

* *
* *
**institute of cultural
capital**

Understanding the Benefits for Mr Kite

A review of the literature
on the economic benefits of
collaborative cultural activity

Justine Karpusheff





*For the benefit of Mr. Kite
There will be a show tonight on trampoline
The Hendersons will all be there
Late of Pablo Fanque's Fair, what a scene
Over men and horses hoops and garters
Lastly through a hogshead of real fire!
In this way Mr. K. will challenge the world!* ”

Lennon and McCartney

FOREWORDS*

Mersey Care NHS Trust was created in 2001 with and for people with mental health needs, addiction and learning disabilities: quality, recovery and wellbeing are at the heart of everything we do.
<http://www.merseycare.nhs.uk/>

Our established and innovative cross sector partnerships have made a significant contribution to our aims. Creative programmes delivered by multi-disciplinary health care clinicians in collaboration with creative practitioners from Liverpool's cultural sector bring the 'outside world' into health settings and help to establish relationships that open doors for service users. This in turn has enabled service users to access our partner organisations, such as Tate Liverpool, FACT, Royal Liverpool Philharmonic, Everton Football Club, LIPA, The Bluecoat, The Reader Organisation and National Museums Liverpool for therapeutically supported programmes; work and voluntary opportunities; or to participate as members of the public.

A summary of an independent evaluation of creative approaches in Mersey Care NHS Trust¹ describes an emerging evidence base that demonstrates the impact of these asset-based strategies on individuals and the organisation as positive contributions to:

- * Improving the quality of care in our services
- * Shaping the culture of the organisation and facilitating participation, hope and opportunity
- * Improving positive mental health, wellbeing and recovery in simple, practical ways.

As we move forward together, amidst the urgent and growing mental health needs in our communities, along with the economic problems we now face, it is clear we need more strategic and collaborative approaches across our systems. In creating and sustaining holistic strategies that consider and utilise all available resources we first need to understand our shared assets and their value in health, social and economic terms. The *Understanding the Benefits for Mr Kite* report makes an important contribution in progressing this and highlights the need to move away from our separate schemas, frameworks and practices, to create a mutually beneficial approach to economic assessment that simultaneously recognises our unique characteristics and contributions. We sense something significant is happening through our shared endeavours, but we currently don't have the shared language or research base to fully describe this. I welcome the recommendations presented.

Dr Mandy Chivers
Director of Quality and Innovation
Mersey Care NHS Trust, April 2013

The Institute of Cultural Capital (ICC) is a cultural policy research institute launched in August 2010 as a strategic collaboration between the University of Liverpool and Liverpool John Moores University.
<http://iccliverpool.ac.uk/>

Understanding the Benefits for Mr Kite represents 'phase 1' in a planned programme of collaborative research working in association with Mersey Care NHS Trust, provisionally titled 'Joining the Dots: the Holistic Management of Cultural Collaborations'. The work is fuelled by shared interests in forming a greater understanding of the economic benefits, both actual and potential, of cross-sector collaborative cultural practice and activities – that being collaborations between arts, cultural and creative organisations and 'other' health and social service providers. Anticipated economic benefits range from pragmatic cost savings gained from co-located services, joint commissioning and other shared resources, to more strategic considerations of reduced costs through alternative, cultural approaches and interventions (for example within clinical settings). Both approaches are dependent upon holistic management strategies that consider and utilise all available resources within given environments, working towards agreed common objectives. The first step however in understanding what the economic benefits of cross-sector collaborative working may be is to consider the existing evidence base (as far as it exists) – the review was commissioned to this effect.

The review furthermore provides a critical 'nuts and bolts' assessment of economic impact and valuation techniques traditionally used when evaluating cultural activity and interventions. This level of detail is useful in considering the research expertise required in taking the project forward and as an intellectual

appraisal of the appropriateness of different techniques within collaborative settings. This will help to inform and develop an on-going programme of collaborative, empirical research, intended to complement Impacts 08 and other ICC-led research on the impact of major cultural interventions, by considering in detail the mechanisms and outcomes of 'everyday' collaborative grassroots cultural activity and practice within urban settings, and within the context of shared policy agendas.

The main limitations of research undertaken to date - as indicated by 'Mr Kite' - include:

- * Lack of consensus on how the value of culture should be expressed and prioritised (e.g. economic, aesthetic, intrinsic, or instrumental value)
- * Lack of consensus on how to practically measure the economic impact and/or value of cultural activity
- * Lack of evidence on the *mutual* economic benefits of collaborative cross-sector activity, due to a continued focus on 'culture' as a single variable.

This presents both a significant challenge and opportunity to researchers in cultural policy and related fields – a challenge in unifying the current wildly divergent interpretations of 'cultural value' within a common cause, and an opportunity to reframe the debate for the mutual benefit of wider policy and practice communities. As debates on the 'intrinsic' and 'instrumental' value of culture continue to go round in circles, the latter can potentially gain real traction when actively considered within the context of 'real life' social priorities and policy agendas, as experienced by those working in a variety of relevant services and sectors. The review indicates that a valuation study focusing on collaborative cross-sector cultural activity will fill a clear gap in the

¹ http://www.merseycare.nhs.uk/Library/Media_centre/Publications/Shift%20Happens.pdf

CONTENTS*

existing evidence base, and also overcome other limitations of economic evaluation research within the cultural sector including

- * The prevalence of research undertaken for the purposes of cultural advocacy and a desire for grand statements that seek to justify independent public funding of the arts
- * The dominance of published evaluation from larger organisations and initiatives that can afford to commission it in the first place, set against a scarcity of grassroots evidence from smaller, less formal organisations and practitioners;
- * Collaborative valuation studies may also help to overcome issues of attribution, displacement or diverted funds in economic impact studies by considering holistic approaches where the policy agenda is the focus, rather than a single 'industry' or economic unit of analysis.

The ICC welcomes the challenge set out by 'Mr Kite' and looks forward to advancing the cultural value debate with colleagues at Mersey Care NHS Trust. Thanks to Justine for providing the perfect starting point.

Kerry Wilson, Head of Research
Phil Redmond CBE, Chairman
Institute of Cultural Capital, April 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	05
1 INTRODUCTION	06
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	09
3 FINDINGS	11
- 3.1 Impact assessment Methods	11
- 3.2 Valuation Methods	19
- 3.3 Creating the Contexts and Conditions	32
4 CONCLUSIONS	37
- 4.1 POSTSCRIPT	38
REFERENCES	39

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

This report sets out findings of a literature review of the economic models used to assess the long-term benefits of cross-sectoral collaborations. The literature search was conducted using search terms agreed with the commissioners of the review: The Institute of Cultural Capital and Mersey Care NHS Trust. The literature search was not systematic in nature, but aims to provide an overview of the relevant works identified through the extensive literature search, as detailed in Appendix 1. The main findings were organised under two categories to distinguish types of studies: those using an ‘impact’ framework and those studies using ‘value’ as a frame. It is recognised that the question of the appropriateness of using an economic framework to explore the ‘value’ of cultural activity is subject to ongoing debate. The review found a lack of consensus, not only with regards to the use of these frameworks as a fundamental issue, but also, even where models had been used, to which might be the most appropriate for exploration of cultural activity. This is exacerbated by a scarcity of economic studies in cross-sectoral settings. Where these have been undertaken, the unit of analysis is invariably a single organisation or sector.

This reflects the complexity of the process of understanding ‘impact’ and ‘value’, which in a cross-sectoral setting is heightened by the difficulties of attributing the contribution of particular organisations to outputs or outcomes. The findings reinforce other commentary in identifying clarity of purpose as the most important starting point, not only of the activity, but of the evaluative work. Impact assessment methods may have potential where activity involves an event and visitor data can be drawn upon, but there is a lack of cross-sectoral studies to draw exemplars from. Impact assessment is particularly relevant to understanding economic growth. Valuation studies offer more potential for longer-term cross-sectoral activity. Stated preference techniques may be useful for the value of events and organisations, but seem less relevant for exploration of ongoing programmes and projects due to their snapshot nature.

Methods such as Cost-benefit Analysis and Social Return on Investment present opportunities for longer-term evaluation. Their main strength over other methods is the ability to engage stakeholders more fully in determining value and subsequently improve commitment to evaluative work. Collaborative contexts offer an opportunity to pool resources and thereby overcome some of the challenges with these methods, including the resources needed for data collection.

The conclusions of this review are that collaborative contexts offer particular challenges to exploration of economic assessment. In addition to attributing contribution, methods need to develop with partnerships, moving from one-off assessments to ongoing integrative evaluation. Methods also need to be able to account for and work with multiple notions of value and be able to express findings for different stakeholders’ needs, as well as facilitating the emergence of shared agendas. This suggests that models such as Social Return on Investment may be more suitable where the focus is longer-term cultural activity. To date the critique of this field has centred upon ‘grandiose claims’ and a perceived advocacy agenda to influence public funding decisions. However, this review has highlighted circumstances in which use of valuation frameworks may provide insight into achievement of objectives, whether those are economic or social and enable critical reflection on ‘what is really happening’. Consequently and most importantly, methods need to be able to encourage a critical reflection on whether cultural activity can lead to both economic development and development for the participants: to understand the benefits for Mr Kite.

1. INTRODUCTION*

This literature review has been commissioned by the Institute of Cultural Capital, in collaboration with Mersey Care NHS Trust. The aim of this review is

* To explore the approaches used to understand the longer-term economic benefits of cross-sectoral collaborative cultural activities and interventions.

This includes the following commissioned objectives:

- * discussion of methods and measurement approaches for assessing economic value or impact, both strengths and weaknesses;
- * description of the contexts and conditions within which economic value or impact arising from collaborative contexts is most likely to occur;
- * identification of any gaps in the existing evidence base.

It is not the aim of this review to make judgements on the claims of value or impact made in the literature, but to explore the strengths and weaknesses of the models that have been used to make those arguments in the context of cross-sectoral initiatives. The review has been conducted against a backdrop of ongoing debate as to whether economic frameworks are appropriate and useful approaches to understanding the impact or value of cultural activities. This report acknowledges those debates, but does not seek to address the fundamental question. The review begins from the starting point that although there has been an ongoing debate, as old as Plato and Aristotle’s questioning of aesthetics (Belfiore and Bennett, 2007), this public dispute appears to have continually washed up the same core questions around the appropriateness of estimations of the

value of ‘culture’, with fluctuating assertions dominant. Those questions still appear to hover over the field currently and although two of the main commentators: John Holden and David Throsby could be viewed as ultimately concurring that culture has some ‘intrinsic’ ‘value’ not compatible with a financially driven understanding (O’ Brien, 2010), the question of a more ‘instrumental’ value and how that can be understood appears to remain contested.

In 2010 the DCMS commissioned a review to develop a consensus on how the value of culture should be measured. The report concluded that the Government should develop guidance and recommended that these should be in line with the methods approved by HM Treasury’s Green Book (O’Brien, 2010). This guidance was not forthcoming and in 2012 a DCMS blog called for responses to the question:

“Can the value of culture be measured by government in monetary (or other) terms, or is it ‘priceless’?”²

This was described as part of ‘Phase 2’ of the AHRC, ESRC and DCMS ‘Measuring Cultural Value’ initiative. One of the responses on the blog begins with the following retort:

“welcome to the Measuring Cultural Value debate that began in 2003 when the then Secretary of State for Culture, Tessa Jowell, attended a conference organised by the National Theatre, the National Gallery, Demos and AEA Associates.”³

This respondent goes on to highlight a number of Demos publications on the subject and asks:

“I wonder if you are hoping to reinvent the wheel.”⁴

² http://blogs.culture.gov.uk/main/2012/01/welcome_to_the_priceless_blog.html

³ Shirley Burnham, http://blogs.culture.gov.uk/main/2012/01/welcome_to_the_priceless_blog.html

⁴ Ibid.

The creator of the blog defends the necessity of the question by describing the debate as still “polarised”. Likewise, David O’Brien also blogs in 2012 that we are

“at the start of what could be a vital debate that might even go far beyond the cultural sector itself”

and calls for a discussion on

“the nature, usefulness and limits of economic valuation.”⁵

He then looks to the next year for

“dialogue between Whitehall’s measures and the cultural sector’s vision”⁶

More recently than these online debates, and two years after the DCMS report recommendations for a national steer, the Arts Council published guidance on the measurement of economic benefits in the arts. The guidance presents a range of possible approaches to identifying economic benefits, but at the same time seems to caution against the use of a financially driven approach, seeing this as arising from an ‘instrumental’ view of purpose. Although it describes one method: Social Return on Investment as ‘intriguing’, it concludes the methodology is problematic because

“Most arts organisations’ work (with the notable exception of participatory arts companies) is not intended primarily to achieve social benefits – other elements, such as enjoyment, cultural enrichment or entertainment are stronger.” (BOP, 2012, p.25)

The guidance states that it has been published, in part, due to the “grandiose claims” of some impact assessments and sees this as generating scepticism towards ‘claims’ of value (BOP, 2012, p.32). Despite its cautionary stance, ultimately the report acknowledges that there are a number of reasons for conducting these type of evaluations in addition to ‘influencing funders’, such as raising profile and ‘strategic thinking’(BOP, 2012, p.3).

The idea that conducting this type of work can be useful for strategy is rarely highlighted in the literature and is an important point to make in the debate around value. There is an implicit assumption in much of the commentary that economic assessments are driven solely by the need to influence funding decisions. The Arts Council’s guidance points out that this may not be the only reason for pursuit of economic assessment and there could be internal uses for the information. And yet, echoing the Arts Council publication’s criticism of ‘grandiose claims’, much of the evaluative literature on cultural impact or value has been described as adopting a largely ‘advocacy’ stance, in order to prove the worth of activity (Merli, 2002). And perhaps that is in part driven by the ‘non-mandatory’ nature of cultural activities in local authority agendas (Wood, 2005). This need to assert a ‘value’ has become increasingly apparent in the last five years. The heyday of ‘culture’ and the ‘creative industries’ in New Labour’s policy has given way to a climate of ‘difficult spending decisions’ (Arts Quarter, 2011; Cutler and Bakewell, 2011; Hicks et al., 2010; O’ Brien et al., 2010). The economic climate coupled with the existence of public funding in the cultural sector and a policy approach that seeks to ‘join-up’ policy agendas (Gray, 2004) means that there is a demand for the cultural sector to be put alongside other publically funded services in competition for scarce resources⁷.

The DCMS report in 2010 ‘Measuring the Value of Culture’ is driven by the need to articulate benefits “so that funding decisions can be made” (O’ Brien et al., 2010, p.5) and the call for economic demonstration of benefits was described in 2010 as “stronger... than it has ever been” (Doyle, 2010, p.245).

In a discussion of the findings from an arts sector survey exploring impacts of the recession on the UK Cultural Sector in 2011 it was asserted that:

“there can be no doubt that the sector is broadly in the throes of a second recessionary wave brought about by public sector cuts and continuing disappointing levels of private sector fundraising growth” (Arts Quarter, 2011, p.4).

In the context of the current climate and policy approaches to public spending (Mirza, 2006; Scott and Soren, 2009; Selwood, 2010; Smith, 2010), it would seem all the more important to understand what approaches have been used to assess ‘value’ or impact and explore how far these models may be used not simply for advocacy purposes, but potentially for understanding what benefits there may be from cultural activities in cross-sectoral contexts. This report aims to bring a contribution to that field of literature in reviewing the existing research and evidence on economic models used to explore the long-term economic benefits of cross-sectoral cultural activities.

⁵ <http://sotablog.artscouncil.org.uk/post/17547433925/a-year-of-measuring-the-value-of-culture>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/culture/2012/jan/05/david-edgar-why-fund-the-arts>

2. LITERATURE REVIEW*

One of the fundamental issues with exploring economic assessments in this field highlighted by the previous discussion is the concepts and terms involved. In the stated objectives of this review the terms impact and value are used. In the literature these terms are often used interchangeably without definition. However, there are semantic distinctions made in the economics field.

Generally, 'economic impact analysis' (EIA) is the term used to describe an approach to economic assessment that seeks to identify the effect on the local economy of some form of activity. EIA uses an input-output model to understand the revenue from activity less the expenditure and thereby its effect on a specified economy. This approach is useful for contexts that are concerned with economic growth and appeals to a political agenda.

Economic value is described as useful for understanding 'efficiency' and is used to describe how much an activity is worth to people. The net value is calculated by estimating the benefits less costs. The approach is generally utilised for policy agendas and underpins the approaches recommended by the HM Treasury's Green Book⁸.

In the context of this review, the potential use of both 'economic impact' and 'economic value' approaches are considered, following the distinctions above, in order to explore the possibilities for cross-sectoral cultural activities. The term 'cultural activities' also presents semantic challenges (Guersen and Rentschler, 2010; Gray, 2004; Jones, Comfort, Eastwood and Hillier, 2004; Reeves, 2003; Tepper, 2002; Weisand, 2005). It has been described as a "fluid" term and a definition of the 'cultural sector' and what activities that includes is "unclear" (Doyle, 2010, p.246).

The issue of defining 'culture' runs throughout the literature reviewed and indeed one of the shortcomings of the EIA method frequently cited is how the 'cultural sector' has been defined in calculations.

For this review the Institute of Cultural Capital (ICC) provided the following working definition of 'cultural activities':

* Building upon the ICC's core assertion that culture is the sum of our shared creativity, that being everything we do together, the broadest possible definition of cultural activity would be applied. This encompasses activities that 'allow the expression of identity, a sense of self, [at] the level at which social groups develop distinct patterns of life' (Mitchell, 2000), as well as the artefacts produced from these patterns of life- the music, the plays, the images etc. In a collaborative context, this can include examples along the continuum of cultural activity from grassroots initiatives to organised culture. These can be categorised according to types of activity and/or organisations involved, for example:⁹

CULTURAL ACTIVITY	CULTURAL ORGANISATIONS
Cultural heritage and history	Museums
Informal leisure pursuits ¹⁰	Community groups
Literature/literary culture	Libraries
Performing arts	Theatres
Visual arts	Galleries
Media/film	Cinemas
Music	Social/performance venues

The scope of the study was agreed as:

* research and practice over the last 20 years, i.e. since 1992, conducted in the UK, with a particular focus on Merseyside.

The aim of the literature search was to identify economic models used in cross-collaborative initiatives involving the cultural sector, both nationally in the 'grey' and published literature and more locally within the Merseyside region. Whilst this is not a 'systematic review' of the literature, so strict criteria on quality of studies included has not been generated, the review was 'exhaustive' (See Appendix 1 for Literature Search sources) and adopts a critical stance with possible weaknesses in studies identified and highlighted.

The search indicated that whilst a broad definition of cultural activities is taken, the published literature largely reflects the work of institutions and large organisations. The definition adopted for this review echoes the recent Liverpool Plan which describes culture and events as:

"not confined to galleries, museums and theatres. Creative and cultural events are everywhere and for everyone." (Liverpool Council, 2012, p.20)

However, the published literature on economic impact and value throws up findings from a potentially narrower definition of that activity. Community agencies and smaller-scale initiatives are less likely to have the resources needed to undertake evaluative studies (Miles and Clarke, 2006). Efforts were made to attempt to overcome this potential skew in the publications by extensive searching of 'grey literature' and use of networks and contacts to call for examples of unpublished studies of relevance¹⁰.

Although it has been stated that there "are literally dozens of studies on the economic benefits of the arts" (Mccarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras, and Brooks, 2004, p.16), studies exploring the impact or value of cross-sectoral activity and collaboration appear to be lacking. Some of the studies may have been cross-sectoral in nature, but the exploration of impact was generally focussed on the cultural sector's role, as opposed to exploring the benefits of the collaboration. Where collaboration has been explored, it largely concerned partnerships between cultural activities not cross-sectoral alliances. Therefore, there are some studies explored in this review that may not be cross-sectoral in nature, but were found to offer valuable insights into collaborative practice.

⁸ In the Green Book the term 'cost-benefit' analysis is used http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/green_book_complete.pdf

⁹ It should be noted that this term did not include the category of Sport.

¹⁰ These might include for example cookery, crafts, DIY etc.

3. FINDINGS*

As discussed in the Introduction, there are generally two approaches used to undertake economic analysis of a sector, organisation or activity: those concerned with impact or 'effects' and those exploring 'value' or worth (Selwood, 2010). These are not the only terms used to categorise the range of approaches employed and whilst it is acknowledged that what is grouped under them in the report may also be contestable, the two headings provide useful distinctions to organise the findings.

3.1 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODS

3.1.1 MODELS

An introductory exploration of impact assessment models is necessary to set the context, but it should be noted that this report does not seek to go over the history of economic multipliers. The literature review conducted for Impact 08 provides a useful overview of input-output models and the benefits and disbenefits of use (Phythian-adams, Sapsford and Southern, 2008, 2008). This report tries to add to that work through the lens of cross-sectoral collaboration and explore whether there is anything further to be learned from these examples.

The heading of Impact Assessment draws on the term Economic Impact Assessment (EIA). However, in other reviews this heading has differentiated EIA from related methodologies. For example, the Arts Council guidance of 2012 distinguishes two types of 'effect' analysis: economic impact and economic footprint (BOP Consulting, 2012).

These 'effect' type of analyses have generally been used for sectors, organisations and events (Collett and Lovatt, 2010; Llop and Arauzo-Carod, 2011). Economic footprint analysis has been described as more useful for understanding impact for a national economy of either sector or large institutions, but not for a regional level. In the cultural field, there appears to be a range of views on the specific usefulness of Economic Impact Assessment and whilst there are differing opinions on where the bulk of initiatives have taken place, this literature review identified application of the method in sectoral,

organisational and event settings. EIA has been described as generally focussed on sectoral level analysis (Collett, M. and Lovatt, 2010) and the Arts Council guidance concluded that studies at the organisational level are rare (BOP Consulting, 2012). However, a number of these have been done in the UK, such as Travers' study of the Museums and Galleries sector (2006); a study for the Duxworth Museum in Cambridge (Zivan and Truscott, 1999) and a study of an Open Air Museum in Beamish (Johnson and Thomas, 1992). Moreover, economic impact assessments have also been used for a large number of event studies, including the study on the Capital of Culture (England's Northwest Research Service and Impacts 08, 2010) and more recently Liverpool's Sea Odyssey event (Vector Research, 2012). In contrast to the Arts Council's conclusion, Collett and Lovatt (2010) assert that there has been a "considerable amount of work undertaken" in Liverpool using impact assessment methods in large cultural institutions and sees this as being due to a number of capital bids, including:

- * National Museums of Liverpool ;
- * Liverpool Philharmonic;
- * Everyman Playhouse;
- * Liverpool Biennial. (p.8)

However, the majority of these studies use either a single organisation as the unit of study, a single event or a single sector. Where collaborative initiatives are explored they usually involve more than one organisation from the same sector and these are generally agencies that could be described as within the 'cultural sector'. Where initiatives are cross-sectoral in nature the data gathered still tends to focus on the contribution of one of those sectors to a set of outcomes. The evidence base on the use of impact assessment to look at cross-sectoral activity is lacking. However, it is worth exploring some of these impact studies to understand whether economic impact assessment methods have potential to be used in cross-sectoral contexts.

Economic Impact Assessment generally uses visitor data, alongside government data, to

understand the impact of a specific event or activity in the local economy. Within economic impact assessment there are three types of potential effects explored: direct, indirect and induced spend (BOP Consulting, 2012; Mccarthy et al., 2004; Oxford Economic Forecasting, 2006; Phythian-adams et al., 2008). The direct effect is the output of the activity created, such as jobs or wages. The indirect effect is the spend generated in the wider economy, as a result of the activity, for example travel costs of visitors to an event. The induced impacts are the effects spread throughout the wider economy, such as non-cultural sector job creation.

Direct or 'First Round' Spending

Economic impact assessments start with direct or 'first-round spending' and particularly for events this is usually gathered through visitor surveys. One example of the use of this method, which illustrates neatly the most frequently used model of EIA, is an evaluation of the AV Festival in the North east in 2010 (BOP Consulting, 2010). This used a simple first round calculation of audience numbers and total spend on festival, gathered via face to face and online surveys (BOP Consulting, 2010). The next step was to calculate the inputs of local visitors and incoming visitors and account for those who had visited from outside of the area or 'only for' the festival (BOP Consulting, 2010, p.5). The adjustment to take out local residents' spend is recommended in many of these studies (Snowball, 2008). The aim of adjustment is to address the issue of 'displacement', where spending by locals within their economy would have taken place anywhere regardless of the event. However, in other economic studies of cultural events this data was used in another way to attribute spend. In a study of the Lakes Alive Festival local people were asked to indicate how much they had spent in attending the event and also how much they would normally have spent over the same period in the same place when there was not an event (Miles and Savage, 2009). This latter figure was then subtracted from their event associated spend to give an indication of attributable local spend. Local spend could subsequently be included in the total net spend connected to the event (Miles and

Savage, 2009, p.20). In many other studies this approach is avoided, in part because the figure could turn out to be negative (Wood, 2005), which may not fit with an 'advocacy argument, but also due to the issue of reliability in asking people to determine an 'average' figure.

Although the 'first round' or direct effect process appears to be more straightforward than the following 'indirect' spend calculations, the direct effect is reliant upon the data gathered. The potential issues with data collection for this type of study have been described as 'well documented' (Collett and Lovatt, 2010). The quality of the fieldwork will significantly affect the reliability of a study (AEA Consulting, 2004; Herrero, 2006; Phythian-adams et al., 2008). The first issue is of the burden of data collection that this type of analysis entails (Throsby, 2004). However, Morris Hargreaves and MacIntyre point out that adoption of a collaborative approach to data collection could overcome this barrier (2009). They suggest identifying where mutual benefit could be gained from encouraging other organisations that already have data collection processes in place to revise surveys to incorporate relevant data. They give an example of marketing data that may already be collected and highlight the cost savings that could be gained to make it manageable (Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, 2009). This would appear to be a particular area of economic assessment where collaborative approaches could present advantages.

The second issue that leaves data collection methods open to critique is the 'reliability' of the responses. There is potential for both omission: under reporting and also exaggeration: over reporting (Breen, Bull and Walo, 2001). The latter issue was described by Faulkner and Raybould as a 'social bravado' effect, whereby responses were exaggerated due to the presence of peers (1995, p.80). To overcome this issue it is suggested that interviews should be randomly sampled and conducted individually (Breen et al., 2001). However, there may also be the 'social desirability' influence of the interviewer (Breen et al., 2001). The Liverpool ECoC study of how far people's visits were influenced by the Capital of Culture

programme found that 83% of interviewees “indicated that the Liverpool ECoC events programme had been an important factor in their decision to visit” (England’s Northwest Research Service and Impacts 08, 2010, p.5). However, findings also showed that only 7.5% were attending an ECoC event (England’s Northwest Research Service and Impacts 08, 2010, p.5). It could be conjectured that this is an example of people providing the answer to a closed response question that they assumed the interviewer wanted to hear. In addition, the ability of people to accurately recall spend has been found to be inconsistent (Breen et al., 2001; Faulkner and Raybould, 1995; Wood, 2005). Breen et al. suggest use of a diary method to gather data to overcome issues of influence in face to face situations and address the issue of ‘memory decay’ (Breen et al., 2001). However, where data is collected at the time of the event, it has been argued that the diary method is not necessary (Wood, 2005).

Data collection also raises issues of replicability of studies for comparisons and Collett and Lovatt assert that a one size fits all approach does not account for differing emphases and primary objectives in organisations (2010). However, this assertion assumes that a study of impact will always be on a single organisation. In the context of collaborative initiatives, the important consideration will be how to align organisation’s differing emphases against a whole objective or shared purpose. Rather than a one size fits all approach, the aim in collaborative contexts may be to look at how the differing emphases can contribute to and build a richer picture.

Indirect or Induced Effects

The next step in the EIA process is to move to calculation of indirect effects or the demonstration of the ‘virtuous circle’ of how a small amount of spend can generate a greater amount in the economy (Phythian-adams et al., 2008). This has been described as the ‘advantage’ of impact assessment over other methods (Snowball, 2008). Again, the AV Festival is an example of the model that many studies of events in the cultural field adopt. The ‘virtuous circle’ was calculated by using the reported spend averaged by length of stay for all incoming visitors (BOP Consulting, 2010).

The following stages of this approach are the steps in the process that present the most challenges and attract the greatest critique. They are also the processes that offer the most challenge for the context of cross-sectoral initiatives.

In order to identify the ‘virtuous circle’, the indirect and then induced effects must be demonstrated. The indirect or induced effects in the wider economy are estimated to provide figures of a potential effect. In some studies the surveys include questions on amounts that people have spent during their stay for an event and in what sectors of the economy spend occurred. So for example in Liverpool Impact 08 they asked people to identify how much they had spent on accommodation for their visit (England’s Northwest Research Service and Impacts 08, 2010). In other studies, this primary data is not collected and in particular when the focus is an event local standard estimates are used, such as STEAM¹¹. This data provides estimates of local visitors’ contribution to the economy. The ‘first round’ or direct effects of spend can be identified through collection of primary data. However, as this last example shows, these indirect and induced effects demand the use of further ‘estimations’ and the issue of what is included, excluded or emphasised is viewed as key to developing a robust case (Phythian-adams et al., 2008).

¹¹ Appendix 1 provides the list of resources used in the search strategy.

3.1.2 ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

McHone and Rungeling highlight that there a number of areas where transparency of how figures have been achieved is crucial (2000), but the use of ‘multipliers’ in particular has been described as leaving the method “vulnerable to manipulation” (Snowball, 2008, p.24). Moreover, this crucial calculation is often used with no explanation of how the multiplier was derived (McHone and Rungeling, 2000).

The use of multipliers is particularly open to the critique of manipulation as the net effect will depend upon the size of the multiplier chosen for calculation (Madden, 2001; Mccarthy et al., 2004; new economics foundation, 2002). Multipliers are an estimation of how far the effect will spread through an economy. For every pound spent a further multiple of it will be spent as a result of that activity. A look at a number of the studies reviewed demonstrates the range of possible multipliers that could be used and the ambiguity that those interpreting studies can be left with.

Travers and Glaister (2004) state that HM Treasury find a general range of multipliers between 1.5 to 1.7 in economic studies within the cultural sector. This range was used by Travers, et al. in their exploration of the impact of the museum sector, stating that they decided to “err on the side of caution” (Travers and Glaister, 2004, p.47). A study looking at the impact of the arts sector on the economy in London used estimates of 1.53 for spend effect and 1.39 for employment effect, but this study did not give clear detail on how the multipliers were determined (Oxford Economic Forecasting, 2006). This lack of explicit description is not confined to older studies. More recently, a study of the Liverpool Sea Odyssey Festival also appears to leave us with an unclear sense of the calculation of multiplied expenditure, saying only that it used “estimates of local linkages derived from previous economic research in Liverpool” (Vector Research, 2012, p.25).

A study of the impact of the LARC group of cultural institutions in Liverpool used a multiplier of 1.30 for the impact within the City economy, then 1.45 for the Liverpool City region and 1.60 for the North West economy, which they saw as in line with the HCA Additionality¹² guidance of multipliers between 1.38 to 1.57 (Roger Tym and Partners, 2011, p.36). The Lakes Alive study stated that the multiplier of 1.99 used was informed by BAFA guidance from Allen and Shaw 2000¹³ (Miles and Savage, 2009). In their study of cultural institutions in Liverpool, Collett and Lovatt identified a wider range than that of the HM Treasury finding, between 1.1 to 1.9 across studies (2010). As these examples show and as Collett and Lovatt concluded, there is ‘little consensus’ on appropriate multipliers (2010, p.23). The problems that a lack of consensus over methods generates are illustrated by the example of the Liverpool Everyman. Two different consultancies produced two ‘radically different’ findings for impact assessment and the Everyman was described as being left with a ‘dilemma’ over how to understand their economic impact ongoing (Collett and Lovatt, 2010, p.8.)

Some multipliers appear more conservative than others, but generally there is scant explanation as to why a particular multiplier has been chosen. Several commentators assert that the development of bespoke multipliers particular to the local project and economy is preferable (Kelly and Kelly, 2000; Miles and Savage, 2009; Phythian-adams et al., 2008). However, some studies derive ‘off the shelf’ multipliers from previous studies and argue that bespoke development is not always possible practically. In the review of economic impact methods for the Impact 08 Study the development of a bespoke model was recommended. However, when the impact assessment was conducted the choice was taken to use an off the shelf model, so that previously collected data could be drawn on for a baseline (England’s Northwest Research Service and Impacts 08, 2010).

¹² The Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor (STEAM) provides an indicative base of the local economic impact of tourism (from both staying and day visitors) for monitoring trends. <http://www.visitengland.org/england-tourism-industry/DestinationManagerToolkit/destinationmonitoring/3CDeterminingtheLocalEconomicImpactofTourism.aspx?title=3C%3A+Determining+the+Local+Economic+Impact+of+Tourism>
¹³ <http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20100911035042/http://englishpartnerships.co.uk/communitiespublications.htm>

Similarly, in the Lakes Alive study, Miles et al. acknowledge that the development of bespoke multipliers is the ideal, but stated that this presented challenges in their context of a number of small economies. They also concluded that it was beyond the 'scope' of the study, which perhaps infers limited resources to do this (Miles and Savage, 2009, p.20). This issue of resources for development of bespoke models appears to be the most often cited reason for the choice of 'off the shelf' multipliers.

A key issue highlighted by the use of multipliers is that these calculations could be described as merely showing 'displacement' effects of spend (Madden, 2001, p.166). In other words spend that could have been generated by another sector within the economy. Throughout the literature, it is recommended that EIA should account for three considerations in 'additionality': displacement, which is the idea of diverted spend from somewhere else; leakage, spend which occurs elsewhere from the economy or region in focus and finally deadweight, where spending would have taken place anyway¹⁴.

However, the concept of accounting for displacement illustrates the challenges and difficulties that this approach is fraught with. Firstly, displacement can occur not only between differing sectors within a local economy, but also beyond (Madden, 2001). Spend within a specific regional economy may be displacement from another region. Commentators assert that multipliers should be used to explore 'exogenous' spend where money has come from outside of the local economy (Madden, 2001, p.109; Palmer, 2002). However, the risk of using this type of analysis for public spending is that decisions to spend on one sector in a local economy 'diverts' attention from another industry (Mccarthy et al., 2004, p.18) and the analysis becomes 'meaningless' in this context (Madden, 2001, p.168).

In order to try and overcome some of these challenges, Madden argues that where 'additionality' is used it should account for any

potential 'inverse' impact on other sectors (2001, p.167). One particular example of a potential inverse impact is highlighted by Throsby who asserts that claims of 'new job creation' in this form of analysis are misleading because in a 'fully employed' economy those workers would have been employed elsewhere (2004, p.109). In a study of the impact of the arts in Birmingham it was found that those from outside the region spent a greater amount than locals and so a recommendation was made to 'encourage' visitors from other areas to generate greater economic impact (Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, 2009, p.13). However, the figures given in the report indicate that there is public sector investment in the arts sector in Birmingham and so this could be described at a national level of economy as displacement and potentially an inverse effect for another publically funded sector in another region. This is obviously an argument that has particular currency where analysis is made of only one sector's contribution. The aim of this review is to identify economic analysis in collaborative contexts and perhaps this is an issue that collaborative efforts could begin to address. By looking at sectors not in isolation, but alongside other sectors perhaps these issues of displacement and the analysis of potential inverse impact could be explored more fully.

Whilst Madden and others urge for net effect analysis, which tries to take into account some of these issues (Madden, 2001; Mccarthy et al., 2004), this is not always taken up. A study of the impact of the arts sector in London in 2006 states that their analysis is conducted on a gross basis because

"this is a standard procedure in the analysis of the economic impact of individual industries or businesses." (Oxford Economic Forecasting, 2006; p.16)

This same study highlights that some of the institutions included in its calculations received £11 million in sponsorship in 2004/05. (Oxford Economic Forecasting, 2006; p.30) However, neither this investment nor the government

funding is considered in calculations as potentially diverted funds from elsewhere. All of the investment into the institutions is viewed as investment generated by those institutions. This study of London's arts sector explains in detail where spend is located in the borough and further afield, but the description of the scale of these induced effects is vague and we are told that calculations have been made using the:

"Oxford Economic Forecasting's UK macroeconomic model. This is an extensive set of statistical relationships that characterise the complex interactions that occur within the UK economy." (Oxford Economic Forecasting, 2006, p.30)

This example of the 'black box' type of methodology, where the methods are not seemingly transparent, weakens the credibility of this type of approach. It would seem therefore that despite economic impact assessment now being well established in the tourist industry and a wealth of literature on the ways to improve credibility of the technique (Collett and Lovatt, 2010), the critique of advocacy driving 'over inflation' of results (Merli, 2002) in the cultural sector may still be valid.

In some studies there is a further step in the process to place the multiplied induced effects in a wider context. A study looking at capital spend in seaside areas placed the calculations in the context of local ONS figures for employment and business numbers to get an aggregate 'gross value added' (BOP Consulting, 2011). A 'gross value added' (GVA) methodology has been described as a 'truer' picture of economic impact, in looking at earnings, profit and investment 'within the area of benefit' (Roger Tym and Partners, 2011, Executive Summary), rather than those 'outside' the area of benefit. However, the concept of 'GVA' is another example of the complexity of the choice of appropriate models for application to the cultural field. In contrast to the view of GVA as a 'truer' picture, Morris Hargreaves and MacIntyre assert that use of GVA becomes 'fruitless' when the aim is to make wider comparisons to other

sectors, because the cultural sector is largely non-profit making and so comparisons cannot be made (Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, 2009, p.15).

3.1.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR CROSS-SECTORAL CONTEXTS

The main issue emerging from the literature on impact assessment for cross-sectoral initiatives is attribution. How the contribution of different organisations, particularly from different sectors could be understood in an input-output model that looks at visitor spend and numbers and reasons of visits. Understanding how different organisations contribute to activity is described as 'critical' by Collett and Lovatt (2010, p.23). However, few studies attempt to address this and only one study in those reviewed, The Liverpool Biennial Impact Study, makes 'an attempt' to identify additional impact of the Biennial over and above that which could be attributed to other organisations (Collett and Lovatt, 2010, p.10). The issue of potential double counting or 'overlap' with what could be claimed by partners is acknowledged and there is a call for 'further work' on this issue (Collett and Lovatt, 2010, p.10).

A further challenge for cross-sectoral activity is presented by the use of estimate figures for calculations of activities involving contributions from more than one sector, the determination of what figure to use from which sector can affect final output. An example of this is presented by a study looking at the impact of the museum sector (Travers and Glaister, 2004). To estimate job creation a figure of £75,000 to £100,000 of turnover for every job created was used. However, the report acknowledges that the equivalent figure for National Museums' Directors Conference organisations is only £69,400 (Travers and Glaister, 2004, p.20). As with other studies, although the difference is again acknowledged, there is a lack of explicit explanation of selection of the higher figure for turnover. Economic assessment of cross-sectoral activities would need to make transparent and explicit decisions on figures used and this could present significant challenges with differing agendas.

¹⁴ Allen, K. & Shaw, P. (2000), Festivals Mean Business: The shape of arts festivals in the UK, London: British Arts Festival Association

Where impact assessment takes a sectoral level view, the core issue will be determining what definition of a sector is used. Again choices will affect the results. Mirza gives an example of Heartfield's questioning of the inclusion of the software industry in the DCMS study of impact of the 'creative industries (Heartfield, J. 2004 'Branding over the Cracks', *Critique*, 35 in Mirza, 2006). This industry contributed the most significant portion of the earnings and employment to the overall total and so the conclusions were viewed as 'overinflating' impact (Mirza, 2006, p. 77).

In addition to these challenges, the main problem is the lack of previous economic impact assessment studies to draw from. There is a scarcity of studies looking at the impact of more than one sector in cross-sectoral initiatives or indeed the impact of one sector or organisation's economic effects on another. One example of identification of potential effects is given in the case study of the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra's performance at the recent Shanghai Expo (Collett and Lovatt, 2010). However, this is only a brief reference to the use of the cultural sector to 'drive' the agenda of the other sector, in this case development of business links with another economy. (Collett and Lovatt, 2010, p.45) This example also perhaps highlights an underlying challenge to efforts to develop more strategic collaborative approaches to understanding economic impact. In the Liverpool Impact 08 stakeholder report, it was found that for the private sector, the benefits of involvement in cultural sector activity was viewed chiefly as a "business opportunity" and the attendant "awareness" for businesses that sponsorship afforded (O'Brien, 2008, p.6). Moreover, in a study of impact of events in Blackburn, the most frequently cited benefit by local business was 'the image of Blackburn' and the least mentioned were 'money to the town' and 'investment to the area' (Wood, 2005, p.48). Rather than assuming an associated increase in turnover for local businesses from the event, this study asked businesses to identify the economic impact. They found that in fact the event had either not had an impact on turnover or turnover had decreased

(Wood, 2005, p.48). This raises the potential drawback of economic impact assessment for cultural activity in the context of spending decisions on a local basis. It also underlines the view of many commentators that exploration of cultural activity using economic frameworks brings greater 'imprecision' than in those sectors where the 'market' is the frame for outputs (Oxford Economic Forecasting, 2006, p.14).

At the core of all of these issues is purpose of the assessment. The example of the Shanghai expo appears to be aiming predominantly at businesses and the private sector in its case for the benefits of the Philharmonic. The study of the events in Blackburn had wider aims. The authors sought to throw light on how such events could be assessed systematically in order to effectively plan future events and inform local authority spending decisions. The purpose of the study will of course inform the approach taken and although it may seem obvious that this should be the first step, the lack of a clear purpose of what a study is aiming to achieve appears to be at the heart of many of the issues that have dogged studies in the cultural sector (Phythian-adams et al., 2008; Trine, 1995).

The common element in many of the studies reviewed does appear to be an aim of attracting funding. Although the example of the Philharmonic could perhaps be seen as trying to appeal to the private sector, the majority of studies appear to be primarily concerned with influencing public spending decisions. However, as discussed previously, some commentators assert that economic impact assessments are unsuitable for this context:

"Spending-based impact studies are not really relevant to decisions on the allocation of public money." (Van Puffelen, 1996 in Madden, 2001, p.165)

Madden argues that ultimately analysis of economic impact of publically funded activity in terms of size should be described as 'diversion' not 'creation' (Madden, 2001, p.166). Moreover, Madden's critique of economic impact assessment

for cultural activity centres on its inability to account for 'intangibles' (2001, p.170). He asserts that in the frame of public spending, intangibles are put before financial considerations and gives the example of pornography as illustrative of this. He asserts that whilst this may be an economically lucrative sector, it is highly unlikely to be supported from public funds (Madden, 2001).

Although Schuster commented in 1994, that "[economic impacts] have run their course... we are beginning to discover that their political half-life is limited" (Schuster, 1994, in Madden, 2001, p.163), this review indicates there still appears to be a burgeoning industry of studies. Madden asserts that "nearly every" economist commenting on 'economic' impact studies in the cultural field highlights the limitations of the methodologies." (Madden, 2001, p.165) He points to the 'absences' of economic impact studies in what he terms the 'major works' as indicative of its poor standing and says that

"In its 20-year history, the *Journal of Cultural Economics*, the academic flagbearer for the economics of the arts, has carried only a handful of 'economic' impact analyses." (Madden, 2001, p.164)

However, this 'half-life' view of economic impact is clearly not shared by all and in their 2008 review of economic impact assessments in the cultural field, Phythian-adams et al. concluded that there were four studies that had a 'solid base' for development of an input-output model (2008, p.2). Moreover, included in this four was a study of the impact of UK Theatres by Shellard (Shellard, 2004). This study is used by other commentators as an example of the issue that Madden levelled against EIA. The Shellard study is repeatedly criticised for not taking into account the concept of alternative spending scenarios (Jura Consultants, 2008). And yet more recently, in their study of the impact of the arts in Birmingham, Morris, Hargreaves and MacIntyre selected the Shellard model because it provided a model that could be "used comparatively across the cultural sector" (Morris Hargreaves MacIntyre, 2009, p.12). The field appears to be lacking

consensus in what approaches are appropriate for the cultural sector and widely differing in their view of what constitutes a 'robust' methodology.

Most importantly, in addition to the limitations of the methods, this review has highlighted the potential risks of economic impact assessment. As in the case of the events in Blackburn, taking this approach may demonstrate that activity has a negligible or negative impact (Wood, 2005). Moreover, economic impact predominantly centres on visitor economy and so whilst it may be particularly useful for events, for understanding the impact of long-standing activity developed by organisations the method could underestimate the contribution (Bryan, Munday, & Bevens, 2011). When the purpose is to influence public spending decisions, as appears to be the case in the majority of studies, these outputs could potentially have the opposite effect to that intended.

Although this review has drawn a thread of recent development in this field from the call for guidance in the DCMS funded review of methods in 2010 to the Arts Council guidance in 2012, it would appear that the latter did not wholly subscribe to the recommendations in the former. In the DCMS funded review, O'Brien identifies value or cost-benefit methodology as preferable to economic impact assessment (O'Brien, 2010). Despite these limitations and risks, in 2012 the Arts Council guidance recommends the use of impact assessment where appropriate because it sees this approach as the most widely used and so the 'best understood', as well as presenting a less costly method (BOP Consulting, 2012, p.13).

Ultimately, it goes back to the issue of purpose. If the aim is to understand the impact of an event that multiple organisations from different sectors have developed and delivered then there may be a case for use of an impact assessment model. However, as the discussion has demonstrated there are a number of challenges that would need to be addressed. EIA and its use of 'visitor numbers', spend and turnover is less relevant where the purpose is to assess long-term impact of cultural activity in a cross-sectoral setting.

3.1.4 CONCLUSIONS ON IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODS

- * EIA is viewed as useful for events and sector impact - it appears less appropriate for long-term activity developed by organisations;
- * EIA is useful for understanding contribution to economic growth;
- * adoption of a collaborative approach to impact assessment may offer the advantage of pooling data collection efforts and sharing costs to overcome the burden of resources.
- * for exploration of sectoral level collaborative activity EIA would present the following challenges:
 - clear definition of what a 'sector' is – what is included or not;
 - how to identify the different organisations contribution to impact;
 - need to ensure clear purpose by aligning potentially differing objectives to a shared objective;
 - transparent choice of figures for job creation – which sector these represent;
 - accounting for potential 'inverse' impact on other sectors.
- * for exploration at an organisational level use of EIA could underestimate the contribution of cultural organisations;
- * there is a lack of studies using EIA to look at the impact of more than one organisation or sector contribution to cross-sectoral activity;
- * the literature dealing with EIA lacks consensus - still being used within the cultural field - some recommend as 'best understood' - more recent commentary identifies the 'imprecision' of the method for non-market frame of cultural sector – many commentators recommend the use of value or cost-benefit assessment for cultural activity as more suitable.

3.2 VALUATION METHODS

In 2011, a year on from the DCMS funded review of economic models, Bakshsi lamented that despite the recommendations in that review

“all the economic studies one sees in the cultural sphere tend to be of the economic impact variety. Next to none look at valuation, using the empirical tools endorsed by the Treasury’s Green Book” (Bakhshi, 2011, p.10).

Bakhshi states that it is 'shocking' that by 2011 there are still only two major valuation studies in the cultural field that are repeatedly cited: the British Library study, conducted in 2003 and the MLA sponsored study of Bolton Museum and Libraries published in 2005 (2011, p.11). Other studies using valuation methods have been conducted and are reviewed in this section, but, as Bakshsi points out, overall there would seem to be a greater number of studies employing impact assessment, rather than valuation. The 'umbrella' of valuation appears to have diversified in more recent years with methods being combined and the lines between models blurring. This could be viewed as being driven by the growth in 'public value' in policy agendas (Gray, 2008; Hewison, 2012; Holden and Jones, 2006; Travers, 2006) and an increasing use of the economic concepts of 'value' and 'utility' for exploration of the 'social' 'intangibles' that policy agendas aim to effect. This has given rise to a range of methods, from the long-standing preference models to a wider concept of cost-benefit analysis and the combined impact and value panel format of multi-criteria analysis through to the stakeholder driven social return on investment.

3.2.1 MODELS

O'Brien's 2010 review provides a useful overview of the most commonly used methods in valuation studies with descriptions of their relative advantages and drawbacks (O'Brien, 2010). He identifies six main methods:

- * Contingent valuation – looking at people's preferences;
- * Choice modelling – assessment of different options through comparators;
- * Hedonic – relationship between goods and prices – often uses property prices as indicator;
- * Travel costs – willingness to pay for distance travelled;
- * Subjective well-being – exploration of well-being and income;
- * QUALY measures – quality of life measures generally used in healthcare.

(based on O'Brien et al., 2010)

As Bakshsi highlighted contingent valuation is the most frequent (Bakhshi, 2011), with choice modelling being used for a small number of museum related studies and subjective well-being for attendance at cultural events (Marsh, Kevin and Bertranou, 2012). The QUALY method could be useful for a collaboration between healthcare and the cultural sector¹⁵, but the advantages and drawbacks of this approach could generate its own report (Kelly, McDaid, Ludbrook and Powell, 2005) and uses of this method in this context did not emerge from the literature search. Likewise, few UK studies using only hedonic and travel costs emerged in the review and these methods do not appear to be particularly suited to exploration of cultural activity. Both methods use people's 'revealed preferences' and although these can be used to determine value for non-market goods, stated preference technique or 'willingness-to-pay' is viewed as far more applicable to

the cultural sector in its ability to also account for 'non-users' preferences (O'Brien, 2010) Hedonic methodology uses people's decisions to move to a particular area and assumes that a link can be traced between development of cultural organisations and events in an area and an increase property prices. This assumption is criticised, as there may be many reasons why a person decides to move to a particular area (BOP Consulting, 2012). Whilst travel costs can be useful for 'cultural goods' or comparisons of competing organisations¹⁶, the perceived weaknesses of the method are that it does not reveal non-users value and the distance travelled may in fact be short, so this could undervalue a cultural organisation. Moreover, while travel costs and hedonic pricing offer useful methods for an event, neither method would yield significant understanding of the value of collaborative longer-term activity. Given the drawbacks of QUALYs, travel costs and hedonic pricing, this review focuses on the following valuation methods:

- * contingent valuation as 'willingness-to-pay';
- * cost-benefit analysis;
- * social return on investment;
- * subjective well-being.

The shift in policy to a need to demonstrate the 'value' of public funding decisions: 'public value' has been echoed in the literature commenting on economic assessment methods. As early as 1989 Hughes was arguing for a broader understanding of benefits to people 'not normally captured in market transactions' (Hughes, 1989). And this has continued, in 2008 the Jura study of the museums, archives and libraries sector described the multiplier analysis of impact assessment as 'inappropriate' for this sector because it fails to capture benefits not reflected in market transactions, such as "impact on the enjoyment, appreciation, and human capital of participants" (Jura, 2008, p.41).

¹⁵ Guidance for Using Additionality Benchmarks in Appraisal, BIS, 2009 Report published online at: webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file54063.pdf

¹⁶ For further info on QUALYS see <http://www.nice.org.uk/newsroom/features/measuringeffectivenessandcosteffectivenessstheqaly.jsp>

The need to go beyond 'market transactions' and economic flow to understand 'social value'(Cox et al., 2012) has driven the development of more recent models, such as social return on investment, where people are involved collectively in defining the benefits as they perceive them (new economics foundation, 2009a). This is also the basis of a related method that has been used in the cultural sector: multi-criteria analysis. It is worth mentioning this method in the context of cross-sectoral collaborative activity because it offers a potential approach to understanding different perceptions of aspects of a service or initiative and in using a Delphi process can seek to gain collective consensus between stakeholders (Bryan et al., 2011). However, although it enables individuals and then groups to determine 'value', people are given a series of statements of potential value, rather than expressions of value in monetary terms. Therefore, as O'Brien suggested, it is a method that could be used 'alongside' economic values for decision-making (O'Brien, 2010).

At the basis of all valuation techniques is the idea that individuals determine the 'value' they derive from activity. The more long-standing valuation techniques derive from exploration of people's preferences, although in this methodology 'value' is defined on an individual basis, rather than collectively. This technique is the basis of contingent valuation, which has been described as the most commonly used method within the cultural sector (Carson, Flores and Meade 2001). As stated previously, the technique reviewed here, is the 'revealed preference' technique, which is viewed as more useful in this context for its ability to look at users and non-users preferences.

3.2.2 CONTINGENT VALUATION

Contingent valuation has been developed within the environmental field (Noonan, 2004) and has three concepts of 'value':

- * the value that people derive from use;
- * the value from having use as an option;
- * the potential and future value of its existence even if not used (BOP Consulting, 2012; Mccarthy et al., 2004).

In a special issue of The Journal of Cultural Economics dedicated to contingent valuation, the editorial states that

"studies in the cultural field [using contingent valuation] have been hypothetical, conducted by economists who are perhaps more interested in their analytical techniques than in informing actual policy debates. Few seem to have been commissioned by actual clients who have decisions to make..." (Schuster, 2003, p.157).

This situation does not seem to have shifted greatly, with more recent commentators pointing to a lack of contingent valuation studies in the UK, in particular those commissioned by the cultural sector (Bakhshi, 2011; BOP Consulting, 2012; Eftec, 2005; Frey, 2005; O'Brien, 2010). As stated previously, the two most often cited UK studies using this technique are the Bolton Museum and Libraries study conducted in 2005 and the study of the British Library in 2003.

The British Library study surveyed 2000 randomly selected people and asked them a series of questions around their willingness to pay as users of the library and as member of the public.

Respondents were asked questions in four areas:

- * willingness to pay for the service;
- * willingness to accept in compensation, if they couldn't use the service;
- * investment in their access to the service – their time and the cost to access the service;
- * costs incurred if they had to use an alternative service. (British Library, 2003).

The study of Bolton Museum and Libraries in 2005 stated that it followed on from the British Library in using similar methodology, but differed in its exploration of the total value of each service, rather than only looking at certain services (Jura Consultants, 2005). The approach also used questionnaires, face to face and telephone, but additionally conducted focus groups. The Bolton study used the same four categories as those used by the British Library study to frame interviews.

The British Library study differed from the Bolton one in attempting to outline how the institution adds value to the 'creative industries' through job creation and export. However, this was chiefly done through identifying the amount that people from the creative industries have contributed to the library through document supply and numbers of readers (Brit Library, 2003).

Issues

The Bolton Libraries study was described by O'Brien as an illustration of the advantages and disadvantages in the model as the outputs were 'robust and useful', but open to criticism in their model of people as rational decision makers (2010, p.26). This issue is echoed in other critique of contingent valuation that raises the question of whether individual preferences can be aggregated to indicate social values (Klamer, 2003). However, as the British Library study acknowledges, similar to economic impact assessment, "this work is still not an exact science" (British Library, 2003). O'Brien describes these types of issues as "philosophical critiques" that go to the heart of economic assessment and as such "are unsolvable", because they demand a stance on the underlying paradigm (O'Brien, 2010, p.32). Other, less fundamental issues also mirror those raised against impact assessment. Critique again points to 'displacement', data collection and a lack of transparency in calculations.

Displacement can also present a challenge for contingent valuation, in particular where investment includes public funding. In the British Library study this was recognised and in order to overcome this, they discounted public funding in calculations of revenue generated (British Library, 2003).

Data collection raises some of the same potential weaknesses as impact assessment. The question of reliability of people's responses can be open to question, in preference techniques people are asked to identify a notional cost. Two examples of studies using this technique demonstrate that in fact findings often contradict what is expected and challenge the critique. In the Bolton study

it was found that the stated value of users emerged as 'almost exactly' equal to the actual cost per taxpayer, suggesting that responses are not always unreliable (Jura Consultants, 2005, p.22). This study also recognised another potential problem, often cited as a drawback of the preference approach; people's responses may be 'protest votes' (O'Brien, 2012). They may overinflate if they perceive the questionnaire to be informing closure of a service. In the Bolton study calculations were adjusted to account for this possibility (Jura 2005). However, in another study it was found that not all respondents give 'protest vote' responses or the answer they think the interviewer 'wants to hear'. A study of the BBC asked people to identify how much they would be willing to pay as a subscription to avoid the BBC closing down (Thickett, 2004). Although the vast majority indicated that they would be willing to pay to avoid closure, 19% stated that they would not be willing to pay (Thickett, 2004).

Data collection issues also emerged as timing, format and use of existing data. The time of year a study is conducted could affect results, an example being that at different times of years there may be greater numbers of tourists (Jura 2005). The Bolton study also found that the format of data collection made a difference; face to face was deemed more effective than telephone or 'self-completion' (Jura, 2005, p.43). And the inclusion of focus groups was described as generating "a deeper understanding" of the key drivers behind responses and subsequently gave a 'truer' representation of willingness to pay scenarios (Jura, 2005, p. 43). Finally, the use of an existing data set was viewed as crucial to build a 'comprehensive' picture (Jura, 2005, p.42), reinforcing the emergent issue of the quality of data from the impact assessment literature. The building of data sets raises a further issue also apparent in impact assessment, gathering data is resource intensive and needs specific expertise to ensure quality (BOP Consulting, 2012; Eftec, 2005; Noonan, 2004; O'Brien, 2010). In the Lakes Alive study contingent valuation was 'abandoned' due to the 'context' and the time needed to conduct it (Miles and Savage, 2009, p.19).

Other less prominent drawbacks of using contingent valuation are the possibility of unfavourable findings (Noonan, 2004) and the 'snapshot' nature of the method (British Library, 2003; Throsby, 2003). In particular for long-term cross-sectoral activity, the latter issue could suggest that this technique would not be a useful model on which to base valuation. A final issue relates not to the method itself, but as with impact assessment studies, to the manner in which the analysis has been presented. The British Library study appears to fall prey to the same problem as many of the impact assessment studies in not explicitly stating how its final cost benefit analysis of 4:4:1 has been reached. This echoes the importance of transparent analysis clearly presented at all stages of the method.

Advantages

In 2004 Noonan states that although there is not a consensus on the most appropriate method to use in this context, there is a "wealth of knowledge about proper CVM survey design" (Noonan, 2004, p.207). As the British Library and Bolton studies demonstrated, steps can be taken to address most of the potential challenges apparent in this methodology. Aside from the snapshot nature, which appears to present a drawback in the context of this review, the main issue is one of a fundamental challenge to the use of an economic paradigm, which can be levelled against any or all of the methods.

The advantage of contingent valuation methodology in a cultural context, and in particular the stated preference technique over impact assessment, appears to be the ability to understand the value people place on activity even in circumstances where people are not 'doing anything' (Noonan, 2004, p.206). It has been highlighted that if we accept that 'the arts and culture' has a 'non-use' or external value, then contingent valuation becomes "a regrettable necessity" (Epstein, 2003).

For libraries contingent valuation has been described as the "most acceptable means at present of evaluating services." (Bawden et al., 2009, p.64) The special edition of the Journal of Cultural Economics mentioned previously contains a number of articles discussing the limitations of contingent valuation, but the overall conclusion drawn by the commentators appears to be that whilst further development of the method is needed, contingent valuation has potential to be used more widely. And most commentators appear to concur that the main advantage of this method is its capture of the 'intangibles' in monetary terms and consequently in its comparability to alternative scenarios (Noonan, 2004; Noonan, 2003; Phythian-adams et al., 2008; Snowball, 2008).

The idea of comparing different possible scenarios to identify the optimum decision is the driver behind another method akin to 'willingness to pay' in contingent valuation: choice experiment. This method has been used predominantly in the heritage and museums sectors to estimate the value placed on different exhibitions and inform visitor experience (Kinghorn and Willis, 2007; Willis, 2009) Although choice modelling has been described as more effective than direct questions on willingness to pay, this approach is largely useful for the management of cultural institutions and for understanding the 'characteristics of goods' (O'Brien, 2010). The method also presents the same issue of cost and expertise as contingent valuation (O'Brien, 2010, p.28).

Whilst 'willingness-to-pay' approaches are useful for identifying individual 'value' placed on a service or good and have been described as understanding the 'intangibles', others argue that the method does not go far enough in indicating the 'social value' that can be gained from engaging with cultural services or goods (Cox, et al., 2012).

3.2.3 SOCIAL VALUE

Social value has been described as generally used to refer to two ideas:

- * "impact on people (individuals or groups), which could be financial or economic impact, but is generally impact on health or well-being;
- * economic benefits, primarily for the government arising from social change." (Cox, et al., 2012, p.17)

It has been described as a term used in decision making to understand the value of 'social outcomes' (Cox, et al., 2012, p.17). In 2012 the Public Services (Social Value) Act required all public bodies in England and Wales to take into consideration how services they commissioned and procured improved the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area in focus (Social Enterprise UK, 2012). This heralded a duty on public bodies to demonstrate 'social value' and made 'official' what had been a growing use of 'social value' as a concept in policy agendas. 'Public value' and 'social value' parallel a rise in an increasingly preventative agenda in local authority driven by an intention to reduce dependency and cut 'reactive' spend (Cox et al., 2012). In the current climate of austerity measures the need to demonstrate reduced spend or 'delivery' of savings has become dominant in policy. Consequently, guidance developed on demonstrating value in the public sector tends to now focus on methods that can demonstrate not only the 'intangibles' or social value, but also the cost-benefits or how spend can 'benefit' a community, whether that be in economic or social terms (Cox, et al., 2012)

Increasingly evaluative approaches to understanding 'value' in the public sector are using the concept of 'social value' alongside decision-support tools, such as cost-benefit analysis. Cost-benefit analysis offers particular advantages over the methods reviewed so far, in providing a model that can identify where the benefits of activity might be felt across a number of organisations (Cox et al., 2012).

3.2.4 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

A growing number of cost-benefit analyses have been conducted within the social care and voluntary sector, some of which provide useful examples of application in practice, as well as a smaller number conducted in the cultural sector. The basic premise of this model is illustrated neatly by a study conducted by the new economics foundation for the British Red Cross. The aim was to look at how the Red Cross's preventative intervention with people resulted in wider public cost savings (The British Red Cross, 2012). They took a small number of case studies of individuals who had been helped by the Red Cross and identified the cost savings to the state from their intervention. However, the study also illustrates the main contestable stage of this approach: the use of potential 'worse-case' scenarios. For example, in one case study we are told that without the intervention of Red Cross an individual's depressive state could have spiralled into depression that would have required support from more costly public health services. This also potentially may not have happened. A more robust case is built using the example of a person with dementia who needed to remember to take medication and the case study shows, using recent research data on health intervention costs, how regular visits from a Red Cross volunteer helped to avoid a possible costly in-patient re-admission. The calculations generated a final return on investment figure demonstrating the cost-benefit (The British Red Cross, 2012).

The use of a hypothetical worst-case scenario is not the only issue that has been highlighted with cost-benefit analyses. Similar to the previous methods, the identification of potential estimates for outcomes leaves the methodology open to challenges of being 'vulnerable' to manipulation.

A study conducted by New Philanthropy Capital used cost-benefit analyses to explore the value of the arts in the criminal justice sector. They looked at three initiatives using the methodology. They used a slightly different approach for each of the initiatives, “so the return on investments should not be compared” (Johnson, 2011, p.5).

For the first project they followed up women who had participated in a theatre initiative in prison and looked at offending rates and employment status over one year and educational status over ten years. In order to calculate cost savings from those who had gained employment, they used ‘counterfactual’ estimates to calculate the number of women who gaining employment over this period could be identified as presenting a potential cost saving. They found from research data that on average two women may have gained employment following release. In their follow-up of women from the project a total of five women had gained employment and so they subtracted the two who may have gained employment anyway and were left with a figure of three women gaining employment following participation in the theatre initiative (Johnson, 2011). They then calculated their earnings and state contributions over a year as an economic gain. The education calculation used is a further estimate and shows the challenge in using this methodology. They found that two of the women were in higher education. They then ‘estimated’ that both passed their qualification and calculated projected higher earnings from this chain of events over a ten year period. They acknowledge that these estimates needed further validation:

“However, we recognise that better quality evidence is needed to validate this assumption.” (Johnson, 2011, p.17)

To calculate a return on investment they put together the one year benefits of the first two outcomes with the educational outcome and divided that by the cost of the programme. However, the study says that not all women in the cohort attended the same courses.

The initiative included a range of courses. It is therefore difficult to see how far the outcomes claimed can be attributed to particular courses and this appears to weaken the causal link that has been inferred between participation in theatre initiatives and criminal activity. For example, one of the courses: the access course is described as lengthier and therefore costlier, but there is no exploration of which of those who did not re-offend or which of those who went on to access higher education attended the access course. The study states that 12 of the cohort did not attend the access course, but did attend ‘one other course’ and so for these 12 participants there is a lower investment figure per person than the other levels of participation. Further exploration of exactly who had attended which courses and what pathways these people’s subsequent trajectories followed could perhaps have shed more insights into the cost-benefit analysis. Moreover, what is not stated is whether participation on particular courses is due to referral pathways or levels of ability in cohorts. The study potentially leaves us with further questions around the link between the ‘intervention’ and the ‘outcomes’

The study acknowledges a list of issues with the approach. In addition to estimates, the sample of people that were tracked may not be representative of the total group, as the people who were ‘not found’ could be a less stable, more likely to re-offend group. The second initiative studied, ‘Only Connect’ highlights the continuing issue of data collection. For this study they were only able to use offending data and this was not an applicable measure for all attendees because not all had offended (Johnson, 2011, p.27). Moreover, the data used was taken from the Social Exclusion Unit estimates in 2002, data that is almost ten years old.

The main issue with this approach emerges throughout the three case studies and in particular in the third example where the unit of study is a summer arts programme: the establishment of a link between ‘intervention’ and outcome. For this programme analysis they

conduct comparative calculations using baseline and follow-up data to determine the cost-benefit of participation in a summer programme across a range of factors including offending, literacy and numeracy (Johnson, 2011). As is the case with all of these examples, there is an underlying assumption that there is a causal relationship or a ‘theory of change’ behind participation and outcomes. And in particular with these cases, an assumption that participation in a short-term initiative can lead to longer-term outcomes. However, the report acknowledges this issue and in its recommendations states that the first task in undertaking evaluative work is to establish a ‘theory of change’ (Johnson, 2011, p.37). This is described as identifying “a path from needs to outputs to outcomes to impact” (Johnson, 2011, p.37). This is viewed as providing a framework for demonstrating that changes in ‘soft’ outcomes lead to changes in ‘hard outcomes’, such as re-offending (Johnson, 2011, p.37).

Despite the challenges and issues that need to be addressed, many of which repeat the emergent issues associated with previous methods, cost-benefit methodologies appear to offer greater advantages in the context of cross-sectoral activity. Rather than looking at a ‘snapshot’ of ‘value’, this kind of data collection can track activity over time. Although there are some of the same issues around data collection, the method can utilise background data on ‘hard’ outcomes that is already gathered on a large-scale (Johnson, 2011).

Most importantly, for cross-sectoral initiatives, the approach enables the exploration of shared objectives across sectors or organisations. And yet despite this obvious benefit, the study of the arts in criminal justice discussed only looked at the impact of the arts intervention. It worked from the basis of a ‘theory of change’ that saw an intervention as existing in isolation of other factors and did not seem to explore whether there were other ‘interventions’ that the criminal justice sector may have put in place for those individuals in parallel.

It gathered primary data on the individuals and used national and secondary research data, but the data on individuals held by the criminal justice sector was not explored. However, a number of commentators have highlighted that this can be difficult in practice (Mirza, 2006; Selwood, 2010). In an evaluative study of a dance programme in a criminal justice setting Miles and Strauss found that trying to access the records of participants in custody “proved especially fruitless” (Miles and Strauss, 2008, p.21) and in order to overcome these data issues they conducted follow-up interviews.

As with other methods, collection of data may be resource intensive and although this approach draws on national data more extensively than impact or contingent valuation techniques, different challenges emerge from data quality issues (Cox et al., 2012; Miles and Strauss, 2008). A further issue with this type of method is that although analyses can be either formative or summative, those that have been conducted are largely retrospective, as funding for evaluative work has not been included in many initiatives (Cox et al., 2012).

However, the main advantages of cost-benefit analyses over the methods discussed so far is the potential for engaging people whose agendas may not be predominantly fiscally driven (Cox, et al., 2012). This could be stakeholders, such as volunteers who may be involved in projects, but also in the cultural sector organisations or initiatives who are approaching evaluation not only as an ‘advocacy’ tool.

The engagement of stakeholders in cost-benefit methodology is largely at the final stage in discussing the findings. The next methodology discussed takes this engagement a step further. Social return on investment has been described as ‘set apart’ from other cost-benefit analyses by involving stakeholders in determining what benefits are important to measure from the start (Cox, et al., 2012).

3.2.5 SOCIAL RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Social return on investment is now recommended by the National Audit Office and is increasingly used not only in the social enterprise and voluntary sectors, but across a number of cultural settings and organisations, in particular in the libraries setting in the US (Jura, 2008). In its review of methodologies for museums, libraries and archives, nef concluded that social return on investment presented the “most relevant” approach (new economics foundation, 2009b). This was echoed in the recommended use of return on investment approaches in a DCMS commissioned study looking at methods for impact assessment in libraries (BOP Consulting, 2009).

SROI draws together a number of techniques from economic assessment and take two forms, either retrospective or predictive, ‘forecast’. Social return on investment is described as

“a process of inquiry and analysis that illustrates an intervention or organisation’s theory of change (how outcomes are achieved for different stakeholders)” (new economics foundation, 2009b, p.2).

As well as utilising a theory of change model, it attempts to address the ‘transparency’ issues of other methods by showing explicitly how indicators and financial values have been determined. The process generates a range of information, but generally focus is placed on the ratio calculation, which is established by dividing the net value of social benefits by the value of the investment made to achieve those benefits: the ‘return on investment’ (new economics foundation, 2009b). The process has six stages and begins by drawing together all relevant stakeholders and ‘mapping’ how the activity may impact them. This ‘impact map’ describes the theory of change or the relationship between inputs, outputs and outcomes. The next stage is to ‘evidence’ the outcomes, gathering data to explore whether the outcomes have happened and assigning

a value to them. Establishing impact involves accounting for ‘additionality’, as discussed in the previous sections, and SROI is generally viewed as stronger than other methods in taking into account deadweight, displacement, attribution and substitution (BOP Consulting, 2012).

SROI is distinguished from cost-benefit analysis in showing the benefits to a number of stakeholders, rather than only to the funders (new economics foundation, 2009b). The approach is underpinned by seven key factors ‘for success’, which are worth presenting in full here as they encapsulate many of the issues identified with other methodologies previously discussed:

1. Involve stakeholders (measure with people, allow them to say what is important and what should be counted).
2. Understand what changes (how an intervention is making a difference in the world – the theory of change).
3. Value the things that matter (attach monetary values to economic, social and environment outcomes this is not to represent cashable savings, but as a way to illustrate value – these values are used as proxies).
4. Only include what is material (i.e., that information that affects how a management or investment decision is made – if you leave it out, it significantly alters the result).
5. Do not over claim (be clear on the distinction between outcome and impact, by taking account of what is attributable, what would have happened anyway (deadweight), and any negative effects (displacement)).
6. Be transparent (particularly when assigning monetary values, where judgement calls are frequently made).
7. Verify the result (accountability from an external source is vital if the analysis is to be used for advocacy purposes).

(new economics foundation, 2009b).

Issues

The principles above aim to address many of the weaknesses of value assessment. However, one of the main criticisms of SROI is the use of ‘proxy’ measures that are used as substitutes for concepts that do not have a direct measure (BOP Consulting, 2012; Zappala and Lyons, 2009). This is a challenging process and the difficulties are illustrated by the creation of a proxy measures database through the SROI network¹⁷. This may also be a subjective process and different stakeholder groups in different initiatives may end up choosing different proxy measures for similar concepts. An example of this is perhaps illustrated by the evaluation of the Tyne and Wear Museums project: Culture Track (BOP Consulting, 2012). In determining the final ‘cost: benefit’ ratio there was disagreement over the ‘set of assumptions’ used to arrive at a ratio that was seen as ‘too conservative’ because the assumed salary levels were too low (BOP Consulting, 2012, p.27). The figures were re-calculated with a different set of assumptions and a range of ratios presented. This shows the ‘flexibility’ around assumptions and perhaps reinforces the critique levelled previously at economic methods that can be ‘vulnerable to manipulation’.

This subjectivity in process is one of the reasons for the non-comparable nature of the method, which is also seen as a drawback (BOP Consulting, 2012). However, supporters of the method assert that the aim is not for comparability across initiatives because of the acknowledgement that how “outcomes are achieved will differ between organisations” (nef, 2009b, p.1). This is seen as potentially ‘confusing’ for people though, as the findings are expressed in financial terms that seem comparable, such as a ratio of 1:2 for one project and 1:3 for another project, both of which may be for projects conducted in the same sector (BOP Consulting, 2012, p.28). SROI is described as “most powerful” when used as a performance management tool repeated within the same setting over time to evaluate changes in allocation of investment (nef, 2009b, p.1).

Although none of the studies identified fitted this description, the method has been used to understand the impact of a strategic initiative over a particular time period. SROI was used to explore the value of the Libraries for Life strategy, which ran from 2008-2011 in Wales (CyMAL, 2011). The process gathered a range of data through interviews, online surveys, focus groups and documentation analysis over a sixteen month period. (CyMAL, 2011) Although it was not stated in the report, follow-up dissemination of the project concluded that SROI was not particularly suitable to “a programme of this size” and would be more applicable to smaller “discreet projects”¹⁸. One of the main drawbacks highlighted by this project was the length of time it can take to complete the process, the 16 months of this example is not an isolated case. As with all the methods, the time and cost of gathering data for SROI can be a barrier (Jura, 2008). Related to this is the lack of baseline data for a particular sector that can be drawn upon to potentially speed up the process (BOP Consulting, 2009). Similar to the challenges facing the use of impact assessment, there is a lack of longer-term evaluative data gathered and existing studies tend to be time-limited and ‘one-off’ on particular initiatives (BOP Consulting, 2009).

Advantages

However, although the study using SROI for the Welsh Libraries for Life initiative concluded that it was better suited to projects than the strategy in focus, it was felt that the findings gave useful information for further development. The use of SROI showed “the added value” that the strategy had brought to the sector and in particular demonstrated how the investment had proved to be “excellent value for money” (CyMAL, 2011, p.149). A particular strength highlighted over impact assessment approaches is its ability to identify the extent to which the objectives of the strategy had been achieved, as well as pinpointing a number of areas for improvement and solutions to address these issues (CyMAL, 2011).

¹⁵ For a useful example of this method in practice see Boter, J. Rouwendal, J. and Wedel, M. 2005. Employing Travel Time to Compare the Value of Competing Cultural Organizations, *Journal of Cultural Economics* (29) pp. 19-33. http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/44648/10824_2005_Article_5796.pdf;jsessionid=754444A417C1DAE660CD28DEF51AB235?sequence=1

¹⁶ http://www.wikivois.org/index.php?title=Main_Page

Two further aspects of the methodology, where SROI is viewed as more effective than impact assessment, is in its accounting for additionality and involvement of stakeholders. The SROI framework appears to be more demanding of transparency when accounting for additionality and the gross to net calculations (BOP Consulting, 2012). Within this stage of the process, SROI also includes adjustment for 'drop-off' of effects over time, a concept not generally apparent in other approaches.

The involvement of stakeholders in the process of determining value and subsequently their engagement in the findings and in responding to and acting upon recommendations appears to offer an advantage for cross-sectoral activity not apparent in the other methods (CyMAL, 2011; BOP Consulting, 2012; Jura, 2008).

And yet although the recent Arts Council guidance identifies the engagement of a range of stakeholders in the process as an advantage, the guidance seems to conclude that fundamentally SROI is not compatible with the main purpose of the work of the cultural sector. The guidance states that:

“SROI may not be a suitable tool for the bulk of the work most arts and cultural organisations carry out, which is not directly intended to have significant social benefits.” (BOP Consulting, 2012, p.28)

Again there is a challenge to the concept of a 'social' or perhaps 'instrumental' value being explored in cultural activity. As already discussed this goes back to a core issue of whether these types of 'reductive' assessment should be undertaken at all (Matarasso, 1997).

And yet, emerging throughout this review of 'valuation' methods is a counter challenge, particularly suggested by the benefits of SROI, that approaching 'value' in this way may offer not only a way to 'advocate' for cultural activity, but most importantly to generate objectives of purpose by and from communities, rather than formulated for them from 'outside' (Newman, Curtis and Stephens, 2001, p.13). And it is this key benefit that perhaps "offers a way forward that is more sensitive to the unique texture of artistic encounters" (Newman, Curtis and Stephens, 2001, p.13). SROI, in particular, seems to offer the potential for a 'story' of change that illuminates beyond financial return, to include the "narrative" (CyMAL, 2011, p.133). The Arts Council describes the Culture Track initiative as "unusual in the cultural sector in being almost exclusively focused on achieving social benefits" (BOP Consulting, 2012, p.26). The project was designed to "use volunteering to raise employability skills among participants and hence help them find work" (BOP Consulting, 2012, p.26). However, the context of this review is to explore how the impact of cross-sectoral collaborative effort might be explored. This is in a context in which cultural activities are being delivered in other sectors that may have objectives that are more instrumental. The aim in this context will be to combine efforts to achieve joint objectives. Therefore, it is likely that there will be both 'instrumental' and 'intrinsic' objectives and in this context methods will need to be able to explore both.

One further potential method emerged from the literature search and this is perhaps the most 'socially' driven, rather than fiscally driven of the approaches.

3.2.6 SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

The use of subjective-well being measures have been described as advantageous for their focus on the "public's internal judgements of well-being", rather than imposed policy views (Walmsley, 2012). Similar to SROI they are viewed as a more acceptable framework for understanding values that are 'imperfectly' captured by the market (Baumol, 2003 in Marsh and Bertranou, 2012, p.300).

However, in comparison to other methodologies the use of Subjective Well-being in the cultural field is in its "infancy" and has been described as thirty years behind preference driven approaches in development (Dolan and Metcalfe, 2008, p.25). A study by Marsh and Bertranou of attendance at concerts and the cinema used the framework of subjective well-being to understand the value of attendance. They used British Household Panel Survey data, which asks a number of questions around attendance at the cinema and concerts and contains a Life Satisfaction Measure, the General Health Questionnaire and identification of income (Marsh and Bertranou, 2012, p.301). Using statistical analysis they estimated the impact of engagement in culture on subjective well-being and then calculated the income compensation that would generate a 'subjective well-being' equivalent to engaging in culture, in other words how much income would be needed to generate that impact (Marsh and Bertranou, 2012, p.301). Although Dolan et al. concluded that use of subjective well-being measures should "generate meaningful monetary values of non-market goods for public policy" (Dolan and Metcalfe, 2008, p.25), the Marsh and Bertranou study found that the final figures were likely to be overestimates of the value (2012, p. 307). Both studies concluded that further research was needed to understand the relationship between income and well-being (Dolan and Metcalfe, 2008, p.25; Marsh and Bertranou, 2012).

In the context of cross-sectoral activity, it may be that use of subjective well-being measures could form part of a suite of tools that are used to understand value. However, the issue this

method also presents is that the measures used by the Marsh and Bertranou study are only some of the possible measures claiming to look at 'well-being' available. There is a pool of "literally hundreds" of measures that could potentially be viewed as measuring 'well-being' (Walmsley, 2012, p.328). As with all of these methods the choice should be informed by the purpose.

3.2.7 CONCLUSIONS ON CONTINGENT VALUATION METHODS

- ★ From a range of valuation models four identified as most relevant in this context –
 - Contingent valuation as 'willingness-to-pay'
 - Cost-benefit Analysis
 - Social Return on Investment
 - Subjective Well-being
- ★ Contingent valuation includes revealed and 'stated' preference techniques.

Stated preferences are travel and hedonistic. Travel is useful for organisations and events but can underestimate. Hedonistic is useful for organisations but highly contestable. Stated techniques are less useful than preference in context of cross-sectoral activity. Preference can identify value for users and 'non-users'.

- ★ Multi-criteria Analysis offers potential use alongside economic models as provides choices of statements of value.
- ★ Subjective well-being is still in its infancy as a methodological approach to valuation. Relationship between income and well-being is 'complex' and needs further research. May be useful alongside economic valuations.
- ★ Each valuation method has advantages and drawbacks, some of which are unique to a particular method and some of which are universal. The table below provides an outline of the advantages and drawbacks of the approaches offering the most potential in the context of cross-sectoral activity that emerged from the literature.

FIGURE 1: COMPARISONS OF ADVANTAGES AND DRAWBACKS OF VALUATION MODELS

	TRANSPARENCY OF PROCESS	RESOURCES TO CONDUCT	DATA COLLECTION	DATA CAPTURED	POLICY AGENDAS
Contingent Valuation	Lack of transparency in calculations in some studies. Displacement can be an issue. 'Best understood'	Data collection can be costly. Need specific expertise to conduct.	Responses can over inflate 'value' – 'protest votes'. Timing of study important – e.g. influx of tourists Snapshot in time.	Can demonstrate 'non-use' value. Captures the 'intangibles'. Can be used to compare alternative scenarios.	Recommended by HM Treasury 'Green Book'.
Cost Benefit Analysis	Use of hypothetical 'worst-case' scenarios contestable. Uses underpinning theory of change as first step.	Data collection can be costly. Several studies in cross-sectoral settings. Majority of studies utilise single organisations as unit of study. Can be predictive or retrospective. Majority of studies retrospective.	Use of secondary large datasets can be strength – statistical significance Can track change over time. Access to data sets of other organisations can be challenging. Available data not always current.	Can demonstrate 'social value'. Can be used to compare alternative scenarios. Can identify where benefits fall across number of organisations.	Public Services Act 2012 – duty on public bodies to consider 'social value'. Fits with 'preventative agenda' and identifies potential cost savings. Outcomes not just outputs.
SROI	Proxy measures are subjective Strong on 'additionality'. Includes accounting for 'drop-off' of effect over time. Looks at benefits for all stakeholders not only 'funders'. Develops shared objectives.	Data collection can be costly. Can be lengthy time period to conduct. Can be prospective or retrospective. Majority of studies retrospective.	Snapshot in time Recommended to be repeated at intervals.	Non-comparable. Can demonstrate 'social value'. Generates a 'story', not only ratios. Shows achievement against objectives of project. Engages those not driven by financial agenda.	Public Services Act 2012 – duty on public bodies to consider 'social value'. Fits with 'preventative agenda'. Identifies potential cost savings. Community engagement. Strong support -SROI network.

The table on the left shows that many of the challenges of the methods emerge against all approaches, in particular, the need for transparency of process and careful planning of data collection. Three of the methods fit with national policy agendas and cost-benefit analysis and SROI fulfil the more recent demands around the concept of 'social value'. In the context of cross-sectoral activity: the 'things that we do together', the purpose of evaluative work is to capture the total 'value' of that cross-sectoral collaboration. Acknowledging the difficulties inherent in attributing impact, there is a particular need to identify how different organisations may be contributing to that value and how benefits might accrue to those organisations, whilst still understanding a 'total' value for the participants of that activity. This is obviously a highly complex scenario and is perhaps part of the reason for the lack of studies that go beyond looking at a single organisation as the unit of study. Cost-benefit analysis enables the exploration of where benefits might fall across different organisations in cost terms and so offers a potentially useful approach. However, it could be that more collective methods, such as social return on investment offer more potential to be tested in this context, particularly as this not only engages all stakeholders, but can also look at both the cost benefits of activity, as well as exploring the achievement of objectives of activity.

As emerged from the literature, there is a paucity of studies exploring the economic value of collaborative activity across sectors. It is therefore recommended that research in this context testing one or more of the above models is undertaken to develop an evidence base. Clearly the choice of method will depend on the purpose of the activity.

The literature search did yield several studies that looked at collaborative cross-sectoral activity involving the cultural field from non-economic standpoints. These generated a number of valuable insights around creating conditions for effective collaboration. It was identified that these may provide further useful information to inform future collaborative endeavours.

Therefore, the following section outlines the emergent themes from these studies alongside findings on collaboration from works previously discussed.

3.3 CREATING THE CONTEXTS AND CONDITIONS FOR COLLABORATION

The finding that there appears to be little research on cross-sectoral value is not a new finding. In 2002 Tepper called for further research on collaboration across sectors, although his main focus was how far commercial enterprises benefit from the work of the non-profit sector (Tepper, 2002).

Tepper also picked up on the issue of attribution, emerging from the discussion of methods here, in stating that when organisations are 'lumped' together the details of contributions and impact are masked. He argued that disaggregating in evaluative work was essential for "policy and understanding" (Tepper, 2002, p.160). This is echoed by Throsby's call for approaches that explore how a sector interacts with another for a 'full picture' (Throsby, 2004, p.190). Tepper also recognised that it is not only the impact that should be explored, but also "what conditions we can expect innovation and diversity to blossom" (Tepper, 2002, p.160).

The question of what conditions encourage innovative collaboration may in part depend on how the collaborative activity has emerged. The concept of cross-sectoral activity has also been described in less positive terms as the arts 'tagging on' to other agendas (Gray, 2004, p.43). In his discussion of local authority arts strategies Gray cautions against a 'joining-up agenda' that has been imposed 'top down' rather than being generated by those delivering the agendas (2004, p.43). He also sees the most important factor for effective joint strategy as a clear purpose of the benefits expected articulated in shared objectives (Gray, 2004).

The need for clear objectives or purpose as a starting point emerged previously in the sections on methods. However, it would appear that the setting of objectives in collaborative settings is viewed as highly problematic.

When different groups of stakeholders are involved the 'value' of activity may be viewed very differently (Guersen and Rentschler, 2010; Hicks, et al., 2010; Jura, 2008). As the findings suggest, in a collaborative context value can be 'multi-dimensional' and each group of stakeholders will represent value in the most useful form for their own purpose (Guersen and Rentschler, 2010, p.201). Guersen and Rentschler recommend that these differences are recognised and argue for a representation of value that will reflect those differing interests and "creative missions" (2010, p.209). The comparison of different methods discussed indicated that this is where the SROI approach can have added benefit. It enables different stakeholder groups to express their own 'missions' and for these differing expressions of 'value' to be represented in the 'impact map' process. In practice of course it must be acknowledged that the 'translation' of different sectors' languages can be a time consuming process (Miles and Strauss, 2008, p.16).

An illustrative example of differing stakeholder views of value is given in a study by Peaker and Vincent of arts in the criminal justice setting (1990, in Jermyn, 2001). Whilst those working in the prison setting identified value from the 'dynamic security' delivered through engagement in activities, education staff focussed on learning outcomes and artists identified the creative outcomes and process benefits for prisoners (Jermyn, 2001, p.22). This was echoed by a study of cultural activities in a healthcare setting. Clinical staff narratives emphasised 'risk management' benefits of 'diversionary activities', whilst service users described the 'social' benefits of new relationships and impact on identity (Karpusheff, 2011). However, both of these examples also demonstrate that cross-sectoral activity can generate benefits for different groups whilst contributing to a shared agenda. In both of these scenarios the differing objectives contributed to a 'total' value of an improved experience for the participant. And as highlighted in the 'Invest to Save' study, which looked at a range of 'arts-based' practice in health, in order for a 'transformative experience' to lead to 'real change' there is a

need for strong partnerships with clear objectives that can facilitate sustained engagement (Kilroy, Garner, Parkinson, Kagan and Senior, 2007).

As highlighted, for collaborative activity to have effective purpose, agendas should be shared rather than 'tagged on'. And in some settings the 'shared agenda' is being recognised as not only a creative experiment, but a more fundamental need to achieve outcomes for people:

"It is widely understood that the NHS cannot work alone to help people live independently, but has to work in partnership with other statutory bodies and voluntary agencies in the development of services and models of intervention to assist people in living independently and maintaining health and wellbeing." (Skingley, Clift, Coulton and Rodriguez, 2011, pp.1-2)

This recognition of the possibilities of collaboration in achieving better outcomes is not only apparent in partnerships between the cultural and healthcare sector. There are obviously a range of cross-sectoral partnerships that have been forged by organisations within the cultural sector. In a study looking at museums and galleries, Travers identifies that there is a "spider's web of links" between this sector and other cultural or civic bodies and describes his attempts to quantify some of those links as "crude efforts" that can only give a "partial sense" (2006, p.36). He concludes that it is "impossible" to identify the added value from these collaborations, but asserts that the work of the museums and galleries "enrich" the other sectors' outputs (Travers, 2006, p.30). This is also the conclusion made by a study on engagement in the museum sector by the National Museums Directors' Conference. They identified an 'immense' number of interactions, which were "virtually impossible to catalogue or measure" (National Museums Directors' Conference, 2004, p.2). The overview given included links between National Museums Liverpool and refugee organisations, a project between Tate Modern, the police and social services with the aim of tackling truancy, as well as a strategic partnership between the V&A Museum,

the voluntary sector and criminal justice whereby people in prison were able to sell work created and generate an income (National Museums Directors' Conference, 2004, p.22). However, none of these initiatives appeared to be accompanied by economic evaluation work and the publication identified an over emphasis on 'front of house' rather than these 'deeper links' as a barrier to exploring the value of these (National Museums Directors' Conference, 2004, p.2). Moreover, as the discussion on economic impact assessment demonstrated the bulk of economic analysis has derived from the tourism industry and therefore the focus has tended to be on the contribution of museums for tourism (Smithies, 2011).

A wider review looking at museums and libraries, also found that there was a lack of literature exploring the nature of partnerships between these industries and other sectors (Smithies, 2011). However, this does not appear to be due to a lack of cross-sectoral activity. The literature reviewed here identified a number of examples of libraries contributing to the work of other sectors. One example that illustrates the potential cross-sectoral role of libraries is a scheme to encourage foster carers' children to read funded by Paul Hamlyn between libraries and care services (Thebridge, 2009). This initiative is a clear example of how organisations from differing sectors can have a set of objectives that are shared, whilst delivering on each group of stakeholders' agendas. For the library services the scheme brought more awareness of the service: new users and increased use. For the 'looked-after' children the scheme responded to identified barriers to library membership, such as books not being returned because of moving location and subsequent fines or bans. The scheme introduced 'special tickets' that would provide more flexible rules to reflect their situations and provided targeted reading groups and other activities using library spaces and collections "without giving the impression that they were different or stigmatised" (Thebridge, 2009, p.2). For care services the scheme introduced groups that carers and children could attend together and gave carers strategies to read with children.

However, the library sector also illustrates an underlying issue that hampers the potential for growing collaborations. Several studies pointed to opportunities where shared agendas could lead to collaboration that had not been exploited (ADP Consultancy, 2007; Hicks et al., 2010). Hicks et al give the example of the possible 'synergies' between Age Concern and Libraries, which they see as underdeveloped (Hicks et al., 2010, p.31) Moreover, even when cross-sectoral links are there they are not always acknowledged as value-added contributions to other agendas:

"Almost 93,000 housebound readers were served by English public libraries in 2007-08. CIPFA Public Library Statistics Actuals 2007-08. The lack of acknowledgement of such services as part of the health and well-being offer is a missed opportunity for libraries to strengthen their position." (Hicks et al., 2010, p.17)

Despite all these calls for increased partnerships and acknowledgement of potential synergies and shared agendas, the literature has pointed to a number of barriers. Even when shared objectives can be reached, the issue of data collection that emerged strongly from the methods discussion re-emerges as a major barrier to evaluative work in collaborative settings.

Strengthening the theme of a lack of reliable data, it was found in the library and refugee organisation collaboration that 'robust' statistical data was unavailable and that primary data collection was needed to provide accurate "mapping data" (ADP Consultancy, 2007, p.9). In a study of the Liverpool 'In Harmony' programme, a schools orchestral programme led by the Liverpool Philharmonic, the challenge of data collection was due to changes in personnel and infrastructure (Burns and Bewick, 2012, p.63). Also echoing the methods findings, the issue of incompatible data re-emerged. In a study of visual arts partnerships it was found that different sources were recording similar transactions differently (Throsby, 2004, p.197).

The issue of data collection has been described as needing a three way collaborative effort between funders, those gathering data and policymakers (Johnson, 2011, p.38). The role of the funders should be to provide resources to enable the gathering of evaluative data, whilst those gathering data should ensure baseline data on 'key indicators' is available over time (Johnson, 2011, p.38). For policymakers the focus needs to be on providing support to organisations on what outcomes data is needed and improving access to different datasets (Johnson, 2011, p.38). The In Harmony project identified that data collection issues had necessitated the use of 'shortcuts' to traditional ways of joint working (Burns and Bewick, 2012, p.63). However, although the role of policymaker is described as encouraging access and guidance on outcomes, there is a tension here that may need to be managed, as suggested by Gray's caution on top-down imposed collaboration (Gray, 2004).

In some studies data collection was hampered by lack of commitment (Miles and Clarke, 2006; Roger Tym and Partners, 2011). And this reinforces the need for approaches that involve all stakeholders, whether policymakers, funders or service providers in determining shared objectives and the outcomes to be measured. This suggests that valuation approaches that begin with stakeholder involvement, such as SROI, might provide a more effective mechanism than other methods in collaborative contexts. The Arts Council guidance concludes that SROI might help with commitment to data collection as stakeholders' data, rather than primary data, is more heavily drawn on and they are involved in defining the data to be collected (BOP Consulting, 2012).

Commitment to data collection can also be improved by the nature of the partnership generated. Echoing the idea of 'tagging-on' agendas as an ineffective approach, the literature on partnerships suggested that collaborations "cannot always be affected" (Roger Tym and Partners, 2011, p.15). Rather than being forced from the top down most of the commentary recommended an initial organic or informal development of partnerships as a more

sustainable approach (Austin, 2000; Hicks et al., 2010; Roger Tym and Partners, 2011). This enabled a 'synergy model' where resources are brought together, but the differing cultures of the partners acknowledged and valued (Roger Tym and Partners, 2011). However, it is identified in the organisational development literature that alliances will shift and develop over time and Austin categorises three stages as

- * "philanthropic" – where the non-profit seeks donations;
- * "transactional" – where interaction focuses on special activities;
- * "integrative" – where an alliance becomes strategic and objectives aligned.

(Austin, 2000, p.20)

Kotler and Kotler discussing museum collaborations describe the three stages in more pragmatic terms as: begging, collections and campaigning (Kotler and Kotler, 1998).

The emerging suggestion so far is that many of the collaborations discussed have perhaps advanced to a transactional stage indicated by the involvement of partners in one-off projects, but few are described in integrative terms as having aligned objectives. In the study of sponsors of the Liverpool Capital of Culture year it was found that "very few" had formal agreements with the cultural sector (O' Brien, 2008, p.17). Indeed where cross-sectoral partnerships between the cultural and private sector were identified these appeared to be merely 'philanthropic' relationships (O' Brien, 2008) to enhance "organizational legitimacy" (HwiJung, 2009, p.5). However, organisational literature points to the potential not only for 'new markets' in alliances, but also "to share expensive research and development costs and to manage innovation more effectively" (Thompson, 2001, p.615). The latter benefit is clearly of interest in the context of economic evaluation where effective alliances that go beyond the transactional to a more strategic relationship may be able to look at pooling resources to conduct 'expensive research' (Austin, 2000; Iyer, 2003; Malin, 2011; Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, 2009).

Although it has been suggested that effective collaboration may be most effective when initiated organically on 'pilots' and projects (Hicks et al., 2011), many of these studies convey the frustrations of organisations seemingly 'stuck' in the transactional stage. Lynch et al. found that there was dissatisfaction among the museums sector over the nature of collaborations (2011, p.20). This latter review found that the partnerships viewed as most effective were those where the community partner's role had been shifted from 'beneficiaries' to 'active agents' (ADP Consulting, 2007, p.20). This more 'active' relationship was described as enabling a more 'joined-up agenda', whereby partners could relate their work to local and national strategies to see "how it all fits together" (ADP Consulting 2007, p.10; Hicks et al., 2011, p.38; Holden and Jones, 2006).

However, this latter 'strategic' picture does not appear to be the widespread experience emerging from these studies. Most of the evaluative work in cultural sector collaborations described is of the 'one-off' type and this reflects the nature of most of the partnerships as largely transactional. The funding arrangements will therefore reflect that relationship and evaluative work will inevitably be funded on a 'one-off' basis. This 'short-termism' is perhaps one of the factors behind the 'overestimations' and critique of largely advocacy purposes apparent in much of the critique of this literature (Lynch, 2011; Cox et al., 2012; Hicks et al., 2011; Miles and Clarke, 2006; Smithies, 2011).

And where evaluative work is conducted in silos then the evidence is more open to challenges of manipulation and overestimation (Harland et al., 2000; Mirza, 2006). Approaches need to be more 'joined-up' to explore and understand the nature of the contribution to and impact on differing organisations involved in activity. Although this has been described as almost 'impossible' (National Museums Directors' Conference, 2004; Travers, 2006), others argue that where approaches can clarify purpose and determine clearly what impact is in focus, then evaluative work can yield greater insights into value. Newman et al. see the testing of 'claims' as "not impossible" in the context

of collaborations between the healthcare and cultural field and they identify outcomes such as improvements in health as shared objectives that can be explored (Newman et al., 2001, p.13).

However, this assertion is contestable. Firstly there is the fundamental question of what the primary purpose of cultural organisations should be and whether, as the Arts Council guidance asserts, they should be largely driven by 'enjoyment' (BOP Consulting, 2012). Secondly as Mirza points out, particularly in the healthcare field, the use of 'arts' practice in this context is a targeted purpose to achieve a health outcome and therefore less complex to explore as a potential 'effect' (Mirza, 2006, p.98). And yet other commentators have questioned how far the eventual impact on health can be viewed as a 'direct' effect (Galloway, 2008; Hicks et al., 2010; Holden, 2006). When agendas become less specific and deal with concepts such as 'social inclusion' or 'well-being, the question of whether the cultural activity's involvement has a direct effect or in policy terms represents 'value for money' is far less straightforward (Mirza, 2006).

Some have circumvented this latter question by aiming to work on the basis of highlighting a 'contribution', rather than a direct effect (Hicks et al., 2010). Others assert that in order to address this core issue, economic frameworks must be complemented by evaluative methods driven by non-monetary frameworks to capture that 'contribution'.

In a study of a dance programme in a criminal justice setting, Miles asserts that in these less specific contexts analysis needs to consider a range of potentially shifting variables that cannot be 'controlled for' and rather than a 'direct effect' findings must be viewed as "no more than an indication of a relationship" (Miles & Strauss, 2008, p.21). Holden and Jones describe the need for a methodology that can meet the requirements of different parties and help to understand how the contribution of the cultural sector is to "many different values at once" (Holden and Jones, 2006, p.36).

4. CONCLUSIONS *

Emerging strongly from this literature is the need for an approach that can recognise the nature of a collaborative relationship and respond to it. Moreover, a method that can capture not only specific outcomes that are easily measured, but also a 'value' that may be understood and articulated in different ways. As discussed in the introduction, there has been an ongoing debate as to whether economic frameworks are appropriate to explore the 'value' of cultural activity and a challenge to the policy frameworks that are used to understand 'value for money'. It would certainly appear from the literature that for collaborative efforts to be sustainable approaches adopted need to be able to develop alongside a partnership, from a more transactional position to an integrative alliance. This will not be the case if evaluative work remains as 'discrete' one-off projects, or if funding models constrain this.

The recent Health is Wealth publication in Liverpool aiming to develop a 'joint common approach' to delivery of improved health concludes that there are three key barriers to this aspiration:

- * "short-term funding for projects that have 'faded away' or 'come to an end'";
- * "historical lack of co-ordination between agencies running programmes with related aims";
- * a lack of "evaluation of the effectiveness of programmes aimed at health behaviour".

(Woodward & Devaney, 2010, p.23)

Whilst these barriers remain the ongoing debate of how far 'value' can be understood will continue unresolved. Ultimately, the choice of methodology will depend upon the purpose of the activity. If the activity is a collaborative cultural event involving more than one organisation, economic impact assessment and some forms of valuation, such as 'stated preference' may have a useful role. Moreover, if the purpose is to understand economic growth then again impact assessment may present the most appropriate model.

Where the aim is to understand the 'value' or worth of activity, and in particular explore the benefits for people, then valuation techniques will be more relevant. Despite a gap in the evidence base that leaves strong conclusions around how to understand the economic benefits of cross-sectoral collaborations problematic, the literature review has indicated the choice of methodology for exploration of longer-term collaborative cultural activity needs to be able to address the following:

- * gather data longitudinally;
- * help not hinder the development of shared objectives;
- * demonstrate 'value' for a range of stakeholders with differing views;
- * be able to account for differing contributions;
- * account for 'additionality' transparently;
- * enable the pooling of resources to build a 'richer picture' and share the burden of data collection;
- * encourage responses that are reflective not 'protest votes';
- * explore outcomes, as well as outputs.

These imperatives should guide decisions on how to understand benefits. On the basis of the findings of this review, it is suggested that Social Return on Investment offers a process with the potential to address all of the above challenges. The main hurdle currently is the lack of relevant studies looking at cross-sectoral activity from a collaborative standpoint from which to draw lessons for future work and inform evaluative approaches.

Therefore, the following recommendations are made:

- * Identify a suitable cross-sectoral initiative that will benefit from evaluative work exploring the potential long-term benefits of cultural activity;
- * Pilot the use of Social Return on Investment using this initiative to identify the advantages and disadvantages of this model in the context of cross-sectoral collaboration.

4.1 POSTSCRIPT

There is clearly a lack of consensus in the literature as to which methodology is viewed as more 'robust' or more relevant to activity in the cultural sector. Indeed there is a perpetual debate as to whether economic models are an appropriate framework for understanding 'value' in the cultural sector.

The majority of the critique of economic frameworks appears to centre on the use of these for 'advocacy' purposes and the resultant overestimation of claims of contribution. However, the literature search has shown that there can be other uses of these frameworks, including understanding how far objectives have been achieved, looking at outcomes over time, identifying what aspect of a service works better than others and facilitating communities to articulate 'value' in their own terms and subsequently help develop a shared understanding of value.

The critique of these approaches is exacerbated by the predominant use of these as one-off 'snapshot' studies. In the context of activity, many studies are retrospective and do not use baselines to understand change over time. However, as discussed this format appears to follow the model of funding that these initiatives are underpinned by. When funding is short-term in nature, then it is more likely that a need for advocacy will drive evaluation, rather than a desire to find out "what is actually happening" for participants of activity (Healy, 2002, p.101).

Madden argues for a shift in our stance to the purpose of this evaluative work, rather than being concerned with economic 'growth', he sees a more positive way forward in understanding 'development':

"art and culture are not means to economic ends (as advocated by 'economic' impact arguments), but that the economy is a means to artistic and cultural ends...i.e. that art and cultural activity promote creativity, that creativity promotes innovation, and that innovation promotes economic development" (Madden, 2001, p.169).

Using a framework of 'development' to understand benefits brings the need to find out 'what is actually happening' into the centre of choices on methodologies. However, some commentators are sceptical of the sector being able to place a high value on 'self-assessment' (Eckersley, 2008). Although Eckersley was referring to the way in which public funding decisions are made, rather than a choice of economic methodologies, this notion of self-assessment echoes Healy's call for exploration of what is happening, in order to reflect on the activity more critically and less from an advocacy standpoint. The question is whether 'self-assessment' or a more critical reflection can be shifted to in the current climate where public spending is dominating agendas.

Perhaps if a central concept of development was taken up that embraced both an exploration of how economic development might be promoted by cultural activity alongside a rich picture of development over time for the participant, then possibly a healthier evidence base that is less driven to a default advocacy stance can emerge to understand what is 'really happening': to understand the benefits for 'Mr Kite'.

REFERENCES*

ADP Consultancy. (2007). *Welcome To Your Library: connecting public libraries and refugee communities. Evaluation Report.*

AEA Consulting. (2004). Thinking beyond economic impact: demonstrating value. Retrieved from <http://www.bl.uk/aboutus/stratpolprog/increasingvalue/publicvalue/confpres/wistinghausen.pdf>

Austin, J. E. (2000). *The collaboration challenge: How nonprofits and businesses succeed through strategic alliances.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bakhshi, H. (2011, July). Take a leaf from greens. *The Stage*, pp. 10–11. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/arts/docview/906359578/13AFA5224127DD9CF6?accountid=12253>

Bawden, D., Calvert, A., Robinson, L., Urquhart, C., Bray, C., and Amosford, J. (2009). Understanding our value; assessing the nature of the impact of library services, *Library and Information Services*, 33(105), 62–89.

Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O. (2007). Rethinking the Social Impacts of the Arts. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(2), 135–151.

BOP Consulting. (2009). *Capturing the Impact of Libraries: Final report.* Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/Capturing_the_impact_of_libraries.pdf

BOP Consulting. (2010). *AV Festival 10: Evaluation Report.* Retrieved from 2010.avfestival.co.uk/download/31d41713333c728ee28fb0131f38363c

BOP Consulting. (2011). *Sea Change Evaluation Final Report.* Retrieved from <http://www.transparency.culture.gov.uk/cabe/files/2012/02/Sea-Change-Evaluation-Final-Report.pdf>

BOP Consulting. (2012). *Measuring the economic benefits of arts and culture: Practical guidance on research methodologies for arts and cultural organisations.* Retrieved from http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/media/uploads/pdf/Final_economic_benefits_of_arts.pdf

Breen, H., Bull, A., and Walo, M. (2001). A comparison of survey methods to estimate visitor expenditure at a local event. *Tourism Management*, 22(5), 473–479.

British Library. (2003). *Measuring Our Value.* London. Retrieved from <http://www.bl.uk/pdf/measuring.pdf>

Bryan, J., Munday, M. and Bevins, R. (2011). Developing a Framework for Assessing the Socioeconomic Impacts of Museums: The Regional Value of the “Flexible Museum”. *Urban Studies*, 49(1), 133–151.

Burns, S. and Bewick, P. (2012). *In Harmony Liverpool: Interim Report: Year Three. April 2011-March 2012.*

Carson, R. Flores, N. and Meade, N. (2001). Contingent Valuation: Controversies and Evidence. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 19, 173–210. Retrieved from <http://econ.ucsd.edu/~rcarson/papers/CVcontroversies.pdf>

Collett, M. and Lovatt, A. (2010). *LARC Economic Impact of the Arts Scoping Study Main Report.* Retrieved from <http://www.larc.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/LARC>

Cox, J., Bowen, M. and Kempton, O. (2012). *Social Value: Understanding the wider value of public policy interventions.* *New Economy Working Papers.* http://neweconomymanchester.com/stories/993-new_economy_working_papers_archive

Cutler, D. and Bakewell, D. J. (2011). *Older People and Professional Participatory Arts in the UK.* Retrieved from http://www.allaboutaudiences.com/media/resources/3/0/3/3038/AQ_Recession_Impacts_Report_Nov_11_.pdf

CyMAL. (2011). *Evaluation of Libraries for Life: Final Report.* Edinburgh.

Dolan, P. and Metcalfe, R. (2008). *Comparing Willingness-To-Pay and Subjective Well-Being in the Context of Non-Market Goods. CEP Discussion paper No. 890.* London. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/28504/1/dp0890.pdf>

Doyle, G. (2010). Why culture attracts and resists economic analysis. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 34(4), 245–259.

Eckersley, S. (2008). Supporting excellence in the arts: from measurement to judgement. *Cultural Trends*, 17, 183–187.

Eftec. (2005). *Olympic Games Impact Study – Stated Preference Analysis Final Report.* London.

England’s Northwest Research Service and Impacts 08. (2010). *The Economic Impact of Visits Influenced by the Liverpool European Capital of Culture in 2008.* Liverpool. Retrieved from http://www.liv.ac.uk/impacts08/Publications/Economic_Impact_of_Visits.pdf

Epstein, R. A. (2003). Regrettable Necessity of Contingent Valuation. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 27, 259–274.

Faulkner, B. and Raybould, M. (1995). “Monitoring visitor expenditure associated with attendance at sporting events: an experimental assessment of the diary and recall methods”. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3, 73–81.

Frey, B. (2005). *What Values Should Count in the Arts? The Tension between Economic Effects and Cultural Value: Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 253.* Zurich.

Galloway, S. (2008). *The evidence base for arts and culture policy: A brief review of recent selected literature. Executive Summary.* Scottish Arts Council.

Geursen, G. and Rentschler, R. (2010). Unraveling cultural value. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 33(3), 37–41.

Gray, C. (2004). Joining-Up or Tagging On? The Arts, Cultural Planning and the View From Below. *Public Policy and Administration*, 19(2), 38–49.

Gray, C. (2008). Arts Council England and Public Value: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(2), 209–214.

Harland, J., Kinder, K., Lord, P., Slott, A., Schagen, I. and Haynes, J. (2000). *The Effects and Effectiveness of Arts Education in School.* Slough.

Healy, K. (2002). What’s new for culture in the new economy? *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 32(2), Summer, 86–103.

Herrero, L. C. (2006). The Economic Impact of Cultural Events: A Case-Study of Salamanca 2002, European Capital of Culture. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 13(1), 41–57.

Hewison, R. (2012). The benefits of the valuing culture debate, 2003 – 2011. *Cultural Trends*, 21(3), 209–210.

Hicks, D., Creaser, C., Greenwood, H., Spezi, V., White, S. and Frude, N. (2010). *Public library activity in the areas of health and well-being. Final report.* Museums, Libraries and Archives.

Holden, J. (2006). *Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy: Why culture needs a democratic mandate.* London. Retrieved from <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Culturalvalueweb.pdf>

Holden, J. and Jones, S. (2006). *Knowledge and Inspiration: the Democratic Face of Culture: Evidence in Making the Case for Museums, Libraries and Archives.* London. Retrieved from http://www.demos.co.uk/files/knowledgeinspiration_fullreport.pdf

Hughes, G. (1989). Measuring the economic value of the arts. *Policy Studies*, 9(3), 33–45.

HwiJung, K. (2009). *Making Creative Connections: A Study on the Relationship Evolution and Developing the Arts and Business Relationship Model in a Changing Cultural Policy. Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy.* Ohio State University. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/business/docview/304974124/13AFA96899266DE82B737?accountid=12253>

Iyer, E. (2003). Theory of alliances: Partnership and partner characteristics. In W. Wymer & S. Samu (Eds.), *Nonprofit and business sector collaboration: Social enterprises, cause-related marketing, sponsorships, and other corporatenonprofit dealings* (pp. 41–58). New York: Best Business books.

Jermyn, H. (2001). *The Arts and Social Exclusion: a review prepared for the Arts Council of England.* Retrieved from http://culturability.fondazioneunipolis.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files_mf/1271756791theartsandsocialexclusion.pdf

Johnson, H. (2011). *Unlocking value: The economic benefit of the arts in criminal justice.* London.

Johnson, P. and Thomas, B. (1992). *Tourism, museums and the local economy: the economic impact of the North of England open air museum at Beamish.* Aldershot.

Jones, P., Comfort, D., Eastwood, I. and Hillier, D. (2004). Creative Industries: Economic Contributions, Management Challenges and Support Initiatives. *Management Research News*, 134–141.

Jura Consultants. (2005). *Bolton’s Museum, Library and Archive Services: an Economic Valuation.*

Jura Consultants. (2008). *Economic Impact Methodologies For the museums , libraries and archives sector: What works and what doesn’t.* Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20111013135435/http://research.mla.gov.uk/evidence/documents/economic_impact_methodologies_june_2008_final_version.pdf

Karpusheff, J. (2011). *Shift Happens: Co-creating health in Mersey Care NHS Trust.* Retrieved from http://www.mersecare.nhs.uk/Library/Media_centre/Publications/Shift_Happens.pdf

Kelly, M., McDavid, D., Ludbrook, A. and Powell, J. (2005). *Economic appraisal of public health interventions. Briefing Paper*. (pp. 1–8). NHS Development Agency. Retrieved from [http://www.cawt.com/Site/11/Documents/Publications/Population Health/Economics of Health Improvement/Economic_appraisal_of_public_health_interventions.pdf](http://www.cawt.com/Site/11/Documents/Publications/Population%20Health/Economics%20of%20Health%20Improvement/Economic_appraisal_of_public_health_interventions.pdf)

Kelly, M. and Kelly, A. (2000). *Impact and Values, Assessing the Arts and Creative Industries in the South West*, Bristol. Bristol.

Kilroy, A., Garner, C., Parkinson, C., Kagan, C. and Senior, P. (2007). *Invest to Save: Arts in Health Evaluation Exploring the Impact of Creativity, Culture and the Arts on Health and Well being*. Manchester. Retrieved from [http://www.miriad.mmu.ac.uk/investtosave/reports/Summary Report ISP Text.pdf](http://www.miriad.mmu.ac.uk/investtosave/reports/Summary%20Report%20ISP%20Text.pdf)

Kinghorn, N. and Willis, K. (2007). Estimating Visitor Preferences for Different Art Gallery Layouts Using a Choice Experiment. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 22(1), 43–58. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09647770701264887>

Klamer, A. (2003). A Pragmatic View on Values in Economics. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 10(2), 1–24. Retrieved from <http://klamer.nl/docs/pragmatic.pdf>

Kotler, N. and Kotler, P. (1998). *Museum strategy and marketing: Designing missions building audiences generating revenue and resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Liverpool Council. (2012). *Liverpool Plan*. Retrieved from [http://www.liverpoolvision.co.uk/Docs/DownloadDocs/330liverpoolplan doc20-7single.pdf](http://www.liverpoolvision.co.uk/Docs/DownloadDocs/330liverpoolplan%20doc20-7single.pdf)

Llop, M. and Arauzo-Carod, J.M. (2011). Identifying the economic impact behind a cultural asset: an input–output subsystems analysis. *The Annals of Regional Science*, 49(3), 861–877.

Madden, C. (2001). *Using “ Economic ” Impact Studies in Arts and Cultural Advocacy: A Cautionary Note* (pp. 161–178). Media International incorporating Culture and Policy. Retrieved from <http://christopherdmadden.files.wordpress.com/2009/02/economic-impacts-mia-madden.pdf>

Malin, E. (2011). *The Quality of Silence: Galleries engaging with older people. Phase 2, focus on dementia - Evaluation Report*. Retrieved from http://www.engage.org/downloads/OP_Research_Report_English.pdf

Marsh, K. and Bertranou, E. (2012). Can subjective well-being measures be used to value policy outcomes? The example of engagement in culture. *Cultural Trends*, 21(4), 299–310.

Matarasso, F. (1997). *USE OR ORNAMENT? The social impact of participation in the arts*. Retrieved from http://mediation-danse.ch/fileadmin/dokumente/Vermittlung_ressources/Matarasso_Use_or_Ornament.pdf

McCarthy, K. F., Ondaatje, E. H., Zakaras, L. and Brooks, A. (2004). *Gifts of the Muse; Reframing the Debate About the Benefits of the Arts*. RAND Corporation.

McHone, W. W. and Rungeling, B. (2000). Practical Issues in Measuring the Impact of a Cultural Tourist Event in a Major Tourist Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 300–303.

Merli, P. (2002). Evaluating the Social Impact of Participation in Arts Activities. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8(1), 107–118.

Miles, A. and Clarke, R. (2006). *The Arts in Criminal Justice: A Study of Research Feasibility*. CRESC, Manchester.

Miles, A. and Strauss, P. (2008). *The Academy: A Report on Outcomes for Participants (June 2006- June2008)*. London.

Miles, A. and Savage, M. (2009). *Lakes Alive 2009: Evaluation Report*. Manchester. Retrieved from [http://www.lakesalive.org/assets/files/LA 09 Evaluation Report.pdf](http://www.lakesalive.org/assets/files/LA_09%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf)

Mirza, M. (2006). *Culture Vultures: Is UK arts policy damaging the arts ?* Policy Exchange, London.

Mitchell, D. (2000). *Cultural Geography: A critical introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Morris Hargreaves McIntyre. (2009). *Cultural Impact Study: The impact of the arts in Birmingham*. Retrieved from [http://birminghamartspartnership.co.uk/userfiles/file/Cultural Impact Study.pdf](http://birminghamartspartnership.co.uk/userfiles/file/Cultural%20Impact%20Study.pdf)

National Museums Directors’ Conference. (2004). *Museums and Galleries: Creative Engagement*. London. Retrieved from http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/media/documents/publications/creative_engagement.pdf

new economics foundation. (2002). *The Money Trail: Measuring your impact on the local economy using LM3*. Retrieved from http://www.neweconomics.org/sites/neweconomics.org/files/The_Money_Trail.pdf

new economics foundation. (2009a). *Seven Principles for Measuring What Matters: A guide to effective public policy-making*. Retrieved from <http://neweconomics.org/publications/seven-principles-measuring-what-matters>

new economics foundation. (2009b). *Proving Value and Improving Practice: A discussion about Social Return on Investment*. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090705002831/research.mla.gov.uk/evidence/documents/mla-sroi-discussion-paper-may-2009.pdf>

Newman, A. T., Curtis, K. and Stephens, J. (2001). *Do community-based arts projects result in social gains? A review of literature*. Barnardo’s.

Noonan, D. (2003). Contingent Valuation and Cultural Resources: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 27, 159–176.

Noonan, D. (2004). Valuing Arts and Culture: A Research Agenda for Contingent Valuation. *The Journal of Arts Management , Law , and Society*, 34(3), 205–221.

Oxford Economic Forecasting. (2006). *Viva City! The economic impact of the City arts cluster*. Oxford. Retrieved from <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/economic-research-and-information/research-publications/Pages/vivacity!-the-economic-impact-of-the-city-arts-cluster.aspx>

O’ Brien, D. (2008). *Who Pays the Piper ? Understanding the experience of organisations sponsoring the Liverpool European Capital of Culture*. Liverpool. Retrieved from http://www.liv.ac.uk/impacts08/Publications/Who_Pays_the_Piper.pdf

O’Brien, D. (2010). *Measuring the value of culture : a report to the Department for Culture Media and Sport*. DCMS.

Palmer, J. P. (2002). Bread and Circuses: The Local Benefits of Sports and Cultural Businesses. *Commentary - C. D. Howe Institute*, 161. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/business/docview/216588614/13AFA83DAE97B950555/13?accountid=12253>

Pythian-adams, S. L., Sapsford, D. and Southern, A. (2008). *Considering the Economic Impacts of the 2008 European Capital of Culture “ Economic Multiplier ” A Review on the Literature Concerning Multiplier Effects*. Liverpool.

Arts Quarter (2011). *Impacts of the Recession on the UK Cultural Sector. Findings from the 4th Arts Quarter Survey*.

Reeves, M. (2002). *Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts : a review*. Arts Council.

Roger Tym and Partners. (2011). *Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium Economic Impact of the Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium (LARC) Revised Final Report*. Manchester. Retrieved from <http://www.larc.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/LARC-Economic-Impact-Final-Report.pdf>

Schuster, J. M. (2003). Introduction. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 27(3), 155–158.

Scott, C. and Soren, B. (2009). “Introduction to the special issue- exploring the value of museums”. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 24(3), 189–193.

Selwood, S. (2010). *Making a difference : the cultural impact of museums An essay for NMDC*. NMDC.

Shellard, D. (2004). *Economic impact study of UK theatre*.

Skingley, A., Clift, S. M., Coulton, S. P. and Rodriguez, J. (2011). The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a participative community singing programme as a health promotion initiative for older people: protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *BMC public health*, 11(1), 142.

Smith, M. (2010). *Subsidy , commerce and the mixed economy of culture in the UK*. London.

Smithies, R. (2011). *A Review of Research and Literature on Museums and Libraries*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/media/documents/publications/creative_engagement.pdf

Snowball, J. D. (2008). *Measuring the value of culture: Methods and examples in cultural economics*. Berlin: Springer.

Social Enterprise UK. (2012). *Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012*.

Tepper, S. J. (2002). Creative assets and the changing economy. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 32(2), 159–168.

The British Red Cross. (2012). *Taking stock: assessing the value of preventative support*.

Thebridge, S. (2009). Power to the Young People. *Public Library Journal, Summer*, 7–9.

-
- Thickett, J. (2004). *Measuring Success at the BBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.bl.uk/aboutus/stratpolprog/increasingvalue/publicvalue/confpres/thickett.pdf>
-
- Thompson, J. L. (2001). *Strategic management* (4th ed.). London: Thomson Learning.
-
- Throsby, D. (2003). Determining the Value of Cultural Goods: How Much (or How Little) Does Contingent Valuation Tell Us? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 27, 275–285. Retrieved from http://culturalheritage.ceistorvergata.it/virtual_library/Art_THROSBY_D-Determining_the_Value_of_Cultural_Goods_-.pdf
-
- Throsby, D. (2004). Creative Industries : Economic Contributions , Management Challenges and Support Initiatives. *Management Research News*, 134–144.
-
- Travers, T. (2006). *Museums and Galleries in Britain: Economic, social and creative impacts*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/media/documents/publications/museums_galleries_in_britain_travers_2006.pdf
-
- Travers, T. and Glaister, S. (2004). *Valuing Museums: Impact and Innovation among national Museums*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/media/documents/publications/valuing_museums.pdf
-
- Trine, B. H. (1995). Measuring the Value of Culture. *Cultural Policy*, 1(2), 309–322.
-
- Vector Research. (2012). *Visitor Research and Impact Assessments: Sea Odyssey*. Liverpool. Retrieved from <http://www.liverpoolvision.co.uk/Docs/DownloadDocs/309Sea Odyssey Economic Impact Assessment 2012.pdf>
-
- Walmsley, B. (2012). Culture and Sport Evidence (CASE) programme. *Cultural Trends*, 21(4), 325–334.
-
- Weisand, A. (2005). *The “ Creative Sector ” – An engine for diversity, growth and jobs in Europe. An overview of research findings and debates prepared for the European Cultural Foundation*.
-
- Willis, K. (2009). Assessing visitor preferences in the management of archaeological and heritage attractions: a case study of Hadrian’s Roman Wall. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(5), 487–505. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jtr.715/abstract>
-
- Wood, E. H. (2005). Measuring the economic and social impacts of local authority events. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(1), 37–53.
-
- Woodward, S. and Devaney, C. (2010). The Liverpool City-region Health is Wealth Commission. *European Review*, (September). Retrieved from http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1062798709990111
-
- Zappala, G. and Lyons, M. (2009). *Recent approaches to measuring social impact in the Third sector: An overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.csi.edu.au/assets/assetdoc/b20aada17ffad8f7/v2>
-
- Zivan, L. and Truscott, R. (1999). *The economic impact of Duxford imperial war museum on Cambridge and the region*. Cambridge.
-

Justine Karpusheff has been working in the health and social care field for the past fourteen years, following a former career in adult education. Whilst in healthcare she held a range of roles in provider organisations, including Head of Clinical Governance and Risk Management at a mental health Trust in which position she managed the Trust’s research and development agenda. She studied for a Masters in Health Information and went on to programme manage the new QOF and Quality Standards workstreams at NICE. During this time she established Baseline Research and Development Ltd. specialising in social research with ‘hidden populations’ whose work in around 35 areas of the country to date seeks to use ‘peer’ research techniques to make a difference in the lives of marginalised groups. More recently she also set up JKR&D Ltd. to conduct research and development in mental health settings and is working on a variety of initiatives around social participation, cultural activities and the E-health agenda. In addition, she is trying to fit in a PhD in cultural activities and mental health at the University of Manchester.

Justine Karpusheff
Director
JKR&D Ltd.

jkarpusheff@yahoo.com @jkrandd

