theorist, Nancy Fraser, summed up this sentiment: “cultural domination supplants exploitation as the fundamental injustice. And cultural recognition displaces socio-economic redistribution as the remedy for injustice and the goal of political struggle”.<sup>19</sup> In other words, the concern for addressing social cohesion and inclusion through a ‘soft’ approach such as the use of cultural projects, might be seen as a convenient means to divert attention from the real causes of today’s social problems and the tough solutions that might be needed to solve them. According to this line of reasoning, the whole discourse of social inclusion is a lot more appealing to the political elite than the old-fashioned rhetoric of poverty and the call for economic redistribution. As Merli explains:

... making deprivation more acceptable is a tool to endlessly reproduce it. Social deprivation and exclusion arguably can be removed only by fighting the structural conditions which cause them. Such conditions will not be removed by benevolent arts programmes.<sup>20</sup>

## Conclusions

So, we come back to the initial question “are the beneficial social impacts of the art a myth or reality?” The lack of evidence and the problems in

## 34 Culture Vultures

current evaluation procedures would seem to invalidate the claims that the arts can tackle social exclusion, health, crime issues and so on and so forth. And yet, the faith of politicians, arts administrators and artists alike in the transformative powers of the arts is extremely resilient. One of the most fascinating aspects of present-day cultural policy is that, despite the problems and limitations that I have discussed above, the growing trend towards instrumentality has not been slowed down by the obvious lack of evidence of the existence of such impacts. It is significant that, in a recent paper, Matarasso himself has taken a stance against what he sees as the excesses of arts evaluation:

Instead of being guided by the possibility of opening debate about culture within democratic society, arts evaluation is little more than an extension of private sector managerialism to a public service.<sup>21</sup>

Despite what I have referred to as the 'evidence dilemma', the rhetoric of instrumentalism and measurement is still popular. The present Secretary of State, Tessa Jowell, made a recent attempt to find alternative (and possibly non-instrumental ways) to articulate the value of the arts to society. Her essay, entitled *Government and the Value of Culture* (2004), was hailed as a welcome and overdue appeal for the reinstatement of 'arts for arts' sake'. However, the essay is fraught with internal contradictions, and is, in truth, far from being a repudiation of instrumentalism in cultural funding and policy.

Jowell claims that one of the main tasks of government in today's society is to eliminate "the poverty of aspiration which compromises all our attempts to lift people out of physical poverty. Engagement with culture can help alleviate this poverty of aspiration". She also adds: "Addressing poverty of aspiration is also necessary to build a



society of fairness and opportunities”. I would suggest that this final statement brings us back full circle, for, if the arts can and should address poverty of aspiration, and this can bring about a just society, then the arts are entrusted with the task of bringing about the conditions for such a “society of fairness and opportunities” to exist. In other words, we are back to a worldview whereby the arts are to be supported for the ‘good’ they do to society.

### **Recommendations**

Where does this leave the cultural policy-makers and professionals working in the cultural sector? I would suggest that an important step forward would be the adoption of a more cautious approach to the whole rhetoric of the social impacts of the arts. Making exaggerate claims for the potential of the arts to transform lives will inevitably backfire if such claims cannot be substantiated by evidence. A more realistic vision of how the public interacts with the arts forms that are currently funded through taxpayers’ money is certainly needed, together with the sobering realization that one cultural event cannot have all sorts of social impacts on all its audiences/participants, and that the workings of the arts on people’s psyche are not something that you can always plan and direct in advance.

Secondly, I would suggest that the only way out of the ‘evaluation dilemma’ is a genuine commitment to serious evaluation work, and the acceptance that it is unlikely that robust evidence for whether and how the arts have life-transforming powers could ever be achieved through a ‘quick, one-size-fits-all’ evaluation toolkit. Impacts evaluation, if done properly, is a time- and resource-consuming exercise: there are no acceptable shortcuts!

## 36 Culture Vultures

Finally, I would argue that it befalls on researchers, policy makers and administrators working in the cultural sector to push for a 'critical deconstruction' of the notion of evidence, with a view to elaborating a more relevant and useful understanding of what constitutes acceptable and adequate evidence of social impact in the cultural sphere. Freeing the debate over the social impacts of the arts from the straightjacket of a view that equates acceptable evidence with a narrow conception of performance measurement will mean being finally able to talk meaningfully about all that performance indicators fail to assess. The area of debate this exercise would ultimately free up might turn out to be the very essence of what the arts 'do' to people.

- 
- 1 Gray, C. (2002) "Local Government and the Arts." *Local Government Studies*. 28:77-90.
  - 2 Selwood, S. 2001. *The UK Cultural Sector*. Policy Studies Institute; pp. 54 ff.
  - 3 DCMS (1999) *Policy Action Team 10; A Report to the Social Exclusion Unit: Arts and Sport*, London, Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
  - 4 Noordegraaf, M. and Abma, T. (2003) "Management by measurement? Public management practices amidst ambiguity." *Public Administration*. 81: 853-871.
  - 5 In his already mentioned paper, Clive Gray argues that one of the first examples of this trend can be traced within local government, when the Labour party was in power in the Greater London Council (GLC) between 1981 and 1986. It was precisely around this time that a shift first occurred from a policy focus on the arts per se, towards a conception of the arts as an instrument to bring about economic development and employment growth. This is confirmed by a 1985 GLC document entitled *The State of the Art or the Art of the State?* that reads: "we envisaged the state playing a new role, going well beyond the provision of culture to an often passive public. We see this role as being primarily based on investment rather than grant aid, and on supporting economic infrastructures- such as distribution and publicity networks - rather than individual productions".
  - 6 Belfiore, E. (2004) "Auditing Culture: the subsidized cultural sector in the New Public Management." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 10:183-202.
  - 7 Merli, P. (2002) "Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 8:107-118; p. 108.
  - 8 Ibid. p.108.

## The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality? 37

- 9 Belfiore, E (2002) "Art as a means towards alleviating social exclusion: does it really work? A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 8:91-106; p.98.
- 10 Lingayam, S., Mac Gillivray, A., Raynard, P. (1996) *Creative Accounting: Beyond the Bottom Line*, Comedia, p.33.
- 11 Matarasso, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament? The social impact of participation in the Arts*. Comedia, p.81.
- 12 Ibid. p.ix.
- 13 Merli, P. (2002) "Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 8:107-118., 107. In this respect, it is interesting to note that, in 2003, Matarasso published another piece of writing on how to evaluate the impacts of community arts project, entitled *Did it make a difference?* Here he appears to put forward a more sophisticated version of his earlier methodology. Yet, this document never matched the popularity, circulation and influence of *Use or Ornament?* (Matarasso, F. 2003. *Did It Make a Difference? Evaluating community-based arts and business partnerships*, Arts & Business, London).
- 14 I am grateful to Munira Mirza for pointing me in the direction of this inconsistency in Coalter's argument.
- 15 Hughes, J (2004) *Doing the Arts Justice: A review of research literature, practice and theory*. The Unit for the Arts and Offenders, p.28.
- 16 See for instance: Jermyn, H. (2001) *The Arts and Social Exclusion: A review prepared for the Arts Council of England*, ACE; Jermyn, H. (2004.) *The Art of Inclusion*, ACE; Reeves, M.(2002) *Measuring the Economic and Social Impact of the Arts: A review*. ACE; Guetzkow, J. (2002) *How the Arts Impact Communities: An introduction to the literature on arts impact studies*. Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, Princeton; Ruiz, J. (2004) *A Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, the Arts and Sport Policy*, Scottish Executive; and, Hughes, J (2004) *Doing the Arts Justice: A review of research literature, practice and theory*. The Unit for the Arts and Offenders.
- 17 Csikszentmihalyi, M. and Hunter, J. (2003) "Happiness in everyday life: The uses of experience sampling". *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 4:185-199.
- 18 Sharp, J., Pollock, V., Paddison, R. (2005) "Just Art for a Just City: public art and social inclusion in urban regeneration". *Urban Studies* 42:1001-1022.
- 19 Fraser, N. (1995) "From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age." *New Left Review* 212:68-93; p.68.
- 20 Merli, P. (2002) "Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 8:107-118, p. 113.
- 21 Matarasso, F. 2005 "How the light gets in: The value of imperfect systems of cultural evaluation". Paper presented at the "Räkna med kultur!" conference in Vara, Sweden, 4-5 October 2005.