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Abstract

Jazz, classical music, opera, musical plays, non-musical plays, ballet, and art museums/galleries are denoted collectively as the ‘benchmark arts activities’ in the *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts* (SPPA) reports published by the National Endowment for the Arts since 1982. While the reports have documented public attendance at each benchmark arts activity, the extent and patterns of audience overlap among the activities have not been documented over the years. Given prior research findings that suggest increasingly diverse cultural consumption behavior and also given the expanding volume of interdisciplinary arts products, there exists a timely need to study reliable evidence for audience overlap in the United States. Using cross-tabulation method, this research has produced results showing audience overlap among the benchmark activities in the United States between 1982 and 2008 based on the SPPA data. The results of the research confirm significant audience overlap among all of the benchmark activities and highlight certain patterns of audience overlap in light of prior research findings on audience overlap. Further statistical and/or qualitative analysis of the results of this research should extend the implications of this research and add to the present understanding of cultural consumption behavior in the United States.
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Background of the study

“(If) the arts are an essential means for cultural expression, then the study of arts participation is central to our understanding of American culture and its evolution.”
(National Endowment for the Arts, 1995a)

Early studies of public participation in the arts in the United States date back to as early as 1920s when scholars documented the observed behavior of museum visitors (e.g. Robinson and others, 1982). An interest in the understanding of public participation in the arts persisted throughout the remaining years of the twentieth century and an array of related studies of various scope and nature have been published to date.

According to a report published by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in 1995, the study of public participation in the arts gained particular research attention and a distinction from arts audience study during the 1970s. The basis for the distinction is that while arts participation research is a study of general population which consists of both “users and nonusers of all types of arts programs” (p.2), arts audience research is specifically concerned with known attendees at a particular arts
institution (National Endowment for the Arts, 1995). Although the scope of an arts audience research may be extended beyond a single arts institution, the basis for the distinction continues to prevail.

The two kinds of research carry different functions. According to the report, arts participation research is most notably utilized in the process of cultural policy formulation, public funding allocation, program evaluation, cultural planning, arts advocacy, and audience development. A primary focus of arts participation studies, in effect, is illustrating the extent to which arts has penetrated into the lives of a population. In the United States, the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) carried out by the NEA is generally regarded the most comprehensive arts participation study pertaining to nationwide participation in arts and culture activities. The study has been published about every five years since 1982 and the most recent study was published in 2008.

Arts audience research, on the other hand, often seeks to gain an insight into observed behavior. Examples of arts audience research inquiries include reasons for attendance, factors affecting ticket purchase intentions, audience preferences, and many others. Since arts audience research is specifically concerned with known attendees at live arts events, implications of arts audience research are seldom extended to the people who participate in the arts via means other than
attending live arts events in person.

Arts participation studies and arts audience studies may be understood as having utilities that serve different users. Since arts participation studies provide an understanding of both users and non-users of various arts offerings, arts participation studies can serve policy makers and funders who must consider the needs of both the users and non-users and weigh the costs against public good when making decisions. However, arts organizations would benefit more from knowing specifically who their audiences are and learning the ways to deepen their relationship with their existing audience as it has been suggested that the cost of attracting new audience often exceeds the cost of retaining existing audience (Rentschler, Radbourne, Carr & Rickard, 2002). Meanwhile, arts organizations that present a particular arts discipline would gain considerably more from learning specifically about the audience who attends that particular arts discipline events.

Statement of the ‘missing gap’

Rapid development in technology in the recent years has brought about new ways of participating in the arts such as web blogging and content sharing through the social media. The SPPA reports have been tracking public participation in the arts via four specific means: attending live arts events; performing or creating arts; arts learning; and participating in the arts through the media. Of all means of arts participation,
attendance at live arts events arguably poses an overriding concern for artists and arts organizations. Do artists and arts organizations not only seek person-to-person or live arts-to-person communication but typically rely heavily on the sales of event tickets to generate revenue. Moreover, the number of attendees at live events is generally seen as a common indication of public interest in an arts organization or the organization’s arts offerings and relevant statistical data are often leveraged by arts organizations to obtain public and private funding. Hence, the study of live arts event attendees may be termed a study of the core market for arts organizations.

Typically, arts participation studies reveal what portion of a population attends a particular type of arts offering. For instance, the SPPA published in 2008 confirmed that about 9.3 percent of adults living in the United States attended at least one classical music event in the past twelve months and about 7.8 percent of the same population attended at least one jazz event in the same time period. Looking at the statistical information presented in the SPPA reports, one learns, in the simplest sense, the popularity of each arts discipline in the United States.

However, a careful observation of arts participation studies reveals an interesting fact. In the SPPA report published in 2008, for instance, it is noted that 34.6 percent
of adults living in the United States attended at least one benchmark activity\(^1\) in the past twelve months. An analysis of data in the report shows that if every arts patron in the United States engaged themselves in one type of benchmark activities only, then a relatively large total of 61.5 percent of all adults would have attended at least one benchmark activity in that year. On the other hand, if all arts patrons were drawn from a pool of people that engaged themselves in at least the most popular benchmark activity – which is non-musical theater –, then the percentage of all adults who have attended at least one benchmark activity would be as small as 22.7 percent. Given the actual percentage of adults who have attended at least one benchmark activity, namely 34.6 percent, one may conclude that there is a substantial amount of overlap of live arts events attendees across at least the seven benchmark activities. In the body of existing literature, terms such as ‘cross-attendance’ and ‘co-patronage’ are used to indicate the more colloquially called ‘audience overlap’ in the arts. What is surprising is that the SPPA reports have not once illustrated the extent of audience overlap explicitly despite the vast amount data that have been collected for the SPPA. The raw data are currently archived online at Cultural Policy and the Arts National Data Archive (CPANDA).

Economist Bruce A. Seaman (2004) has noted: “A(n)... example of the relative paucity of overlap evidence is the absence of even one table directly documenting

\(^1\) The SPPA benchmark arts activities are jazz, classical music, opera, musical plays, non-musical plays, ballet, and art museums/galleries.
such evidence in the 2002 *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*” (p.27). No studies have, thus far, featured tables directly documenting audience overlap based on the SPPA data that have been collected since 1982.

**Supporting reasons for the study of audience overlap**

One may argue that the reason for the absence of detailed illustration of audience overlap in the SPPA reports may be that the SPPA is an arts participation study by nature and that the study of audience overlap falls within the realms of arts audience research. Given the assumption, the study of arts audience overlap could, in effect, bridge the gulf between arts participation research and arts audience research by providing an insight into the empirical implications of arts participation research.

In addition to many foreseeable benefits of studying audience overlap, reasons for the study of audience overlap may be found in a number of prior research findings. Early on, the subject of many arts audience studies was the socioeconomic status of arts audiences. The findings of the studies adhered to the question “Who are the arts audiences?” In an array of studies, it was then commonly pronounced that higher socioeconomic status was strongly correlated with the frequency of attendance at live arts events. (Baumol & Bowen, 1966). However, Fisher and Preece (2002) later reported that “audience overlap relationships are not only statistically significant but also much greater in magnitude than socio-economic variables” (p.20) in terms of
having a correlation with attendance frequency.

Another ground for studying arts audience overlap is a widely recognized finding that the ‘highbrow’ arts patrons have increasingly become more eclectic in their cultural consumption choices and preferences (Peterson, 1992). In light of this finding, the legitimacy of arts audience segmentation by arts disciplines withers. For instance, if a person is an avid attendee at jazz and classical music concerts but attended only one opera and one ballet performance in a given year, it would be more appropriate to label the person as, for instance, a music patron rather than a jazz, classical music, opera, or ballet audience.

Another reason for the study of audience overlap lies in the fact that arts offerings in recent years, too, have been going through a metamorphosis as arts organizations began introducing an increasing number of ‘interdisciplinary’ performances that feature various art forms on stage simultaneously. In 2009, for instance, the Columbus Symphony Orchestra played live the score to the film *Wizard of Oz* while the concert attendees watched the film projected on a huge screen that covered almost the entire space above the musicians’ seats and virtually took the audience’s attention away from the music and the musicians. In the same year, The Irving Symphony Orchestra devoted its entire 2009 – 2010 season to a series of interdisciplinary concerts that featured aerialists, Asian kites etc. (Kushner, 2010).
Today’s symphony orchestras are not only diversifying their products by administering a ‘classical series’ and a ‘pops series’ separately but are also presenting arts offerings that can neither be defined as ‘highbrow’ nor ‘lowbrow’ arts. Given the diverse forms of arts offering by symphony orchestras, one may find that the range of cultural consumption behavior, preference, motivation, and expectations of today’s ‘symphony-goers’, in this case, is so diverse that to refer to them collectively as ‘symphony-goers’ proves to be an oversimplification.

Lastly, since the study of audience overlap is a study of arts patrons’ behavior, the results of the study are empirical in nature and could assist further inquiries on peripheral and intangible research subjects such as cultural preference, and attendance motivation. Since the composition of arts audiences in the United States and their behavior are constantly changing, continuous study of arts audience overlap and other related issues will complement and reinforce each other.

**The use and limitations of arts audience overlap studies**

There are many potential benefits to studying audience overlap. The benefits are often pragmatic as well as academically meaningful. Fisher and Preece (2002) suggest that an accurate understanding of common patterns of audience overlap can provide a reliable basis for making managerial decisions pertaining to “cross-promotional efforts, development, collaborative ventures, scheduling coordination,
outreach, and programming priorities.” (p.21)

However, a number of practical limitations to the use of audience overlap studies exist. First, study results of audience overlap studies may vary dramatically depending on the sample used. For instance, a cultural and arts market analysis of Columbus, Ohio in 1998 (Artsmarket Consulting, Inc.) revealed that 12.1 percent of people who have attended at least one classical music concert also attended at least one musical theater performance within a time frame of twelve months. However, as revealed in this research, according to 1997 SPPA report data, 61.5 percent of people who have attended at least one classical music concert also attended at least one musical theater performance in the same length of time frame. As such, audience research at the local level may reveal a very different set of results from audience research at the national level. But instead, the discrepancies may reveal other fundamental differences between two regions. For example, Hughes, M., J. Harrison & J. Ryan (2010) have reported that Americans are more eclectic in terms of musical taste and cultural consumption in comparison to a number of foreign populations.

Another factor that limits the utility of an arts audience overlap study is the fact that the extent of audience overlap between two arts disciplines do not necessarily match up with the extent of audience overlap between two arts organizations whose arts
offerings are the two arts disciplines that have been studied. For example, the aforementioned cultural and arts market analysis of Columbus, Ohio (Artsmarket Consulting, Inc., 1998) revealed that 12.8 percent of people who have attended at least one classical music concert also attended at least one opera performance in the same year. However, the report also revealed that only 4.8 percent of audience for Columbus Symphony Orchestra – the largest classical music organization in Columbus – attended a performance by Opera Columbus – the only major opera company in Columbus – that year. A plausible explanation may be that there are a number of arts organizations in Columbus that present classical music concerts throughout the year. It is also possible that some potential audience members have resorted to other arts organizations located outside of Columbus. Hence, to better understand the implications of audience overlap research findings, the availability of the arts offerings must be taken into account.

In a study of audience overlap between various arts and leisure activities, Montgomery & Robinson (2006) borrowed the concept, of ‘complement’ and ‘substitute’ goods from the study of economics to explain the relationship between two arts disciplines with regard to their audience overlap. While the use of the concepts of complement and substitute goods were adequate for Montgomery & Robinson's research, the concept cannot necessarily be extended to all audience overlap research, however. In economics, the consumption of a complement or
substitute good is understood to be positively or negatively affected by the changes in price of another good respectively. However, studies (e.g. Hume, 2008) illustrate that many factors affect arts audiences' repurchase intentions. In addition, statistical evidence of audience attendance overlap records an observation of a phenomenon that is not often conserved over time. Hence, audience overlap does not necessarily indicate consumption of an arts event having a direct impact on consumption of another arts event.

Despite the inherent limitations of audience overlap research, common patterns of attendance overlap across disciplines could prove useful to arts organizations that seek an understanding of their audiences’ whereabouts away from their own performance venues. In light of Fisher and Preece's (2002) suggestion, two arts organizations whose audiences are known to overlap to a considerable extent may benefit by promoting their arts offerings at each other’s events and coordinating their performance schedules in advance to avoid presenting two performances at the same time. Similar strategy is likely useful to arts organizations that present arts events of various arts disciplines.

**Research questions**

The primary purpose of this research is to examine statistical evidence for arts audience overlap in the United States according to the SPPA reports published in
1982, 1988, 1992, 1997, 2002 and 2008. The data is obtained by using an analysis tool available online at Cultural Policy and the Arts National Data Archive (CPANDA). The following questions guide the qualitative analysis of the data generated:

- To what extent do arts patrons overlap across the seven benchmark arts activities in the United States according to the most recent SPPA report published in 2008? Where are the most noticeable areas of audience overlap?
- According to the data collected for the SPPA reports between 1982 and 2008, to what extent did arts patrons overlap across the seven benchmark arts activities in the United States between 1982 and 2008? Was there a consistent trend of audience overlap or have the patterns of audience overlap changed over the years? How has the extent of audience overlap changed over the years?
- How do the identified patterns of audience overlap compare with the findings of prior studies?

Scope of the research

The SPPA has been documenting public participation in an increasing number of arts and culture activities since 1982. Out of dozens of activities, seven arts disciplines
are distinguished as ‘benchmark’ arts activities: jazz; classical music; opera; musical plays; non-musical plays; ballet; and art museums/galleries. Public participation in the benchmark activities has consistently been compared in relation to past records to enable a consistent trend analysis of public participation in the arts in the United States. Many arts participation studies and arts audience studies, too, examine all or some of the SPPA benchmark arts activities. The benchmark activities are arguably ‘elite’ or ‘highbrow’ arts disciplines that have had continuous consumption by the U.S. public.

My research inquiry is concerned with the way arts audiences attend arts events of multiple arts disciplines and specifically across the seven benchmark arts activities. As my research inquiry is solely concerned with known attendees' behavior (i.e. attendance at live arts events), my research should be sorted as an arts audience research by definition. As with many arts audience studies, however, my research uses statistical data from arts participation studies in addition to arts audience studies.

My research uses data from the following sources: the SPPA (NEA, 1982, 1985, 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2008). All data were collected by conducting surveys and interviews. It must be noted that the surveys and interviews asked about people’s attendance at live arts events within past twelve months. Hence, the researcher must bear in mind that the frequency of attendance documented in the sources is a form
of one's arts consumption in a given single year.

The SPPA data collection was conducted at the national level. The subjects of the research were adults (age 18 and older) living in the United States and were randomly selected. The SPPA research has been conducted with regularity for almost three decades.

A review of existing literature is a significant portion of my research. Prevailing hypotheses and repeated observations pertaining to my research inquiry will be identified from the existing literature and then be examined against some statistical data. It appears that a relatively small portion of existing literature has examined arts audience in countries other than the United States.

Definition of terms

Advances in technology have multiplied the number of ways of participating in the arts. The NEA’s recent publication (2010) specifically examined public participation in the arts via media. Since an individual engaged in any means of arts participation is an arts audience or an arts consumer, the word “patron” is used in this thesis to specifically refer to an arts audience who has participated in the arts by attending live arts performances or visiting arts exhibitions. In other words, the term
“audience” refers to a broader scope of arts participants that participate through various means. The focus of this research is narrower in scope as the research is solely concerned with arts patrons.

In the SPPA reports, jazz, classical music, opera, non-musical plays, musical plays, ballet and visiting arts museums are referred to as “activities”. However, to clear possible confusion with various means of arts participation and also to keep in congruency with prior arts audience studies, jazz, classical music, opera, non-musical plays, musical plays, ballet and visiting arts museums will be referred to as various “arts disciplines” in this thesis. In some studies, the arts disciplines are called by more colloquial terms. For instance, classical music is often referred to as symphony and non-musical plays are referred to as theatre. Musical plays are often called musicals.

“Audience overlap” refers to arts patrons attending arts events that are of different arts discipline within a certain time period. In many cases, audience overlap is measured within a time period of twelve months. “Cross-attendance” and “co-patronage” are often used synonymously as having the same meaning as audience overlap.

Branches of arts participation research
Figure 1. Illustration of arts participation research inquiries

Figure 1 is a visual illustration showing branches of research inquiry within the realm of the study of arts participation. The words in each box are keywords commonly found in many arts participation literatures. A keyword at times becomes the very focus of a research inquiry while at other times the relationship
between two or more of the keywords receives inquisitive attention. It should be noted that the linear, top-to-bottom layout of Figure 1 is not intended to suggest that only the words that are connected with a line in this illustration have an academically inquired relationship. Indeed, all of the research inquiry subjects featured in Figure 1 have at least some peripheral relationship with each other. Nonetheless, what the layout of Figure 1 is intended to show is that the study of arts participation may be segmented according to certain research variables.

The first horizontal set of branches in the illustration shows that arts participation studies may generally be concerned with three populations: the general public which includes both attendees and non-attendees of live arts events; non-attendees who are not currently attending any live arts events but could become future attendees; and people who are currently attending live arts events. The people who are described as potential attendees or non-attendees may also include people who were formerly regular attendees at live arts events but have stopped attending over a certain period of time.

As for the studies of the general public participation in the arts, Figure 1 shows that scholarly observation of public involvement in the arts could become the basis on which policymakers make their decisions regarding the use of public money to support the arts. In such a case, the policy decisions may vary
significantly depending on the assumed public value that the support of the arts will generate and assumed beneficiaries of the public value.

As for the study of potential arts audience, Figure 1 shows that researchers endeavor to identify the factors that prevent a potential audience from actually attending a live arts event. While many studies of existing arts audience question many intrinsic factors that lead to one’s attendance at a live arts event, a significant number of recent studies about potential arts audience seem to be aimed at identifying the external factors affecting one’s attendance. At any rate, both kinds of research yield results that assist endeavors of arts audience development. Specifically, findings about arts audience's intrinsic motivation help arts organizations retain their existing audience whereas findings about obstacles to people’s attendance help arts organizations attract new audience members by eliminating the obstacles.

The most elaborate part of Figure 1 is, nonetheless, showing the constructs of research inquiries about existing arts audience. There are many variables by which researchers segment and understand arts audiences: cultural preference; cultural taste; motivation for cultural consumption; patterns of live arts event attendance; and socioeconomic status. Additional variables may be identified from other literatures.
Audience segmentation according to each variable reveals a different level of understanding arts audience and each level of understanding entails a different type of practical implications. First, one’s social status draws a significant correlation with his or her cultural consumption. Then, understanding of people’s preference for certain arts offerings assist marketing efforts that may take the form of product differentiation or market differentiation. Furthermore, studies on motivation leading to cultural consumption suggest ways to intensify an existing arts audiences’ relationship with the arts and to increase the frequency of the person’s cultural consumption. The study of audience overlap is, in effect, the study of patterns of cultural consumption and adds another layer of understanding today’s evolving arts audience.

It should be noted that the significance of the overarching conceptual framework that Figure 1 illustrates is that the findings of the research inquires interrelate with each other. Hypothetically, for instance, a public participation study may document a noticeable interest in the arts among a population residing in a rural area. Then another study may reveal that the poor transportation system in the area prevents the residents from attending local arts events. With the help of a study that documents positive attitude for the public support for the arts, policymakers may decide to build a better transportation system to not only provide the constituencies with greater access to local arts offerings but also to generate
additional public good for the community. As for the arts organizations in the area, many forms of arts audience studies could guide them in discovering ways to retain their increasing number of audience and to design their arts offerings to better suit the needs and wants of the community.
Chapter 2: Review of the literature

Literature review

Various kinds of arts participation studies and arts audience studies have been published since the early decades of the twentieth century. However, arts audience studies became most notably distinguished from arts participation studies during the 1970s (NEA, 1995) and various studies about the composition of arts patrons and arts audience segmentation followed. Arts audience segmentation studies have an essential relation to arts audience overlap studies because audience overlap essentially refers to the incidence of various audience segments attending the same or similar arts events and, hence, audience overlap studies show that the segments are not mutually exclusive.

In 1966, economist William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen published The Performing Arts – The Economic Dilemma – a book whose propositions became known as “Baumol’s cost disease”. Although the primary subject of the study was the economic standing of cultural nonprofit organizations in the United States, the authors surveyed patrons at 153 arts performances to find out who arts consumers were. Of the 153 performances, 13 were free open-air performances and the rest were what are now the benchmark arts activities in the SPPA reports. Baumol and Bowen’s observation led to the conclusion that performing arts patrons, as a whole,
were comprised of people who share very similar socioeconomic and demographic characteristics regardless of the type of arts discipline they patronize. The authors made a remark about audiences from one arts discipline to another discipline:

“They all show a median age in the middle 30’s; over 60 per cent of the audience for each art form consists of people in the professions...; all exhibit an extremely high level of education...; and there is a consistently high level of income...” (p. 84). Baumol and Bowen's finding continues to be accepted as a credible observation at the time but their study did not clarify whether or not each of 29,413 survey respondents was a unique performance attendee.

As with Baumol and Bowen's study, a large portion of early studies on arts patrons posed the question: “Who are the art patrons?” Such studies often observed socioeconomic and demographic status of the patrons and a number of studies yielded results that were congruent with Baumol and Bowen’s finding. For instance, DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (Center for the Study of Public Policy, 1977) confirmed that patrons of theater, dance, ballet, classical music, opera, art museums, history museums, and science museums are highly educated, higher in occupational status, have higher income, and are less likely to be composed of racial minorities. Although later studies have pinpointed the level of education as having the strongest correlation with arts attendance (e.g. 22
Heilbrun and Gray, 1993), it has been established that patrons of various performing art disciplines, as a whole, tend to create a certain segment of population that share many similarities as well as a common liking for the arts (Fisher and Preece, 2002). In other words, one may say, arts patrons were generally described as a homogeneous group.

In the following decades, scholars delved deeper into the study of arts patrons to develop a more sophisticated understanding of arts patrons. In the late-1970s and early 1980s, in particular, studies began segmenting arts patrons often using cluster analysis (Seaman, 2005). The cluster-based segmentation is a kind of market segmentation where multidimensional statistical analyses are used as a basis for grouping subjects in such a way that “each segment is homogeneous with respect to a set of descriptors but the segments are heterogeneous across segments” (Clopton, Stodddard & Dave, 2006). The legitimacy of audience segmentation may find its ground in a marketing approach that accepts consumers’ heterogeneous preferences. Unlike product differentiation where marketing efforts are utilized to converge a variety of consumers’ preferences on a product, market segmentation suggests that the products be adjusted to meet consumers' divergent preferences. (Clopton, Stodddard, and Dave, 2006). Many arts audience studies have employed the cluster-based market segmentation
approach to segment arts audiences into distinct groups. Early on, Frank, Massy and Wind (1972) developed taxonomy of market segmentation bases consisting of both observable variables and unobservable variables. Observable variables included gender, age, and race while unobservable variables included personal values and personality.

In regards to the scope of arts audience segmentation research, two study findings gave rise to the study of arts audience across various arts disciplines. Firstly, Belk, Semenik & Andreason’s (1981) observed and confirmed a previously suggested idea that the most frequent attendees at one arts discipline also tend to participate in a wide variety of other arts and certain leisure activities. Additionally, Peterson (1992) later reported having captured two diverging musical tastes associated with social status in the United States. He argued that while the social 'elites' were acquiring a widening musical taste and acceptance for a wide range of musical forms, the social “mass” tended to preserve a narrow range of musical taste. Peterson named the elites “omnivores” and the mass “univores” and the terms became the subjects for empirical testing in subsequent years. Peterson revisited his study once again in 1996 and confirmed that “highbrows are more omnivorous than others and that they have become increasingly omnivorous over time.” (Peterson, 1996). What the studies suggested, in effect, was that some arts patrons exhibit more heterogeneous
cultural consumption behavior than others.

Many scholars, indeed, have found use in observing arts patrons’ attendance across various arts disciplines. For instance, Sexton and Britney (1980) categorized their sample of multiple arts discipline patrons into four clusters: “lights”; “museum fans”; “all-rounders”; and “specialists”. “Lights” and “museum fans” were primarily distinguished by the number of performance attendance in a given year. On the other hand, “all-rounders” and “specialists” were sorted primarily according to the diversity of performance attendance choices. Other scholars have used an array of variables to segment arts audiences. For instance, Belk, Semenik and Andreason (1981) illustrated six distinct leisure lifestyle groups and argued that arts patrons tend to cluster around a similar leisure lifestyle. Some studies have discussed arts patrons having various cultural preferences and tastes. Another example of segmentation is the study of Cuadrado and Mona (2000) who devised clusters called “beginners”, “theater buffs”, “enthusiasts” and “indifferent” to segment theater, dance, opera and music patrons according to their attendance goals. Each new method of arts audience segmentation adds a new perspective on understanding arts audience.

Within the business realm of arts management, marketers most commonly segment patrons of one particular arts discipline based on the patrons’ attendance frequency.
For instance, the League of American Orchestras published a major audience initiative research in 2008 with the *pro bono* work of the management consulting firm Oliver Wyman. The research, which became also known as the “churn report”, studied the patrons of nine major symphony orchestras in the United States and segmented the symphony orchestra “customers” into six clusters according to their attendance frequency and the number of consecutive years that they have been attending. The most ‘intense’ attendees are likely season subscribers, and the rest may be thought of as single ticket buyers or first-time ‘trialists’. Subscribers are known to have “higher levels of satisfaction, trust and commitment, and have more positive intentions of supporting and donating to the organization.” (Johnson & Garbarino, 2006, p.61) and retaining them would be most beneficial to the fiscal standing of arts organizations. Moreover, the cost of retaining an existing patron from year to year is known to be less than the cost of attracting a new patron for the first time (Rentschler, Radbourne, Can & Rickard et al., 2002). The term ‘retention’ specifically refers to maintaining or increasing a known attendee’s performance attendance frequency.

Hence, one may argue that the most useful arts audience segmentation studies for arts organizations are arguably the ones that have segmented patrons of one particular arts discipline based on the patrons’ attendance frequency. In light of the findings of Belk, Semenik & Andreason (1981) and Peterson (1992), at the least,
the arts organizations will gain additional benefits from arts audience overlap studies. Bruce A. Seaman has recently illustrated some of the major arts audience overlap studies and arts audience segmentation studies in chapter 2.2 of his working paper entitled *Attendance and Public Participation in the Performing Arts: A Review of the Empirical Literature* (2005). However, as Seaman notes, the volume of existing arts audience studies is relatively small.

**Prior findings on audience overlap**

Certain patterns of arts audience overlap have been documented in a number of prior studies although the number is relatively small. Some studies were specifically dedicated to the study of arts audience overlap while others have noted evidence for audience overlap while studying other aspects about arts audience. The following studies have documented specific patterns of arts audience overlap across various arts disciplines.

A Ford Foundation study (1974, Vol. II, p.11) reported that of all surveyed U.S. arts patrons, over half of the patrons attended only one arts discipline. Opera and ballet patrons, in general, were found to have a wide interest in the arts as at least three quarters of the patrons attended at least one other arts discipline. Theatre and symphony patrons, on the other hand, consisted of a greater portion of people who do not attend other arts disciplines. Sixty-three percent of theatre patrons and 36
percent of symphony patrons were found to have attended no other arts disciplines in a given year. Opera and ballet patrons showed a noticeable interest in symphony music as 75 percent of opera patrons and 60 percent of ballet patrons attended symphony performances. Throsby and Withers (1979, p.101) and Seaman (2005, p.26) later noted the Ford Foundation study to have shown that ballet patrons have a particular liking for theatre. However, the data in the Ford Foundation study showed that 60 percent of ballet patrons attended theatre and the same portion of ballet patrons attended symphony. Given that the overall arts patrons’ participation in theater (16 percent) is significantly higher than the overall arts patrons’ participation in symphony (10 percent), it appears that a more accurate observation is that ballet patrons are, in fact, more partial to symphony than theater. In sum, the data in the Ford Foundation study suggested that both opera and ballet patrons have a particular liking for attending symphony concerts.

Belk, Semenik & Andreasen (1980) noted the Ford Foundation study as having shown that U.S. theater patrons are in some way different from patrons of other arts disciplines because a great portion of theatre patrons were shown to attend no other arts disciplines. Based on their own sets of data, Belk, Semenik & Andreasen argued that theater patrons were actually well integrated in other arts disciplines. One set of data showed that “83 percent of heavy-attenders to theater were heavy attenders at museums, ballet, and symphony.” Another set of data
showed that “58 percent of heavy theater attenders were co-patrons of other arts offerings.” The “heavy attenders” were defined as individuals who attend three or more events in a year. Belk, Semenik & Andreasen also added that museum patrons, too, were well integrated with other arts disciplines as the two sets of data showed that over 50 percent of museum patrons attended other arts disciplines. The researchers’ observation about theater and museum patrons may be explained by their own conclusion that “heavy attenders of individual art forms demonstrate the greatest amount of co-patronage to other art forms.”

A NEA study on public participation in jazz (1995) noted that jazz patrons and classical music patrons overlapped considerably. According to the study, 39 percent of jazz patrons attended classical music events and 33 percent of classical patrons attended jazz events. Moreover, jazz patrons and classical patrons were similar in size.

In Canada, Fisher & Preece (2002) published a widely recognized arts audience overlap study based on the survey results of 10,749 adult Canadians. They found that 17 out of 20 cross-over relationships among theater, symphony, opera, choral, and dance to be statistically significant and the strongest relationships were between theater and the other performing arts, namely symphony, opera, choral, and dance. However, it was noted that the relationships are not necessarily
reciprocal. In other words, attendance at theater was not necessarily a strong indicator for attendance at symphony or opera even though a large portion of symphony and opera patrons were found to attend theater performances. The reason may be that the absolute number of theater patrons (2,023) is much greater than the number of symphony (887) or opera (295) patrons, making it much more likely that a randomly chosen symphony or opera patron would be a theater patron than vice versa. As for the patrons with ‘monogamous’ tastes, Fisher & Preece’s study reported that 42.8 percent of theater patrons, 17.7 percent of symphony patrons, and 8.8 percent of opera patrons attended no other arts disciplines. In comparison with the Ford Foundation (1974) study, the statistics in Fisher & Preece’s study indicate considerably smaller portions of theater, ballet, and opera patrons with monogamous attendance choices. It is questionable whether the comparison suggests a fundamental difference in arts consumption behavior between American and Canadian adults or, in light of Peterson's (1992) argument, people have become more omnivorous over time. However, it is just as possible that the difference in arts consumption is due to the different amount of available arts offerings given the 18 years of time difference between the Ford Foundation study and Peterson's study.

Noted audience overlap patterns in the SPPA reports
The SPPA reports have not featured tables documenting arts audience overlap. The following two NEA studies included a table documenting audience overlap based on the 1992 SPPA: *American Participation in Opera and Musical Theater 1992* (1992); and *American Participation in Theater* (1996). Nonetheless, remarks pertaining to audience overlap have been articulated in the 2002 and 2008 SPPA reports and another NEA report (1993).

*Arts Participation in America: 1982-1992* (NEA, 1993) is a report that reports on the findings of the 1982, 1985, and 1992 SPPA. The report makes a brief remark pertaining to arts audience overlap:

“In examining overlapping arts audiences, certain pairings of arts attendances showed more overlap than others: for example, opera and classical music. However, detailed analysis revealed a general common pattern of high correlations across each of the eleven arts activities. In other words, the data did not reveal distinct clusters of arts attendance that would suggest that audiences for music, theater, dance or the visual arts were considerably different from one another.” (p.7).

The 2002 SPPA and 2008 SPPA reports pointed out the following observations about audience overlap:
The 2002 SPPA report noted that “(a)t least 50 percent of attenders at jazz, classical music, opera, ballet, other dance, art festivals and historic sites also visited an art museum in 2002” (p.55). In 2008 SPPA report, Latin music and craft fairs were added to the list of arts disciplines that share at least 50 percent of patrons with art museums.

The 2002 SPPA report noted that “(o)pera has the most crossover with ballet. People attending “other dance”, including modern, folk and tap, are also more likely to attend ballet” (p.55). The 2008 SPPA report made a similar remark that “(p)eople who go to opera were more likely to attend a ballet performance than those who attended classical music or jazz performances” (p.81).

The 2002 SPPA report noted that “(a)dults attending a ballet or opera performance are much more likely to attend a classical music performance” (p.56) and the same remark was duplicated in the 2008 SPPA report.

The 2002 SPPA report noted that “(m)ore than four in ten adults who said they attended an opera or ballet performance in the past twelve months also went to a jazz performance” (p. 57). However, the 2008 SPPA report noted that “about one-third of adults who said they attended an opera, ballet, or classical music performance in the past 12 months also went to a jazz
performance” (p.80).

- The 2002 SPPA report noted that “(t)here is very high crossover for attenders of ballet and opera with musicals. Over 60 percent of opera attenders also attended a musical in 2002” (p. 57) and the same remark was duplicated in the 2008 SPPA report.

- The 2002 SPPA report noted that “(t)hose who attend ballet performances have high crossover with those attending opera” and that “(c)rossover is also high for attenders of classical music performances” (p.58) The 2008 SPPA report made a similar remark, adding that ballet patrons and classical music patrons were more likely to attend opera performances than jazz patrons and theater patrons.

- Lastly, Seaman (2005) noted that “only non-musical theater audiences were not identified as having any particular crossover partners” (p. 27) in the 2002 SPPA report. The remark held true for the 2008 SPPA report as well.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Methodology

This research employs grounded theory. Data from the SPPA reports (1982, 1988, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2008) have been used to obtain evidence regarding patterns of audience overlap in the United States between 1982 and 2008. The data are archived online at CPANDA. Using an analysis tool available on the CPANDA website, a cross-tabulation of arts patrons’ attendance at the seven benchmark activities has been obtained. Some parts of the obtained data had a structure which has required some additional calculation process in order to create tables that show audience overlap in percentages. The number of recorded cases for the SPPA reports ranged between 12,349 and 19,837, with an average case number of 17,115. There is a minute difference between the data archived at CPANDA and the statistics that appear in the SPPA reports. For this research, however, the raw data are used.

Reading the results tables

In order to explain the results of the research, one must understand how the results tables are constructed and how one should read the statistics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[2008]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. 2008 SPPA audience overlap (in percentage)

The tables should be read vertically. For instance, when reading Table 1, one should locate an arts discipline in the first row of the table and read vertically down the column to read the percentage of total audience for the located arts discipline that overlaps with corresponding arts discipline in the first column of the table.

Specifically, Table 1 shows that 40.2 percent of people who have attended at least one jazz concert have also attended at least one classical concert in the same twelve month period. Hence, given the table were describing an appropriate sample of arts audiences, a jazz orchestra, for instance, would study the second column of the table and learn that 40.2 percent of their current patrons attend classical concerts and 10.5 percent of their current patrons attend opera concerts and so on.

Reading the table horizontally, on the other hand, one reads the proportion that a
particular arts discipline's patrons make up at other arts disciplines. For instance, the second row of Table 1 shows that jazz patrons make up 33.7 percent of classical patrons and 38.3 percent of opera patrons and so on. However, reading the tables horizontally requires an important consideration. The statistics that are in the same row are not really comparable because each statistics is a percentage of a sample that is different in size in comparison to other samples. In other words, the overall number of unique patrons for each of the arts disciplines varies significantly and the statistical percentages alone are not true reflections of the actual number of patrons that crossover between two arts disciplines.

The 2002 SPPA and 2008 SPPA reports have articulated which arts disciplines have the most crossover with one another and have also stated that adults attending certain arts disciplines are more likely to attend certain other arts disciplines than others. For instance, it is noted in the 2002 SPPA report that “(o)pera has the most crossover with ballet.” However, it should be noted that the noted ‘most crossover’ does not indicate the greatest number of people.
Table 2. 2002 SPPA audience overlap (in percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. 2003 SPPA audience overlap (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To illustrate, the fourth row of Table 2 shows that 23.2 percent of people who have attended at least one ballet performance has also attended at least one opera performance. It appears that the 2002 SPPA report has noted opera as having the most crossover with ballet because the 23.2 percent is the greatest in size among all other percentages found in the same row. However, when the percentages are
multiplied by the total number of arts patrons for each of the arts disciplines, as Table 3 shows, the total number of ballet attendees that also attend opera (1.9 million) is smaller than ballet attendees that cross-attend other arts disciplines. Thus, in reality, an opera company should, perhaps, choose a company other than a ballet company to collaborate in cross-promotion and preventing performance schedule conflicts.

**Limitations of the research**

This thesis features statistical results that have not been publicized previously. Nonetheless, this research entails limitations in its ability to draw conclusive implications of the results as the research consists of a qualitative analysis of statistics. In the absence of further statistical analysis, this research does not account for many variables that may influence audience overlap. Accounting for the variables becomes most important when one compares statistical evidence for audience overlap from one year to another. The researcher suggests the following variables as having at least a hypothetical influence on the extent of audience overlap – most likely simultaneously.

*Total arts consumption*

The total volume of arts consumption varies from year to year. Of many possible
measures of the volume of arts consumption, the number of attendance at live arts
events is most relevant to the study of arts audience overlap.

There are a number of factors that are likely to affect the total number of attendance.
First, the total number of arts attendees (i.e. the total number of people who have
attended at least one live arts event in a given time frame) may correlate with the
total number of arts attendance. In addition, the total number of arts attendees may
vary depending on the total number of population (i.e. the sum of arts attendees and
those who do not attend arts events at all). Second, external factors such as the
economy may impact people’s consumption ability and, consequently, impact the
number of arts attendance. Third, the number of attendance may increase or decrease
depending on the quality of the arts offerings and the success of marketing and
programming strategies.

*Availability/Accessibility*

Since audience research is concerned with live attendance, availability of arts
offerings would have an undeniable impact on audience overlap. Specifically, art
museum or gallery visits are fundamentally different from attending performing
arts performances because, unlike performing arts performances, art museums and
galleries are open for access throughout the year and usually do not require
advance purchase of admission tickets.
Changes in cultural taste and preference

People's cultural taste and preference may change over time. In light of Peterson's (1992) observation, people may have generally become more ‘omnivorous’ over time and, thus, increasing the extent of audience overlap over time.

Research method

It should be noted that the method of data collection and documentation, too, can have an impact on the statistical evidence for audience overlap. When comparing statistics drawn from a number of survey reports, factors such as the different methods of data collection, sampling techniques, questions asked, and the size of the samples should be taken into account.

Given the limitations of the research, the primary value of this research lies in the unprecedented focus on the questions of audience overlap. The research results are analyzed only to the extent possible with a cross-tabulation analysis. The research results nonetheless add to existing pool of data pertaining to audience overlap. Meanwhile, this research may be utilized as a springboard for further statistical inquisition with regard to variables influencing audience overlap.
Chapter 4: Results

Results and implications

In accordance with the research questions posed earlier, the results of this research are analyzed with two functions in mind. One is to provide a detailed, up-to-date overview of audience overlap in the United States according to the most recent SPPA report and the other is to illustrate common and uncommon patterns of audience overlap since 1982. While the results tables provide statistical results that have been obtained, accompanying graphs facilitate a visual understanding and comparison of the statistical results. As with other audience overlap researches, the attendees are referred to by the name of the arts discipline that they attend. For instance, ‘jazz overlap with classical’ refers to the extent to which jazz attendees have attended classical performances.

Audience overlap in 2008
The most recent patterns of audience overlap among the seven SPPA benchmark activities are obtained from the most recent SPPA report published in 2008. Table 1 shows the statistical evidence obtained. There are no arts disciplines whose audiences overlap completely nor are there any arts disciplines whose audiences do not overlap at all.

**Jazz attendees in 2008**

- Table 1 shows that 66.8 percent of jazz attendees have also attended one or more art museums or galleries in the same year. The relatively high audience overlap with art museum/gallery is common to all other arts disciplines. Most likely, the reason is that art museums and galleries together have the greatest total number of attendees which may be attributed to the greater accessibility to art museums and galleries.

## Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[2008]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 2008 SPPA audience overlap (in percentage)
• About half (50.7 percent) of jazz attendees have attended musicals and a little less than half (40.2 percent) of jazz attendees have attended classical music.

• A smaller portion (37 percent) of jazz attendees has attended theater despite the fact that the total number of theater attendees (21.2 million) was actually slightly greater than the total number of classical attendees (20.9 million) in 2008. It is possible that jazz attendees have a stronger preference for arts disciplines with a strong music orientation over theater performances.

• A much smaller portion of jazz attendees has attended ballet and opera: 12.3 percent and 10.5 percent respectively.

*Classical attendees in 2008*

• 71.7 percent of classical attendees have visited art museum or gallery. Given that classical music concerts are largely music-oriented and that art exhibitions are largely visually-oriented, the overlap seems to suggest that a significant portion of classical attendees exhibit a taste for both music and visual art.

• About a third (33.7 percent) of classical attendees has attended jazz. It appears that a substantial portion of both classical attendees and
jazz attendees share an interest in both music forms.

- Over half (53.1 percent) of classical attendees have attended musicals. This may also be described as over half of classical attendees listening to both ‘highbrow’ and ‘lowbrow’ music.

- 37.9 percent of classical attendees have attended theatre. Inversely, this indicates that 62.1 percent of classical attendees have not attended a single non-musical theatre performance. Nonetheless, one cannot conclude that classical attendees prefer musicals over non-musical theatre because the total number of musicals attendees (37.6 million) is significantly greater than the total number of theater attendees (21.2 million).

- The percentage of classical attendees that have attended ballet and opera are about the same: 14.4 percent and 14.8 percent respectively. However, the total number of ballet attendees (6.6 million) was significantly higher than the total number of opera attendees (4.8 million). A plausible reason for the relatively high opera attendance in this case may be that opera music is, in fact, an important form of classical music.

*Opera attendees in 2008*
• Opera is the least attended SPPA benchmark activity and the proportion of opera attendees that have visited an art museum or a gallery (80.1 percent) is the largest in comparison with other performing arts disciplines. **This may suggest that art museums and galleries could almost think of opera attendees as their attendees as well.**

• 66.4 percent of opera attendees have attended musicals and a similar proportion (64.5 percent) of opera attendees has attended classical music. In light of the fact that the overall number of musicals attendees (37.6 million) is much greater than the overall number of classical music attendees (20.9 million), **it seems that opera attendees have a somewhat stronger affection for classical music than musicals.** A possible explanation may be that opera attendees patronize an arts discipline that is regarded as the most ‘elite’ and some of them do not readily enjoy or associate themselves with musicals which are more ‘popular’ arts offerings.

• 45.8 percent of opera attendees have attended theater and a smaller portion (38.3 percent) has attended jazz. As with other arts disciplines, a relatively small portion (23.3 percent) has attended ballet.

Musicals attendees in 2008
• Musicals is the second most attended arts discipline of the seven benchmark activities. Over half (57.3 percent) of musicals attendees have visited art museum or gallery. Inversely, 42.7 percent of musicals attendees never visited an art museum or gallery during the course of a year. Based on the statistics, one may speculate that the serene nature of art museum or gallery experience does not appeal to some musicals attendees that may prefer more active arts performances.

• 34.5 percent of musicals attendees have attended theater and 29.9 percent of musicals attendees have attended classical. It is interesting that less than a quarter (24 percent) of musicals attendees have attended jazz given that a lot of musicals feature jazz or jazz-inspired type of music.

• Only 10.4 percent of musicals attendees have attended ballet and 8.6 percent of musicals attendees have attended opera. The relatively small numbers may be interpreted as signifying a large number of musicals attendees that shy away from the most ‘elite’ arts disciplines.

_Paper A_
• 63.3 percent of theater attendees have visited an art museum or gallery.

What is interesting is that a higher portion (71.1 percent) of classical attendees has visited museum or gallery despite a feasible assumption that classical attendees would be less interested in visual art.

• Given that the total number of theater attendees (21.2 million) is very comparable to the total number of classical attendees (20.9 million), recorded patterns of overlap behavior of theater attendees and classical attendees make a legitimate comparison. In sum, theater attendees displayed greater overlap (59.4 percent) with musicals but less overlap with all other arts disciplines when compared with classical attendees. Specifically, 36.8 percent of theater attendees have attended classical, 30.2 percent have attended jazz, 12 percent attended ballet, and 10.2 percent attended opera. In other words, one may suggest that theater attendees are somewhat less ‘omnivorous’ than classical attendees with the exception of overlap with musicals.

Ballet attendees in 2008

• 68.3 percent of ballet attendees have visited art museum or gallery.

Interestingly, almost as many ballet attendees (60.1 percent) have
attended musicals. Given that access to art museums and galleries is far greater than access to ballet performances, the statistics show that a significantly large number of ballet attendees have attended musicals. In other words, it appears that ballet attendees have a particular liking for musicals.

- A little less than half (46.8 percent) of ballet attendees have attended classical and a slightly smaller portion (40.1 percent) has attended theater.
- About a third (33.6 percent) of ballet attendees has attended jazz. Opera was attended by 17.5 percent of ballet attendees.

Art museums and galleries visitors

- Across all arts disciplines, the largest audience overlap has occurred with art museum/gallery. One highly plausible reason for the occurrence is that the overall number of art museum/gallery visitors is much larger than the overall number of attendees at any other performing arts discipline. According to the 2008 SPPA, a total of 51.1 million people visited an art museum or a gallery at least once in the past year while musicals were the second most attended art discipline and were attended by 37.6 million people. 42.9 percent of musical attendees have
visited an art museum or gallery.

- Classical, theater, and jazz were attended by relatively large proportions of art museum/gallery visitors: 30 percent; 27.5 percent; and 23.7 percent respectively. Ballet and opera were attended by 8.9 percent and 7.8 percent of art museum/gallery visitors.

- **The fact that art museums and galleries had the greatest number of attendees is likely, at least in part, for the fact that, unlike performing arts performances, art museums and galleries are open for access during the business hours throughout the year.** Hence, it is much more likely that a person who has attended a live performing arts event would have also found some time to visit an art museum or gallery than the other way round.

- The fundamental difference in accessibility between an art exhibition and a performing arts performance should be taken into account when interpreting the statistical evidence for audience overlap. In other words, *it would be an oversimplification to denote art museum/gallery as the most ‘popular’ benchmark activity solely based on the number of art museum/gallery visitors in comparison with the number of performing arts events attendees.*
Patterns of audience overlap between 1982 and 2008

Comparing statistical evidence for audience overlap over the years shows how the extent of audience overlap has changed over the years. As previously mentioned, however, it should be reiterated that different factors could have caused increases and decreases in the extent of audience overlap at different times. Conclusive explanations for the observed increases and decreases in the extent of audience overlap over the years are cannot be stated in the absence of a research that is designed to control for specific variables.

Additionally, it must be noted that the data collected in a particular year in which a SPPA report is published only represent audience overlap during twelve months preceding the date of data collection. Although the graphs included in this thesis feature broken lines connecting statistics on the graph in order to better illustrate the changes over the years, the lines do not represent a continual change between two points in time.

The graphs show the percentages of a particular arts discipline attendees that have also attended other arts disciplines between 1982 and 2008.

Jazz attendees 1982 – 2008
Overall, it appears that jazz overlap with art museum/gallery has increased more or less steadily over the years with the exception of a radical increase (79.2 percent) in 1997. Actually, jazz overlap with all arts disciplines was higher in 1997 than in 1992 and, subsequently, jazz overlap with all arts disciplines in 2002 was lower than in 1997.

The increase in jazz overlap with art museum/gallery (79.2 percent) and musicals (57 percent) in 1997 are particularly great in comparison with
jazz overlap with other arts disciplines.

- Jazz overlap with musicals is almost parallel with jazz overlap with art museum/gallery. One exception for jazz overlap with musicals is that the overlap was slightly lower in 1985 (41 percent) than in 1982 (41.8 percent) despite jazz overlap with all other arts disciplines being higher in 1985 than in 1982.

- In comparison with jazz overlap with art museum/gallery and musicals, jazz overlap with classical, theater, ballet, and opera have not changed as much. In other words, the differences between the highest and lowest overlap records for these arts disciplines are relatively small.

- In 1992, jazz overlap with classical (40 percent) and ballet (15.2 percent) decreased slightly from 1985 while jazz overlap with other arts disciplines increased from 1985.

- The changes between 2002 and 2008 are interesting. While jazz overlap with art museum/gallery, musicals, and theater saw increases from 2002 to 2008, jazz overlap with classical, ballet, and opera saw decreases during the same time period. Unlike in other years, in other words, the graph shows very distinct changes in jazz overlap between 2002 and 2008.

- Jazz overlap with ballet in 2008 (12.3 percent) is smaller than in 1982 (14.4 percent). Jazz overlap with all other arts disciplines, on the contrary,
was greater in 2008 than in 1982.

- In 1992, jazz overlap with classical (40.2 percent) fell below jazz overlap with theater (40 percent).

- In general, it appears that jazz overlap with art museum/gallery has increased steadily over the years.

- It should be noted that jazz overlap with classical is slightly higher than jazz overlap with theater despite the fact that the overall participation in theater and classical are generally comparable. This seems to suggest that jazz attendees have long had a stronger preference for classical music over theater.

*Classical attendees 1982 - 2008*
Figure 3. Classical overlap 1982 – 2008

- Classical overlap over the years resembles jazz overlap over the years in that overlap with art museum/gallery and musicals saw significant increase in 1997 while overlap with other arts disciplines (i.e. theater, jazz, ballet, and opera) have remained relatively consistent over the years.

- In 1985, classical overlap with musicals (50 percent) and opera (14.7 percent) saw a slight decrease from 1982 while classical overlap with other arts disciplines saw an increase from 1982. Similarly, in 1992,
classical overlap with ballet (20.1 percent) saw 0.2 percent point decrease from 1985 while classical overlap with all other arts disciplines saw an increase from 1985. Classical overlap with theater in 1997 (43.8 percent) saw 0.1 percent point decrease from 1992 while classical overlap with all other arts disciplines saw an increase from 1992.

- On the other hand, classical overlap with jazz in 2002 (36.9 percent) saw a slight increase from 1997 while classical overlap with all other arts disciplines saw a decrease from 1997.

- Classical overlap with all arts disciplines decreased in 2008 from 2002. In fact, classical overlap with musicals (53.1 percent) was lower than in 1982 (53.9 percent) and classical overlap with theater (37.9 percent), ballet (14.8 percent), and opera (14.4 percent) was the lowest recorded since 1982.

- In 2008, classical overlap with ballet (14.4 percent) fell below classical overlap with opera (14.8 percent)

*Opera attendees 1982 - 2008*
Figure 4. Opera overlap 1982-2008

- Figure 4 shows a number of instances where the order of opera overlap has changed. Specifically, opera overlap with classical in 1982 (70.9 percent) exceeded opera overlap with art museum/gallery (70.5 percent) in the same year. This is significant given that accessibility to art museums or galleries is much greater than accessibility to classical performance. Similarly, opera overlap with musicals exceeded opera overlap with classical in 1997 (68.7 percent) and in 2008 (66.4 percent).
Additionally, opera overlap with jazz was lower than opera overlap with jazz in 1982 and 1985 but it exceeded opera overlap in the subsequent years.

- Opera overlap with all arts disciplines increased in 1985 from 1982.
- Opera overlap with art museum/gallery in 1992 (72.3 percent) increased slightly from 1985 while opera overlap with all other arts disciplines was lower in 1992 than in 1985. Similarly, opera overlap with art museum/gallery (80.1 percent) and musicals (66.4 percent) in 2008 increased from 2002 while opera overlap with other arts disciplines was lower in 2008 than in 2002.
- On the other hand, opera overlap with theater (47.1 percent) and jazz (29.2 percent) in 1997 was lower than in 1992 while opera overlap with other arts disciplines was higher in 1997 than in 1992.
- Opera overlap in 2002 was mixed. Opera overlap with art museum/gallery (77.3 percent), theater (60.7 percent) were lower than in 1997 while overlap with classical (65.2 percent), theater (48.7 percent), ballet (42.3 percent) were higher than in 1997. Opera overlap with jazz was the same in 1997 and 2002.
- In general, it appears that opera overlap with art museum/gallery has increased steadily over the years.
• In the meantime, opera overlap with classical and musicals have been relatively inconsistent over the years. It should be noted, however, that opera overlap with classical over the years has been just as high as opera overlap with musicals. Given that the overall participation in musicals is significantly greater than overall participation in classical, the relatively high opera overlap with classical seems to suggest opera attendees’ strong preference for classical music over musicals. A possible explanation may be that opera is an extended art form of classical music.

*Musicals attendees 1982 – 2008*
Figure 5. Musicals overlap 1982 – 2008

- Figure 5 shows a noticeable increase in musicals overlap with art museum/gallery (68.8 percent) in 1997. As for other arts disciplines, however, musicals overlap has stayed relatively consistent in comparison between 1992 and 1997.

- **Musicals overlap with theater and ballet has been particularly consistent over the years.**
• Figure 5 shows increases in musicals overlap with other arts disciplines in 1985 from 1982 with the exception of ballet. In 1992, musicals overlap with arts disciplines other than theater and classical saw increases from 1985. Similarly, in 1997, with the exception of overlap with theater, musicals overlap with other arts disciplines saw increases from 1992. In sum, **besides the aforementioned exceptions, musicals overlap has steadily increased between 1982 and 1997.**

• **Between 1997 and 2008, musicals overlap with all arts disciplines has steadily decreased with only one exception** of an increased in musicals overlap with theater from 1997 to 2002.

• In 1997, musicals overlap with classical (41.5 percent) exceeded musicals overlap with theater (41.2 percent).

*Theater attendees 1982 – 2008*
Theater overlap, in general, saw a noticeable increase in 1997 from 1992 with all arts disciplines and also a common decrease in 2002 from 1997 with all arts disciplines.

The change in theater overlap in 1985 in comparison with 1982 is mixed. Theater overlap with art museum/gallery (60.7 percent), classical (45.4 percent), and jazz (27.6 percent) in 1985 was higher than in 1982. On the
contrary, theater overlap with musicals (60.3 percent), ballet (17.3 percent), and opera (12.4 percent) in 1985 were slightly lower than in 1982.

- Theater overlap with art museum/gallery (63.2 percent) and jazz (30.6 percent) in 1992 was higher than in 1985 while theater overlap with other arts disciplines was lower in 1992 than 1985. Similarly, theater overlap with musicals in 2008 (59.4 percent) was higher than in 2002 (56.8 percent) while theater overlap with all other arts disciplines was lower in 2008 than in 2002.

- In 2008, theater overlap with musicals (59.4 percent), classical (36.8 percent), ballet (12 percent), and opera (10.2 percent) was lower than in 1982. Of those, theater overlap with classical, ballet, and opera were the lowest of all years.

- **Overall, theater overlap with classical, ballet and opera has been in decline since 1982.**

*Ballet attendees 1982 – 2008*
In 1985, ballet overlap with classical (59.4 percent) exceeded ballet overlap with musicals (54.7 percent). Ballet overlap with classical and jazz (35.6 percent) in 1985 was higher than in 1982 while ballet overlap with other arts disciplines was lower in 1985 than in 1982. Similarly, ballet overlap with theater (43.2 percent) and jazz (35.5 percent) in 1997 was higher than in 1992 while jazz overlap with other arts disciplines during the same time period showed otherwise.

In 1992, only ballet overlap with art museum/gallery (71 percent)
increased from 1985 while ballet overlap with other arts disciplines decreased. Inversely, in 1997, only ballet overlap with theater (43.2 percent) decreased from 1992 while ballet overlap with other arts disciplines in the same year showed otherwise.

- In 2008, ballet overlap with classical (46.8 percent), theater (40.1 percent), and opera (17.5 percent) was the lowest across all years.

- Interestingly

- **Interestingly, ballet overlap with art museums/gallery, musicals, and jazz in 2008 is about the same as in 1982.**

*Art museum/gallery visitors 1982 – 2008*
Art museum/gallery overlap with all arts disciplines saw a common increase in 1997 from 1992. Similarly, art museum/gallery overlap with all arts disciplines saw a common decrease in 2002 from 1997. The increase in 1997 was the greatest for art museum/gallery overlap with musicals.
• In 1992 and 2002, art museum/gallery overlap with classical and theater were the same. In other words, art museum/gallery overlap with classical saw significant decreases in 1992 and 2002 in comparison to previous years.

• In 1985, art museum/gallery overlap with classical (37.2 percent) and jazz (24 percent) was higher than in 1982 while art museum/gallery overlap with other arts disciplines were lower in 1985 than in 1982.

• In 1992, art museum/gallery overlap with musicals (39.2 percent), classical (32.4 percent), and ballet (12.7 percent) was lower than in 1985 while art museum/gallery overlap with jazz (25.3 percent) and opera (9.3 percent) was higher in 1992 than in 1985. Art museum/gallery overlap in 1985 and 1992 was the same.

• Art museum/gallery overlap with musicals in 2008 (42.9 percent) saw a significant increase from 2002 despite art museum/gallery overlap with all other arts discipline being lower in 2008 than in 2002. In fact, art museum/gallery overlap with classical (30 percent), theater (27.5 percent), ballet (8.9 percent), and opera (7.8 percent) in 2008 was the lowest across all years.

• Art museum/gallery overlap with classical, theater, jazz, ballet, and opera has been in decline since 1997. One may speculate that arts
museum/gallery attendees have shown less audience overlap in the more recent years.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

Audience overlap in 2008

The research has revealed a handful of interesting patterns of audience overlap that entail possible implications for understanding arts patrons’ cultural tastes and preferences. While the implications are articulated along with the results in the ‘results and implications’ section of this paper, a few concluding remarks on the results pertaining to audience overlap in 2008 may be added here.

First, classical attendees were found to overlap with other arts disciplines in particularly interesting ways. About half of classical attendees have attended musicals which may be considered a ‘lowbrow’ musical arts discipline and a significantly high portion (71.1 percent) of classical attendees were found to have visited art museums or galleries despite the differing aesthetics between classical music and visual art. In addition, classical attendees appear to have a particular liking for opera over ballet while opera attendees, in turn, appear to have a particular liking for classical music.

The research has also revealed a close overlap relationship between classical, jazz, and theater. Congruent with prior research, classical attendees and jazz attendees were found to overlap to a considerable extent. Specifically, about a third of
classical attendees have attended jazz and just over forty percent of jazz attendees have attended classical. Interestingly, theater attendees, too, were found to overlap with jazz and classical attendees. A little less than a third of theater attendees have attended jazz and a little more than a third of theater attendees have attended classical. In return, over a third of jazz and classical attendees have attended theater. To summarize, one may reasonably speculate that classical, jazz, and theater collectively share about a third of their patrons with each of the other two arts disciplines. The fact that the total number of theater attendees is comparable with the total number of classical attendees bolsters the strength of the argument. Seaman (2005) once pointed out the fact that the SPPA reports have not identified a crossover partner for theater. However, this research now suggests otherwise.

*Audience overlap between 1982 and 2008*

Each of the graphs showing changes in audience overlap between 1982 and 2008 was analyzed on three levels. First, each graph, in effect, shows the order of audience overlap extent for each arts discipline. Second, the graphs show how the extent of audience overlap changed between two consecutive SPPA report years. Third, the graphs show whether or not audience overlap has followed a common trend between 1982 and 2008. In general, the results were mixed, giving rise to reasons for further research. The first level of analysis is designed to reveal where a
particular arts discipline attendees may congregate away from that particular arts discipline venues. The second level of analysis is designed to reveal whether a particular arts discipline attendees became more ‘omnivorous’ across all arts disciplines within a relatively short period of time. The third level of analysis is designed to reveal how audience overlap patterns have changed over a longer period of time.

Between 1982 and 2008, all arts disciplines showed the least overlap with opera followed by slightly higher overlap with ballet and jazz. On the other hand, all arts disciplines showed the highest overlap with art museum/gallery followed by musicals. In general, the order of audience overlap extent correlates with the total number of arts attendees that each arts discipline attracts. What is interesting is that while jazz, opera, ballet, and art museum/gallery showed higher overlap with classical than with theater, musicals showed higher overlap with theater than with classical. The discrepancy appears to suggest musicals attendees’ strong liking for theater. Another interesting observation is that there have been times when the order of audience overlap extent deviated. Most notably, for instance, figure 4 shows that opera attendees overlapped more with classical than with musicals at certain times while they overlapped more with musicals than classical at other times.

The extent of audience overlap soared in 1997 for most overlap relationships.
However, the high overall overlap in 1997 was not maintained in subsequent years. Instead, audience overlap in 2002 and 2008 was, in general, closer to audience overlap recorded in 1982 and 1985. Hence, the researcher suspects that a certain variable may have had a particular impact on the recorded audience overlap in 1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[2008]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. 2008 SPPA audience overlap (in percentage)

Year 2008, on the other hand, recorded generally low audience overlap overall. One may question whether the low overlap is due to a relatively low level of arts participation in 2008. Table 1 shows audience overlap in 2008. Only the numbers in shaded cells show increase in overlap in comparison with overlap in 2002.

An analysis of the exceptions (i.e. the numbers in the shaded cells) may actually suggest strong correlation between the level of participation and extent of audience participation.
overlap. According to the 2008 SPPA report, the overall attendance at musicals was greater in 2008 than in 2002 while the overall attendance at opera, theater, ballet, and art museum/gallery was less in 2008 than in 2002. The remaining two percentages that have shown an increase since 2002 are somewhat different in that the overall attendance at both of the arts disciplines that crossover saw a decrease in 2008. However, the percentage increase (0.3 percent points each) for the two percentages is so small that a statistics analysis may reveal that the increase is negligible.

The graphs in this thesis show many instances where a particular arts discipline attendees’ overlap with certain arts disciplines decreased while its overlap with other arts disciplines increased within the same time frame. One may question, then, whether the discrepancies are attributed to the different changes in overall consumption for each arts discipline or if additional factors had an impact on the different changes in overlap.

The research results show that, in many cases, audience overlap has gone up and down rather sporadically between 1982 and 2008. But in a number of cases, certain trends may be suggested. First, classical, musicals, theater, and art museum/gallery overlap with all other arts disciplines decreased between 1997 and 2008. The only exceptions are theater overlap with art museum/gallery in 2008 and art
museum/gallery overlap with musicals in 2008 which have incased from 2002.

Second, a few audience overlap relationships have shown a consistent overlap trend over a longer period of time. Classical overlap with jazz steadily increased between 1982 and 2002 and opera overlap with jazz decreased between 1985 and 2008, the research has identified a number of audience overlap trends between 1982 and 2008.

A significant debate over the years has been whether or not theater patrons are different from other arts attendees in terms of their overlap behavior. The results of this research have shown that all arts attendees are well integrated in terms of overlap.

Suggestions for future research

The results of this research invite further investigation at many different levels. First, further research may be carried out to confirm the relationship between audience overlap and the volume of arts consumption. The findings of such research could potentially reveal whether increases in audience overlap is attributed to increases in arts consumption or, instead, the increases in audience overlap suggest a fundamental change in arts attendees’ cultural tastes and preferences over the years. In addition, the researcher suggests that the relationship between the changes in audience overlap and the changes in availability of arts offerings be investigated to gain a better understanding of arts attendees’ cultural tastes and preferences. The results of this
research thesis that are noted as ‘exceptions’ or ‘interesting’ may be utilized as starting points for future research inquires that seek to identify the factors that have caused the deviations from more common and generalizable occurrences.

The researcher strongly suggests that future researches be conducted with a relatively small geographic scope. The reason is that the volume of arts consumption and the availability of arts offerings differ substantially from one region to another. Study findings at the local or city level will not only help researcher account for many variables that could affect audience overlap but also entail practical implications for arts organizations and public arts supporting entities in that particular area. Future research may involve interviews or surveys as well as statistical analysis. In the meantime, future research may narrow its scope by studying only one arts discipline as well.
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### Appendix: SPPA audience overlap 1982 - 2008

#### 1982 SPPA audience overlap (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[1982]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1985 SPPA audience overlap (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[1985]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 1992 SPPA audience overlap (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[1992]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1997 SPPA audience overlap (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[1997]</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 SPPA audience overlap (%)
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## [2002] Audience Overlap (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2008 SPPA Audience Overlap (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th>Opera</th>
<th>Musicals</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Ballet</th>
<th>Art museum / gallery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art museum / gallery</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>