

The Web of Production: The Economic Geography of Commercial Internet Content Production in the United States

Matthew A. Zook

University of California, Berkeley
Department of City and Regional Planning
Wurster Hall, Room 228
Berkeley, CA 94720
zook@socrates.berkeley.edu

February 5, 1999
(This Version)

forthcoming in
Environment and Planning A

Introduction

The Internet has captured the world's imagination with its ability to quickly distribute information on a real-time basis across the globe. While the power of this technology opens up new possibilities for long-range collaboration, it does not, as some suggest, end the importance of place in economic organization. The emerging business of Internet content creation, which is best prepared to take advantage of the space-transcending ability of the Internet, exhibits much of the traditional unevenness that has characterized urban and economic development throughout history. The fact that information and content can be easily and widely distributed is often mistaken for an indication that the organization of this business is also necessarily diffused. In fact, there is a much more complicated dynamic involving the connection of specific places to global networks resulting in a system of production that is both place-rooted and networked at the same time.

One of the greatest challenges facing any research project involving the Internet is finding reliable and practical indicators. In particular, assigning geographical locations to what takes place on the "spaceless" Internet is especially difficult. With this problem in mind, this article outlines a technique for mapping the supply of Internet content and describes the current physical geography of this production system. It then turns to an analysis of some of the factors influencing the location of this activity in certain places.

While it is not within the scope of the article to prove why specific nodes are emerging, there is evidence that a region's existing industrial structure plays an important role in supporting the development of commercial Internet content production. In particular, three regions – San Francisco, New York and Los Angeles - appear as leading centers for Internet content in the United States both in terms of absolute size and degree of specialization. Moreover, it appears

that there is a stronger connection between Internet content and information intensive industries than between Internet content and the industries providing the computer and telecommunications technology necessary for the Internet to operate.

Explanation of Data

Due to the emerging and rapidly evolving nature of the Internet, it is imperative at the outset to provide a clear definition of the commercial Internet content business. This article defines it as enterprises involved in the creation, organization, and dissemination of informational products to a global marketplace where a significant portion of the business is conducted via the Internet. These informational products could be the sale of physical items, e.g., eBay, the sale of digital products, e.g., CD-Now, the sale and use of services, e.g., Travelocity or Home Shark, the use of a database search engine, e.g., Inktomi, or convenience of portals or destination sites, e.g., Yahoo, Amazon or AOL.

This definition purposively encompasses firms from a wide array of traditional industries because the new methods for communication and distribution offered by the Internet have a wider impact than any one particular sector. In a very real sense, these firms are actively engaged with a technology that could restructure the current organization and boundaries of their respective industries. Just as Chandler (1977) argues that technologies of the railroad and telegraph enabled the transformation of traditionally small businesses into a system of corporations, this article asserts that the Internet has the potential to bring about a similar reorganization of business structures. While the exact nature of this reorganization is still undetermined, it promises to have a profound effect on the spatial organization of many portions of the economy.

Because this definition of the Internet content business is primarily based on the activities of individual firms rather than of a traditional industry as a whole, it is difficult to use standard sources of sectoral and geographically based data such as the census or county business patterns. There have been numerous techniques developed for measuring data packet flows or the infrastructure of the Internet fiber optic backbone¹. However, these studies largely illuminate the workings of the technical geography of the Internet rather than the economic geography of the people and firms using it. For example, the criteria for selecting the computer that hosts a firm's content is based on how fast data packets can flow to the rest of the Internet. Conversely, the criteria for choosing the physical place where the content is created, depends upon access to skilled labor, capital and other services. Since these two decisions can be made separately and are based on very different criteria, it is entirely possible that a firm decides to host its content on a server farm located hundreds or thousands of miles from where it is designed and created.

Given this problem of measuring infrastructure rather than economic activity, it is crucial to find alternative indicators for economic activity on the Internet. Moss and Townsend (1997) suggest one of the most useful methods in determining the site of content creation with their technique of using the registration addresses of domain names, e.g. yahoo.com or wired.com, to determine a geographical location. In many ways domain names are one of the most basic building blocks of the commercial Internet. Although actual data packets are routed by computers according to IP addresses, these numbers, e.g., 169.229.39.137, are hard for human beings to remember. The domain name system was developed so that users could use the Internet address *www-dcrp.ced.berkeley.edu* rather than its numeric equivalent. This system, which was originally designed as a convenience for a small number of computer specialists and

academics, has now become the ubiquitous means of brand identification within the Internet content business.

Although the connection between registration addresses and production of Internet content is not necessarily straightforward, clusters of registered com domain names are arguably the best available indicators of where the Internet content business is locating. This argument is based on the following assumptions:

1. registration of a com domain name indicates a higher degree of purposeful and commercial information distribution than just surfing or emailing friends and family;
2. there is no inherent geographic bias in the means of registering a domain name;
3. the registration address, particularly for newly conceived Internet ventures, corresponds to the location of the site where content creation is taking place; and
4. it is a marketing and brandname necessity for Internet content firms to have their own com domain name².

Although these assumptions are reasonable, they are undercut by the phenomenon of domain name speculation, i.e. people who register multiple domain name in the hope of profiting from someone else who wants the name. While there is no means to definitively determine the extent to which speculation colors the domain name data, it appears that it is probably less than ten percent. In an effort to remove the bias caused by this speculation, this analysis removed 35,000 (about 2 percent of all domain names) based on observable traits such as a "For Sale" line in the registration address or more than 25 domain names registered to a post office box.

Furthermore, using just the number of domain names does not differentiate between domain names that have a substantial Internet presence versus those that are less important players in the Internet content business. This issue is resolved somewhat by the fact that serious Internet content firms generally register multiple variations of their domain name both to protect their Internet brand and to allow differentiation between various products they offer. For

example, Wired Magazine has over 75 registered ".com" domain names and Amazon.com has registered dozens of names such as amazonfilms.com or amazonkids.com. This gives additional weight to the most important Internet content firms and helps to counter-balance the phenomenon of smaller and less used domains.

The domain name data set for this article is based on a tabulation conducted by the author during June and July of 1998 and uses an Internet utility program known as "whois" which returns contact information for a particular domain. Included in this information is a mailing address, contact names with phone numbers and emails, the date the domain name was registered, the last time it was updated, and the name servers responsible for the domain. In order to build a list of all registered domain names it is necessary to first use an option contained within the whois utility to request a list of all domain names that start with a certain series of letters and numbers, e.g. aaaab or deff4. This list can then be used to query each individual domain name to obtain its contact information. Because of the large number of queries involved in this process, several perl scripts were written to both automate the queries and process the information that was returned. This included programs to standardize address information so that it could be used to aggregate to higher geographical levels and to map to street addresses using a dataset obtained from the Environmental System Research Institute (ESRI).


While it is important to acknowledge that there are significant shortcomings to the use of domain names as an indicator of the location of the Internet content business, these issues are not debilitating. Information on individual domain names may be inaccurate or misleading, but it is reasonable to assume that these inaccuracies will be fairly evenly distributed and the process of aggregation to the regional level will help dilute the bias introduced by any one incorrect data point.

Current Geography of Internet Content Production

This section of the paper presents the empirical results of the mapping of commercial (".com") domain names in the United States. This provides a good overview of how the production of Internet content is clustering and which cities and regions are emerging as key nodes in this network.

Map 1 shows the distribution of com domain names around the United States which represents 75 percent of all ".com" domains registered worldwide. One immediately sees significant concentrations in Northern and Southern California, the Northwest, the Eastern Seaboard, and scattered throughout the rest of the country. In many ways this pattern follows the distribution of population with most all cities emerging as notable sites of domain names registrations. In fact, a simple linear regression at the MSA level with number of com domain names as the dependent variable and population as the independent variable yields an r-squared of 0.65.

Map 1 – Distribution of Commercial Domain Names in the United States, 1998



Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998

However, the distribution of the Internet content business as indicated by com domain names, is not simply a straightforward story of correlation to population. Moving from the national level to the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) it is possible to note significant differences between regions. A useful technique for comparing regions is the domain name specialization ratio which indicates the extent to which a region is specialized in domain names compared to the United States as a whole. A value greater than 1.00 indicates a higher specialization than the national average and a value less than 1.00 indicates a lack of specialization. Although any number of standardizing variables can be utilized, e.g., population, jobs, etc., number of establishments is used since the phenomenon under study is the process of firms creating Internet content. The formula use to calculate these specialization ratios is as follows:

$$\text{Domain Name Specialization Ratio} = \frac{\text{Number of com domains in a region} / \text{Number of firms in a region}}{\text{Number of com domains in US} / \text{Number of firms in US}}$$

Although most CMSAs have specialization ratios higher than the national average, the variance between these regions can be quite extreme. For example, as Table 1 illustrates, the San Francisco Bay region has almost three times the number of domain names per firm as either the Chicago, Philadelphia or Houston metropolitan regions. Also of interest is the noticeable discontinuity between the top three regions and the rest in terms of total numbers of domain names. Together, the New York, San Francisco and Los Angeles regions have more ".com" domain names as the next 11 largest metropolitan regions combined.

Table 1 – Top 15 Concentrations of Commercial Domain Names by CMSA, 1998

<i>CMSA Name</i>	<i>Commercial Domains</i>	<i>Domains per 1000 Firms</i>	<i>Firm Specialization Ratio</i>
1 New York, Northern NJ, LI, NY-NJ-CT (C)	142,375	274.19	1.25
2 San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA (C)	122,970	674.11	3.08
3 Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, (C)	118,000	339.17	1.55
4 Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI (C)	50,222	238.35	1.09
5 Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-C(C)	45,110	390.38	1.79
6 Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV (P)	38,213	421.64	1.93
7 Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City(C)	37,296	252.78	1.16
8 Dallas-Fort Worth, TX (C)	34,064	299.50	1.37
9 Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL (C)	32,518	290.04	1.33
10 Atlanta, GA	30,285	320.22	1.47
11 Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO (C)	29,409	434.68	1.99
12 Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA (C)	27,934	334.21	1.53
13 San Diego, CA	25,903	429.98	1.97
14 Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX (C)	24,769	253.65	1.16
15 Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	22,331	304.45	1.39
National Totals	1,440,671	218.54	1.00

Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Firm data from the 1995 Zip Code Business Patterns

However, the geography of the Internet cannot simply be described in terms of total numbers of domains since in many ways this simply reflects size. As Table 2 illustrates, one obtains a very different ordering of metropolitan regions on the basis of domain name specialization ratios - the San Francisco Bay moves to the number one position and the New York region drops off the table completely. Additionally, new regions, such as Provo, Utah; Portland, Oregon; Austin, Texas; and Las Vegas, Nevada, appear as smaller but highly specialized areas of ".com" domain names.

Table 2 – Top 15 Specialized CMSAs in Commercial Domain Names, 1998

<i>CMSA Name</i>	<i>Commercial Domains</i>	<i>Domains per 1000 Firms</i>	<i>Firm Specialization Ratio</i>
1 San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA (C)	122,970	674.11	3.08
2 Provo-Orem, UT	2,862	505.21	2.31
3 Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO (C)	29,409	434.68	1.99
4 San Diego, CA	25,903	429.98	1.97
5 Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV (P)	38,213	421.64	1.93
6 Austin-San Marcos, TX	10,336	406.35	1.86
7 Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-C(C)	45,110	390.38	1.79
8 Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA	3,679	362.21	1.66
9 Las Vegas, NV-AZ	7,668	360.19	1.65
10 Portland-Salem, OR-WA (C)	17,791	350.61	1.60
11 Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, (C)	118,000	339.17	1.55
12 Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA (C)	27,934	334.21	1.53
13 Athens, GA	1,362	333.33	1.53
14 Atlanta, GA	30,285	320.22	1.47
15 Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	22,331	304.45	1.39
National Totals	1,440,671	218.54	1.00

Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Firm data is from 1995 Zip Code Business Patterns

Furthermore, as one would expect, domain names are not evenly distributed within regions but are clustered in particular locations. In the largest three regions there are high concentrations of domain names in the city of San Francisco, Manhattan, around San Jose and Silicon Valley, and in the Santa Monica-Hollywood area of Los Angeles. In addition there are numerous other smaller concentrations such as Berkeley-Emeryville, Brooklyn, and Long Beach.

Given these sub-regional clusters, it is useful to take the analysis to the next smallest geographical category, i.e. the city³. The data presented here is also used for Maps 2 and 3 of downtown San Francisco and New York. Interestingly, the top three cities mirror the experience of the metropolitan regions with New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco containing more domain names than the next 12 cities. As one would expect, Table 5 shows even more variation in specialization ratios at this finer grain of analysis. For example, the cities of Houston, Dallas and Denver fall below the national average in terms of domain names to firms, Chicago and

Phoenix are hovering close to the national average and San Francisco again stands out as the most highly specialized major center of com domain names. Of course, in many ways these findings reflect the larger urban structure of these cities and regions. For example, although Denver defined as a city fall below the national average for domain names, it is third most specialized CMSA in the country illustrating the spread-out nature of recent urban development around Denver.

Table 3 – Top 15 Concentrations of Commercial Domain Names by Census Defined Cities, 1998

<i>City Name</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Commercial Domains</i>	<i>Domains per 1000 Firms</i>	<i>Firm Specialization Ratio</i>
1 New York	NY	56,003	310.11	1.42
2 Los Angeles	CA	38,086	328.39	1.51
3 San Francisco	CA	20,868	668.25	3.07
4 San Diego	CA	16,590	421.57	1.94
5 Chicago	IL	14,274	225.48	1.04
6 Houston	TX	13,822	192.34	0.88
7 Dallas	TX	12,074	215.72	0.99
8 Seattle	WA	10,754	446.46	2.05
9 San Jose	CA	9,883	359.45	1.65
10 Phoenix	AZ	8,588	226.27	1.04
11 Boston	MA	8,078	377.74	1.73
12 Portland	OR	6,606	257.81	1.18
13 Washington	DC	6,000	320.67	1.47
14 Austin	TX	6,000	293.63	1.35
15 Denver	CO	5,869	170.38	0.78

Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Firm data is from 1995 Zip Code Business Patterns

Again, because total numbers of domain names are only one side of the story, it is also important to examine how cities compare according to their specialization in domain names. Table 6 shows the top fifteen cities in the United States ranked according to specialization ratios. It is immediately obvious that many of these cities are relatively small although San Francisco, Seattle and San Diego make this list. Also interesting is the geographic proximity of many of these cities, i.e. Los Altos, Foster City, San Francisco, Sunnyvale, Mountain View and Berkeley

are all in the San Francisco Bay Region, Redmond and Seattle are in the Seattle Metropolitan area, and Cambridge and Waltham are located in the Greater Boston area.


Table 4 - Top 15 Specialized Census Defined Cities in Commercial Domain Names, 1998

<i>City Name</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Commercial Domains</i>	<i>Domains per 1000 Firms</i>	<i>Firm Specialization Ratio</i>
1 Los Altos	CA	1,345	1036.21	4.76
2 Foster City	CA	974	995.91	4.57
3 San Francisco	CA	20,868	668.25	3.07
4 Long Branch	NJ	479	630.26	2.89
5 Sunnyvale	CA	3,895	589.44	2.71
6 Santa Monica	CA	3,696	565.05	2.59
7 Mountain View	CA	3,401	524.68	2.41
8 Waltham	MA	1,244	497.60	2.28
9 Cambridge	MA	3,368	495.29	2.27
10 Berkeley	CA	2,544	483.93	2.22
11 Blacksburg	VA	291	474.71	2.18
12 Redmond	WA	1,333	446.87	2.05
13 Seattle	WA	10,754	446.46	2.05
14 Carson	NV	757	446.08	2.05
15 San Diego	CA	16,590	421.57	1.94

Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Firm data is from 1995 Zip Code Business Patterns


Maps 2 and 3 illustrates how these commercial domain names are distributed in the cities of New York and San Francisco. There are significant concentrations of domain names in the financial district of San Francisco as well as the South of Market or Soma district also known as Multimedia Gulch. The New York City Map clearly shows concentrations in domain names near the tip of Manhattan in the TriBeCa district, Soho, and Greenwich Village which generally corresponds to the parts of the city referred to as Silicon Alley. One can also see a dense concentration of domain names on the East side just south of Central Park where many corporations and businesses are located.

Map 2 – Location of Commercial Domain Names in Downtown San Francisco, 1998



Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998

Map 3 – Location of Commercial Domain Names in Downtown New York City, 1998



Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998

Implications of Geography

This section demonstrates that the production of Internet content exhibits a remarkable degree of clustering despite its much ballyhooed spacelessness. Given the space-transcending nature of Internet technology it seems strange that such differences in the commercialization of the Internet should exist. Despite the possibility of every region developing its own particular brand of Internet content, it appears that in fact distinct inter-regional differences in domain names are occurring. Given the fact that the Internet offers enormous returns to scale in which small first mover advantages can quickly translate into meaningful competitive advantage, the geography described here has significant implications for future trajectory of the Internet content business.

However, one of the most interesting aspects about the three leading regions is that although they all have a significant Internet presence, they are very dissimilar to one another in basic industrial makeup. This suggests that there are multiple pathways towards the development of an Internet content specialization. Industry analysts often point to the existing high technology industries of Silicon Valley, the financial and publishing industries of New York, and the entertainment industry of Southern California to explain their high concentrations of Internet related activity. In order to better understand how these differences impact the formation of the Internet content business, the next section provides an analysis of how the commercialization of the Internet has changed from 1993 to 1998 and explores the relationship between existing industrial sectors and the specialization in commercial domain names.


Temporal and Industrial Make-up Analysis

Although the Internet as a system has been in existence since the 1970s, 1993 in many ways marks the birth of the commercial Internet with the introduction of the browser Mosaic and

the subsequent mass interest in the World Wide Web. Because there is no readily available source of historical data on the registration locations of Internet domain names, this paper uses the creation date of domain names to determine how the location of domain name registrations has changed over time. It must be noted that there is a degree of fallacy in using the domain name data in this manner because the registration address obtained in July of 1998 is not necessarily the same address at which the domain name was initially registered. However, because speculation in domain names for resale probably consists of less than 10 percent of all registrations and given that firms value the maintenance of a consistent domain name identity, this data should provide a reasonable sense of how the location of the Internet content production has shifted over time.

Figure 1 provides an overview of how the specialization ratios⁴ of the ten CMSAs with the most domain names has changed over the past six years. It is interesting to note the relative drop in specialization of San Francisco, Boston and Washington DC over time. This can be partially attributed to their early involvement in the academic and military version of the Internet and the subsequent diffusion of the Internet content business as the World Wide Web became more widely popularized. This is also supported by the fact that many of the most specialized CMSAs in 1993 such as Champaign-Urbana, IL and Colorado Springs, CO were closely associated with universities or the Defense Department and quickly dropped in specialization as the Internet commercialized.

Figure 1 – Top 10 CMSAs by Commercial Domain Name / Jobs Specialization Ratio in 1998, 1993-1998



Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Employment data from US Department of Commerce

Equally interesting is the relatively large increase in the specializations of New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and Dallas. While it is impossible to provide a single causal factor for the increased specialization of these cities, these results illustrate an evolution of the use of the Internet from its initial role as a technological development tool for the defense department, to its application for broader commercial purposes. However, while the trends illustrated in Figure 1 corresponds well with anecdotal stories of the development of the Internet content business, a more systematic analysis is warranted. In this vein, the last section of this article explores two arguments about the underlying relationship between Internet content production and a region's industrial makeup.

Industrial Makeup and Production of Internet Content

The first hypothesis under consideration is that the growth of the commercial Internet is largely based on the technological abilities contained within a region. Therefore regions which have strong high-tech industries, such as San Francisco, Seattle or San Diego, have an advantage in developing firms producing Internet content. The second hypothesis is that the real competitive advantage in the Internet content business lies in a region's ability to produce information to be distributed via the Internet. Therefore regions with large media or entertainment sectors such as New York and Los Angeles would be at an advantage. In an effort to provide an answer to these two hypotheses, a series of scatterplots are presented. These figures compare the relationship between domain name specialization ratios and location quotients⁵ for clusters of industries that represent the key supporting industries for each hypothesis.


The first industrial cluster – **Internet Technology** – is defined to include computer manufacturers, telecommunications, and software⁶. The second industrial cluster - **Informational** - is made up of Media and Publishing, Entertainment, Advertising and Public

Relations, and Advanced Users⁷. Although the exact make-up of these clusters can be debated, the goal is simply to create categories that capture the theoretical underpinnings of the two hypotheses. In other words, is the growth of Internet content production more closely tied to the technological capacity brought by a specialization in technology or the supply of informational products from a specialization in informational industries? While the formulation of this inquiry, the methodology used and the characteristics of the data do not permit the drawing of definitive conclusions, this technique does provide some initial and valuable insights.

The first comparison undertaken is between Figures 2 and 3 which contains the top 100 most domain-name specialized CMSAs in 1993⁸. One can see that in the case of the Internet technology (Figure 2) there does not appear to be a particularly strong relationship between a specialization in this cluster and the development of Internet content. Only nine percent of the top 100 Internet specialized CMSAs had both a specialization ratio and a location quotient greater than 1.00. Moreover, only half of the regions specializing in Internet technology also had an above average specialization ratio for domain names.


However, the Informational cluster does not appear to have a particularly strong relationship with the commercialization of the Internet either. As with the technology cluster, only nine percent of the CMSAs had both a location quotient and a specialization ratio greater than one. Additionally, one can observe that the three CMSAs with the highest location quotients in the Informational cluster not only have lower than average specializations in domain names but are not even within the top fifty most domain name specialized CMSAs.

Figure 2 – Scatterplot of Commercial Domain Name / Jobs Specialization Ratio versus the Location Quotient of Internet Technology Industries, 1993



Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Employment data from US Department of Commerce

Figure 3 – Scatterplot of Commercial Domain Name / Jobs Specialization Ratio versus the Location Quotient of Informational Industries, 1993




Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Employment data from US Department of Commerce

All in all, the lack of noticeably strong relationships between these two industry clusters and domain names is not terribly surprising. At this time, the development of the Internet was driven by the logic of academic and military designs and thus the limited commercialization that had taken place was most likely the result of local connections to universities than any particular economic advantage.


The next set of figures illustrates the results of six years of commercialization and development of the Internet. Figures 4 and 5 show the location quotients and specialization ratios for 100 CMSAs with the highest specialization in domain names in 1998. In the case of the Internet technology cluster there is a continued weak relationship between these industries and a specialization in domain names. Only 12 percent of these CMSAs had both a location quotient and a specialization ratio greater than 1.00. Moreover, the median location quotient for the top 25 CMSAs actually dropped during this period from 0.86 to 0.81. While one should not read too much into these figures, it is readily apparent that both in 1993 and 1998 being specialized in the technology of the Internet was not sufficient to guarantee the development of a strong Internet content business.

Figure 4 – Scatterplot of Commercial Domain Name / Jobs Specialization Ratio versus the Location Quotient of Internet Technology Industries, 1998



*Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Employment data from US Department of Commerce
Please Note: All Employment data used in this figure is from 1996 – the latest year available.*

Figure 5 – Scatterplot of Commercial Domain Name / Jobs Specialization Ratio versus the Location Quotient of Informational Industries, 1998



*Source: Domain Name data from Author Survey – June/July 1998; Employment data from US Department of Commerce
Please Note: All Employment data used in this figure is from 1996 – the latest year available.*

Interestingly, the findings for the Informational cluster suggest a different and stronger relationship. A comparison between Figure 5 with Figure 4 reveals that unlike the Internet technology cluster, there appears to be a strong relationship between a specialization in domain names with a specialization in informational industries. Eighty-two percent of CMSAs which are specialized in domain names are also specialized in informational industries. This compares to only thirty-two percent of these same CMSAs being specialized in the Internet technology cluster. Moreover, Figures 5 and 3 reveal that this relationship between specialization in Informational industries and specialization in domain names has increased over time. For example, the median location quotient for the informational cluster of the top 25 industries increased from 1.05 in 1993 to 1.31 in 1998.

In addition, a simple linear regression using the specialization ratio for domain names as the dependent variable and the location quotient of Informational industries as the independent variable resulted in an adjusted r-squared of 0.04 in 1993 and 0.17 in 1998. Although these correlations clearly demonstrate that specialization in informational industries cannot alone explain a specialization in the Internet content production, the increase in the correlation suggests that that this industry cluster is becoming increasingly connected to the production of Internet content.

Conclusion

Due to the multiplicity of assumptions that have been made about the significance of domain names and the methods employed, it is not possible to assign a causal explanation to the relationships outlined here. This analysis has shown a relationship between information industries and the production of Internet content but cannot explain why an important

informational center like Chicago is not also emerging as an equally strong and important node as New York or Los Angeles. Therefore, these findings should be seen as a suggestive first step in theorizing about the overall commercialization process of the Internet.

In many ways the first six years of the commercial Internet content business corresponds well to the first stage of Vernon's (1966) product cycle theory. Product cycle theory argues that in the early phase of a product innovation, production will locate in regions that are equipped with highly skilled labor with access to highly specialized information and then later move to more peripheral regions as the products become standardized. While the reduction in location quotients for cities outlined in Figure 1 indicates a reduction in some of the Internet's initial concentrations it is still too early to see whether production of Internet content will ever reach a point of product standardization. After all, industries based on the manipulation of information are a recent phenomenon and researchers are still striving to understand what this means for long-term development patterns. And as the continued specialization of San Francisco and the growth of specialization of New York and Los Angeles illustrates, some cities are continuing to attract new start-ups despite the high costs associated with doing business there.

Thus, this article's most significant finding is that the Internet is not bringing about the wholesale elimination of place-based networks in favor of cyberspace. As Graham (1997) argues, "time and space barriers are only selectively being overcome...Place-based and place-bound ways of living, and the social, economic institutional, and cultural dynamics that can arise where urban propinquity does matter are still critically important in shaping how cities and localities are woven into global lattices of mobility and flow." Just as the earlier technologies of the telegraph and railroad upset the standards upon which the competitive advantage of firms and regions were based, the Internet promises a reorganization of the production systems of a wide

range of industries. The challenge for future research will be understanding and analyzing the way specific regional networks and individual firms adapt to and exploit the opportunities offered by the Internet.

References Cited

- Bicknell, C, 1998, "Here Comes AltaVista" *Wired (On-line)* 13 October, (<http://www.wired.com/news/news/business/story/15589.html>)
- Chandler, A, 1977, *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- Cheswick, B, Burch, H, 1998, "The Internet Mapping Project" *Wired* **6(12)** 216-217 (<http://www.cs.bell-labs.com/who/ches/map/index.html>)
- Dodge, Martin, 1998, *Atlas of Cyberspace*, (<http://www.cybergeography.org/atlas/>)
- Gorman S, 1998, "The Death of Distance but not the End of Geography: The Internet as a Network" paper presented at the Regional Science Association Meeting, 29th October 1998, Santa Fe (http://www.geog.ufl.edu/grad_students/seanspaper.pdf)
- Graham, S, 1997, "Cities in real-time age: the paradigm challenge of telecommunications to the conception and planning of urban space" *Environment and Planning A*. **29** 105-127
- Joint Venture Silicon Valley, 1998 *Index of Silicon Valley: Measuring Progress Toward a 21st Century Community* San Jose, CA.
- Moss, M, Townsend, A, 1997, "Tracking the Net: Using Domain Names to Measure the Growth of the Internet in U.S. Cities" *Journal of Urban Technology* **4(3)** 47-60
- Scott, A, 1995, "From Silicon Valley to Hollywood: Growth and Development of the Multimedia Industry in California", Working Paper No. 13, The Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies, University of California – Los Angeles
- Vernon, R, 1966, "International Investment and International Trade in the Product Cycle" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **80** 190-207.

Endnotes

¹ For example, Gorman (1998) use Internet backbone data from Cooperative Association for Internet Data Analysis (CAIDA) to construct a connectivity matrix for the United States and Cheswick and Burch (1998) use traceroutes to display the connections between individual networks on the Internet. To gain a better sense of efforts to map the Internet, please consult the Atlas of Cyberspace (<http://www.cybergeography.org/atlas/>) and the Matrix Information and Directory Services (www.mids.org).

² The recent sale of the altavista.com domain name for \$3.35 million illustrates how fundamental and valuable domain names can be to the prospects of an Internet firm. Bicknell (1998)

³ Unfortunately, using the city as a unit of analysis does not adequately reflect the true nature of economies that ignore municipal boundaries. For example, two key economic nodes in the Internet content industry, i.e. Silicon Valley and Southern California's entertainment complex, do not appear in Table 5 at all because they cross multiple municipal boundaries which makes analysis and comparison difficult.

However, using Joint Venture's 1998 *Index of Silicon Valley* definition of Silicon Valley one discovers that if it had been included it would come in second on the list of cities with 47,486 com domain names. The Southern California entertainment complex was more difficult to aggregate since no widely used definition was found. However, using the rough description offered by Scott (1995) in his study of the multimedia industry an area running from Santa Monica through Hollywood to Burbank was discovered to contain approximately 30,000 domain names making it the third largest "city" in the U.S. Internet system.

⁴ Due to data availability the domain name specialization ratios used in this section uses number of jobs rather than number of firms as its standardizing variable and therefore will differ somewhat from the value in Tables 2 and 3.

⁵ Location quotients are a measure of a regions specialization in employment within a particular industry in comparison to the national average. The formula for calculation a location quotient is $(\text{Employment in Sector}_i \text{ in Region}_j / \text{Total Employment in Region}_j) / (\text{Employment in Sector}_i \text{ in US} / \text{Total Employment in US})$.

⁶ This cluster is made up of SIC 357 – Computer and Office Equipment, 366 – Communications Equipment, 367 – Electronic components and accessories, 481 – Telephone communications, 482 – Telegraph & Other Message Communications, 489 – Communications nec, and 737 – Computer and data processing services.

⁷ This cluster consists of **Media and Publication** = SIC 271 – Newspapers, 272 – Periodicals, 273 – Books, 483 – Radio and TV Broadcast Stations, 484 – Cable & Other Pay TV; **Entertainment** = 701 – Hotels, 781 – Motion picture production, 782- Motion picture distribution, 783 – Motion Picture Theaters, 794 – Commercial Sports, 799 – Misc. Amusement & recreational Service; **Advertising and Public Relations** = 731 – Advertising, 874 – Management and Public relations; and **Advanced Users** = 621 – Security brokers and dealers, 622 – Commodity Contracts Brokers, 623 – Security & Commodity Exchanges, 628 – Security and commodity services, 738 – Misc. Business Services, 871 – Engineering & architectural services, Accounting, auditing & bookkeeping, and 873 - Research and testing services.

⁸ Please note, a value greater than 1.00 in either specialization ratios or location quotients indicates that a region has more domain names or employment in the industrial cluster than the national average.