This article builds on an important but underdeveloped social science concept—the "scene" as a cluster of urban amenities—to contribute to social science theory and subspecialties such as urban and rural, class, race and gender studies. Scenes grow more important in less industrial, more expressively-oriented and contingent societies where traditional constraints fall and self-motivated action around consumption, leisure and amenities is a more important feature of social cohesiveness and interaction. Scenes contextualize the individual through amenities and consumption-based expressions of shared sensibilities as to what is right, beautiful and genuine. This framework adds to concepts such as neighborhood and workplace by specifying 15 dimensions of the urban scene. Like neighborhood and workplace, scenes reduce anomie, but because of their focus on consumption and the use of specific amenities, they are more consistent with today's ethos of contingency, moving beyond traditional ideas of the fundamental power of social, family and occupational background. We introduce a new amenities-focused database to measure and analyze scenes and their dimensions for each of 40,000 U.S. zip codes. We illustrate the framework by applying it to one distinct type of scene, bohemia, and analyze its position in the broader social system.

The Salience of Scenes: Culture and Urban Attractiveness

This article proposes a new analytical framework for the study of culture and place, developing the concept of "scenes" as clusters of urban amenities. Although "the cultural turn" brought culture "back in" to sociological research (Smith 1998; Bonnell and Hunt 1999; Steinmetz 1999; Molotch 2003; Mohr 2003; Harding 2007; Alexander 2003; Swidler 1986), it did so usually without locating cultural practices in concrete cities, spaces and places. Ironically, in the years when sociologists stressed economic and other constraints, economists began to study cultural activities systematically. Terming them "amenities," defined broadly as "non-market transactions," (Glaeser, Kolk and Saiz 2004) economists have built many models of consumption and lifestyle. But they largely assume that individuals act in isolation and that each amenity (e.g., restaurant or museum) can similarly be analyzed atomistically. This research seeks to join the amenities and consumption work from economics and cultural geography with core social and cultural processes. It aims
to combine the (renewed) concern for culture in sociology with a more systematic and comparative approach to neighborhoods, cities and regions.

Cities and Culture

This turn to culture as connected with distinct places and spaces dovetails with a shift in urban development research, which in the past decade has increasingly stressed cultural amenities as attracting "high human capital individuals" whose innovations drive economic development (Glaeser, Kolko and Saiz 2004; Florida 2002; Clark 2004; Markusen, Schrock and Cameron 2004). Vibrant artistic communities, thriving music and theater, lively restaurants, beautiful buildings, fine schools, libraries and museums contribute to a better local "quality of life." In increasingly post-industrial societies, it is claimed, where labor-intensive production is giving way to knowledge- and information-intensive production, more individuals have more time to enjoy and define themselves by their engagement with the amenities of life." (Fogel 2000) Cities are quickly becoming centers of consumption rather than production (Glaeser, Kolko and Saiz 2004). Culture and tourism are gaining momentum, adding intangible value to what is there and restructuring the existing stock of capital (Sacco and Blessi 2006). Residents respond by exercising "symbolic ownership" over the aesthetic and ethical images projected by their local establishments (Deener 2007). But these formulations raise many questions.

Earlier urban development theorists did not explore specifics of culture and amenities. Economists (such as Roback 1982) pioneered by adding culture and amenities to urban research. But typically they used climate-related amenities (i.e., humidity, clean air) and studied their impact on land value (Zelené 2004 reviews this tradition). Amenities were important to urban economists if they increased land value, but the process of how and why was largely ignored. Some Continental economists (e.g., Santagata 2004) write about cultural districts, extending industrial district ideas, but these, as in some more Marxian studies of consumption (Zukin 1989), frame culture and consumption as largely driven by broad economic changes. So does the "post-modernism" of Inglehart (1990), downplaying specifics of culture and politics. Florida (2002) suggests that street life and bicycling, rather than opera and bowling, attract creative people who favor multi-tasking and autonomy, although differences among "creative" lifestyles are not explored (Florida 2008 begins to remedy this).

There is considerable ferment over conceptual approaches to the sociological study of cultural activities, evidenced in the shift from mass culture criticism to increased questioning about the distinctiveness of broad divisions such as "high" vs. "low" culture, "formal" vs. "informal," "elite" vs. "popular," or "passive" vs. "participatory" as meaningful dimensions to capture cultural experiences (Peterson and Kern 1996; Abbing 2006; Lizardo and Skiles 2008). In both sociology in general and urban studies in particular, translating the "meanings of social life"—theoretically and empirically—into specific analyses of the concrete role of culture in
defining the character of places and spaces and in driving social processes has been difficult. "Culture" remains a contested concept with a range of meanings. "Culture" typically includes the traditional high arts of opera, Shakespearean theater and classical symphonies. Does it also include local, authentic items like Chicago blues or Carolina barbecue? How about experimental, innovative avant-garde art galleries, cutting-edge theater and novel architectural forms? Does it extend as far as adding an aesthetic perspective to more standard fare: street-level culture, beachfront entertainment, arts and crafts fairs? These and other definitional issues invoke distinct paradigms and can shape competing priorities for policymakers, to invest in or ignore. Class, race, gender, neighborhood and political culture, in turn, invoke competing criteria for theoretical, ideological and policy allocation debates by political leaders, foundation officials, public intellectuals and an urban populace increasingly divided along moral in addition to class axes (Sharp 2005).

Empirical issues are complicated not only by these issues of "high" and "low," but also by the fact that cultural activity involves more than the arts. Cultural meanings and codes are expressed in, and define, different styles of life and situations, shaping what it means to frequent restaurants, cafes, sporting events, parks and more. And culture is more than the "cultural industry" or "cultural districts" (Alexander 2003) because cultural amenities are not only, or even mainly, sites of economic activity, and their attraction is not reducible to economic factors; cultural amenities may well generate jobs and economic development, but they do so (at least in part) because they provide places where people can express their lifestyles, generating independent value (Currid 2007). Culture is not disembodied; cultural products and meanings exist in geographic spaces, ecologically distributed across neighborhoods, cities, regions and nations. Distinct urban cultures may emerge spontaneously in response to citizens' lifestyles, but private and public actors also seek to produce them intentionally; they are both top-down and bottom-up. How can we see form and structure amidst such variety? New conceptual and empirical resources are needed.

Enter "scenes." As settings structuring shared cultural consumption, scenes provide a new conceptual fulcrum for cultural analysis. Scenes include the arts, but also beaches, cafes, restaurants, sporting events, street life and more. Scenes join these together, permitting a range of seemingly diverse activities—from sipping coffee to listening to music to reading poetry—to be analyzed as part of one social process. Scenes provide ways of social belonging attuned to the demands of a culture in which individuals increasingly define themselves less by primordial attachments to home or family background or class or party or confession and more contingently and expressively, in terms of lifestyle and sensibility (Joas 2004). Just as neighborhoods and family contextualize residence and heredity, and occupations contextualize achievement and work, scenes provide specific social contexts for individuals to interact on the basis of their contingently cultivated sensibilities as to how to dress, eat, listen to music, look at art and more. By articulating the concept of scene, de-
veloping techniques for measuring scenes, and showing how the social consequences and correlates of scenes vary across local contexts, we lay out a research program that injects culture into urban studies in a systematic and comparative way.3

What is a Scene? The Situated Character of Urban Culture

Social Consumption, Culture and Territory

The arts, in particular, and consumption, in general, occupy an important place in recent studies of urban development (Markusen, Shrock and Cameron 2003; Markusen and King 2003; Glaeser, Kolko and Saiz 2004; Clark 2004; Molotch 2003; Currid 2007; Florida 2002; Lloyd 2006; Scott 2000). Yet these rarely specify how distinct types of arts and amenities differentially affect urban change. Nor do they identify contexts within which arts and amenities are embedded—not to mention the effects of geographically (and temporally) varying combinations and densities of amenities, as well as differences in their aesthetic and ethical symbolism.

What they lack is a conception of cultural consumption as a structured, embodied and emplaced social activity that can come in varying forms and degrees. To fill this gap, we draw on recent work in cultural and youth studies that has begun to develop the notion of scene as just such a form of activity. Irwin (1977) links the importance of scenes to the rise of self-conscious niche expressive and leisure groups and their resulting social connections, identifying certain grand scenes such as surfing and hippiedom that influenced broader societal values and lifestyles. Straw (1991, 2002) defines music scenes as “geographically specific spaces for the articulation of multiple musical practices,” (Straw 2002:8) stressing the useful flexibility of the concept (compared to the more rigid counter-culture, class, art world or movement)4 and the way scenes function as sites of fluid but gripping urban community, both intimate and cosmopolitan (Straw 2002, 2004 reviews many meanings of the term in discussions of popular music). Blum (2003) seeks to ground scenes in “urban theatricality,” providing a “grammar” of scenes that includes dimensions such as mortality, transgressiveness, exhibitionism, extensiveness, regularity and more. Bennett and Peterson (2004) compile descriptions of various music scenes, dividing them into groups of local, translocal and virtual scenes; Lena and Peterson (2008) treat scenes as one stage in the life course of music genres. Hitzler et al. (2005) link scenes to the “rise of youth” as a specific phase of the life course. He stresses the function of scenes as localized, typically part-time, voluntary meeting points for the like-minded, linked to physical places (bars, clubs, cafes, etc.), whose loose membership criteria and boundaries are not reducible to other social structures or institutions. Leach and Haunss (2009) build on this approach to explore the connections between scenes and social movements. Lizardo and Skiles (2008) summarize many aspects of the emerging “scene perspective” in popular culture studies. They highlight how sub-cultural codes (e.g., Goth unconventionality or Club glam or Salsa authenticity) can become key ways to determine membership and status within a scene.
In these discourses, the concept of scene has turned attention to the specific locales and places, the constellations of establishments and activities, in which cultural practices are articulated. Some urban development scholars have drawn from this work (cf., Currid 2007 on Hebdige's 1979 discussion of punk cultural places), stressing that scenes are less starkly demarcated and demanding than oppositional counter-cultures. Here, scenes are primarily indicated by “diverse, open and amenity-rich places,” (Currid 2007:107) constituting nodes in which the cultural and social generate the economic (Florida 2008).

Our approach to scenes synthesizes many aspects of these strands of research. We seek to join key insights from cultural, youth, music and urban studies to build a more flexible and differentiated notion of scenes suitable for comparative studies about how scenes vary in specific locales and how those variations affect key urban development variables. Generally, these diverse approaches to the phenomenon suggest to us that scenes should be conceived as places devoted to practices of meaning making through the pleasures of sociable consumption. The possibilities for, and practices of, sociable consumption available in a place (its restaurants, cafes, galleries, clubs, stores, theaters) articulate a range of experiences and values, and these are what defines that place as the scene it is. Thus, a scene is more than (1. neighborhood (2. physical structures (3. persons labeled by race, class, gender, education. We include these but stress (4. specific combinations of these and activities (like attending a concert).

These four components are in turn defined by (5. the values and meanings scenes enable people to actualize. General dimensions of meaning stressed often in the scenes literature are legitimacy, a right or wrong way to live (Haenfler 2004); theatricality, a way of seeing and being seen by others (e.g., Blum 2003); and authenticity, as a meaningful sense of identity (Grazian 2003; Urquia 2004). Scenes enable participants to share in a certain mood—listening to a certain style of music, dressing in a certain manner, eating in a certain ambiance. Such moods embody distinctive feelings as to what is right, genuine and beautiful. These, in turn, are transformed when combined in different ways: a tattoo parlor, water pipe store and modernist art gallery make a different scene than do a tattoo parlor, motorcycle shop, gun shop and biker bar. Each involves an affirmation of transgression, but that transgression is fused with different dimensions of meanings, like self-expression and tradition, in which the meaning of the whole scene changes—from Avant-garde to Don’t Tread on Me. Thus, such dimensions can join in ideal-typical combinations such as Bohemia.

Scenes generate meaningful social spaces of consumption rather than of work or residence. What matters are the CDs one listens to (jazz or indie pop or country, say), the types of foods and restaurants one enjoys (barbecue or fusion, for example), the clothes one buys and wears (leather or African print), and more. These are not necessarily determined by how creative one’s job is: we prefer to disaggregate occupations Florida calls creative. His creative class is not a homogenous consumption block—teachers, engineers, lawyers, programmers may not listen to
the same music or go to the same restaurants. Jobs weakly predict how people play. Consumption groups and occupation groups need not align (Markusen 2006). That one values a colleague's drive at work does not straightaway mean that one welcomes him to the barber shop scene or country line dance. Nor is one's consumption and leisure activity in scenes straightaway determined by ascriptive, particularistic ties of kinship and neighborhood; a younger brother deep into the vegan punk scene need not share this interest with his older brother, and within the scene their shared blood or heritage may not bring status to the older brother. More important for the scene is sharing and expressing its sensibilities.

These are analytical distinctions, and it is possible to stress one perspective over the other: depending on the types of practices and relationships it promotes, a place can be more or less a scene, more or less a neighborhood, more or less an industrial cluster. Overlaps may generate considerable strains and productive tensions, and advocates of one perspective often reduce the others to their own. A full study of the place of the scene in the broader social system would need to map out the potential interactions between scenes, neighborhoods, and work—not to mention politics, families, and religion. Nevertheless, what is clear is that scenes mark arenas in which consumption can become a shareable and meaningful activity, and that the dynamics of this general process merit study in their own terms so that we can develop more systematic theories for a spatial sociology of consumption.

The Internal Dimensions of Scenes: Theatricality, Legitimacy, Authenticity

Our conception of scene seeks to capture a range of key symbolic dimensions of consumption, going beyond identifying amenity-rich places to the specific values and experiences different constellations of amenities promote. Building on past work that highlights the performative character of social interaction in general (e.g., Goffman 1959, 1974; Alexander 2003) and the role of mutual self-display in past scenes literature (Blum 2003), we include theatricality as one of our three general dimensions of scenes. Yet we treat theatricality as multi-dimensional; it is not only raw exhibitionism, bodies on display. We thus include four additional sub-dimensions of theatricality, all relevant in past discussions about scenes: deviance (transgression) and conformity (the formal theatricality of manners and etiquette)
Table 2: The Symbolic Dimensions of Scenes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatricality</th>
<th>Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Sample Amenity Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glamorous</td>
<td>Standing on the red carpet at Cannes gazing at the stars going by</td>
<td>Fashion Shows &amp; Designers; Designer Clothes &amp; Accessories; Beauty Salons; Nail Salons; Motion Picture &amp; Video Exhibition; Motion Picture &amp; Sound Recording Studios; Agents, Managers for artists &amp; other public figures; Film Festivals; Night Clubs; Jewelry Stores; Casinos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Going to the opera in a gown or white tie and tails</td>
<td>Formal wear &amp; costume rental; Opera Companies; Fine Dining; Private Clubs; Dance Companies; Night Clubs; Golf courses &amp; country clubs; Theater Companies &amp; Dinner Theater; Religious Organizations; Offices of Lawyers; Professional Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgressive</td>
<td>Watching a performance artist pierce his skin</td>
<td>Body Piercing Studios; Tattoo Parlors; Adult Entertainment: Nightclubs; Adult Entertainment: Comedy and Dance Clubs; Leather Clothing Stores; Skateboard Parks; Casinos; Beer, Wine, &amp; Liquor Stores; Gambling Industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborly</td>
<td>Attending a performance by the community orchestra</td>
<td>Bed &amp; Breakfast Inns; Civic &amp; Social Organizations; Religious Organizations; Golf Courses &amp; Country Clubs; Sports Teams &amp; Clubs; Playgrounds; Elementary &amp; Secondary Schools; Fruit &amp; Vegetable Markets; Coffee Houses; Pubs; Baked Goods Stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitionist</td>
<td>Watching weightlifters at Muscle Beach</td>
<td>Adult Entertainment: Night Clubs; Fashion Shows &amp; Designers; Body Piercing; Tattoo Studios; Health Clubs; Fashion Shows &amp; Designers; Beauty Salons; Nail Salons; Discotheques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Sample Amenity Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Listening to the blues in the Checkerboard Lounge, landmark of the Chicago blues</td>
<td>Bed &amp; Breakfast Inns; Historical Sites; Fishing Lakes &amp; Ponds; Marinas; Book Dealers: Used &amp; Rare; Antique Dealers; Scenic &amp; Sightseeing Services; Nature Parks &amp; Other Similar Institutions; Spectator Sports; Sports Teams and Clubs; Microbreweries; Fruit &amp; Vegetable Markets; Meat Markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>Recognizing the twang of Appalachia in the Stanley Bros.' Voices</td>
<td>Ethnic Restaurants (approximately 40 cuisines); Ethnic Music; Ethnic Dance; Folk Arts; Cultural and Ethnic Awareness Programs; Language Schools; Gospel Singing Groups; Martial Arts Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>Reviling a Britney Spears show because she is a corporate creation</td>
<td>Marketing Research; Management Consulting Services; Warehouse Clubs &amp; Superstores; Designer Clothes &amp; Accessories; Fast Food Restaurants; Business &amp; Secretarial Schools; Department Stores; Convention &amp; Trade Shows; Public Relations Agencies; Spectator Sports; Amusement &amp; Theme Parks; Advertising &amp; Related Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Rational</td>
<td>Visiting the Gettysburg Battlefield</td>
<td>Political Organizations; Embassies and Delegations; Historical Sites; American Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reveling in the cosmic scope of human reason at a planetarium</td>
<td>R &amp; D in Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences; Scientific R &amp; D Services; Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools; Planetaria; Aquariums; Human Rights Organizations; Management, Scientific, &amp; Technical Consulting; Exam Preparation and Tutoring; Libraries &amp; Archives; Computer Training; Offices of Lawyers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legitimacy

In addition to their theatricality and authenticity, scenes may be defined by a sense of the right and wrong way to behave. Participants can share in the pleasure of a common sense of being in the right or rejecting those in the wrong. This is the pleasure of a good will, acting on the basis of an authority one takes to be valid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Sample Amenity Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Sharing in the stability and assurance of hearing Mozart performed in the Vienna State Opera as you believe it was earlier</td>
<td>Genealogy Societies; Historical Sites; Opera Companies; Antique Dealers; Fine Arts Schools; Libraries &amp; Archives; Family Restaurants; Family Clothing Stores; Religious Organizations; Country Clubs; Dance Companies; Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Attending a benefit concert because it contributes to positive outcomes or savoring the value of efficient production at a museum of industry</td>
<td>Fast Food Restaurants; Technical &amp; Trade Schools; Warehouse Clubs &amp; Superstores; Business &amp; Secretarial Schools; Management Consulting Services; Convenience Stores; Business Associations; Junior Colleges; Computer Systems Design; Database &amp; Directory Publishers; Exam Preparation &amp; Tutoring; Educational Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Enjoying the democratic implications of a crafts fair</td>
<td>Human Rights Organizations; Salvation Army; Public Libraries: Elementary &amp; Secondary Schools (Public); Environment &amp; Wildlife Organizations; Junior Colleges; Services for Elderly &amp; Disabled Persons; Social Advocacy Organizations; Individual &amp; Family Services; Religious Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Still, we deny that theatricality is the Ur-scene of Every Scene, and so add two other broad dimensions: first, legitimacy. We build on authors (like Weber 1978; Bellah 1996; Elazar 1975; and Habermas 1981) who stress the moral values implicit in everyday practices and in scenes (as in the Haenfler 2006 discussion of the strong moralism in straight-edge punk scenes). But again we include five sub-dimensions. These highlight temporal aspects of legitimacy: tradition, in stressing the authority of the past (as in classicism), charisma, the auratic presence of a star performer, utility, the value of future outcomes (as in, say, benefit concerts); they also highlight spatial aspects of legitimacy: egalitarianism, the value of universal ideals (as in the global moralism of fair trade coffee) and individual self-expression, the value of personal adaptiveness to particular situations (the non-repeatable uniqueness of an improvised solo or encounter).

Our third general dimension builds on authors (like Taylor 1992, 2007; Heidegger 1996; as well as Grazian 2003 and Urquia 2004 in the scenes literature) who highlight authenticity. Authenticity in discussions of scenes often focuses on ethnicity, but the category has broader significance in that the artifice associated with scenes' theatricality raises questions about what it means to be genuine rather than phony. Thus, following Taylor (1989) we suggest that there are many ways of getting in touch with "the real" rather than the fake that have been central to the cultural traditions out of which scenes grow and thrive. We identify five, starting at the particular (the authenticity of the local contra the foreign), and moving outward to the most general, through notions of the authentic self rooted in state citizenship (rather than class or religious community, famously articulated by Rousseau), ethnicity (as in Herder), corporation (Nike vs. knockoffs, cf. Taylor 2007) and reason (from Kant to Hegel). Table 2 catalogs the 15 dimensions of scenes and provides illustrative examples of some of their indicators from our national database of 650 urban amenities.
Recognizing Scenes: Towards Systematic and Comparative Analysis of Urban Cultural Life

Others have noted that assessing urban attractiveness requires studying the mix of amenities, built environment and people. This has typically turned researchers toward ethnography (Lloyd 2006) or anecdote (e.g., the tattooed programmer invoked by Florida 2002). We seek to retain some of the conceptual holism and subtlety of ethnography, and do ethnographic work ourselves. But codifying scenes dimensions and measuring them helps place individual cases in broader context.

The concept of scene, consistent with the phenomenological character of ethnographic approaches, permits theorizing meanings internal to urban cultural spaces in terms of the qualities they manifest as valuable and the holistic networks within which any single amenity is located. How, then, do we know what sort of scene exists in a given place? Our proposal is to measure the dimensions of scenes empirically as they are indicated by clusters of urban amenities, allowing us to undertake what Baudelaire called a “botany of the sidewalk.” For example, the combination of amenities composing a given scene may promote a sense of self-expressive legitimacy, transgressive theatricality, local authenticity, anti-rational authenticity and anti-corporate authenticity—this combination we call a “bohemian scene.” Another cluster of amenities might promote neighborly theatricality, traditional legitimacy and local authenticity—a more “communitarian scene.”

Our analytical framework thus grounds systematic and comparative analysis of embedded urban culture. Research may proceed from inductive and deductive standpoints, and pursue intensive and extensive research strategies (of individual cases or large Ns). Inductively, the empirical distribution and levels of the 15 dimensions can generate a scene profile for neighborhoods, cities or metropolitan areas. Deductively, the framework helps specify theoretical ideal-typical scenes by ex-ante-defined combinations of sub-dimensions, against which empirical scenes can be measured.

Measuring Scenes: Clustering Individual Amenities into Meaningful Scenes

Combining our conceptualization of scenes with our amenities database allows us to begin to formulate and test hypotheses about the relations between (varieties of) cultural attractiveness and more traditional developmental factors (income, cost of living, etc.). How to do so empirically? By systematically scoring the meanings of distinct physical spaces of consumption. Operationally a scene is a specific cluster of amenities constituted by the ensemble of meanings or value orientations offered to the potential consumer. By scoring the value orientations of individual amenities, coding individual amenities in our database on each of the 15 sub-dimensions
with a 5-point scale, analyzing how they combine in distinct territories (neighborhood, city, MSA, region...), we capture distinct cultural experiences of separate territories. In our framework, the analytical units are the 15 sub-dimensions measured for every amenity in a territory; these dimensions are the minimal analytical components of the scenes approach. By contrast, the amenity (like a restaurant or museum) is the observational unit. We do not count amenities, but analyze their implicit substantive meanings. The cultural life of cities is the focus, not the components or size of the cultural, leisure or tourist industry.

Ideally, the specific amenities should meet at least two criteria. First, the analysis should highlight consumption-oriented rather than production-oriented establishments (factories are not included, while cafes are). Second, the amenity should be potentially present across all territories under analysis in approximately similar form; local users should be able to reveal their preferences by patronizing a shoe store or Thai restaurant if they choose. But in other localities if citizens prefer catfish restaurants, the local market should not prohibit a catfish restaurant from emerging. The amenities, such as these types of restaurants, should be linked with similar meanings among potential cultural consumers; they should be "functionally equivalent." (Van Deth 1998) Standardized amenities such as Starbucks and McDonalds meet this criterion relatively straightforwardly; less standardized amenities are more difficult, for example, cultural centers (which offer diverse activities) or restaurants (which differ by cuisine and price) (Kaple et al. 1996).

Because there is no systematic database of all possible amenities across U.S. cities that could guarantee these two conditions, we assembled a national database of amenities from sources where the agency constructing each variable has ideally been sensitive to these criteria, such as the Yellow Pages or U.S. Census Bureau. This maximizes coverage of potential amenities (varieties of types) and territories (minimal units, as zip codes), and limits definitional ambiguity. Our database includes hundreds of amenities such as theaters, restaurants, bookstores, dance companies, jazz clubs, museums, gospel choirs and liberal arts colleges. It covers all U.S. metro areas and rural areas, some 40,000 zip codes. Levels and changes in more traditional factors such as education, crime, housing prices, and ethnic and class demographics can be analyzed to measure their relative contributions to various scenes. No such massive and comprehensive database has previously been generated. It took us five years with some dozen assistants, and is still growing.

We coded roughly 650 amenities from high to low on each of the 15 scene dimensions. Hence the analysis can "travel empirically" from the observational unit—individual amenities—to the minimal analytical unit—the 15 scenes dimensions. To compare scenes, we created a performance index for each territory by multiplying the number of amenities of a given type in a zip code by that amenity type's score on each sub-dimension, and then summing the products for each of the 15 sub-dimensions, then dividing this product by the total number of amenities in the zip code. These provide a scene profile for each U.S. zip code based on
the 15 dimensions of legitimacy, theatricality and authenticity. The whole scene emerges in the combination of amenities, distinguishing for example, places with cafes and lawyers offices from others with cafes adjacent to nightclubs and bars. To be sure, scenes and zip codes are not neatly aligned, and the limits of this measure are legion. Other measures are no doubt possible and necessary, as is on-the-ground ethnographic work that can capture subtle variations of amenity usage and meanings. Nevertheless, this analytical profile permits analysis of consumption activity as a situated social phenomenon using the criteria above: (1. meanings and value orientations (2. interconnected in a holistic way and (3. situated in space and time. The appendix discusses index construction.

Analyzing Scenes: Validation by Scenescapes Analysis

What picture of the American scenescape emerges from these profiles? Do our measures provide a valid proxy of the cultural life of cities? Because there are no similar measures to contrast our proposal against using “construct-validity” (convergent or divergent) (Webber 1990:18-19), we initially pursue validation by “face validity” (are theoretical concepts and measures adequate to the judgements of researchers or to previous knowledge, do the scenes measures discriminate among different cultural contexts that are well documented by previous literature?) and “hypothesis validity” (can the measure illuminate theoretical relationships (Webber 1990:18-22), are the scenes measurements confirmed by the “culture and cities” literature?).

Basic Descriptive Insights: Confirming Expectations of Regional and Urban Cultural Life by Cross-Territorial Comparisons

Simple statistical analysis of our measures of scenes helps to document the cultural variations among different regions, cities and local contexts. We have pursued many descriptive analyses for face validity and more. Some brief examples: Scenes in the Northeast and West have amenities that rely more on individual self-expression for their legitimacy, while those in the South and Midwest express more traditionalistic legitimacy. Scenes in the South and Midwest contain amenities that offer neighborly theatricality, while northeastern and especially western scenes manifest more transgression (see Figure 1). These fit common views. As an example: we tabulated glamour for each Los Angeles zip code, and found Hollywood close to the top and Watts scores near the bottom. These regional differences are striking, as they confirm that our methods yield results consistent with broad expectations from other sources, and identify cultural contexts varying within an emerging more expressively-oriented consumer society. Equally striking are variations among New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles as widely discussed global centers identified with the new economy, where rents, education, arts and culture, technology jobs, and young people are rapidly increasing (Gyourko, Meyer and Sinai 2006; Cortright 2001; Currid 2007). Yet these three cities reveal strikingly different patterns: from the clustering of finance in downtown New York (Sassen
These are simple correlations, Pearson r's, of dummy variables of the four major U.S. regions with some of the sub-dimensions of scenes. Each zip code is assigned 1 if it is within the region, and 0 if it is not.

2001), to Mayor Richard Daley's enthusiastic embrace of culture and aesthetics as central to urban policy (Clark forthcoming), to the individualism, fragmentation and image-building that lead some to name Los Angeles as ground zero of the post-modern age (Dear 1981). Critical differences appear in Figure 2.

Compared to all U.S. zip codes (scored 0), scenes in these three cities are legitimated more by individual self-expression and utility than by tradition and egalitarianism; they encourage transgression, glamour and formal codes more than neighborliness; and they root identities in rational calculation, the state and corporation more than in local culture. Broadly, "urbanism as a way of life" (Wirth 1938; Simmel 1971) continues in the late modern city, as more abstract, formal, distanced social relations are linked with heightened individualism and weaker primordial ties. The three cities also show striking differences. Los Angeles scenes are defined much more by individual self-expression and glamour, highlighting more amenities such as art schools, arts organizations and information, movie
Figure 2a. Urban Variation in Scenes
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These are z-scores of the mean performance scores (like Traditionalistic) of all zip codes within each of the county areas overlapping these three cities: Los Angeles County, Cook County, and the five county boroughs of New York. They show the strength of these scenes-dimensions in these cities relative to the national average.
theaters, dance companies, yoga studios, exercise and fitness classes, and infant and children’s clothing accessories. New York scenes more strongly affirm that identity is based in the power of reason and the stamp of the corporate brand; they legitimate themselves by appeals to efficiency, activity and material success, and promote the formal theatricality of the business suit and the dress code, featuring, relative to Chicago and Los Angeles, more amenities such as night clubs, book stores and book publishers, art dealers, designer clothing and accessories, convenience stores and delicatessens, advertising agencies and newsstands. In Chicago, scenes are the most neighborly, traditionalistic and egalitarian of the three, stressing more amenities such as pizza restaurants, bowling alleys, churches, parks and playgrounds, cemeteries and public libraries. Similar demographic patterns are here mediated by different cultural settings, which in turn might well account for divergent economic and political outcomes that would be otherwise difficult to capture. This all has much face validity and is consistent with recent urban scholarship. These data are simply the first to document these patterns so systematically.

Perhaps even more striking than these differences in levels are different relations among the sub-dimensions of scenes. Figure 3 shows correlations within New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles of charismatic legitimacy by zip code, and Figure 4 shows correlates of self-expressive individualism scores with selected sub-dimensions.

Strikingly, in Chicago, amenities that express charismatic legitimacy correlate strongly with amenities that support a sense of neighborliness and appeal to equality. By contrast, in New York City and Los Angeles, the more charismatic scenes are more individually self-expressive and glamorously theatrical. In Chicago, scenes high on individual self-expression also show a sense of corporate identity (for example, the fabulously post-modern Millennium Park built with massive corporate donations). Further, self-expression in Chicago is less strongly separated from local roots and abstract reasoning, and less tied to transgressiveness and glamorousness. In New York and Los Angeles, zip codes high on self-expressive individualism tend to show more transgression and glamour, less rootedness in the local, less faith in reason and more hostility to corporate culture. The scenes of these cities channel the power of charisma in different directions, some into individualism and transgression, others into the local neighborhood—there is no single track for The City of the Future, but multiple scenes structuring alternative responses to a social life more attuned to cultural consumption.

Theoretical Elaborations: How Scene Analysis Reframes Bohemia

The New York Times columnist David Brooks (2000) is credited with identifying a “Bobo” orientation which joins 1960s bohemian values with 1980s bourgeois budgets, as illustrated by President Bill Clinton. Brooks subtly describes several cases, especially Bobo cities such as Burlington, Vermont and Bethesda, Maryland. Richard Florida (2002) used Brooks’ Bobos as his core concept, but retitled it the “Creative Class” at the publisher’s suggestion; the book relies less on “class”
and more on Bobo-like tolerance, which Florida holds is a key driver of urban innovation. Richard Lloyd’s “neo-bohemia” (2006) builds on these but makes the strongest case for a more literal bohemia as an urban dynamic, closer to 19th and early 20th century classic bohemia: contra Brooks and Florida, Lloyd claims that creativity requires breaking eggs, challenging authority. Brooks’ work is self-identified “comic sociology,” and offers only subtle anecdotes as evidence. Lloyd’s evidence is an ethnography of Chicago’s Wicker Park neighborhood that provides sensitive insight but does not locate this case in comparison with others. Florida’s prime systematic measures of bohemian tolerance are the percent of gays and artists in a metro area. He correlates these with patents and other innovation measures, but Clark’s (2004) reanalysis suggests that gays were largely spurious, and education was a more important indicator of creativity.

The classic statements of Murger, Balzac and Baudelaire focused on Paris but (neo-)bohemia is increasingly woven into the post-industrial political economy, as a testing ground for new styles and patterns of consumption, analogous to that of scientific and technological research on the side of production (Campbell 1989), and a defining half of the modern spirit (Grana 1964). Our scenes approach provides more precise tools to capture and analyze these ideas. As Murger, Balzac and Baudelaire suggested, an ideal-typical Bohemian scene has a distinct shape (see also Grana and Grana 1990). Our coding of Bohemia draws on such past and recent discussions to determine how a Bohemian scene combines the 15 sub-dimensions of scenes, as shown in Table 3.

Defined thusly, a scene is more Bohemian if it exhibits resistance to traditional legitimacy, affirms individual self-expression, eschews utilitarianism, values charisma, promotes a form of elitism (Baudelaire’s “aristocracy of dandies”), encourages members to keep their distance, promotes transforming oneself into an exhibition, values fighting the mainstream, affirms attending to the local (Balzac’s intense interest in Parisian neighborhoods), promotes ethnicity as a source of authenticity (cf., Lloyd 2006:76),13 attacks the distant, abstract state, discourages corporate culture and attacks the authenticity of reason (Rimbaud’s “systematic derangement of all the senses”). Scenes whose amenities generate profiles that are closer to this ideal type receive a higher score on our Bohemian Index (measured as the value distance from the “bliss point” defined by Table 3).14 This measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditionalistic</th>
<th>Self-Expressive</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
<th>Charismatic</th>
<th>Egalitarian</th>
<th>Neighboring</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Glamorous</th>
<th>Exhibitionistic</th>
<th>Transgressive</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 is negative, 3 is neutral and 5 is positive
### Table 4: A Continuous Scale of “Bohemianness” as Dependant Variable: National Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% 18-24 year old (1990)</td>
<td>-.003 (-.292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in % 18-24 (2000/1990)</td>
<td>-.018* (-2.155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25-34 year old (1990)</td>
<td>-.035* (-2.307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in % 25-34 year old (2000/1990)</td>
<td>-.027** (-2.647)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-White (1990)</td>
<td>-.086*** (-10.139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in % Non-White (2000/1990)</td>
<td>.001 (.155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Baby Boomers (1990)</td>
<td>.021 (1.212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in % Baby Boomers (2000/1990)</td>
<td>0 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Retiree (1990)</td>
<td>.046*** (3.766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in % retiree (2000/1990)</td>
<td>.016 (1.594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population in 1990</td>
<td>.209*** (24.982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population change 2000/1990, logged</td>
<td>.061*** (8.571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote cast for president, % democratic 1992</td>
<td>-.006 (-.717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime rate (1998)</td>
<td>.027*** (3.422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% College graduate (1990)</td>
<td>.009 (.597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in % college graduate (2000/1990)</td>
<td>.036*** (4.397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduate/profession degree (1990)</td>
<td>-.061** (-2.826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in % profession/profession degree (2000/1990)</td>
<td>.023 (1.467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income (1990)</td>
<td>.064*** (4.636)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in per capita income (2000/1990)</td>
<td>-.022** (-2.738)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: t-ratios are reported in parentheses

a. Dependent Variable: Bohemian Index
b. $^p < .05$  $^{**}p < .01$  $^{***}p < .001$ (tests are two-tailed)

d. Adj R$^2$: .053
from a bliss point is analogous to policy distance analyses in voting (e.g., Riker and Ordeshook 1973). While we continue to investigate alternative measures of Bohemia, in practice the index identifies many neighborhoods which others cite as distinctly Bohemian: in Chicago, the highest scoring neighborhoods in 2000 include Bucktown, Wicker Park, Humboldt Park and Logan Square, all commonly perceived as Bohemian at the time (Lloyd 2006), even if they have since changed.

Analyzing our Bohemian Score as dependent variable in a regression including all U.S. zip codes and a number of standard urban development variables (summarized in Clark 2004) provides insight into where the most bohemian American scenes are (see Table 4).

Bohemian clusters of amenities are stronger in locations with larger populations, increasing populations, more retirees, higher income, increasing numbers of college graduates, more crime and fewer non-whites. Levels of baby boomers, youth and Democratic voting (in both simple correlations and regression coefficients) are not significant at the .001 level, nor are change in income, retirees, youth population and baby boomers.\textsuperscript{16}

Comment on these results: First, bohemian scenes are stronger in areas with higher crime rates. The “established” or “bourgeois” theory that crime indicates social disorganization and “would repel most residents” does not hold in a Bohemian scene, which inverts this anti-crime value. Our finding confirms the River Styx theme from Baudelaire to Lloyd. While Baudelaire noted “the magic” in “murky corners of old cities,”\textsuperscript{17} Lloyd (2006:78) stresses that “the manifest dangers of the neighborhood coincide with the bohemian disposition to value the drama of living on the edge.”

A second set of important findings concerns age. Florida and Lloyd both stress the youthful nature of their neo-bohemia, but we find that retirees are more numerous in bohemia than youth. “Youth” does not necessarily translate into edgy creativity—there are “square” and “establishment” and many other types of youth. What seems to matter more is how various contexts channel and transform the energy of youth. Bohemias may include “old-timers” that lend a form of authenticity to the neighborhood (Brown-Saracino 2007), and the denizens of “rural bohemia” such as Carmel, CA may be older (Austin 1990). Moreover, there may be a particularly strong connection between bohemia and what we have elsewhere termed the “grey creative class.”\textsuperscript{18}

Third, the finding that voting patterns are not significantly connected with Bohemian neighborhoods suggests that whatever sense of political legitimacy and activism Bohemias create often operates outside of standard notions of parties. The Red and Blue map is too simple. To understand how scenes generate political identification—in cafes, poetry groups, punk clubs and galleries—it is necessary to move past models building heavily on party voting.

We find more when we repeat the same basic analysis of zip codes within the three largest cities. The main finding in Figure 5 is that in Chicago the percent
Figure 5. College Grads increasing in Chicago Bohemias more than in Los Angeles, Decreasing in New York.
of college graduates increases in more Bohemian zip codes; this same effect is insignificant in Los Angeles and New York. The common explanation for such dynamics is cost or income, but these Bohemian results hold strong after we control income and the other variables in the model.

Interpretation? Bohemia is no silver bullet for urban development. In Chicago, the Neo-Bohemian thesis that artist neighborhoods fuse with educated young people to meet the needs of the new culture-driven economy is empirically supported. However, the thesis demands contextualization, as such Bohemian neighborhoods are not significant attractors of the college educated in New York and Los Angeles. In New York, zip codes with 25-34 year olds seem sharply distinct from bohemian neighborhoods. Moreover, in New York, both college graduates and 25-34 year olds reside in zip code scenes that feature corporate authenticity \( (r = .326 \text{ and } .238, \text{ respectively}) \), while both groups are declining over the 1990-2000 decade in more corporate-authenticated scenes in Chicago and Los Angeles. Los Angeles contrasts most with the "neo-Bohemia leads to growth thesis" because college grads in Los Angeles increase more in higher income zip codes and with more young persons. Related: glamorous scenes in Los Angeles attract the young and educated more strongly than in the other cites \( (r = .493 \text{ vs. } .32 \text{ in Chicago and } .17 \text{ in New York}) \). Perhaps the unique ways that Chicago (as shown in figures 3 and 4) combines individual self-expression with utilitarian legitimacy and corporate authenticity increase the likelihood that its Bohemians may become "useful labor" (Lloyd 2006); or perhaps timing matters, as Chicago's bohemian scene has bloomed only recently in comparison to New York's. Still, these strong results document the power of local scenes in transforming simpler national patterns. By pointing to specific differences in both levels and dynamics of scenes across three major cities, scene analysis helps cultural analysts become more conscious of the multiple institutional and other mechanisms that join to create specific types of scenes.
Leisure and consumption as vehicles of personal expression have increased in the past century. This brings, as Nobel economist Robert Fogel (2000) suggests, a need to engage in questions about quality of life that cuts across class divisions. If Fogel is right that, in a society where leisure time has massively risen, “non-material” or “spiritual” goods and inequalities are increasingly becoming key drivers of social change (as Inglehart 1990 and others stress), then differences about which spiritual goods and how to arrange them will become increasingly central social and policy questions. Scenes-based research suggests one way to address this more precisely.

There is little use in speaking of the coming of the creative class or the rise of Neo-Bohemia in flexible capitalism or the advent of omnivorous cultural consumption among the new elite or the transformation to a knowledge economy or the transition to post-industrialism. Accepting these as important general trends, the more critical and sensitive question then becomes the concrete one about which creativity (and where), which Bohemianism (and where). The scene within which any of these processes occurs not only shapes the direction toward which they move, it helps to define what it means to be creative or Bohemian or omnivorous or knowledgeable or beyond industry, and so to pursue the goals associated with those terms. These are not clear uncontested concepts, as was illustrated by the positive and negative takes on crime in Bohemian and non-Bohemian scenes. As leisure and consumption increase in salience, disputes over how to answer questions of the sort captured in our 15 scenes dimensions are likely to heighten, sometimes as new points of conflict.

These observations suggest eight axial points of a scenes-based agenda for urban and cultural policy studies:

1. **Conceptualize the city as pluralistic, diverse, filled with competing subcultures.** Government typically acts in distinct policy arenas such as housing or culture, which differ just like neighborhoods. We see the world more as an ecology of games and scenes than as a monolithic unity.

2. **Identify growth dynamics of distinct scenes.** Identify scenes with neighborhoods (via zip codes etc.). Invest in key amenities to make each scene more vital, relying on its impact on the specific, local scenescape.

3. **No city represents the nation or the world.** There is no Middletown. Disputing Michael Dear’s claim that L.A. is “the city of the future,” our more culturally relativistic perspective suggests instead: No one city is The Future.

4. In addition to production, feature consumption.
5. **Culturally strong neighborhoods remain separate from the workplace.** Chicago's remarkably rich neighborhoods differ from the European social democratic tradition, where workers would reside in homes built near their factories, and social life was more driven by production. Explore the implications of such work/home contexts as they transform scene dynamics.

6. **Multiple research methods.** Use in-depth cases, oral history, ethnography, content analysis, archival history, voting, interviews of leaders, qualitative, quantitative and more.

7. **Include the metro area.** Think not solely of a single metropolitan government, but look for cooperative, voluntary civic and intergovernmental patterns, some built from specific agreements among local governments and private contracting groups, others involving citizen values that lead them to prefer one location over another.

8. **Connect global changes in many urban dynamics with local interpretations of those changes.** Theorizing more precisely about multiple levels of socio-economic processes—from global to metro to zip code—can lead to more precise operational models which methods such as Hierarchical Linear Modeling can help assess and calibrate.

All of these require elaboration. The effort of this research has been to show how the concept and reality of scenes provide a new, powerful tool to help do so.

Our concepts and our data can be fruitfully expanded and merged with other approaches to enhance the power of each. We are working with teams from Finland, France, Spain, Portugal and Korea to specify cross-national scenes patterns. Our ongoing work seeks to expand and refine our concepts and methods to distinguish globally-shared and nation-specific patterns, and then to generalize the nation-specific results. For example “Korean scenes” often feature extended families—in weddings, funerals and college preparatory schools. We analyze the impact of these variables on others, such as rent. Indeed rent differences across Korean scenes are strongly influenced by college prep schools, not so in the United States (Lee, Clark and Anderson 2007). These analyses need to be combined with more narrow economic variables or individualistic/socialization-oriented discussions of identity or self-realization. Studies of race, ethnicity, religion, class as well as civic groups and neighborhoods can be enhanced and sharpened by adding these scenes components, highlighting the specific cultural setting within which any of these operates, and allowing for systematic comparisons of the relative impact of each.
Notes

1. To be sure, some geographers and sociologists have recently discussed the concept of place or space (much of which is summarized in Gieryn 2000 and Relph 2006).

2. See, e.g., Parsons 1951; Alexander 2003; Griswold 2004; Swidler 1986; Sewell 1999.

3. Even if we frequently use the term "urban," most comments and data cover all local contexts.

4. By contrast, Tanner et al. (2010) stress that the concept of scene should not be over-extended, and that its applicability in particular to oppositional sub-cultures, such as some types of rap music, is limited.

5. There is no doubt that the emergence of scenes as an increasingly important social formation generates new social strains, just as the differentiation of production and residence continues to do. Analysis of the interchanges and interpenetrations among scene, family, work, politics and religion is an important subject of our further work, as is how scenes change in and organize experience of time. Likewise, analysis of virtual scenes is an important field of research, although, following Gieryn 2000 and because of the distinct role of theatricality and hence visibility in scenes, we consider only non-virtual scenes here.

6. From the perspective of work and class, the experiences in scenes are commonly interpreted as promoting or opposing the interests of different classes—elite art for the elite class, mass art for the non-elite, both judged by how they block or support the dominating or emancipatory interests of classes, depending on where one stands (Bourdieu 1984; Dimaggio 1982). From the perspective of the traditional residential neighborhood, the looser, more transient glue that holds a scene together can seem to offer short-term commitment, shallow friendships and anomie, unlike the deep ties of classic neighborhoods (Wirth 1938; Sennett 1998). From the scene perspective, the job one holds and the place one lives are driven by the scenes of which they are a part. For example, Lloyd (2006) shows that in Chicago’s Wicker Park scene, “coolness” drives hiring decisions rather than the other way around. Clark (2004) shows that amenities drive location decisions (see also Florida 2002 and Brooks 2000).

7. This move is understandable, as the data to study such questions have often been unavailable or difficult to acquire. This is hardly surprising, given that the cultural sector has traditionally been subdivided: those interested in opera or ballet have not considered restaurants or bookstores, while others exploring football or country music have ignored museums and jazz clubs. Omitting these associated key elements of a scene, however, has meant that past estimates of how amenities have an impact on urban development have been misspecified, statistically biased by omission of key variables.

8. We have elsewhere identified 12 ideal-typical scenes such as Disney Heaven, Bobo’s Paradise, Black is Beautiful, that variously combine the 15 sub-dimensions. See Clark (2007).

9. The coding process required many details and fine judgments and tests for validity and reliability reported elsewhere. Our general strategy was to use the coding process to add operational detail about each dimension. We computed intercorrelations among coders’ results almost weekly, and if they fell below .8, we would meet, discuss and add more conceptual consistency in writing with more detail about how and what to code, to make the criteria as explicit and consistent as possible for any future coder/analysts to use or recode differently. See scenes.uchicago.edu for the complete database and scores.
10. This operational option does not preclude the possibility of applying the same framework to non-physical amenities such as cultural events: regular annual celebrations, festival, fairs, bike rallies and the like.

11. In comparative analysis it is critical to define the "theoretical unit" to be compared, because the result should make reference to this unit, not to the unit used to observe and/or measure the analytical properties intended to be studied (cf., Przeworski and Teune on "levels of analysis" vs. "level of observation" (1970:49-50)). In cross-national or cross-city analysis, the analyst has to transcend names of the city or country and interpret the analytical meaning they represent (Przeworski 1987). Our approach to scenes follows a similar logic.

12. Our database combines information from the surveys of individual attitudes and behavior from the DDB Lifestyle Survey, amenities from The Urban Institute, online Yellow Pages, the Census of Economic Activity, and various socio-economic variables as causes and correlates of scenes (scenes.uchicago.edu). Considerations of feasibility and cost-efficiency also guided our selections (Kaple et al. 1996).

13. For neo-bohemians, "sharing the streets with... nonwhite residents... is part of their image of an authentic urban experience."(Lloyd 2006:78)

14. Operationally, we subtract the distance of each zip code on each of the 15 dimensions from the Bohemian "bliss point" defined in Table 6. We then aggregate these 15 distances and take the reciprocal score.

15. For the regression model, we included both level and change measures for a number of standard variables in the literature. Including so many independent variables raises the possibility of statistical bias generated by multi-collinearity. We omitted any variables with intercorrelations (Pearson r's) over .5 and then substituted the omitted variables in alternative specifications to look for consistent results. We applied log transformations to a few skewed variables like population size. Some variables still show high kurtosis scores, mainly generated, it seems, by a higher concentration of amenities in metropolitan areas. This is compounded by the fact that the U.S. Census omits many zip codes due to confidentiality concerns. We are currently conducting further statistical analyses to determine the extent to which these distributional biases affect results.

16. Although change in income and change in 25-34 year olds are significant at the .01 level, and change in 18-24 year olds and level of 25-34 year olds are significant at the .05 level (all negative).

17. Lloyd cites the complete verse: "In murky corners of old cities where/everything—horror too—is magical,/ I study, servile to my moods, the odd/and charming refuse of humanity."

18. A paper called "The Grey Creative Class: Why it is Critical for Cities and Culture," is in draft, and is available from the authors on request.

19. It also may be worth noting that, while in N.Y. and L.A., youth and education tend to point in the same direction (both groups tend to rise in relation to the same dimensions), in Chicago the two often point in different directions (the educated are rising in Chicago's glamorous scenes, but youth are declining).
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Appendix. Building Measures of Scenes

Table 2 provides illustrative samples of our amenities indicators for the 15 dimensions. In producing our indexes, 140 amenities were used, drawing from the U.S. Census of Business, and over 500 more from online yellow pages services and the Urban Institute's Unified Database of Arts Organizations. A team of coders scored each amenity 1-5 for each of the 15 scene dimensions, with 5 positive, 3 neutral, and 1 negative. Our approach to systemizing the coding was to try to lay out highly detailed criteria, then to structure them via simple decision-trees that would automate the process. Whenever we found intercoder reliability fell below r=.8 we would add more detail to the criteria and decision-trees. Our operational definitions are thus highly detailed. We generated dozens of pages of definitional criteria for the 15 scenes sub dimensions, available to others with complete scoring and amenity lists at http://public.me.com/tnclark1/Scenes Project Data and Syntax.

The performance score measures all of a scene's amenities. A few stylized, extreme examples illustrate how it works. Let us imagine an absolutely pure transgressive scene – Berkeley's Telegraph Avenue to the max. And let us say that this scene contains 5 amenities, and that, in this example, all of these are body piercing studios and tattoo parlors. All would receive a score of 5 on the sub-dimension of transgressive theatricality. If we then multiply each of the 5 amenities by its transgression score of 5, we find that each one is putting out 5 units of transgressiveness (5 "transgressies," we could say). The sum total of transgressiveness in the scene would thus be 25 transgressies. If we then divide this total by the total number of amenities in the scene (5), we find that the average experience of transgression in this scene is...5!

Now, let's consider what the performance score on transgressive-theatricality would be for a stylized version of Chicago's Wrigleyville. Let us assume that this scene has 2 body piercing salons, 4 bars, 2 Chinese restaurants, and 1 Starbucks. In this case, the bodypiercing salon would receive a 5 for transgression, the bars might receive 4's, the Chinese restaurants 3's (neither promoting nor denying resistant behavior), and the Starbucks a 2 (their standardization and ubiquity, let us say, may be viewed as impediments to instituting transgressive practices). So, by multiplying the number of each type of amenity by its transgressive-theatricality score, we see that the body piercing salons would be generating 10 transgressies, the bars 16, the Chinese restaurants 6, and the Starbucks 2. If we sum those, we find that the whole scene provides 34 units of transgression to its consumers. Divide that total by the number of amenities in the scene (9), and we see that the average experience of transgression per amenity in this scene is...3.8. Still more than a neutral experience (3), but not as intense as Telegraph's 5.