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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Survival of the performing arts in a society depends upon the support of committed groups and individuals who participate experientially and financially in live arts events. Audiences must be developed and maintained through active efforts on many fronts and at many levels or the perpetuation of this crucial aspect of culture will be in jeopardy.

The performing arts encompass events that are often referred to as formal arts events. These include classical and contemporary music (orchestra, chamber, choral, concert band, and opera), jazz and folk music, ballet and contemporary dance, and traditional and contemporary theater. The classification of these events as performing arts events has been agreed upon by arts administrators, educators, and audiences (Nielsen, Nielsen, & McQueen, 1975). Often, opera, jazz, and classical music, musicals, ballet and plays have been considered "core" arts events in major studies of arts participation (e.g., Harris, 1988; Robinson, 1982, 1985). This classification is useful in distinguishing these arts events from other live performances which may be regarded largely as entertainment.

Many performing arts organizations seek to develop audiences. Audience development programs attempt to build larger and more educated audiences for live arts events. These programs can help to retain established patrons as well as develop new audiences for future events. Studies have been done to explore ways of
increasing the size of audiences at arts events. For example, a study by the National Endowment for the Arts (1981) found that two good strategies for broadening theater and symphony audiences were to give patrons a second ticket at half price, and to feature a well-known performer. The study found that other successful strategies include providing pre-concert talks and selling tickets at half-price on the day of the concert. These approaches seem to attract individuals who would normally not attend such events, without having a negative effect on regular patrons.

Another factor in attracting audience members is programming. Arts organizations clearly must consider the public’s taste and preference when designing programs, yet they also must not compromise the artistic standards of the organization. Reconciling these dual, and sometimes dichotomous, objectives is a constant challenge to arts administrators and organizations.

The purpose is not merely to ‘give them what they want’ but to so comprehend their personalities, situations, attitudes, and aspirations, that the arts administrator might better see how to forge the bond between them and the aesthetic offering. (Levy, 1980, p. 30)

A common solution is to provide various series offerings, such as a “favorites series,” “pop series,” or a series that features a particular composer or more recent works. There are also more eclectic series, often termed “samplers,” or series that enable patrons to design their own series by sampling from each group of offerings.

Many symphonies, opera, ballet, and theater companies, and performing arts presenters are expanding audience development efforts through education and outreach programs. Many of these programs are aimed at the pre-school, elementary school, and middle school levels. High school programs are offered less frequently. Some organizations are exploring the adult market, especially through senior
citizens’ groups. Programming and marketing strategies are obviously an important part of building larger audiences, and reaching groups that may not normally attend arts events. While programming and marketing vary widely, there are basically three approaches currently being used by these performing arts groups in their education/outreach programs:

(1) Artists in the schools or adopt a school programs. These are cooperative efforts between schools and arts organization. Often these programs are designed for magnet schools, especially those with an arts emphasis such as the Arts I.M.P.A.C.T. (Interdisciplinary Model Programs in the Arts for Children and Teachers) schools in Columbus, Ohio. These programs bring performers to the school for a variety of activities (teaching, discussions, performances) and also bring students to the performing arts organization to see rehearsals and performances. Some of these programs are true partnerships and may continue for an extended period of time with visits on a regular basis. Others are “one-shot” or guest appearances.

(2) Pre-concert talks. This approach is based on the commonly held belief that greater information about a particular subject can enhance not only one’s knowledge of it, but also one’s interest in, appreciation, and enjoyment of it. Pre-concert talks are usually open to any interested concert-goer, and are held at the concert site. There are, of course, variations on this theme. The Lyric Opera of Chicago, for example, provides subscribers with a brief pre-concert talk on cassette tape that may be played in the car on the way to the performance. Post-concert discussions with the artists or a moderator are also popular.

(3) Visiting docents. This last approach is a combination of the previous two approaches. This program is most often directed toward elementary school children. Volunteers from an arts organization visit classrooms in schools and prepare the children for an arts event. For instance, in Columbus, docents from the Columbus
Symphony Orchestra provide information on the instruments of the orchestra, the role of the conductor, and the pieces that the children will hear performed (Gerber & Ogden, 1991). Students learn about the symphony through talks, written materials, coloring and activity books, games, songs, and recordings of classical music. Often, the work of the docent is reinforced by the classroom teacher. After the docent visit, the children attend a special children's concert at the symphony hall. Compositions include classical pieces, sing-alongs, and familiar tunes that the children will recognize. The conductor provides comments between pieces to help the children better understand and enjoy the music.

Audience development through education and outreach programs involves a mixture of educational information, concert experiences, public relations, and marketing. This mixture is critical to reaching a larger population and providing meaningful artistic experiences. Despite extensive efforts on many fronts, concern for the healthy continuance of the performing arts has not diminished. The percentage of the total population which actively participates remains relatively small (Harris, 1988; Robinson, 1987). Public support for the performing arts often fluctuates with the economy, and government support, plagued by controversy (e.g., the Robert Mapplethorpe exhibit), has declined in recent years. Moreover, efforts to cultivate new patrons have produced mixed results.

One of the major problems in audience development is the fact that there is a tremendous age difference between the young children targeted by many audience development programs, and the current patrons of the arts. Arts organizations are experiencing a "graying" of current performing arts audiences. Patrons have aged, and this older clientele is less able to participate in, and contribute to, the performing arts. The age gap between young children beginning to learn about the arts and current patrons presents a problem in providing continued support for the
performing arts. Early exposure to the arts is necessary and worthwhile. It is not, however, a practical strategy to wait for young children to be of ticket-buying age in order to save the performing arts from extinction.

Senior citizens comprise another group that is being more frequently targeted by performing arts organizations. While targeting senior citizens is valuable, this too does not ensure the future of the performing arts.

Arts organizations should seek to involve individuals who will, either immediately, or in the near future, carry on the support of the current patrons of the performing arts. College and university students comprise a target group that has the potential to reap more immediate benefits for performing arts organizations.

Many college students will have been exposed to arts programs at the elementary school level. Middle and secondary schools seem a viable point at which to reinforce and expand the arts experiences of the elementary grades. Unfortunately, these programs often taper off during the middle school and high school years. In 1984, the National Center for Education Statistics conducted an analysis of course offerings and enrollments in the arts in American secondary schools. Results indicated that 31% (more than one million) of high school seniors did not take one course in any of the arts during their four years in high school. The study also found that almost 10% of high schools do not offer a single course in music (cited in Fowler, 1988a).

On first consideration, targeting college and university students for an arts outreach program may be a surprising suggestion. It would seem that this population is adequately cultivated through experiences associated with a liberal arts curriculum; a curriculum which commonly includes a performing arts requirement. However, this modest portion of a college student's curriculum appears to do little to ensure participation in arts activities.
In 1986, a study of college students' activities was commissioned by The Ohio State University Office of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the institutional self-study for re-accreditation by the North Central Association. The questionnaire used was based on Robert Pace's *College Student Experiences Questionnaire* (CSEQ). Undergraduate students enrolled at The Ohio State University completed the survey during winter quarter, 1986. One section of the CSEQ asked students to indicate how often they engage in particular kinds of academic-related college experiences. One of these areas included art, music, and theater experiences. Students were asked how often they read about or discussed various visual art forms, artists, music and theater, and how often they attended exhibits or performances. Student responses were summarized by major field of study and student class. As might be expected, the percentage of students participating in all these activities was highest in the majors of humanities and the arts. Even so, an average of 32% of students in the arts and humanities said they never attended an art gallery or art exhibit on campus, 38% never attended a musical concert on campus, and 55% never attended a play, ballet, or theater production on campus. Looking at attendance of campus events across all students, 60% never attended an art gallery or art exhibit, 52% never attended a musical event, and 65% never attended a play, ballet or theater production.

These results are particularly disturbing considering the assumed purpose of a general education curriculum. Through the liberal arts portion of degree programs, or through informal campus activities and programs, students are given opportunities to participate in a variety of experiences. These experiences often involve the study of areas that educated people consider to be important, such as the arts, world affairs, various cultures, and current events. Students are encouraged to examine their ideas and their actions, to experience new opportunities, and to choose alternatives for the future. For example, they may think about how to spend
their current, and future, leisure time and money. They may also develop patterns of behavior (e.g., attendance at arts events) that will continue in the future. College students appear to be a relatively untapped resource in the challenge to build larger and more educated audiences. They will soon graduate and have a disposable income, part of which they may choose to spend on live arts events and performing arts organizations. In the future, some students may also contribute to the arts in their professional roles through corporate sponsorships of the arts.

Rationale for including the arts in the college experience often focuses on the development of the aesthetic domain, humanism, and the senses and emotions. "The development of the senses and the education of the emotions through the arts are not simply desirable aims. They are essential both for balanced behaviour and the effective use of the intellect" (Blacking, 1982, p. 47). Study of the arts provides an individual with another dimension; it aids in producing a complete, whole individual.

I am convinced that the quality of our individual lives and the quality of our society are directly related to the quality of our artistic life. . . . What does it profit us if we solve the great problems but lose our humanism in the process? If we really care about the dignity of the individual, about his potential for self-fulfillment, then we must have a deep and rich sense of the place of the arts in our individual lives. We need the arts if we are to be whole human beings--fully alive and vital and in control of ourselves and our environment. We need the arts as the key to the higher order of things--our faculty, our sense of beauty. We need the arts if we are to have discriminating taste, the ability to judge levels of quality in all the works of man. And we need them if we are to have the truth--if we are to understand the problems that beset us and if we are to understand ourselves. (Rockefeller [cited in Fowler, 1980, p. 4])

It would seem that colleges and universities provide the ideal climate and opportunity for students to be exposed to the arts, whether formally (through a class) or more informally, through university-sponsored student programs and activities.
"The American system of higher education contains unparalleled resources for teaching the arts. Because of a national commitment to the training of professional artists within our institutions of higher education, there exists on most campuses both the resources and commitment to provide education in the arts for those who will find their life's work in other professions" (Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education, 1988, p. 13).

Traditionally, higher education has provided general students with instruction in the fine arts through "appreciation" classes. Most of these classes are based on the premise that increased knowledge stimulates an increase in enjoyment and appreciation.

The inability of appreciation courses to assist students in developing a more positive attitude about the subject matter appears to be a common problem. Lipman (1988) states that "general arts education--not professional training--over the last 25 years has been abysmal" (p. 7). If the goal of arts education is to instill a sense of value manifested by participation in the arts, then Lipman's statement appears all too accurate. This may be due, in part, to the emphasis on knowledge about art, through lectures, in-class examples, and discussions of art, rather than the direct experience of art. "What is humanising about art is the experience of art rather than knowledge about art. The arts are humanistic to the extent they are directly known: to the extent they are aesthetically experienced" (Reimer, 1970, p. 148). Students may learn a great deal of the theory and history of art forms in class, yet when they attend an arts event, they have little or no preparation for what they will actually experience.

Arguably, it is the living act of communication between performer and public that lies at the heart of artistic creation; and if any educational syllabus does not contain this element, it cannot claim to be teaching adequately that
particular art. It may be doing other things extremely well, but it is omitting a crucial element in artistic experience. (Allen, 1982, p. 73)

The area of arts appreciation raises other questions—who should teach arts appreciation, and how should it be taught? Traditionally, music appreciation in higher education has been housed in the department of music history. Surprisingly, students pursuing advanced degrees in music history are given little, if any, instruction on how to teach music appreciation for the general student. Except in very few circumstances, no area of music in higher education provides instruction in how to teach music appreciation for the general college student. This may result in instructors who teach music appreciation courses at levels far beyond the students' abilities, or who assume that the students have had some prior experience with music or concert experiences, when in reality, many have not. There is generally a lack of practical and accessible information about music and musical experiences for the novice or inexperienced listener. Students in these classes may be frustrated by the level of the material presented. This frustration can result in negative attitudes about the class, and music in general.

Setting the conditions for audience education means recognizing where students are in their development and planning for the next higher step. It is a gross error to attempt to jump from the elementary to the most advanced in one step. It is better, sometimes, to commence with the familiar and unsophisticated or with the arts indigenious to a locale, then to weave in less familiar and more sophisticated arts forms carefully and gradually. (Mattil, 1968, p. 76)

In many music appreciation courses the meaning of the term “appreciate” is nebulous. One way to help define this term is to identify specific, desirable behaviors that might indicate appreciation of music, such as buying musical recordings, and attending concerts. Perhaps the goal of music appreciation experiences (whether
formal or informal) should be to expose students to a variety of music, to encourage awareness of, and participation in, live musical events both on and off campus, and to encourage open-mindedness and tolerance of various types of music. By attending musical events and discussing music, students can develop listening skills, and learn to verbalize and write about music and musical performances. Certainly, concert attendance is an important and necessary component of a music appreciation experience.

In 1989, The College Music Society (CMS) conducted a survey on the content of the undergraduate music curriculum. Results showed that one of the primary goals of music courses designed for students who are not majoring in music is "building future audiences" (CMS [cited in Kuhn & Sims, 1991, p. 3]). Other related goals of these music courses which were ranked almost as highly include "increasing musical literacy," and "expanding known/familiar repertory" (p. 3). To assist in attaining these goals, a common feature of music courses for the general student is required concert attendance. Results of the survey also indicated that 73 percent of the 430 institutions surveyed in 1989 required concert attendance for undergraduates enrolled in music in general studies courses. This represents a substantial increase over data obtained in a similar survey in 1982, in which "approximately one-third" of the respondents indicated concert attendance requirements (CMS [cited in Kuhn & Sims, 1991, p. 3]).

Kuhn and Sims (1991) state that "in addition to addressing affective goals, such as building future audiences through developing positive attitudes toward attending music performances, it may be assumed that concert attendance also serves cognitive goals such as expanding familiar repertoire, identifying musical characteristics, and learning to analyze and write about music or musical performance" (p. 14). Educators must determine the goals of instruction, evaluate
the course of instruction, and investigate methods of teaching music appreciation to the general college student.

Music appreciation classes are one means of providing instruction in music to general university students, however, a large percentage of students will not be reached through these classes. In order to provide arts education for the greatest number of general students, colleges of the arts should focus on developing and expanding programs in arts appreciation, with an emphasis on experiencing various art forms. Perhaps these programs should be renamed "arts outreach" or "arts awareness" programs. These programs could combine elements of traditional appreciation courses with audience development techniques.

Are the colleges and universities responsible for preparing audiences for the fine arts? Formal required experiences in the fine arts generally end at the junior high or middle school level. After this period, arts education depends upon self-education or an occasional course. If the growing audiences for the arts are to follow their interests, they will need greater help, particularly if audiences they are to affect positively the directions of the art. The universities are slowly moving from a position of casual, fashionable interest to one of serious, planned commitment. Without clearly defined goals and planned implementation, programs cannot be structured or achievement evaluated. Audience education requires more than offering a few courses in music or art appreciation. It implies the opportunities to pursue programs for personal cultivation and satisfaction and the chance to develop new levels of sophistication as viewers or listeners. Only when opportunities are available to exercise critical judgment can the concern for the arts as an essential part of society be deepened. (Mattil, 1968, pp. 75-76)

Educators and arts administrators must design creative ways of involving college and university students in live arts events on campus, using a mixture of educational information, live performing arts experiences, and public relations and marketing strategies. These experiences can serve to educate and enlighten individuals about the performing arts, reinforce previous arts education, and enhance their overall quality of life. An arts awareness/audience development
program sponsored by a college of the arts will provide university students with accessible educational experiences in the arts, while developing larger, more educated audiences for live arts events on the university campus.

College and university students represent a significant component of our future; a future that ideally will include active support of the performing arts. As future teachers, parents, or community and business leaders, students should be aware of, and participate in, live performing arts experiences during their college careers. An effort should be made to cultivate these future patrons of the arts, and to emphasize their unique role, whether individually or collectively, in the survival of the performing arts. This study was designed to investigate an arts outreach program in the university setting, aimed at developing audiences for music events on campus.

The purposes of the study were:

1) To design and implement an arts outreach/audience development program for school of music events at The Ohio State University that can also be a prototype for music and other areas of the performing arts (e.g., drama and dance) at other colleges and universities.

2) To increase student awareness of, and participation in, live music performances on The Ohio State University campus.

3) To provide students with preparation for live music performances on The Ohio State University campus.
4) To develop current and future audiences for music performances on The Ohio State University campus by providing an outreach/education program to students.

Auxiliary purposes of the study were:

1) To establish a profile of patrons of School of Music large ensemble concerts. This was done, in part, to gather information on student involvement in these concerts.

2) To provide advanced undergraduate students in music education with opportunities to develop professional oral communication and interpersonal skills.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Arts in Higher Education

"Since the 1960s there have been well-publicized, enthusiastic, and often well-conceived attempts to ‘make the arts more central to the school curriculum.’ . . . Yet the arts today appear to be less central to the curricula of American schools than they were three decades ago" (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 104). This statement is supported by a report by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH, 1987) which indicates that enrollment in college humanities courses has fallen dramatically in the last 20 years.

Many colleges and universities are revising the general education portion of their undergraduate curriculum. Emphasis is being placed on a strong liberal arts program that recognizes the humanities as an important aspect of a liberal education. "The Arts have a central role in Education, and it is only in the recognizing of that role that our Colleges and Universities can become and remain centers for liberal education" (Olson, 1974, p. 8). The Working Group in the Arts in Higher Education (1988, p. 6) states that the goal of liberal education is often referred to as the development of individuals who possess "sharpened perception, sensitized emotion, and cultivated intellect," and adds that these attributes may be attained through the study of great works of art.
Works in the arts media are central in the lives of human beings. Further, great works of art are among the highest human achievements; they are the cornerstones of and reference points for the development of civilization in that they synthesize the emotional, spiritual, intellectual, and physical realities of the human condition. Therefore, the arts disciplines must have a significant place in the undergraduate education of all students. (Working Group in the Arts in Higher Education, 1988a, p. 1)

In recent years, the role of the humanities in all levels of education has received increased attention. In part, this is a response to what some view as an overemphasis on science and technology. Much of the emphasis on science and technology is due to fear that the United States will not keep up with its competitors. The 1983 Department of Education Report, A Nation at Risk, states that "our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world" (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5). The Report of the Education Commission of the States (ECS) says that "our faith in ourselves as the world's supreme innovators--is being shaken" (Education Commission of the States, 1983, pp. 13-14).

The increasing dependence on technology in our society has caused some Americans to reflect on the importance of the humanities in a well-balanced education and life. Leonhard (1980) states:

I view the arts as the only possible means to counter the sterility, the mechanization, the depersonalization, and the retreat into isolation that pervade contemporary society. The arts can play this role, however, only with a concentrated effort on the part of the arts community, the public schools, and colleges, and all levels of government to develop a true people's art program. The arts can fill the role of stimulating feelingful thought and thoughtful feeling, processes in which the imagination is freed, ignited and takes flight. This freedom I consider the primary objective of experience and education in the arts. (p. 38)
Despite the unique role that the arts play in human life, some people remain unconvinced of their importance. They are unwilling to place the arts on the same level as reading, mathematics, and science. This viewpoint has prompted a new line of thinking by arts advocates.

In the last ten years, the arts have been increasingly recognized as "systems of meaning--as living histories of eras and peoples and as records and revelations of the human spirit. The arts may well be the most telling imprints of any civilization" (Fowler, 1988b, p. 7). Some prominent educators consider the arts to be symbol systems that are equal in importance to the symbol systems of science and mathematics. "The quality of a civilization can be measured by the breadth of its symbol systems" (Boyer [cited in Fowler, 1988b, p. 8]). The arts are also a means by which humans communicate.

One role, if not the central one, of schooling is the development of communication skills. If we are to meet that challenge we must stretch beyond the traditional spoken and written word. Human feeling and emotion as well as ideas are frequently more forcefully and accurately portrayed through the arts. (Hornbeck [cited in Fowler, 1988b, p. 8]).

Literacy should not be limited to the written word. Literacy also must include the symbol systems of the fine arts. Individuals should be provided with the breadth of symbolic tools and understandings they require to express, represent, communicate, and experience the full spectrum of human life (Fowler, 1988b, p. 9).

The arts are also recognized as "acts of intelligence." Gardner (1983) proposed that humans have at least seven basic intelligences located in different areas of the brain that operate independently: (1) linguistic, (2) musical, (3) logical-mathematic, (4) spatial, (5) bodily-kinesthetic, and (6 and 7) the personal intelligences (knowledge of self and others). It is apparent that the arts are an integral factor in the
development of intelligence and realization of human potential. "The arts are a right, not a privilege; and no citizen should be deprived of the beauty and insights into human experience that only the arts can import" (National Council for the Arts [cited in Terry, 1988]).

The importance of the arts in higher education is well documented, but what exactly is the relationship between higher education and the arts? Griffiths (1982) states, "The chief relationship between higher education and the arts is the formation and development of the skills and perceptions necessary for future practitioners and audiences" (p. 52).

Hyman (1971) states that "colleges and universities have already done much to preserve and extend the arts and they now possess experience and resources that can enormously strengthen future development" (p. 159). He adds that universities should know how to provide all students with an awareness and appreciation of the arts. Hyman stresses that universities cannot rely on class requirements to stimulate student attendance at performing arts events. "Students must be helped, stimulated, persuaded, encouraged to taste the arts, especially those they know nothing about" (p. 159).

Music instruction for nonmusic majors is of importance in higher education as a "means of exploring performance and listening skills as well as increasing historical, social and cultural perspectives" (Flowers, 1983, p. 19). In 1981, The College Music Society sponsored a Wingspread Conference on music in general studies. Purposes of this conference included exploring curricular experiences in music for college and university students who are not majoring in music, and creating a national awareness of the need to strengthen music in general studies. "It is high time that the imagination and energy of the music profession be turned towards the
education of the music public, which alone can be the basis of the musical society we hope to create" (CMS, 1981, p. 7).

Another area explored at the Wingspread Conference was the preparation of the individuals who will teach these courses for nonmusic majors. Butcher (1981) states, "Historically, general music has not enjoyed the respect of college and university faculty" (p. 10). She adds that often these courses are taught by the "youngest, most inexperienced instructors," and that the instructional techniques used in general music courses have "remained seriously immune to recent developments in higher education and society in general" (p. 8).

The proceedings of the conference emphasize the need for improved training in how to teach classes for nonmusic majors. Brody (1981) states that "graduate students can describe in minute detail the notation of a 16th century manuscript, but ask the same students to present a Tchaikovsky symphony to a survey class and they are at a total loss" (p. 10). The instructor should be knowledgeable in his or her subject area, but should also be able to communicate the subject matter effectively, and at a level appropriate to the nonmajor. The instructor must "know how to place himself in the shoes of the novice--the unprepared, the uninformed freshman who comes to him with the basis for a lifetime of pleasure" (Brody, 1981, p. 10).

Providing arts education is critical--not only to the development of human intellect, emotion, and perception, but to the survival of the performing arts.

This effort [arts education] is of central importance not only to the future of higher education, but also to the future of serious artistic endeavor in the United States. The values of liberal education are essential to the maintenance of a significantly informed public which understands the infrastructure supporting both the traditional and new work in the arts. (Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education, 1988a, p. 25)
In recent years, educational leaders have increasingly emphasized that learning should become a lifelong experience that does not end with acquiring a diploma or finding a job (Morrison & Dalgleish, p. 104). The process should be the goal, rather than a means to some other end. In 1983, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) suggested that the value of learning is not contingent on any material payoff, but that the activity itself, pursued throughout one’s lifetime, is the payoff. The report also suggested that the principal objective of educational reform should be the creation of a “learning society” devoted to the joys and rewards of continuous learning (NCEE [cited in Morrison and Dalgleish, 1987, p. 106]).

The Institute for the Advancement of the Arts in Education (IAAE) at The Ohio State University is based on this premise of lifelong learning. The institute is committed to scheduling high quality artistic experiences that will enhance aesthetic literacy—primarily for educators. Gilliom (1990) states that “The Institute operates on two very simple premises:

1) that in this technological age, the arts can provide a healthy counterbalance

and

2) that teachers, through on-going interaction with the arts and artists, will lead richer, more satisfying lives. And people with richer, fuller lives should be better teachers. The projects and professional journals which teachers turn in lead us to believe that their students, in turn, are also becoming more aesthetically literate.” (p. 7)

The institute was developed after a discovery that many teachers working on masters and doctoral degrees at The Ohio State University had never attended any of the diverse cultural events offered in the community or by the university.
"Aesthetic literacy, as one facet in a well-rounded graduate student, seemed to be lacking in both the formal studies and the personal lives of these students" (Gilliom, 1990, p. 1). It was found that this was also true of the majority of teachers and administrators in the Central Ohio area. Paul Klohr and Craig Kridel established the Institute as a unique form of in-service education dedicated to enhancing the aesthetic literacy of educators. The intent of the course offerings is not to teach methods, or the history of the various art forms, "but instead to bring teachers and practicing artists together to interact, to explore artistic processes and problem solving techniques, and to learn appropriate modes of perceiving artistic events" (Gilliom, 1990, p. 1). Offerings include courses in the visual, literary, and performing arts, as well as an overview of the arts. There is some "hands-on" experience, travel to see various art forms, attendance at performing arts events, discussions, and written work which includes creating teaching materials for schools, research papers, and co-production of a group journal which becomes the class textbook.

Although the concept of lifelong learning may appear idealistic in our largely achievement-based society, "it seems wholly compatible with the supposedly fundamental reasons that the arts exist: as a means of exploring, understanding, interpreting, and enriching human experience" (Morrison and Daigleish, 1987, p. 106).

"Higher education will be central to the success of any effort to improve education in the arts for all Americans. Our higher education efforts in the arts need the assistance and cooperation of all the other elements of our arts and education enterprises in order to be effective in serving the nation's expanded needs in the development of basic literacy in the arts" (Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education, 1988b, p. 20).
Socialization and the Arts

"While the capacity to recognize and appreciate beauty may be inborn in all of us, participation in the arts as an audience or artist usually involves a learning process" (Orend, 1988, p. 2). One area of thought regarding this learning process is socialization. Socialization is the "process by which individuals--usually children and teenagers--acquire various orientations, attitudes, and patterns of behavior that will persist when they become adults" (Easton and Dennis [cited in Orend, 1988, p. 2]). "In particular, arts-related experiences are said to create an understanding of and appreciation for the arts that will lead us to participate more as adults" (Orend, 1988, p. 12).

Studies have been conducted on socialization experiences in the arts and their relationship to the level of participation in the arts. Orend (1987) used data from the 1982 survey, Public Participation in the Arts (NEA/Robinson), to examine socialization in the arts. He investigated socialization experiences such as attendance at concerts, plays, museums, and music lessons or appreciation classes during three different time spans: before the age of 12, ages 12-17, and ages 18-24. Sixty percent of the respondents said they had never been to a concert, play, or museum during their youth. Seventy-five percent of the respondents had never taken an arts or music appreciation course. Fewer than 20% of those surveyed took art or music appreciation classes during any of the three time periods. Those who did take these classes tended to do so between the ages of 18 and 24, leading the researcher to conclude that these classes were elective courses at the college level. The remaining respondents (less than 10%) had the equivalent of two appreciation classes during different time periods. Seventy percent of those surveyed say they had some kind of socialization experience during one of the three time periods. Twenty-three percent
indicated they had experiences equal to taking art-related lessons during all three
time periods.

Results of this study indicated that having some socialization in an art-related
activity is associated with a higher probability of adult participation in a similar
activity. The study found that for many activities, the age of socialization is an
important predictor, especially socialization that occurs during college years. It is not
yet known how the quality of, or motivation for, the socialization experience affects
the socialization process.

Andreasen and Belk (1980) studied the level of arts participation in four
southern cities. They found that “early and periodically repeated exposure [to the
arts] is likely a sine qua non in this process of socialization (p. 2).

Anthropological evidence "provides case studies to support the claim that all
normal human beings possess the capabilities for artistic practice and appreciation;
that the cultivation of these talents is probably a consequence of social experience
rather than individual genetic endowment; and that the arts and artistic practice are
central to the definition of and expression of our humanity” (Blacking, 1982, p. 30).

A Brief History of the Arts Movement in Post World War II United States

After the second World War, productivity in the workplace increased sharply
due to a rise in technology. This phenomenon caused major changes in the lifestyles
of Americans. The majority of the nation’s population found that they did not have
to spend all of their time, energy, and income on basic needs such as food, clothing,
and housing. Instead, they had more free time, and greater disposable income.

Americans searched for ways to utilize this newly available income and
leisure time. "The first result of these changing conditions has been an emphasis on
material acquisition and passive enjoyment. But there is a growing realization that
simple materialism cannot permanently satisfy spiritual hunger, that entertainment
which makes no demand upon the mind or the body offers neither permanent
enrichment of the spirit nor a full measure of delight” (Rockefeller Panel, 1965, pp. 4-5).

The emphasis on affluence and acquisition characteristic of the 1950s lessened
in the 1960s, leading Americans to search for other, more meaningful, ways to use
their time and money. This search included the quest for self-expression. During the
1960s, more people than ever before participated in the arts as artists or audience
members (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 12).

This interest in the arts produced a demand for cultural activity far beyond
what had existed prior to the new affluence. This demand contributed to the
tremendous growth of the arts which began in the 1950s, grew dramatically in the
1960s and continued unto the 1970s. Reasons for this expansion of the arts include:

1. an increasing amount of free time—not only in the working week but in
the life cycle as a whole;

2. a rising level of education;

3. the influence of mass media;

4. a recognition that life is more than the acquisition of material goods;

5. the new sense of importance of cities, which historically, and
economically, are the centers where the arts have thrived.

(Kreisberg, 1979, p. 2)

Following are some examples of the dramatic growth of the arts from the
1960s to the 1980s:

• Between 1966 and 1985, the total number of museums in all categories
increased by 28 percent;

• From 1965 to 1975, the number of resident and nonprofit professional
theaters increased from 25 to 101;
• Between 1965 and 1975, the number of major professional dance companies rose from 10 to 51;

• From 1970 to 1980, the number of major opera companies with budgets of more than $100,000 grew from 35 to 109;

• From 1965 to 1975, the number of professional orchestras increased from 58 to 105;

• Membership in the Association of College, University and Community Arts Administrators (ACUCAA), the largest service organization for presenters of performing arts attractions, increased from 29 in 1957, to 275 in 1966, to a total of 980 in 1985;

• The number of local arts agencies and councils grew from two in 1949 to more than 2000 in 1987.

(DiMaggio & Useem, 1989, p. 142; Morrison and Daigleish, 1987, p. 4)

As the demand for arts increased, so did expenses associated with them. Baumol and Bowen (1966) concluded that providing for the performing arts was destined to become more expensive, developing ever-widening gaps between the earned income and expenses of arts organizations.

A major source of income for the arts traditionally has been the contributions of wealthy patrons. This patronage system is seen throughout the history of Western civilization. In Europe, nobility and wealthy merchants were the major patrons of the arts. The church became an important source of funding during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. During the last 100 years, the state has also become a primary patron.

In the United States, wealthy patrons have also been the primary source of financial support for the arts. In the early nineteenth century, these patrons were generally wealthy merchants, financiers, or men with inherited fortunes. With the industrial growth after the Civil War, many business entrepreneurs amassed great
fortunes and became major patrons of the arts (e.g., the Morgans, Rockefellers, Carnegies, Pulitzers, Mellons, Guggenheims, and Hearsts).

Many great family fortunes began to disappear, largely due to the first income tax legislation in 1913. As early as 1922, the Internal Revenue Service saw signs that the nation’s wealth was being redistributed (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 14). Much of the wealth went to the control of corporations and foundations, and some went to the middle and upper classes. Arts institutions could no longer rely on wealthy patrons as their primary source of funding.

By the 1950s, the great demand for arts activities and the rapidly rising costs forced arts institutions to look beyond wealthy patrons for support. Arts organizations began to seek funding from new sources such as business and government.

In 1965, Congress created the National Council on the Arts. This council was influential in the development of state and local arts agencies, and the government’s increased financial support of the arts. “The arts and culture generally in the United States, stimulated by an enlightened policy on the part of the national government, blossomed and flourished after 1965” (Brademas, 1988, p. 38). By 1970, corporations and the government were contributing more than ever to the arts.

In the 1980s, however, federal monies awarded to many arts organizations declined. For example, support from the federal government for orchestras, opera, and theater was cut in half from 1981 to 1985. State and local support, on the other hand, remained fairly constant (Wysomirski, 1989, pp. 2-3). It is interesting to note that among all the nonprofit subsectors receiving direct public support, the arts are the least dependent upon government subsidy. In 1984 the arts received approximately 13% of its funds from governmental sources, whereas the nonprofit health sector received 35%, education received 17%, social services received 44%, and
legal services received 50% of their funds from governmental sources (Hodgkinson & Weitzman [cited in Wyszomirski, 1989, p. 8]).

After 1981, for the first time in the history of the agency, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) budget declined. From fiscal year 1981 through fiscal year 1987, support for the NEA lagged far behind the rate of inflation. Inflation increased by over 25%, while funds for the NEA increased by only 4% (Brademans, 1988, p. 39).

In 1988, the Independent Committee on Arts Policy stated that "for nonprofit art institutions to survive, grow, and continue to serve artists and the public, the sector needs the continued support--moral, legal, and financial--of the federal government" (p. 63). The committee presented suggestions for government involvement in the arts. These suggestions included:

• "The President should endorse the importance of the arts in the education of the young through support of a greater federal involvement in this vital sector."

• "The President should help ensure the financial stability of cultural institutions by advocating an expanded level of federal support and preserving existing mechanisms for the allocation of funds."

• "Decentralization is, in many ways, a welcome process, which has occurred precisely because of federal leadership in funding the arts. The next administration, in the next necessary phase of federal leadership, must ensure that state and local funding are additive, not substitutive of federal support."

(Independent Committee on Arts Policy, 1988, pp. 63, 65, 68-69).

Although public arts patronage by federal, state, and local governments has, overall, grown significantly in the last twenty-five years, private support continues to predominate. Private support for the arts comes from sources such as earned income, individual donors, audience members, corporations and foundations. Using
figures provided by the National Endowment for the Arts, *Five-Year Planning Document: 1989-1993*, Wyszomirski (1989) compared the proportions of support the arts derive from a variety of patronage sources. She concluded that earned income is the single most important source of revenue for arts organizations. Earned income comes primarily from individual arts patrons who pay admission fees, whereas contributed income comes from donations made by patrons, corporations, and government. For orchestras, opera companies and nonprofit theaters, earned income amounts to over half of organizational annual resources. This figure is similar for dance companies and presenting organizations. "Thus, when the proportion of earned income is added to individual contributed income, the importance of individuals to the support of the arts is overwhelming" (Wyszomirski, 1989, p. 2).

Unfortunately, the income earned from admission fees is at risk, for after decades of increasing audience attendance at arts events, the attendance rate has declined. A 1987 study on participation in the arts (Harris, 1988) showed a decline in total arts audiences of 12% since 1984. This decline is due to several factors:

1. a "graying" of current arts patrons. Arts patrons are getting older and are less able to attend performances and to contribute financially to the arts;

2. certain social, economic, and political factors such as

   * inflation leading to a decline in living standards for many individuals, particularly the young;

   * changes in tax laws resulting in lower deductions for philanthropy, including arts patronage;

   * government cutbacks in social services placing increased pressure on private donors to support charity for the "truly needy" rather than philanthropy for activities such as the arts;

   * corporate takeovers decreasing the number of corporate patron units and otherwise undercutting the local or regional loyalties manifest in previous corporate sponsorship;
the necessity of two incomes to maintain middle class standards of living, results in many people finding they have less time for leisure time activities and volunteer work.

(Pankratz, 1988, p. 11)

Participation in the Arts

Studies begun in 1973 by the National Research Center for the Arts, Inc. (an affiliate of the opinion research firm of Louis Harris and Associates) showed that participation in the arts by adult Americans, both as audience members and as amateur or avocational artists, was on the rise. Still, in 1982, 61% of the adult population (100 million people) did not participate at all in attending live performances of music or ballet, or in attending art museums or jazz performances. Of this 100 million, 29% (48 million) cited reasons for nonparticipation such as unavailability, cost, distance to travel, and lack of time. Thirty-two percent (52 million) expressed no interest in participating (National Endowment for the Arts [cited in Fowler, 1988a, p. 137]).

This NEA report also indicated that most Americans reported never having any form of arts instruction: 53% reported they have had no instruction in music; 76%, no visual arts; 91%, no theater; 93%, no ballet; and 82%, no creative writing (cited in Kaplan, 1988, p. 46). It is not clear from these data what respondents meant by arts instruction.

In 1985, the National Endowment for the Arts conducted the second Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (Robinson, 1987). The study collected attendance data for seven core types of arts performances and events (opera, jazz, classical music, musicals, ballet, plays, and art museums). Almost 40% of all survey respondents reported having attended at least one of these seven types of arts events in the previous twelve months.
In 1987, The National Research Center for the Arts conducted the fifth in-depth survey on the arts (Americans and the Arts V). Results indicated that the majority of respondents see societal and personal benefits in the arts. Seventy-two percent of those interviewed believe that museums and music performances “make a community a better place to live.” Sixty-two percent felt that “some means should be found to present more performances of music, theater, and dance in all parts of the country so that all Americans have an opportunity to attend.” Three out of four respondents felt that “the arts just give you pure pleasure to experience or participate in” and “are a positive experience in a troubled world” (Harris, 1988, p. 17).

This positive attitude toward the arts was not, however, reflected in audience participation rates. The study found that the major disciplines of the arts (art museums, movies, theater, classical and pop music, opera and musical theater, ballet and modern dance) suffered a decline of 12% in attendance since 1984. “It now appears that live presentations may well be entering a period of slow absolute decline in audience” (Harris, 1988, p. 6). Specific figures include:

- the number of adults (over 18) who have attended live pop concerts has declined 26% since 1984. The total number of attendees at such concerts has decreased 5%, and the frequency of attendance has decline 23%;

- the number of adults who have attended live classical concerts has also declined 26% since 1984. The total number of attendees at classical concerts has decreased 9%, and the frequency of attendance has decline 20%;

- the number of adults who have attended live opera or musical theater has declined 38% since 1984. The total number of attendees at these performances has decreased 23%, and the frequency has decreased 20%.

Balfe (1989) points out that Harris has consistently found higher levels of arts participation in previous surveys than have other researchers (e.g., Robinson). She states that one might argue that his findings of a new decline simply brings his figures into closer agreement with those of Robinson and others (p. 22).
Survey respondents cited major factors for non-participation in arts events. The most common reasons included lack of time, availability, high cost, and poor accessibility. Lack of time was the reason most frequently cited, reflecting the dramatic decrease in leisure time in America. The survey found that the number of hours a week spent at work has risen from 40.6 in 1963, to 46.8 hours in 1987 (a 15% increase). Leisure time has decreased rapidly from 26.2 hours a week in 1973, to 16.6 hours a week in 1987. This reflects a drop of 37% since 1973, and 8% since 1984.

It is interesting to note that only 29% of those interviewed felt strongly that most other people enjoy attending arts presentations, and another 44% somewhat agreed with it. By contrast, 69% felt strongly that most other people enjoy attending a sports event.

An example of this dramatic decline in attendance patterns has been seen at Mershon Auditorium on The Ohio State University Campus over the past ten years. From the 1979-80 season to the 1989-90 season the average number of tickets sold per performance decreased from 209 to 1173; the average number of single tickets decreased from 747 to 200, and the number of season tickets decreased from 1485 to 973 (Program Review and First Draft Five-Year Plan/Mershon Auditorium at the Wexner Center, 1989). The gradual decline in audience attendance over the past five years is attributed to two principal factors. One was a public perception that Mershon was not easily accessible during the construction of the Wexner Center. The other major factor is the growth of the arts community in Columbus. In 1986 the Greater Columbus Arts Council surveyed six major organizations in Columbus (Ballet Metropolitan, Center for Science and Industry, Columbus Association of Performing Arts, the Columbus Museum of Art, the Columbus Symphony Orchestra, and the Players Theater of Columbus) and found that the growth of these organizations between 1978 and 1986 represented a financial growth rate of 340% and an attendance
growth rate of 73%. Mershon Auditorium is now competing for audiences in a community in which there are considerably more artistic options.

The report provides other, less substantiated reasons for the decline in attendance. One apparent reason is that the age of traditional Mershon patrons is quite elderly, and they are becoming less able to attend performances. Unfortunately, these audiences are not being replaced. The report states that "university students and younger audiences have not developed the same commitment to live performance events nor do they buy subscription programs that commit them to performances over a year-long period of time" (Program Review and First Draft Five-Year Plan / Mershon Auditorium at the Wexner Center, 1989, p. 2).

Although research has been conducted on reasons for non-participation, little research has been done on specific reasons for, or sources of motivation for, attendance at arts events:

Reasons for attendance at a particular event were studied by Raymond, Greyser, and Schwalbe (1975). In this study of an audience at a city symphony, the researchers concluded that the most important reason for attendance was the program itself (42%), followed by the entertainment value of the evening (31%), the conductor (14%), the soloists (10%), and the educational value (3%). The relative importance of these various factors may well vary with the type of event surveyed, as well as among different market segments. For example, educational value may be less important to the regular attenders in symphony audience than to novice listeners or student groups. There will also be some patrons who will attend to see or hear the performance, while others may be more interested in the social satisfaction of a pleasant evening with friends (p. 233).

Waterman, Schechter, and Contractor (1987) examined the use of the media as a means of participation in the arts. The seven core arts forms surveyed (jazz,
classical music, opera, musical stage plays or operettas, nonmusical stage plays, ballet, and art collections) reach adult Americans via television, radio, or recordings. Of the three media, television consistently reaches the largest audiences of the arts.

Results of the study indicate a “significant, though apparently mild tendency” for the media to replace live participation by providing lower cost opportunities to potential audiences. The researchers state that “this was most evident in the case of television, though statistically questionable in the case of radio, and not detectable in the use of recordings” (p. 5). As would be expected, the data suggest a greater tendency for this substitution to occur in relatively expensive live activities. “There is relatively little evidence that media can provide effective substitutes for those who face obstacles to live arts events. The extent to which substitution does occur appears to the overwhelmed by the role of education as the dominant predictor of participation in the arts via live events and activities as well as via all three media” (p. 5).

Zolberg (1989), in reference to orchestral music, states that despite the incredible advances in audio technology, recorded music “cannot replace the live performance with its glamorous aura, extrinsic to music, but closely intertwined with it nevertheless, not to speak of the visual aspect of orchestra-conductor interaction” (p. 333).

An Audience Profile

Over the years, audiences have grown as the availability of the arts has increased, however, the demographic characteristics of arts audiences have remained basically the same as they were when the arts revolution began in the 1950s. The arts still receive their basic support from individuals who are far above the average in education, income, and proportion of professional and managerial occupations.
DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (1977) compiled characteristics of the American Arts Audience through: (1) surveys of other research studies; (2) over 600 questionnaire responses from museums, performing arts institutions, arts councils, and other organizations; (3) directors of 86 recent audience studies; and (4) interviews with directors and users of 25 audience studies.

Results of the study include:

**Gender:** the percentage of men and women in the audiences surveyed varied but did not differ greatly from the population at large. The median male percentage was 43% for the performing arts (compared to 49% of population as a whole).

**Age:** The median age of attenders at performing arts events was 35 (compared to 28 for the United States population as a whole). For Americans aged 16 or older, the median age was 40 years of age. Ballet and theater audiences were the youngest, and opera and symphony the oldest.

**Educational attainment:** Median educational attainment was very high compared to the population at large. The median percentage with graduate training was 30%; with a four-year college degree, 54% (compared to 14% of all adult Americans); with no schooling beyond high school, 22% (compared to 74% of all adult Americans); and without a high school diploma, 5% (compared to 38% of all adult Americans). Education appears to be the single characteristic most closely tied to attendance at museums and live performing arts events.

**Occupation:** Professionals constituted 56% of employed persons in the average arts audience, but only 15% of the employed civilian work force. Blue collar workers constituted 4% of the average arts audience, and 34% of the employed civilian work force.

**Race, Ethnicity:** The study found that minorities are underrepresented in arts audiences.
DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (1978) examined 268 audience studies to compile profiles of arts audiences. Findings were similar to the 1977 study: educational attainment, occupation, and income were significant variables in the composition of arts audiences, whereas age and gender were not.

The researchers also examined the arts audience over time and determined that age, gender, education, income, and occupation variables had not changed significantly over time. Education still emerged as the single most important predictor of participation in arts activities. The researchers speculated on reasons for this trend:

Arts attendance is a habit that one develops over a period of time. . . . if one's friends frequent certain events, sooner or later one is likely to give it a try. Education, particularly higher education, provides both an environment in which the arts are relatively accessible and a group of peers who attend with regularity. Finally, a disproportionate number of men and women who acquire a higher education have parents who are also well-educated. Children of the well-educated are more likely than others to have been exposed to the arts when they were young, and may already frequent the arts by the time they reach college. (pp. 25-26)

DiMaggio and Ostromer (1987) studied the effects of race and ethnicity on participation in the arts. They used data from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts (NEA/Robinson) to determine patterns of participation by Black, Hispanic, and White Americans in selected arts activities (attendance at museums and dance, music, and drama events).

Results of the study indicated that arts participation by Whites is greatest for all selected activities, except for Black attendance at jazz music activities. For most activities, absolute differences are relatively small, and net differences between Blacks and Whites are more marked for visually-oriented art than for performing arts activities. Hispanics were found to participate at rates similar to those of Whites.
of comparable socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic factors are principal participation barriers for both Hispanics and Blacks. The researchers concluded that differences associated with race are small compared to those associated with educational attainment, income, and occupational prestige.

DiMaggio & Useem (1989) write that data suggest that the arts audience is comprised of a core group and various peripheral groups. Peripheral groups occasionally sample a single arts form, whereas members of the core group frequently attend a variety of events. These core group individuals often are part of an active arts social circle. Friendships are formed around a shared interest in the arts, and there is a strong expectation of high attendance at and knowledge of the arts (p. 162).

Several studies show that these frequent attenders are more likely than infrequent attenders to hear about arts events through their social contacts, to have friends who are also arts consumers, and to indicate that arts attendance is fashionable in their social circle (Beldo, 1956; David, 1977; [both cited in DiMaggio & Useem, 1989, p. 162]).

**Obstacles to participation in the arts**

When people are asked why they do not attend cultural events more than they do, or at all, they usually say that they do not have enough time, cannot afford them, cannot get to them, or do not find them interesting or relevant (Nielsen and McQueen [cited in Levy, 1980]).

Levy and Czepiel (cited in Levy, 1980) maintain that these obstacles mainly suggest insufficient motivation. Levy and Czepiel studied obstacles to participation in the arts. Their study utilized lengthy conversational interviews with people about their family and their attitudes toward various forms of cultural activities. In this study, cultural activities were distinguished from work activities by being part of
leisure time, and they were voluntary choice activities that fall on a continuum of social value or prestige at a level regarded as peculiarly meritorious or qualified. They included symphonic music, ballet, modern dance, opera, painting, sculpture, and legitimate theater.

Following are some of the most commonly cited obstacles from this study and some statements from subjects in the study.

The arts are perceived as being for the elite; for those who have special sensitivity and refined taste. Those who participate in the arts are perceived as feeling superior to those who do not. This is illustrated by the following statement by a working-class man:

Those things are too rich for my blood. I don't think it's any fun. I'd be bored. That's for uppercrust people, the ones that have their noses in the air. (cited in Levy, 1980, p. 32)

Because special sensitivity or knowledge is thought to be required, the arts may intimidate people. People often lack confidence in their own aesthetic reactions, and may look to experts or simply avoid the problem. This intimidation can cause people to become uneasy and defensive. This uneasiness can extend to the details of how to dress or conduct oneself at an arts event.

The arts are often perceived as feminine, especially among individuals of a lower socioeconomic status.

I think basically we are a sports-oriented society. We stand in line for baseball and football games but not for theater or concerts. I think for the middle class society, artistic endeavor has an effeminate connotation. (cited in Levy, 1980, p. 32)
Even a man of higher socioeconomic status may characterize the arts as feminine and try to distance himself from them. For example, "Our house is very modern I had nothing to do with it. My wife did it, I just gave her the money" (cited in Levy, 1980, p. 33).

Levy and Czepiel suggest that the obstacles to aesthetic appreciation are "an interaction between the negative self-concepts of people who feel unequipped and hostile and their perceptions of the arts as hopelessly beyond them" (cited in Levy, 1980, p. 34). Not surprisingly, these views are expressed most strongly by those of lower social class positions. Middle- and upper-class people who have alienated attitudes toward the arts usually express disinterest, a lack of experience, or ignorance. For example: "I rarely buy art work. I don’t know enough about it, so I don’t enjoy it" (cited in Levy, 1980, p. 34). They may distance themselves from the arts by emphasizing the esoteric nature of the arts, or regarding the arts as immoral (e.g., inappropriate language, displays of the body in visual art or dance, etc).

Higher-status people may also attempt to explain their lack of involvement in the arts by showing themselves to be superior to the old-fashioned values the arts represent. For example: "Nowadays I feel the theater is too limiting a medium. My wife has a more traditional view of theater, she still goes. I find theater a bore" (cited in Levy, 1980, p. 35).

One can conclude from this research that individuals of low, middle, or upper socioeconomic status, male or female, experience many obstacles to participation in the arts. Sometimes these obstacles are reflections of fear or intimidation of the arts, a lack of knowledge or experience, or a poor self-concept. Many of these individuals feel the need for aesthetic experience and are frustrated by their inability to satisfy that need.
Levy (1980) states that:

An important segment to search out are the people who truly feel frustrated yearnings, whose deeper hungers for aesthetic gratification are in need of feeding, but who are thwarted by circumstances, ignorance, location, family or money. These include women still locked at home, young people with promising sensibilities, and upwardly mobile people who would like to find their way to elite experiences. (p. 43)

The obstacles to participation are numerous and complex. "There is too little study of the obstacles to learning and enjoyment as these appear to the consumer--not the usual litany of time, money, distance, but the closer-in deterrents: getting tickets, box offices, erratic refreshment arrangements, paucity of knowledgeable or helpful personnel, and the dearth of information" (Levy, 1980, p. 44).

**Audience Development**

Although the recent decline in attendance at arts events has caused arts organizations to intensify audience development efforts, developing audiences has been an important issue for arts organizations for many years. Today, it appears that many arts organizations define audience development in its broadest possible sense—as building larger audiences through a combination of promotion, publicity, marketing, communications, education and outreach. Arts organizations want to retain current patrons, while cultivating new patrons for future events. If the total attendance grows, it can reflect an increase in the number of individuals drawn to the arts (reach), an increase the frequency of visits, or both. Reach is the total number of different people who attend an arts institution at least once during a one-year period, while frequency is the average number of visits made by these attenders during the year (Morison & Flehr [cited in DiMaggio, Useem, & Brown, 1978, p. 49]). Reach is a good measure of an organization’s breadth of appeal, while frequency
indicates the extent to which the organization has cultivated a regular constituency. Unfortunately, many attempts at increasing the reach of the audience and frequency of attendance have not been successful.

In 1966 Baumol and Bowen observed that “attempts to reach a wider and more representative audience, to interest the less educated, or the less affluent, have so far had limited success. Fourteen years later, Cwi (cited in Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 53) arrived at the same conclusions. Morrison and Dalgleish (1987) state, “there is almost no attendance or audience composition data to suggest that school programs have resulted in the development of larger or broader adult audiences for the arts on a continuing basis” (p. 104).

Do these statements signal the end of growth of American arts audiences? Morrison and Dalgleish (1987) believe not: “We are convinced that America has not reached the limits of growth for its arts audiences. Rather, the arts have reached the limits of what they can achieve with the current system of audience development and with the current perspectives about the roles and the goals of the arts in our society held by those who govern and manage them” (p. 6).

One of the major issues facing arts organizations in audience development efforts is breadth versus depth. Fromm (cited in Kotler, 1980, p. xiv) suggests that arts organizations must decide between trying to bring serious art to more people and developing a more coherent experience for those people already interested in the arts. Fromm advocates educating a smaller number of knowledgeable and devoted arts patrons who would serve as a nucleus from which a healthy arts culture could grow. Other arts administrators believe that in order to stimulate audience growth, the arts must reach out to a larger, broader group of people not as predisposed to participation in the arts (such as those referred to as the culturally disenfranchised, e.g., minorities, low-income). There is also a middle ground between regular
attenders and extreme nonattenders—the segment of the population that currently does not attend arts events, but whose levels of education, income, and occupation indicate that they would be receptive to invitations to participate. In many arts organizations, all of these segments of the population are addressed (though at varying levels) through some form of audience development effort. Most arts organizations attempt to address both breadth and depth through a variety of promotional offers, public relations, marketing strategies, and education and outreach programs.

It is an admirable and worthwhile effort to seek to share the arts with people whose “cultural tastes, education, and income do not make them, or have not afforded them the opportunity to become, our regular [arts] audiences” (Dawson, 1980, pp 8-9). This is consistent with the position taken by the National Endowment for the Arts, that “the arts are for everyone.” Dawson cautions that this area of audience development may not lead to building regularly attending audiences: “Such efforts should not, however, be confused as a means to reduce financial difficulties or build regularly attending audiences. There is no evidence or documented study that indicates that the amount of effort, talent, and money devoted to such audience development have resulted in significant changes in attendance demographics. Indeed, the evidence points in the opposite direction” (p. 9).

Searles (1980) points out that the novice marketer will be tempted to direct major marketing efforts toward people who are different from current consumers because the potential for improvement is overwhelming (100% of the people receiving the message are not currently consumers). However, he states that “marketing effort should be concentrated on people who have characteristics similar to those who already are supporting the activity or buying the product” (p. 67).
Obviously, a major purpose of building audiences is to increase revenue and maintain the financial support of the arts. There are, however, more altruistic reasons for trying to bring the arts to more people. Zolberg (1989) states, "An important function of American cultural institutions is to teach or indoctrinate as large a public as possible with the importance of the arts" (p. 331). Morrison and Dalgleish (1987) offer a purpose of audience development programs distinct from the need for increased revenue:

For an audience, the process of discovering and exploring, of being challenged and puzzled and surprised, of growing in their involvement with the arts—can in itself be a source of enjoyment and should be the objective of an arts organization's audience development philosophy distinct from the year-to-year need to sell tickets and increase earned income (p. 106)

Specific examples of audience development techniques are provided in the next section, Marketing and the Arts.

**Marketing and the Arts**

One of the "missions" of marketing a performing arts organization is to educate the public and develop appreciation of the cultural contributions of the performing arts. The commonly stated goal of arts marketing is to build an audience (Peterson, 1980, p. 182).

Obviously, a challenge in audience development is to attract the consumer to the arts event for the first time. "To bring about the experience, marketing usually recommends incentives, free samples, easy trial, and starting with examples that most contradict the opposed imagery [i.e., elite, esoteric, inaccessible]" (Mokwa, Nakamoto, & Enis, 1980, p. 43). The real challenge, however, is retention—building a loyal audience. This requires the organization to carefully identify and study its
target segment of the population, and to develop artistic offerings that appeal to that segment. This is done through a combination of research, marketing, programming, and educational efforts.

Over the years, many marketing strategies have emerged in the growing field of “marketing the arts.” In the relatively brief history of this field, the emphasis has shifted from the purely financial and marketing standpoint, to better reflect the artistic mission of the arts organization, and the organization’s commitment to educating the public. A brief description of two such programs will help illustrate this trend.

In the 1960s, Danny Newman introduced his Dynamic Subscription Promotion (DSP). DSP promoted subscribers as the cornerstone of audience development (Newman, 1977). The central premise of the current DSP-based system of audience development is that new people can be attracted to participation in the performing arts through a package of varied events offered at a discount along with other benefits. This approach works well with people already predisposed toward the arts, but does not do much to attract people outside that relatively small circle.

In 1987, Morrison and Dalgleish introduced a new approach to audience development. Strategy to Encourage Lifelong Learning (SELL). This approach tries to integrate subscriptions in a way that meets the needs of a new audience. It requires “a major commitment to a new dimension in audience development—the creation of imaginative programs of lifelong learning” (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 7).

Following are some examples of learning experiences from the SELL program, that are common, educational experiences in many audience development programs today.

• Participatory programs. These programs are most often designed for young children, and provide a variety of activities, including the opportunity to see, hear,
touch, and even play instruments. An example of this is the Lollipop Concert given by the Columbus Symphony Orchestra. On a Sunday afternoon in the Spring, young children (mostly pre-school aged) attend one of two concerts held at the Ohio Theater. Prior to the concert they may participate in activities such as storytelling, dancing, coloring (musical instruments, symbols, etc.), and a musical petting zoo, where they can touch and play musical instruments, and hear instruments being played by high school students in the Symphony’s youth orchestra.

• Discussion, Demonstration, Performance. This is much like the traditional “lecture-recital” except it is more informal in nature. The performer helps people to understand more about artists and art through a combination of informal conversation (e.g., comments on music or the role of the artist, personal anecdotes), demonstration and performance. These performances may be held at the concert hall, but often are held in various settings in the community.

• Season Previews or Sampler Concerts. This is a full-length concert presented prior to the season to give potential patrons and subscribers a “taste” of the music that is included on various series in the season’s offerings. The program will include representative works from all the series that the organization offers. For example an orchestra may include music from the classical series, favorites series, and pops series. Often there will be information on the music provided in the form of a commentary or program notes.

• Printed materials. Newsletters allow organizations to provide informative material on upcoming events, guest artists and programs, well in advance of the productions. Some arts groups believe that a newsletter helps patrons feel like part of the family.

• Video and Audio Recordings. Many museums provide visitors with audio systems for self-guided tours. There is great potential for the use of video and audio
recordings in learning experiences in the performing arts organizations. For example, the Lyric Opera of Chicago provides subscribers with a cassette tape giving a brief description and background of the opera production they will attend. Video tapes would also provide an excellent medium for people to learn more about a specific production or an art form in general. Morrison and Dalgleish (1987) suggest that arts groups should explore the possibilities of producing the recordings in cooperation with public radio and television stations, and that public libraries might help with the distribution.

• Pre- and Post-Performance Discussions. These are among the most common types of learning events. Pre-concert discussions often begin with the artists giving a brief presentation, then responding to questions from members of the audience. Sometimes, the pre-concert session is essentially a lecture, with little or no audience involvement. The central idea of a pre-concert session is to prepare the listeners for what they are about to hear. Post-concert discussions again usually revolve around the artist and the audience, analyzing the performance, and discussing the art form. Variations in format include panel discussions, and the use of a moderator or interviewer. Pre-concert sessions are most often held at the concert site, however, speakers may travel to various locations to present talks.

• Program Notes. This is an obvious, and often used, opportunity for communicating with the audience. Program notes provide specific information about the program the audience is about to experience. At a music performance this information may include a biography of the composer, details about the composition of the piece, and specific parts to listen for.

• Lobby Displays. "A lobby can be an ideal place for visual and printed materials that enhance the audience's understanding of current and future productions. Lobby displays should be designed to help audiences learn enough about the subject
or the context of a future production to make them feel more comfortable about attending something that seems unfamiliar and strange" (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 119).

The emphasis of all these programs is on informing and educating current and potential participants in the arts, and making them feel more comfortable with the experience. Many arts organizations rely on social-type promotions to lessen intimidation, and attract an audience to the event. Examples of this include the activities at the young people's concerts, refreshments at senior citizens (and other) concerts, picnic with the pops concerts, special receptions after concerts, and singles concerts, which include dinner and a social mixer before the concert. Whatever the approach, the central idea is the same—to lessen the intimidation people feel with the arts, and to provide a positive, accessible, and enjoyable experience.

Following is a classic example of the use of promotional techniques, marketing and education in increasing audience reach. This audience development/outreach program was aimed specifically at university students.

In the late 1960s, the Seattle Opera planned a low-priced, opera in English series. The opera developed an outreach program for university students at the University of Washington, based on the concept of peer speaking to peer. Students were recruited to promote the opera in a language other students could understand. Advertisements written by some of these students were used on campus. In one ad, the opera, *Samson et Delila*, was termed "the original Middle-East crisis," "a feast of passion and lust." *Il Traviatore* was said to have "a plot so involved that it made Finnegan's Wake seem easy" (Reiss, 1986, p. 48).

Several hundred free opera tickets were distributed to student residence halls on campus along with publicity on the new subscribers series. Publicity stressed the low cost, stating that the cost per evening was only slightly more than a movie.
Bumper stickers reading "Bravo opera," and buttons stating "Opera Lives" were also distributed. Student leaders spoke to other students at meetings and over the telephone. Student leaders were successful in promoting attendance at the opera productions.

This project and others, have shown that peer involvement can be a key to a successful campaign aimed at a particular audience. "There is no doubt that the most effective selling can be done on a peer-to-peer basis, and recognized leaders can sell programs better to their audiences than the most eloquent arts leaders can--if they can be persuaded to do the selling" (Reiss, 1986, p. 48).

Marketing Research: Getting to Know the Audience

Research on the arts audience dates back to museum research studies in the 1920s (Robinson, 1930), and Federal Theater Project Performances in the 1930s (both cited in DiMaggio, Useem, & Brown, 1978, p. 11). It grew gradually throughout the 1950s and 1960s with more museum studies by Abbey and Cameron (1960, 1961), and performing arts studies by Baumol and Bowen (1966). In the last 20 years, research studies on the audience for the performing arts and museums have increased dramatically. "Arts managers need to know who makes up their audience and how that audience can be better reached and served. The research method of choice for understanding the arts audience has increasingly become the audience survey" (National Endowment for the Arts, 1985, p. 8).

DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (1978) identified three basic types of audience studies for museums and the performing arts: (1) attender surveys in which the audience of a specific arts organization is surveyed. Data are gathered on motivations for attendance, and demographic information such as age, gender, and socioeconomic status; (2) cross-sectional surveys which target a sample of a local, regional,
or national population. This type of survey includes nonattenders as well as attenders. The survey includes questions on attitudes toward arts events, frequency of attendance at such events, and demographic information; and (3) impact studies in which the impact of a specific arts performance on an audience is studied (p. 15).

DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (1978) examined the quality of previous arts audience studies and their usefulness to arts organizations. The researchers concluded that good audience research is scarce. They went on to note that regardless of the quality of the results obtained, most survey findings did not exert a major influence in the formulation of arts policy because most audience research was not undertaken to solve specific problems.

In an attempt to remedy this situation, the NEA Research Division created and tested an instruction book with which arts organizations could learn to conduct their own audience studies and make those studies more helpful for policy development. Guidelines for devising audience surveys are also given in some arts management, marketing, and audience development books. Still, many arts organizations prefer to hire market research firms to conduct audience studies.

One report of this type was conducted by the market research company of Clark Jones, Inc. of Dublin, Ohio for the Columbus Symphony Orchestra. Data were collected through phone interviews and small group discussions. Researchers compiled profiles of six different groups: the attenders, potential attenders, subscribers, donors, lapsed donors, and picnic with the pops attenders. They asked survey respondents for demographic information such as age, gender, occupation, income and education level. The targeting profile of current attenders indicates that the majority (66%) are women, aged 26-55, from medium to high income households ($20,000-$100,000). There is only a small minority proportion (approximately 7%). There is a disproportionate share of employed (41%) and
widowed, separated, and divorced women (26%), the latter taken to be an indication of their approaching middle age. The majority (65%) have substantial college experience, and 19% have moderate levels of graduate and professional school experience. One key result supports findings of previous research, “The continuum of increasing involvement with the Columbus Symphony Orchestra from potential attenders to single ticket buyers to subscribers to donors, shows a corresponding demographic continuum of increasing age, increased income, and decreasing minority income.”

The survey investigated reasons for attendance and nonattendance at symphony concerts. The major reason cited for not attending or subscribing to the symphony was lack of time. Researchers discovered that programming does not appear to be a reason for nonattendance. When potential attenders were asked why they might attend, one-fourth (27%) of respondents cited “having a nice night out.” Another 41% offer a variety of personal reasons, most of which focus on “enjoyment” and a “social evening.” Reasons for attendance among regular attenders is often also celebratory or social in nature, but is also specific to their affinity for classical music.

Other areas investigated include response to promotional strategies, advertisements, reviews, and programming, attendance patterns, price sensitivity, and the image of the symphony. To investigate the public’s image of the symphony, people were asked to respond to statements such as the following: (1) “People really need to go to the symphony at least a few times because it will really broaden their horizons.” (the vast majority of all groups surveyed agreed with this statement); and (2) “No matter what the symphony does, it will never be able to get rid of the image in the general public of being stuffy and boring.” (the vast majority of all groups surveyed disagreed with this statement). When asked what they perceived as the
symphony’s greatest challenge, large majorities of all market groups said to broaden and develop the audience.

Results of the survey showed that the Columbus Symphony Orchestra enjoys very high market penetration. Attendees and subscribers comprise approximately 16% of the adult population in the metropolitan area, and another 17% can be considered potential attenders (people who expect to attend a symphony concert and who will respond to targeted marketing appeals).

It is interesting to note that while many arts organizations commission audience studies, results are often not published or shared with arts institutions. It appears that arts organizations often view other arts organizations as competition for audiences, when in fact, research has indicated almost the opposite. Results of the 1985 Survey of Participation in the Arts indicated that in general, people who attend one of the seven types of core arts events (opera, jazz, classical music, musicals, ballet, plays, and art museums) are considerably more likely to attend the others. For example, the attendance rate for classical music performances among people who attend opera is 71%, while the attendance rate at classical music performances for people who do not attend opera is only 12%. People who attended a jazz concert were six times more likely to attend a classical music performance than non-jazz goers. This is often referred to as "cross-over behavior" or "venues of participation." Ratios of at least this magnitude were found across all pairings of the seven core arts events. Results "obviously indicate considerable overlap across arts audiences rather than a pattern of segmentation of the arts audience into jazz fans, opera lovers, etc."

(Robinson, 1987, pp. 8-9).

Perhaps one of the most controversial issues regarding the role of consumer research is the perceived conflict between the needs and wishes of the performing arts consumer and the artistic mission of the arts organization. Permut (1980) found
that some arts administrators felt that consumer (audience) research was inappropriate since "artistic expression should not be bound by audience expectation or preferences" (p. 53).

Searles (1980) is convinced that the artist should design the core arts product, not the consumer or the audience. "The artist speaks to all through his special insight into the human condition. The message comes whether or not we want it. The individual arts consumer would undoubtedly select those artistic expressions that reflect his or her own taste, aspirations, and view of the world. If the audience were to decide, our arts world would become narrower and increasingly sterile. All of us need to be pulled, pushed, even thrown into new artistic experiences" (p. 69).

Arts organizations certainly should not compromise their artistic missions or standards to give the audience "what it wants." Arts organizations need to understand that market research can provide valuable insight into the consumer that can assist arts organizations in making a variety of artistic and business decisions. Audience-based research appears to be viewed more often as a (feared) substitute than as a mere supplement to artistic decision-making (DiMaggio and Useem [cited in Permut, 1980, p. 80]).

The issue of audience composition, attitudes, and behavior is not simply academic. Information on audiences is of vital interest to individuals concerned with managing the arts, those making general policy for the arts, and to those of the public which has an important stake in their decisions and policies. The arts are increasingly dependent upon public and corporate benefactors for their economic survival. Such donors may want to know just whom their contributions are serving. Particularly for publicly funded arts institutions, establishing the nature and breadth of the clientele to whom services are delivered may be critical to soliciting further support. (DiMaggio and Useem, 1989, p. 26)
Role of Education/Knowledge in Audience Development

Arts audiences are generally characterized by three main demographic variables—high levels of education, income, and professional occupation. Of these three variables, education is generally accepted as the most important because it is usually a prerequisite to the others. As the arts attempt to extend beyond the limits of the relatively small group of arts attenders, it is logical that the first barrier to expanded audiences is an educational one. In potential audience members it surfaces as the need to know more in order to appreciate (Morrison and Dalgleish, 1987, p. 100).

Andreasen and Belk (1980) studied the expectation of positive outcome on whether one will attend a theater or symphony performance. One of the findings of the study was that improved attendance for both theater and symphony may result if nonattenders would become more positive in their perception of the following:

1) the likelihood that they would understand what is going on;
2) the likelihood that they would like the particular program;
3) the likelihood that those with whom they attended would have a good time;
4) the likelihood that the evening would prove stimulating.

In the early 1980s, the Houston Symphony Orchestra carried out extensive research on its present and potential audience. One section of the report states: “Houston audiences, especially single-ticket and infrequent patrons, appear to hunger for more knowledge about classical music. In the group discussions, the interest in knowing more about composers and their works ranged from polite to extreme interest. Although Houston audiences may not be perceived as coming from a deep musical tradition, they express a fervent need for information to extend their education” (Markgraf & Wells [cited in Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 100]).
This need for knowledge among audience and potential audience members is also seen in theater audiences. In a series of focus group discussions held by the Guthrie Theater (Minneapolis), the consensus was summarized by one man's statement: "The biggest thing the theater can do for us is give us information."

Another member of the audience stated: "The Guthrie is more than entertainment. It is continuing education. We must try to understand what they are doing." The report summarizing the research stated: "linked to the information need is the thought that play enjoyment/understanding can be increased and dissatisfaction decreased by preparing people to see a production" (Beldo [cited in Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 100]).

Many artists and arts administrators discount the idea that people need to know anything in order to appreciate any kind of art. "They believe the experience of art itself transcends rationality and communicates regardless of an audience's state of experience, knowledge or sensual awareness" (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 101). In discussing why his museum of contemporary art did not supply visitors with audio devices for exhibitions, the director of education said, "Our curators believe that the audience already knows what is necessary and that you don't have to teach them anything" (cited in Morrison & Daigleish, 1987, p. 101).

Fortunately, individuals with this opinion appear to be in the minority. This is evidenced by the growth of the relatively new position of "Education Director" in arts organizations. Probably more common is this attitude, voiced by the education director of another contemporary museum: "Knowledge can quicken appreciation, help make the experience more important and open up attitudes" (cited in Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 101).

Steven Cahn is a musician, teacher, educational philosopher, and provost of the Graduate School of the City University of New York. He states: "It is
demonstrably false that the person who knows nothing can get as much out of something as someone who knows something. Your chances of liking something are related to how much you know about it. It is a strange view to think that it doesn’t help to understand a subject. It would be like reading a book in a language you don’t understand. If you send two different people to see Waiting for Godot and one of them knows something about theater and the other one doesn’t, the one who knows is going to get the most from it. Why keep art a mystery?” (cited in Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 102).

Wolf addressed the importance of education to presenting organizations. Education may be of particular importance to presenters due to the wide variety of programming that is offered. Wolf suggests that presenting organizations cannot undertake the responsibilities of education alone. “For this reason partnerships must be developed with colleges and universities, other arts organizations (including producing organizations), community music schools and dance academies, private schools, civic and fraternal organizations, and with other institutions that can contribute to a community-wide response to the challenge of arts education.” (cited in the National Task Force on Presenting and Touring the Performing Arts).

Although many artistic leaders accept the need for educating audiences in principle, there is often a certain hesitancy about implementing it. Morrison and Dalgleish (1987) believe that this is a result of two main fears: (1) the fear of the word education. Arts leaders fear “over-intellectualizing art and making it as boring and academic as they believe the schools and colleges do” (p. 102); and (2) at the other extreme, the fear of over-popularizing art and somehow cheapening it or demeaning it.

Leonard Bernstein provided an excellent example of implementing audience education without over-intellectualizing or over-popularizing of the art form. He
won critical acclaim for a series of radio and television programs he created during the 1950s to help people understand music. He provided an excellent blend of “entertainment, humor and scholarly integrity” (Morrison & Dalgleish, 1987, p. 103).

Bernstein acknowledged the difficulty of presenting musical information to the layman:

Obviously we can’t use musical terminology exclusively, or we will simply drive the victim away. We must have intermittent recourse to certain extra-musical ideas, like religion, or social factors, or historical forces, which may have influenced music. We don’t ever want to talk down; but how up can we talk without losing contact? There is a happy medium somewhere... it is hard to find, but it can be found. (1959, p. 16)

Kraus (1985) examined the “untrained audience.” He states that “the education of the untrained should be done as creatively and as unobtrusively as possible” (p. 104). He continues, “what you are looking for are effective means of drawing the untrained outsider into the esoterica and through it to the status of an insider” (p. 105). He provides some suggestions on written information: “You could hook a few dilettantes on the mathematical intricacies of the scales, the notes, the sounds. You could talk about the difficulties of going slow on some instruments and going fast on others” (p. 105). Kraus suggests that one utilize simple terms and language in program notes, so that “someone without a Ph.D. in musicology can understand them.” He further maintains that the untrained audience can be drawn into the subject in “strange and wondrous ways.” For example, “They don’t know why the piano player gets a page turner and the cello player does not. They don’t know that symphonies written at different times in history are played by orchestras with different numbers of instruments, because instruments were invented at different times in history” (pp. 105-106).
Kraus states that “knowledge that expands on even these basics, literately and amusingly, will stimulate interest about what the untrained audience is seeing and make them curious to see more” (p. 106).

“The perpetuation of the arts is dependent upon enriching existing audiences and educating the widest population in the practice and history of art and aesthetics so that all may participate more fully in the culture of our time” (Balfe and Heine, 1988, p. 3).
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study was divided into three phases. In the first phase, information was gathered on the role of the arts in society and education, attendance at performing arts events, and audience development and outreach programs. What emerged was an overview of the state of the arts in American society. Information was obtained from a survey of literature and personal interviews with arts leaders. All sources agreed upon the value of the performing arts and expressed concern over the future of the performing arts in American society.

Using information obtained in Phase I, the researcher designed an audience analysis survey. In Phase II, this survey was conducted to compile a profile of patrons of School of Music large ensemble concerts at The Ohio State University. One of the primary purposes of this survey was to measure receptivity to the idea of a pre-concert talk which was the basis for Phase III.

Using information from both Phase I and Phase II, the researcher designed and implemented an arts outreach/audience development program for students on The Ohio State University campus. This program provided a pre-concert talk prior to selected School of Music large ensemble concerts. At the end of the program, participants completed a survey providing demographic information and their reactions to the program.
Phase I

The researcher conducted a survey of literature and met with various arts leaders in the Columbus, Ohio community to obtain information on the role of the arts in society, attendance at performing arts events, and audience development and outreach programs. Individuals interviewed included: William Cook, Associate Director of the Wexner Center for the Arts; Larry Eckholt, Director of Development and Communications at the Wexner Center for the Arts; Bonnie Gilliom, co-director of the Institute for the Advancement of the Arts in Education at The Ohio State University; Phyllis Hairston, Director of the Outreach Initiative Program for the Ohio Arts Council; Donald Harris, Dean of the College of the Arts at The Ohio State University; Robert Jones, Executive Director of the Columbus Symphony Orchestra; Dennis Rich, Director of External Affairs for the Columbus Symphony Orchestra; and Rosa Stolz, Vice-President of the Columbus Association for the Performing Arts.

One out-of-state source was also contacted--Holly Hudak, the Education Director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

These arts leaders expressed concern over the decline in audiences at live arts events both nationally, and in Columbus. Many provided insights into their personal philosophy of the role of the arts in society, as well as the philosophy and mission of the organization they represented. Education, outreach, and marketing strategies for reaching a greater segment of the population and stimulating audience interest and attendance were discussed. These individuals provided a wealth of information, and confirmed the need for action to be taken in building current and future audiences. They encouraged this research on audience development and were particularly interested in the targeting of university students.
Phase II

An audience analysis survey was conducted in order to compile a profile of patrons of School of Music large ensemble concerts at The Ohio State University. More specifically, the survey was designed to provide information on: (1) percentage of student, faculty, and community attendance at these concerts; (2) demographic information on the individuals attending; and (3) receptivity of the audience to the idea of a brief, pre-concert talk. Members of the music education faculty, the large ensemble directors and the assistant director of the School of Music provided input on the design of the survey questions (see Appendix A).

The survey was conducted at 12 School of Music large ensemble concerts during Autumn quarter, 1990. The 12 concerts were performed by the following groups or combination of groups: the Symphony Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Concert, Symphonic, and University Bands, Jazz Ensemble, Jazz Lab Ensemble, Concert Choir, Chorale, Men's and Women’s Glee Clubs, and University Chorus.

Surveys were distributed with the programs at each concert. An announcement was made at intermission, asking patrons to complete the survey during intermission or after the concert. The survey asked for demographic information such as gender, age, occupation, and relationship to The Ohio State University. Questions were also asked about the mode of transportation to the concert, sources of information about the concert, and patrons’ concert attendance patterns. There was an extra section for students asking rank in school, place of residence, major area of study, and if attendance at the concert satisfied a class requirement. At the end of the survey, patrons were asked to rate their enjoyment of the concert and to speculate on the effect of a brief, pre-concert talk about the music on their enjoyment and appreciation of the program. Space was provided for
comments. After the concert, patrons returned the completed surveys to a box located immediately outside the auditorium.

As an incentive for completing the survey, raffle prizes were offered for those interested. Prizes included a gift certificate and discount coupons donated by two area restaurants, and tickets to the final concert of the university's Mozart Festival donated by the School of Music. Those interested were asked to provide contact information (name and address). A drawing was held at the end of the quarter, and winners were notified by mail.

Attendance data were gathered at each of the 12 concerts to determine attendance levels at events and the survey return rate. The researcher and two observers counted the number of people in four sections of the auditorium: the three main sections (left, middle, and right), and a standing area at the back of the auditorium. A percentage of agreement by observers was calculated by dividing the smaller count by the larger for each section of the auditorium. These percentages were then averaged to produce a level of agreement for each of the 12 concerts. The final 12 percentages were averaged to determine the overall level of interobserver agreement for this procedure. Interobserver agreement ranged from 97.00 to 99.75 and the mean was 98.42.

Phase III

The researcher targeted two types of student populations on campus: (1) undergraduate student social, professional, and service organizations; and (2) music classes for non-music majors. Student social, professional, and service groups included honors organizations, fraternities, sororities, dormitory groups, and special interest groups (e.g., minority student groups, the Human Ecology Council, etc.). Student groups and contact names were made available to the researcher by the
Office of Student Affairs. The researcher contacted the groups and arranged for the
group (or a portion of the group) to attend one of the School of Music large ensemble
performances during Winter quarter. Concerts included performances by the
following groups: the Symphony Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Concert and
Symphonic Bands, Jazz Ensemble, Jazz Lab Ensemble, and Men’s Glee Club. The
group was also asked to attend a brief, pre-concert talk prior to the concert. The talk
was held at the student group’s meeting place (during a regularly scheduled meeting)
or at the concert site (45 minutes prior to the concert).

In some cases the researcher first contacted the group’s president by
telephone, then sent a follow-up letter explaining the details of the project (see
Appendix B). In other cases, the letter preceded the telephone contact, or the group
received only a letter.

Most of the student groups contacted were unable to participate in the study.
Out of 85 social, professional, and service groups contacted, only 3 were able to
participate (The American Home Economics Association, the Human Ecology
Council, and Phi Alpha Omega, an international co-ed service fraternity). Many
student groups had conflicts with concert dates, could not find time in their agenda
for a guest speaker, were reluctant to give up valuable meeting time, or did not have
a meeting that was in close enough proximity to a concert to make the experience
worthwhile. Some of the student groups contacted did not participate in activities
other than organization meetings. The researcher had also intended to invite
dormitory organizations to participate in the project. First, however, permission for
the groups’ participation had to be obtained from the residence and dining halls
administration. Unfortunately, no dormitory groups were able to be involved due to
delays in permission being granted for participation.
Other obstacles to participation included the limited budget for publicity and the limited time of the study. (The project lasted only one quarter, and student groups often had all activities planned for the entire quarter.) Some groups were less interested in participating since it was a dissertation project and not an official university program. It was frequently found that students' perception of time and commitment to the project were unrealistic. Student leaders were interested in participating in the project, however, they were often unable to find time for the program in their group's agenda. Although most of the student groups contacted were unable to participate, the majority expressed interest in participating Spring quarter or the following year.

The researcher also contacted music classes for non-music majors. Flyers (see Appendix C) were distributed to nine sections of a music appreciation class, and the researcher gave a five-minute presentation explaining the project in eight of the nine sections. This class was selected since it had a concert attendance requirement. The researcher gave a brief presentation explaining the project in four sections of a fundamentals of music class for elementary education majors. Several of these classes requested flyers as well. Most of these classes also had a concert attendance requirement. One of the classes volunteered class time for docents to come in to present the pre-concert talk. The next course in the sequence for elementary education majors was also included in the study. A brief explanation of the project was provided to each of the three sections of this course. One section provided class time for a pre-concert talk, and students received extra-credit for attending the concert. The pre-concert talk and concert attendance was given as one option for an assignment in the other two sections of this course. A music industry class also volunteered to participate in the project. A docent spoke during class time, and students attended the concert as part of a class assignment. Except for three classes
which gave class time for the pre-concert talk, students attended the pre-concert talk 45 minutes prior to the concert, and attendance was voluntary.

Perhaps not surprisingly, it was noted that when a personal contact was made (e.g., the researcher giving a brief presentation to a class), the number of participants was much higher than when the organization was contacted by telephone. However, telephone contacts still produced a greater number of responses (whether positive or negative) than the letter alone.

The pre-concert talk, whether held in-class, at the group’s meeting place, or at the concert site, was 20 to 30 minutes in length, and provided information on listening to music and the specific program that group was going to hear. The talks were held prior to seven of the large ensemble concerts during Winter quarter. The number of talks prior to each concert varied with the demand from the student groups and classes. A total of eleven talks were held, and attendance at the talks ranged from 2 to 41.

The talk was designed to be informal and informative, not overly technical or didactic. Emphasis was placed on building rapport with the student group and promoting a positive attitude about the concert experience. By having peers present the talk, and by providing the option of presenting the talk at a group’s meeting, it was hoped that any apprehension over a new experience would be lessened.

Members of the musicology faculty at The Ohio State University were consulted regarding the pre-concert talk. Faculty discussed approaches they had used in similar settings and provided suggestions for the content and nature of the talk, as well as sources of musical information for specific concert programs.

Docents were advanced undergraduates in music education. They were selected by the researcher and the dissertation committee, and trained by the researcher. Docents were selected, in part, on the basis of their communication skills.
Docents received a stipend of $75.00 to $100.00 provided through a university grant (Graduate Student Alumni Research Award).

Docents received a packet of materials to assist them in preparing for their role as a speaker (see Appendix D). This packet included a summary of the research project, guidelines for the pre-concert talk, "tips" on being an effective docent, and a sample form that was used to evaluate the speakers during their practice sessions. Docents also received a list of program selections for their particular concert, and times and locations of their pre-concert talks. The researcher met with each individual to review the requirements and procedures. The docents were responsible for researching the program to be performed, preparing the talk, viewing a model training tape, practicing the talk once with a small group of their peers, and presenting the talk to one or two student groups. The researcher provided assistance with the preparation when necessary. A videotape of the researcher presenting the first pre-concert talk was used as the model training tape for the docents. Prior to the first talk, each docent presented the talk for the researcher and a small group of peers who evaluated the docent in 12 areas of effective teaching and communication.

All pre-concert talks followed the format provided in the docent guidelines. Docents were encouraged to put the content provided in the guidelines in their own words. The talk began with a short introduction which discussed the purpose of a liberal arts education, and the role of the arts in such an education. Participants were also told the premise upon which the pre-concert talks were based: that further information about a particular subject can enhance not only one's knowledge of it, but also one's interest in, enjoyment, and appreciation of it. The benefits of participation in the project were enumerated. Benefits included: (1) a chance for the students to provide input into the design of an arts outreach program; (2) an opportunity to learn about music in an informal setting, and to have a good musical
and social, experience; and (3) information for concert reports. A brief section on the uniqueness of live music emphasized the different forms of communication that take place during a live performance (e.g., from ensemble to audience, audience to ensemble, and among audience members). Some background of the group was given including the instrumentation of the group, percentage of music majors, rank representation, recent honors or awards, and information about the conductor. Docents explained the various traditions associated with the particular type of concert, and spoke briefly about concert etiquette for the audience. Topics included: multi-movement works, ensemble attire, conductor entrances and exits, and knowing when to clap during a performance. Next, the talk was focused upon the music to be performed in the concert. This section included tips on what to listen for, some history of the piece or composer, anecdotes about the composer or the piece, explanations of particular styles, and information on guest soloists. Efforts were made to avoid technical musical vocabulary, and to keep the information interesting and accessible to the listeners. On programs with many pieces, only selected works were discussed. The last portion of the talk described how people can respond to music and what factors may influence responses. It was stressed that responses to music are very individual, and that one does not need specialized musical knowledge in order to listen to, talk about, and enjoy music.

The “docent tips” provided information on establishing rapport with the student group and for presenting a successful pre-concert talk. The tips were derived from research on effective teaching and communication. Docents were encouraged to be positive, enthusiastic, and outgoing. Specific behaviors included eye contact, questioning, clarity of speech, pacing, and enthusiasm (use of humor, facial expressions and vocal inflections). When the docent practiced the talk for the small group he or she was evaluated on these behaviors using a five-point rating scale.
This evaluation was designed to indicate an acceptable presentation. An acceptable presentation was defined as one in which the docent was rated in either of the two highest categories (strongly agree and agree) for all of the 12 behaviors. An average of four observers listened to each docent (the researcher and three of the student’s peers). All docents scored primarily in the two highest categories on all behaviors. No behaviors were rated in the lowest category (strongly disagree). If a behavior was rated lower than the acceptable level, the docent and researcher discussed it and found ways to remedy the problem prior to the actual pre-concert presentation.

After the pre-concert talk, docents distributed surveys to the students (see Appendix E). If the pre-concert talk was held immediately prior to the concert, students received the surveys at the talk. If the talk was held further in advance during class or at the group’s meeting place, students met the docent at the concert to receive the surveys. Students were asked to complete the survey after the concert and return it to the docent who would be standing at the exit. The survey provided: (1) demographic information such as age, gender, rank, place of residence, major, length of time it took to get to the concert, and accessibility of the concert hall; (2) information on attendance at concerts and other live arts events, and how students receive information on arts events; (3) information on the effect of the pre-concert talk on the students’ enjoyment and understanding of the concert; and (4) the students’ overall reactions to the pre-concert talk and concert (what did they like most, what would they change, would they participate again?). Students were also asked to provide suggestions for the experience and to tell what would get them more involved in arts events on campus. Survey responses were anonymous.

Midway through the second phase of the study, the campus newspaper ran an article on the dissertation project (see Appendix E). This helped to draw attention to the project, but did not seem to have a noticeable impact on student participation.
Data from the audience analysis and arts outreach surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and written comments for both surveys were summarized. Results of the audience analysis survey provided a profile of patrons of School of Music concerts. The arts outreach survey provided demographic data on participants in the program as well as their reactions to the experience.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Results of the Audience Analysis Survey

An audience analysis survey was conducted in order to compile a profile of patrons of School of Music large ensemble concerts at The Ohio State University (see Appendix A). The survey was conducted at 12 School of Music large ensemble concerts during autumn quarter, 1990. The 12 concerts were performed by the following groups or combination of groups: the Symphony Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Concert, Symphonic, and University Bands, Jazz Ensemble, Jazz Lab Ensemble, Concert Choir, Chorale, Men's and Women's Glee Clubs, and University Chorus.

Attendance levels at concerts were determined by the researcher and two observers who counted audience members at each concert. Observer agreement ranged from 97.00 to 99.75, with a mean of 98.42. Attendance at the twelve concerts ranged from 141 to 492, and the mean attendance rate was 302 (see Table 1). The total attendance across the 12 concerts was 3701. Some patrons did not receive surveys since not all patrons took a program (which contained the survey), and the researcher ran out of surveys at one concert. Survey responses totaled 1764, providing an overall return rate of approximately 48%. Return rate varied across concerts and ranged from 38% to 71% (see Table 1).
Table 1

Concert Attendance, Return Rate, and Interobserver Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>98.50</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ensemble</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>99.50</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Band</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con Band</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonic Band</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Band</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>98.50</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ensemble</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>99.56</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ensemble</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>99.75</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir/Chorale</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Chorus</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>99.50</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>98.42</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: WE/Con Band = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band

Results of the survey are expressed in two ways: (1) analysis of audiences for total concerts, and (2) analysis of the audience for each concert. All results are expressed in percentages with the exception of mean scores. The categories utilizing mean scores include: (1) the number of minutes to the concert site, (2) the number of concerts attended in the last 12 months, and (3) the level of enjoyment of the concert. To determine the most representative number of minutes to the concert site and the number of concerts attended, the median score for each question was determined for each age group. These medians were then averaged to produce a mean of the medians for each age group and for each concert.
For each survey question, responses are shown as well as the percentage of participants who did not answer that question. The no answer category plus the responses will equal 100% (may be approximate due to rounding), except for two categories: publicity source and types of concerts attended. In these two categories, the responses alone will equal 100%. In both cases, the response rate to the question was 95% or higher.

Analysis of Audiences for Total Concerts

General Information

Table 2 shows the number of respondents and the percentage of respondents by age and gender. The 18-25 age group comprised the largest percentage of responses across all the concerts (47%). The next largest percentage of responses was from the 36-50 (age group 20%), followed by 51-64 (12%). The under 18, 26-35, and 65 and over age groups each comprised 9% or less of the respondents.

Females comprised a larger percentage of audience members than did males across all concerts (56% and 43% respectively). The extent of the female majority varied with concerts as will be seen later. Overall, the most even division (50%/50%) was seen in the 26-35 age group. The largest difference in gender was seen in the 36-50 age group with females constituting 62% of the audience, and males, 36%. 
Table 2

Age, Gender, and Number of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean:

- Total: 56% Female, 43% Male, 1% NA

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Code: NA = no answer

Table 3 shows the relationship of the respondents to the university. Results indicate that the majority of individuals were students at the university (49%).

Relatives comprised 25% of the respondents, visitors, 22%, and faculty and staff, 4%.

Within age groups, the majority of the individuals in the under 18 and 65 and over age groups were visitors to the campus (53% and 55%), while the majority of the 36-50 and 51-64 age groups were relatives of performers (58% and 56%). The majority of the 18-24 and 26-35 age groups were students (91% and 46%). Some students also reported that they were relatives of the performers, but that percentage was extremely small. These responses were included in the student category. There is no overlap among the categories.
Table 3

Relationship to the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Visitor</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; Over</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: NA = no answer

Table 4 shows the occupations of the respondents. Fifty-three percent of all survey respondents were full-time students (under 18 years of age, as well as 18 and over). Respondents who were part-time students generally listed a primary occupation and were categorized by that occupation. The next highest percentage was found in business (8%). This category includes business, law, and sales. Six percent of the respondents were retired, and six percent were in the education field (this includes public school teachers, college and university teachers, private music teachers, and school music teachers). People in the medical field (e.g., doctors, nurses, psychiatrists), administrative and managerial positions, and homemakers (male and female), each comprised 4% of respondents. Individuals in the arts (e.g., visual artists, dancers, other performers) comprised only 1% of the respondents. This number is slightly low due to including music teachers with other teachers in the education category.
Table 4

Occupation of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Managerial</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory/Utility</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Table 5 shows the mode of transportation to the concert. The majority of audience members surveyed (63%) travelled by car to the concert. Thirty-two percent of all respondents walked to the concert. The car was consistently the most common mode of travel across all age groups with the exception of the 18-25 age group. In this group, comprised mostly of students, only 33% travelled by car and 63% walked to the concert.
Patrons were asked how many minutes it took them to get to the concert site. The median of these numbers was determined for each age group at each of the twelve concerts. These twelve medians for each age group were then averaged to produce a mean number of minutes for each age group (see Table 5). The average number of minutes taken to get to the concert ranged from 10 to 61, with a mean of 29. The number of minutes was lowest (10) for the 18-25 age group, which also reported the highest rate of walking to the concert. It may be concluded that these individuals live on or very near the campus. The average number of minutes for the 26-35 age group was also lower than the rest of the groups (14 minutes). Again, this is probably due to the large student representation in this group (46%).

Table 5

Transportation to the Concert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Foot</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Min to Concert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total mean 63% 2% 32% 1% 1% 29

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: NA = No answer  Min to Concert = Number of Minutes to Concert Site (Mean)
Table 6 shows the publicity sources from which audience members received information on the concert they attended. Across all age groups, the majority (58%) received information from a friend or relative. The next highest source of information was a poster or the School of Music marquee (18%). This was highest among the 18-25 and 26-35 age groups, comprised mainly of students. The "other" category accounted for 10% of the information received and primarily included radio, arts and entertainment newspapers such as The Other Paper or Columbus Alive, and announcements made by instructors in music classes.

Eight percent of the respondents received information from the city newspaper, the Columbus Dispatch. The information received from the Dispatch increased with age from 2% for the 18-25 age group, to 31% for the 65 and over group. Only 2% of all respondents said they received information from the campus newspaper (the Lantern). It is surprising that even in the 18-25 age group, only 2% received concert information from the Lantern. The number is slightly higher (5%) in the 26-35 age group.

A calendar of events was not listed on the original survey, but is included in Table 6. The calendar of events most often referred to is distributed by the College of the Arts. Another frequently mentioned calendar is the schedule of School of Music performances. Together these accounted for an average of only 3% of the publicity information for all age groups, except for the 26-35 age group in which they accounted for 10%.
Table 6

Publicity Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Dispatch</th>
<th>Lantern</th>
<th>M/P</th>
<th>Fr/Rel</th>
<th>Cal</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:  M/P = Marquee/Poster       Fr/Rel= Friend/Relative
       Cal = Calendar of Events       NA = No answer

Results indicated that 86% of all respondents had attended at least one concert in the past 12 months. The median number of concerts attended was determined for each age group at each concert, and the medians were averaged to determine the mean number of concerts attended in the past 12 months. The average number of concerts ranged from 3 (in the under 18 age group) to 10 (in the 65 and over age group) and the total mean was 5 (see Table 7).

Table 7 also shows attendance patterns for various types of concerts by age group. Overall, the four types of concerts most frequently attended by audience members were classical (30%), concert band (19%), jazz (14%), and rock (11%). This ranking held consistently across all age groups with only a few exceptions. For example, in the under 18 and 18-25 age groups, classical and concert band were the two most frequently attended types of concerts, then came rock, jazz, then pop music.
In the 26-35 age group, jazz concerts were attended more frequently than concert band concerts (20% and 10%), and attendance at opera and rock performances was the same (9%). Not surprisingly, in the 51-64 and 65 and over age groups, attendance at rock concerts was very low, and the fourth category (replacing rock) was opera.

Pop music concerts were attended most by the under 18 age group. The "other" category included marching band, ethnic music, heavy metal, funk and thrash, and comprised an average of only 3% of the performances attended. Attendance was lowest at country and western music performances (2%).

Table 7
Concert Attendance Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th># Con</th>
<th>Cls</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>Flk</th>
<th>Jz</th>
<th>Op</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Rk</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Cls = Classical, CB = Concert Band, CW = Country & Western, Flk = Folk, Jz = Jazz, Op = Opera, Rk = Rock, Oth = Other, NA = No answer

Patrons were asked how frequently they attended School of Music concerts. Twenty-nine percent of respondents indicated they attend often or very often (see
Table 8). Thirty-one percent said they attend occasionally, and a total of thirty-six percent indicated they rarely attend. Many of those who said they rarely attend indicated in their written comments that they were there for the first time.

Attending School of Music concerts very often was highest for the 26-35 age group (18%), and lowest for under 18 (2%) and 65 and over (6%). The majority of respondents who indicated they attend performances often, centered around the 36-50 and 51-64 age groups (21% and 22%). In general, attendance appeared to increase with age. For example 63% of respondents under age 18 indicated they rarely attend the performances, compared to 38% of the 26-35 age group and 28% of the 65 and over age group. Occasional attendance also showed an increase from 26% in the under 18 group to 40% in the 65 and over group.

Table 8

**Attendance at School of Music Concerts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: NA = No answer
Respondents were asked to indicate their level of enjoyment of the concert on a scale of 1 (very much) to 5 (not much). The majority (78%) gave the concerts an enjoyment rating of a 1 or 2. Only a total of 3% indicated they did not enjoy the concert (2% giving it a rating of a 4, and 1% a 5). These trends were consistent over the age groups. These ratings yielded a mean level of enjoyment of 1.70 over all age groups (see Table 9). The lowest level of enjoyment was 2.50 in the group that did not give their age. In general, the level of enjoyment shows a slight increase with age, from 1.80 (under 18) to 1.44 (65 and over).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale:  

1 Very Much  
2 3 4 5 Not Much

Patrons were asked the question, "To what extent do you think that a brief, pre-concert talk on tonight's program would have increased your enjoyment and appreciation of the music?" Forty-seven percent of all respondents felt that it definitely or probably would have increased their enjoyment and appreciation, while
only 20% thought that it definitely or probably would not have made a difference. Nineteen percent were undecided. The percentage of those undecided decreased with age, from 35% in the under 18 age group, to 15% in the 65 and over age group (see Table 10).

Positive responses to this question (answers of definitely and probably) were lowest in the under 18 age group (26%), and highest in the 36-50 and 51-64 age groups (55% and 54%).

Table 10
Receptivity to Idea of Pre-Concert Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Prob Not</th>
<th>Def Not</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Prob Not = Probably not       Def Not = Definitely not       NA = No answer

The majority of the respondents (76%) included their name and address in order to be entered in the raffle drawing. Names were checked to be sure each patron returned only one survey per concert. No provisions (other than looking at the name, if provided) were made for identifying multiple attenders across concerts.
Student Information

The majority of students (94%) were full-time, with the highest percentage of full-time students in the 18-25 and 26-35 age groups. The majority of students in the 36-50 age groups were part-time (see Table 11).

Students were also asked if they were in a degree program. This question was dropped from the survey due to apparent misunderstanding of the question. Some students may have thought that the question asked if they currently had a degree from the university.

Table 11 also shows the distribution of students by rank in school. There is a decline in attendance with the age of the students. Freshman and sophomores each comprised 26% of the student respondents. This declined to 18% for juniors, 16% for seniors, and only 8% for graduate students. This decline in the upper ranks cannot be explained by the proportional distribution across ranks within the university, as reported by the university registrar's office (Autumn quarter, 1990 enrollment figures: freshman = 11,488 [23%]; sophomore = 9311 [19%]; junior = 8305 [17%]; senior = 9841 [20%]; graduate = 10,228 [21%]).
Table 11

Student Hours and Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: FR = Freshman   SO = Sophomore   JR = Junior
      SR = Senior       GR = Graduate    NA = No answer

The majority of students lived in an apartment or house (55%), and 41% lived in a residence halls (see Table 12). The percentage of residents of fraternities or sororities was even lower (3%).
Table 12

Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Res Hall</th>
<th>Frat/Sor</th>
<th>Apt/House</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:  Res Hall = Residence Hall  Frat/Sor = Fraternity/Sorority
       Apt/House = Apartment/House  NA = No answer

When asked if attending the concert satisfied a class requirement, 39% said "yes" (see Table 13). Fifty-eight percent those attended to satisfy a requirement for Music 141 (a music appreciation class for nonmusic majors), and 21% attended to satisfy a requirement for a music studio (private lessons or ensembles primarily for music majors). Eleven percent attended to satisfy a requirement for Music 270 (fundamentals of music for elementary education majors).
Table 13

**Student Concert Attendance Requirement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>270</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:  NA = No answer     141 = Music Appreciation
       270 = Fundamentals of Music for Elementary Education Majors

Students were asked to state their academic major. Answers were categorized according to the University's organization of Instructional Units (The Ohio State University Bulletin, 1990-91, pp. 437-439). Table 14 shows that the largest numbers of students surveyed were from the College of the Arts and the College of Engineering (19% each). The numbers decreased by almost half to 10% each for the College of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, the College of Business, and the College of Education. The smallest percentage of students came from The College of Dentistry, International Affairs, and The Colleges of Optometry and Social Work (<1% each).
Table 14

Student Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Written Comments

Space was provided on the survey for written comments. Approximately 50% of the respondents wrote comments. The topics covered include the quality of the
performance, programming, nonmusical aspects of the experience such as the appearance of the ensemble, the temperature of the auditorium, patron behavior, and reactions to the performance and the idea of a pre-concert talk. The distribution of topics and positive and negative comments were fairly evenly distributed across all concerts. Following is a summary of the written comments across all concerts.

Comments on the quality of the performance ranged from very general comments to highly specific, technical comments on tone color, intonation, and blend of the various ensembles. The vast majority of the comments were positive: "Wonderful!" "Awesome!" "OSU concerts are a wonderful gift to the community." "Thank you for a lovely evening of music!" "The concerts here are always outstanding." "I particularly liked the fact that the performers were college students. I think it was impressive to see how good they all were."

Many individuals were attending a School of Music concert for the first time, and the experience was positive: "This was my 1st OSU concert and I want to see them again." "Powerful--I have never been to an orchestra concert--I loved it!" "Required or not, I will definitely attend again!" "I plan to attend as often as possible."

Some respondents also provided written comments pertaining to their enjoyment of the concert. It is interesting to note that reasons for a lower rating on their enjoyment of the concert were often nonmusical (e.g., the temperature of the auditorium, seating did not begin soon enough, there were not enough programs, etc.).

A substantial number of comments reflected concern over other concertgoers' behavior. Many people felt that the audience was too noisy, and were disturbed when patrons entered and left the auditorium during the performance. Other areas for improvement in concert behavior were also observed. One person
wrote, "Once the man and woman in front of me stopped making out, I enjoyed the concert very much." It was suggested that tips on basic concert etiquette be provided.

It is interesting to note, that while some listeners did not care for a particular genre of ensemble, they did acknowledge that the quality of the performance was good. For example: "Not my favorite type of music [instrumental] but the group played really well." Sometimes the patron had decided that "this type of music just isn't for me."

Many comments were directed at the survey question regarding the possibility of a pre-concert talk. Some negative comments about pre-concert talks appeared to be due to preconceived notions or unfortunate prior experiences with pre-concert talks: "I hate any pre-concert talks." "I like to form my own opinions about the music and what I think it means." "It would ruin the mood--we aren't children." Perhaps the most classic example of an unfortunate concept of a pre-concert talk was provided by a male student in the 18-25 age group: "I came to listen to music, not to be bored to death by the unconscious rambling of some nerd in a penguin suit."

Many negative comments were based on misunderstanding or lack of information. Some individuals were not sure what would be said at such a talk. Still others did not understand that the talk would be held before the concert started. They were afraid that the talk would begin at the concert time, making the concert unbearably long.

The majority of the comments regarding the idea of a pre-concert talk were positive across all age groups. Many comments had to do with the idea of acquiring more information in order to enhance understanding and enjoyment. "Further knowledge makes anything more enjoyable." "It would be very helpful and vital to our enjoyment and understanding of music in general." "I feel a bit of background
always helps. Not everyone is familiar with this music." "This would give an excellent preview and would enhance the concert's meaning." Even trained musicians felt a talk would be beneficial: "I'm a musician, but would enjoy the talk and hope others can do so and increase their appreciation." Some individuals felt that, as a learning institution, the university should provide educational talks: "Such talks are a responsibility of the university to the community." "After all, this is a School of Music."

Other comments centered around the personal touch that a talk can give to a concert. "It makes the performers and conductor seem more human." "A talk relaxes the audience and shows the personality of the conductor." "A lecture makes it more personable."

In one instance, a pre-concert talk was given by the conductor at the beginning of the concert. Responses to the talk were positive. "The talk did contribute to my appreciation and enjoyment." "The talk helped enhance the music." One parent of a student wrote that his daughter usually gave the family some background on the pieces to be performed and that it did enhance the meaning of the music.

Along similar lines, there were many positive comments on the use of program notes. In general, it was felt that program notes provided information that enhanced the concert experience. Opinions were fairly evenly divided on whether program notes or a pre-concert talk would be a better means of providing information, and whether or not to provide both a talk and program notes.

Specific comments and suggestions were made regarding pre-concert talks. It was pointed out that the success of a pre-concert talk depends, in part, on the competency of the speaker, the content of the material and the particular program presented. In general, suggestions for the pre-concert talk included presenting it 20 to
30 minutes before the concert, keeping it brief, interesting, unique, slightly amusing, and not highly didactic. Patrons indicated interest in knowing some history or background of the piece and the composer. They also would like to know more about the performers and conductors (biographical sketches, recent honors, recognitions, etc.). Others indicated interest in being told what to listen and look for in the music in order to appreciate it more.

Analysis of the Audience for Each Concert

Results of the analysis of data for each concert is provided in Appendix G. Only highlights of the results will be given in this chapter. Results indicate that females comprised a larger percentage of audience members than did males (56% and 43% respectively). There were especially large differences in the number of male and female audience members at three concerts: Concert Band (61% female, 38% male); University Band (65% female, 34% male); and Choir/Chorale (62% female, 36% male).

The 18-25 age group accounted for over 50% of the responses at each concert except four: the two Jazz concerts (44% and 33%), Glee Clubs (31%), and Choir/Chorale (24%). The under 18 age group constituted only two to six percent of responses at all concerts with the exception of the Glee Club Concert (14%).

With only one exception, the percentage of audience members from the 26-35 age group was consistently lower than the 18-25 and 51-64 age groups. The largest percentages of the 26-35 age group were seen at the two jazz concerts (16% and 15%). The largest percentages of the 36-50 and 51-64 age groups were seen at the Choir/Chorale concert (31% and 25%), and for the 65 and over age group, the largest percentage was seen at the Jazz Lab Ensemble Concert (14%).
The percentage of student responses was highest at the performances of the Wind Ensemble (71%), University Chorus (61%), and the first Orchestra concert (61%). The percentage of relatives was highest at the Choir/Chorale (46%) and University Band (40%) concerts. The percentage of visitors was highest at the Jazz Lab Ensemble and the Glee Club Concerts (41% and 36%). Faculty and staff responses ranged from 1 to 8%. Participation of this group was lowest at the two primarily nonmusic major performances, University Band and University Chorus.

The mean number of concerts attended in the past twelve months was highest for patrons at the at the Wind Ensemble and Wind Ensemble/Concert Band concerts ($X = 9$ and $10$) and at both Orchestra concerts ($X = 7$).

Across all concerts, the five most frequently attended types of concerts were classical, concert band, jazz, opera, and rock. Perhaps not surprisingly, patrons attending the various band concerts indicated the highest rate of attendance at band concerts, and the patrons attending the two jazz concerts showed the highest attendance rate at jazz concerts. Patrons attending the choral concerts indicated a high level of attendance at classical music events, especially those at the Choir/Chorale and University Chorus concerts. While attendance at classical music events was high for patrons of orchestra concerts, it was not noticeably higher than for other categories.

Patrons were asked how frequently they attended School of Music concerts. The highest percentages were reported by the audience members at the Concert Band concert (48%), and the Wind Ensemble/Concert Band concert (46%). These individuals indicated they attended School of Music concerts often or very often. The lowest percentages were seen at the University Band and Jazz Lab Ensemble concerts (14% each).
When patrons were asked if a brief, pre-concert talk would have increased their enjoyment and appreciation of the concert the response was positive. A total of 48% indicated that it definitely or probably would increase their enjoyment and appreciation, 15% were unsure, and 18% thought that it definitely or probably would not help. The highest percentage of positive response (definitely and probably) was seen at the Wind Ensemble (74%) and Choir/Chorale Concerts (64%).

Results of the Arts Outreach Survey

Participants in the arts outreach program attended a pre-concert talk prior to one of seven School of Music large ensemble concerts at the Ohio State University during Winter quarter, 1991. Concerts included performances by the Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Concert and Symphonic Bands, Jazz Ensemble, Jazz Lab Ensemble, and the Men's Glee Club.

A pre-concert talk (20-30 minutes in length) was held 45 minutes prior to each of the seven concerts. Additional talks for five of the seven concerts were held in class or at a meeting of a student group. A total of 11 talks were given, and attendance at these talks ranged from 2 to 41 (see Table 15).
Table 15

Attendance at Pre-Concert Talks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>In Class</th>
<th>At Meeting</th>
<th>Prior to Concert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ensemble</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert-Symphonic Bands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ensemble</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ensemble</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee Club</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N = 90</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total N = 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the concert, participants completed a survey which provided demographic data on the respondents as well as their reactions to, and suggestions for, the arts outreach program (see Appendix E). It is not known if all participants who attended the pre-concert talk also attended the concert. Therefore, an exact survey return rate cannot be determined. A total of 233 people attended the pre-concert talks. Survey responses totalled 119, providing an overall return rate of approximately 51%.

Results are given by concert. Table 16 shows the number of responses, the percentage of total responses, and gender of the respondents. Results indicate that, overall, females constituted a higher percentage of responses (58%) than did males (42%). The only concerts in which males comprised a larger percentage of respondents were the two orchestra concerts. Male and female participation was evenly divided (50%/50%) at the Concert and Symphonic Band concert.
Table 16

**Number and Gender of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>% Responses</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean:</strong> 58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

**Code:**
- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands
- Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- # Responses = Number of responses
- % Responses = Percent of total responses
- NA = No answer

Table 17 shows the age of the respondents. Since the study targeted the university’s student population, it is not surprising that eighty-one percent of respondents were in the 18-25 age group. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents were students. All respondents ages 18-50 (95%) were students. Of the respondents over age 50 (5%), one was a student, and two were visitors to the campus. One was a retired member of the international co-ed service fraternity, Alpha Phi Omega.
Table 17

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-50</th>
<th>51-64</th>
<th>65 &amp; over</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
NA = No answer
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands
Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble

Table 18 shows the distribution of responses by student rank. The majority were juniors (34%), followed by seniors (26%), and sophomores (25%). This distribution is probably related to the level of the targeted music courses.
Table 18

Student Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Glee</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble  FR = Freshman  SO = Sophomore  SR = Senior  GR = Junior  NA = No answer

The majority (78%) of the participants lived in an apartment or house (see Table 19). As in the audience analysis survey, the number of residents of fraternities or sororities was low (4%).
Table 19

Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Residence Hall</th>
<th>Frat/Sor</th>
<th>Apt/House</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
      Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
      Frat/Sor = Fraternity/Sorority  
      NA = No answer

Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands  
      Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
      Apt/House = Apartment House

Eighty-four percent of the respondents attended the concert for a class requirement (see Table 20). The majority (48%) attended to satisfy a requirement for Music 270 (fundamentals of music for elementary education majors). Twenty-one percent attended for Music 141 (music appreciation). Seventeen percent attended for Music 370 (the second in the series of music methods for elementary education majors), and 14% for Music 591 (Music Industry). The 16% who did not attend the concert for a class requirement were members of student social, professional, or service groups, or friends of the participants. Exact figures cannot be determined since most of these respondents did not indicate their affiliation.
Table 20

Student Concert Attendance Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>270</th>
<th>370</th>
<th>591</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands
Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble
141 = Music Appreciation
270 = Fundamentals of Music for Elementary Education Majors
370 = Music Methods for Elementary Education Majors
591 = Music Industry

The mean number of minutes taken to get to each concert is shown in Table 21. The median number of minutes was determined for each age group at each concert. These scores were then averaged to produce a mean number of minutes for each of the seven concerts. The number of minutes to the concert ranged from 10 to 17 and the mean for all the concerts was 12.

Respondents were also asked if it was easy to get to the concert site, answering on a scale from 1 (very easy) to 5 (very difficult). The mean scores ranged from 1.28 for the Men’s Glee Club concert, to 2.88 for the Jazz Ensemble concert (due to blizzard conditions that evening). The mean for all the concerts was 1.77 (see Table 21).
Table 21

Minutes to Concert Site & Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Minutes to Site (Mean)</th>
<th>Accessibility (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ensemble</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert &amp; Symphonic Bands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ensemble</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ensemble</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee Club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale (Accessibility): 1 Very Easy 2 3 4 5 Difficult

Table 22 shows attendance patterns at concerts. Respondents were asked how many concerts they had attended in the past twelve months. As in the number of minutes taken to get to the concert, medians were determined by age group for each concert, then averaged to produce a mean number for each concert. The mean number of concerts ranged from 2 to 5, and the total mean was 3.

The four types of concerts most frequently attended were similar to the findings for the 18-25 age group on the audience analysis survey. This time, however, rock led (23%), followed by classical (21%), concert band (14%), jazz (12%), and pop (9%).

Attendance at classical concerts was lowest for respondents at the Men’s Glee Club Concert (14%). Surprisingly, reported attendance at concert band concerts was lowest among respondents at the Wind Ensemble Concert (8%) and the Concert and Symphonic Bands Concert (9%). A significantly higher number of respondents (14%)
at the Men’s Glee Club concert reported attending folk concerts. Attendance at both opera and pop concerts was highest (18% each) among respondents at the Concert and Symphonic Bands concerts. Attendance at rock concerts was highest among respondents at the Wind Ensemble concert (38%) and lowest at the the Concert and Symphonic Bands concert (9%).

Table 22

Concert Attendance Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th># Con</th>
<th>Cls</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>Flk</th>
<th>Jz</th>
<th>Op</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Rk</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Glee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: #Con = Mean number of concerts  
Cls = Classical  
CB = Concert Band  
CW = Country & Western  
Flk = Folk  
Jz = Jazz  
Op = Opera  
Rk = Rock  
Oth = Other  
Orch = Orchestra  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble

Respondents were also asked how many other types of arts events they had attended in the last twelve months (e.g., dance, drama). The median number of other arts events ranged from zero to two, with a mean of 1 (see Table 23).
Table 23 also shows attendance patterns at arts events on and off campus. Overall, more respondents (52%) attended arts events off campus, than on (40%). The only two concerts at which respondents indicated attending more concerts on campus were the Concert and Symphonic Bands concert (83% on and 17% off) and the second orchestra concert (50% on and 45% off).

When asked if they preferred attending arts events on campus, 59% indicated "yes," 11% said "no," and 20% had no preference (see Table 23). The primary reasons given for preferring to attend arts events on campus include easy accessibility, short distance, and low cost (or free). Other reasons include convenience, socializing with other students, and the scope and quality of performances.

Reasons given for preferring to attend arts event off campus include not living on or near campus, and the campus not offering the type of concert the student wanted to hear (the type of concert was not specified). Many students expressed no preference, indicating that it depends on the event. If they are really interested in the event they will attend regardless of where it is held.
Table 23

Attendance at Other (nonmusic) Arts Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>#AE</th>
<th>Attend On</th>
<th>Attend Off</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Pref On</th>
<th>Pref Off</th>
<th>No Pref</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:  #AE = Median number of Arts Events  Pref On = Prefer On Campus  
       Pref Off = Prefer Off Campus  No Pref = No Preference  
       Attend On = Attend on Campus  Attend Off = Attend Off Campus  
       Orch = Orchestra  Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
       Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands  Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
       Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble

Table 24 shows the publicity sources from which the respondents usually receive information on arts events. As in the audience analysis survey, the majority (23%) received information from a friend or relative. Nineteen percent received information from the campus newspaper (the Lantern), and 14% received information from the city newspaper (the Dispatch). Posters and flyers accounted for 15% of the publicity information as did a calendar of events from an arts organization.

Sources of information varied among the concerts. The percentage of respondents who received information from the Dispatch was highest at the Jazz Lab Ensemble concert (28%) and the Concert and Symphonic Bands concert (27%). The Men’s Glee Club concert showed the highest percentage of respondents who received
information from the *Lantern* (26%). The percentage of respondents who received information from other newspapers was highest at the Concert and Symphonic Bands concert (20%).

The percentage of respondents who received information from a poster or flyer was highest at both orchestra concerts (23% and 19%). The second orchestra concert also had the highest percentage of respondents who received information from the School of Music marquee (10%). The highest percentage of respondents who received information from a calendar of events was seen at the Wind Ensemble Concert (24%).

Table 24

Publicity Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Lant</th>
<th>Oth New</th>
<th>P/F</th>
<th>Marquee</th>
<th>Fr/Rel</th>
<th>Cal</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:

- Dis = *Dispatch*
- Lant = *Lantern*
- Oth New = *Other Newspapers*
- P/F = *Poster/Flyer*
- Fr/Rel = *Friend/Relative*
- Cal = *Calendar of Events*
- NA = *No answer*
- Orch = *Orchestra*
- Wind Ens = *Wind Ensemble*
- Jazz Ens = *Jazz Ensemble*
Participants were asked to rate their level of enjoyment of the concert on a scale of 1 (very much) to 5 (not much). Table 25 shows that mean scores ranged from 1.50 for Concert and Symphonic Bands to 2.44 for Wind Ensemble, and the overall mean was 1.89.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concert</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ensemble</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert and Symphonic Bands</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ensemble</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ensemble</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee Club</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mean</strong></td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were also asked about the effect of the pre-concert talk on their enjoyment of the concert (see Table 26). Seventy-seven percent indicated that the talk definitely or probably contributed to their enjoyment of the concert. Among individual concerts, the percentage of positive answers (definitely and probably) was highest at the first orchestra concert (100%) and the Wind Ensemble concert (100%), and lowest at the Jazz Lab Ensemble concert (52%).
Table 26

Effect of Pre-Concert Talk on Enjoyment of Concert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Prob Not</th>
<th>Def Not</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Prob Not = Probably not  Def Not = Definitely not  
NA = No answer  Orch = Orchestra  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble

Respondents were asked if they would have enjoyed the concert just as much without the pre-concert talk (see Table 27). Fifty-eight percent indicated that they definitely or probably would have enjoyed it just as much, 23% were not sure, and 29% thought they definitely or probably would not have enjoyed it as much. Among individual concerts, the percentage that felt they would have enjoyed the concert just as much without the talk was highest at the Men’s Glee Club concert (71%), the two jazz concerts (65% and 64%), and the second orchestra concert (65%). These results perhaps reflect generalized positive perceptions of the concerts rather than misgivings about the value of a pre-concert talk.
Table 27

**Enjoyment Without Pre-Concert Talk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Prob Not</th>
<th>Def Not</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Prob Not = Probably not
Orch = Orchestra
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands

Def Not = Definitely not
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble

When asked if the pre-concert talk contributed to their understanding of the concert, 83% indicated that the talk definitely or probably contributed to their understanding (see Table 28). Percentages of positive answers (definitely or probably) were highest at the Wind Ensemble concert (100%) and the first Orchestra concert (96%), and lowest at the Jazz Lab Ensemble Concert (68%).
Table 28

Effect of Pre-Concert Talk on Understanding of Concert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Prob Not</th>
<th>Def Not</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Glee</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Prob Not = Probably not  
Def Not = Definitely not  
NA = No Answer

Orch = Orchestra  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands

Participants were also asked if the talk contributed to their feeling comfortable as audience member (see Table 29). Seventy-two percent thought that it definitely or probably helped them to feel comfortable, and 21% thought it probably or definitely did not. Positive responses (definitely or probably) were highest at the Wind Ensemble Concert (91%), and the first Orchestra concert (88%) and were lowest at the second Orchestra concert (55%) and the Men’s Glee Club concert (57%).
Table 29

Effect of Pre-Concert Talk on Feeling Comfortable as an Audience Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Prob Not</th>
<th>Def Not</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch #1</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch #2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Glee</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Prob Not = Probably not  Def Not = Definitely not  NA = No answer
Orch = Orchestra  Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands  NA = No Answer

Participants were asked their preference for the location of the pre-concert talk (see Table 30). The majority (46%) indicated on-site, and 38% in class. Among individual concerts, the percentage desiring the pre-concert talk in class was highest at the two jazz concerts and the second orchestra concert. This may be due to the fact that one of the talks for each of these programs was offered during class time.
Table 30
Preference for Location of Pre-Concert Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bands</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Glee</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Orch = Orchestra  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
Bands = Concert & Symphonic Bands  
Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
NA = No Answer

When asked if they would participate in a similar experience 84% indicated “yes,” and only 16% “no.” For those not interested in, or able to, participate again, the most common reason given was lack of time. Other reasons include already having good knowledge of music (therefore not feeling they need a pre-concert talk), or not enjoying a particular type of music. Only one person said that he felt that the music “was way above my level of music appreciation.”

A variety of reasons were given for those wishing to participate in a similar experience. These can be divided into four main categories (1) they enjoyed and liked it, and thought it was fun; (2) it was informative, educational; (3) the information allowed them to enjoy the concert more; and (4) the pre-concert talk prepared them for the concert and reduced apprehension and stress. Following are some
representative comments: "I really felt better knowing about what I was going to hear. I found this experience very enlightening." "I want to expose myself and my family to a wide variety of entertainment." "Love concerts! Enjoyed the personalizing effect of the pre-concert talk." "The talk helped me to understand some basic ideas that made the experience more interesting." "Very enjoyable and most educational for a non-musician who loves the arts." Even a trained musician gained insight into a genre of music he was not familiar with: "Being a jazz studies major, I know nothing about the etiquette and proper settings for a symphony concert. At least now I feel as if I can deal with the concert and the people attending it."

Respondents were asked what aspect of the pre-concert talk they found most enjoyable. The most frequently mentioned aspect was the historical and background information on the music and composers. Other frequently mentioned aspects include tips on concert etiquette, being told what to expect (from knowing what to wear, to knowing when to clap), the speaker and the atmosphere of the talk. "Learning about the music on the program made me anxious to hear it." "The man who gave the talk was a very good speaker. He was very enthusiastic and related well with our group." "I would have been completely lost without it [talk]. I felt a lot more comfortable." "The speaker was very at ease (charming) and made me feel as such throughout the concert."

When asked what aspect of the pre-concert talk they would change, many responded that they would not change a thing. A very small portion of the respondents felt that the concert etiquette and general information portions of the talk were unnecessary because they already knew the information. Only one speaker received unfavorable feedback from a group, however, even this criticism was worded constructively. They felt that the speaker should have been more
enthusiastic and more knowledgeable. They could sense that the speaker was uncomfortable with the program and did not have a thorough knowledge of the instrumental genre.

Most suggestions for change, however, reflected a desire for more detailed information. The most common suggestion was to include even more information and greater detail on both the music and the performers. It was also recommended that the talk start earlier, so it could last a little longer (45 minutes), and provide time for more discussion at the end. Respondents also thought it would be helpful to have handouts with the highlights of the talk, and concert programs available at the pre-concert talk.

Participants were asked what suggestions they had for the entire experience (the pre-concert talk and the concert). Among the suggestions provided were beginning the talk earlier, providing more detailed information, holding the pre-concert talk in the same building as the concert, and publicizing the talks more. The majority felt it was fine, and did not have any suggestions for improvement. This space was most often utilized for positive comments on the experience. “I suggest definitely continuing the pre-concert talks; they enable the audience to appreciate the concert itself a little more.” “I’ll be attending more. It was a very enjoyable, relaxing, thrilling experience. Excellent to have here, free, right on campus.”

The last question on the survey asked participants what would get them more involved in arts events on campus. A few respondents felt that nothing would get them more involved. They simply stated “nothing” in the space provided. Only one clearly indicated no interest: “I’m not really very interested in arts on campus, and I don’t really believe anything would change that.”

Some students found that concert attendance requirements for their classes sparked an interest in attending arts events in the future. “I guess it is just my own
motivation that is lacking, but the Mozart lecture and this concert I’ve attended for my class has increased my curiosity and interest.” “Because I was required to attend this concert I got to see that it is something I will like to go to as a non-requirement even in the future.”

The vast majority of respondents indicated that increased publicity of arts events would increase their participation. They felt that campus arts events need better coverage both on and off campus. They would like to see posters and flyers in buildings across campus, not just in the music buildings, more publicity in the Lantern, and more publicity in the Columbus city newspaper and the community.

Some emphasized the personal touch in communications and publicity. They would like to see more personal contact, perhaps a telephone publicity campaign, or members of the ensemble contacting groups and individuals to invite them to a concert.

Many students said that having friends who would also be interested in attending arts events would increase their participation. Having more free time was also mentioned.

Some individuals felt that if they had more knowledge of the art form or event, they would be more inclined to attend it and appreciate it. They felt the pre-concert talks were a positive step toward this goal.

Docents were not asked to formally evaluate their experience with the outreach program. However, the researcher did receive feedback from all docents through informal conversations.

Overall, the docents felt it was a positive experience. They thought the outreach program was a worthwhile project, and were enthusiastic about participating in it. Most docents appreciated the opportunity to present such a talk
and enjoyed the experience. All felt that they would be interested in participating again.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to design and implement an arts outreach/audience development program for school of music events at The Ohio State University that can also be a prototype for music and other areas of the performing arts (e.g., drama and dance) at other colleges and universities. Auxiliary purposes of the study included (1) compiling a profile of patrons of School of Music large ensemble concerts, and (2) providing an opportunity for music education students to develop professional communication and interpersonal skills.

An audience analysis survey was conducted at 12 School of Music large ensemble concerts at The Ohio State University, during autumn quarter, 1990. The twelve concerts were performed by the Symphony Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Concert, Symphonic, and University Bands, Jazz Ensemble, Jazz Lab Ensemble, Concert Choir, Chorale, Men's and Women's Glee Clubs, and University Chorus. Responses to the survey totalled 1764, and the overall return rate was approximately 48%.

The following quarter, the researcher implemented an arts outreach program. This program provided a brief, pre-concert talk prior to seven School of Music large ensemble concerts during Winter quarter, 1991. The talks were informal and informative, not overly technical or didactic. The talks were given by advanced
ensemble concerts during Winter quarter, 1991. The talks were informal and informative, not overly technical or didactic. The talks were given by advanced undergraduates in music education who were trained by the researcher. Prior to giving the talk, the speakers practiced for a small group of their peers and were evaluated on 12 areas of effective teaching and communication.

Participants included two types of intact student groups on campus: (1) student social, professional or service organizations (such as the Human Ecology Club, the American Home Economics Association, and the international co-ed service fraternity, Alpha Phi Omega); and (2) music classes for nonmajors. Participation by social and professional organizations was very low due to prior commitments and schedule conflicts. The researcher contacted all the participants and arranged for pre-concert talks to be held at the group’s meeting place, in-class, or just prior to the concert.

Participants attended the pre-concert talk and the concert, and then were asked to complete a survey which provided demographic information as well as their reactions to the pre-concert talk and concert experience. It was not possible to determine an exact response rate since it was not known if all individuals who attended the pre-concert talk also attended the concert. Survey responses totalled 119, providing an overall return rate of approximately 51%.

Discussion of Results

Audience Analysis Survey

Overall, 86% of the survey respondents reported attending at least one concert in the last 12 months. The mean number of concerts attended by this group was 5. These figures are very high compared to the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (Robinson, 1987), in which almost 40% of respondents reported having attended at
least one live arts performance in the previous 12 months. Robinson surveyed a
cross section of the national population, obtaining information on attenders as well
as non-attenders. Attendance at performing arts events in the current study is
probably higher due to the survey being conducted at a concert (obtaining
information only from attenders), and the fact that it was conducted at a university.

Results of the audience analysis survey indicated that females comprised a
slightly larger percentage of the audience than did males (56% compared to 43%).
This is supported by previous research which indicates that the median male
percentage of the performing arts audience is 43% (DiMaggio, Useem, & Brown,
1977).

As expected, the percentage of students in the audience was quite high (53%).
However, student attendance showed a decline with increase in rank, from 26% for
freshmen and sophomores, to 18% for juniors, 16% for seniors, and 8% for graduate
students. This may be due to the fact that many older students often live further
from campus, and may not find it as convenient to return to campus for a concert.

It is interesting that 39% of the students said they were there to fulfill a class
requirement. Twenty-one percent of this group were music majors, attending for a
studio (performance class) requirement. It is not surprising that 58% of these
students were there to fulfill a requirement for a music appreciation class, since this
is a popular class which has nine sections, all of which are filled to capacity.

The percentage of students attending for a class requirement may reflect the
increase in concert attendance requirements for undergraduates enrolled in music in
general studies courses (College Music Society [cited in Kuhn & Sims, 1991]). The
concert attendance requirement for music in general studies courses may also help to
explain the decrease in student attendance with age, since these courses are usually
undergraduate level courses taken in the freshman and sophomore years.
It is surprising that the percentage of attendance by students in the College of the Arts and the College of Engineering was the same (19%). Informal observations by the researcher and others in music education, however, indicate that a high number of nonmusic major students who participate in music ensembles, or who have friends in ensembles, are from the engineering field.

After the Colleges of the Arts and Engineering, attendance rates dropped by almost half for the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and the Colleges of Business and Education. Attendance was even lower for students from the health fields. With the exception of Engineering, these findings parallel the trends seen in a survey conducted at The Ohio State University (CSEQ, 1986) that show a steady decrease in participation (although not as dramatic) from the arts to social sciences, business education and the health fields.

Examining occupations other than "student," it is clear that white collar workers constituted a greater percentage of the audience (30%) than did blue collar workers (2%). This again supports DiMaggio Useem, and Brown (1977), who found that professionals constituted 56% of employed persons in the average arts audience, and blue collar workers only 4%.

These findings generally support a study done at the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts at the University of Illinois (Nielsen, Nielsen, & McQueen, 1974). The study found that the core audience at most performing arts events at the center on campus included students, professionals, teachers, and people with at least some graduate education.

Since the concerts took place on a university campus, it is not surprising that the 18-25 age group comprised the largest percentage of audience members (47%). However, when comparing the total number of students responses to the survey (856) to the total student body at the main campus of The Ohio State University
(54,094), the percentage of involvement is actually quite low (<1%). This may not be surprising considering the findings of a survey of undergraduate students on The Ohio State University campus in 1986, which found that approximately 52% of all students (freshman through senior) had never attended a musical event on campus in the past 12 months (CSEQ, 1986).

Examining the results of the audience analysis survey by concert, one sees that the 18-25 age group comprised 50% or more of the audience at all concerts except the two jazz concerts and two of the choral concerts (Choir/Chorale and the Men’s Glee Club). Overall, these concerts had a noticeably higher number of visitors than any other concert (except the orchestra concerts). It would appear that the orchestra, jazz, and choir concerts attract more community members than do other concerts.

There was an unusually high percentage of students at the Wind Ensemble, University Chorus, and first Orchestra concerts. There is no apparent explanation for this except possibly the timing of concert attendance reports for class.

The next largest age group was the 36-50 age group, which comprised 20% of the audience. This group makes up a substantial portion of the audience at School of Music concerts, and they reported that they attend these events often.

The 26-35 age group comprised only a small percentage of the audience (9%). This may be due to people in this age group having young children at home. It is interesting to note that although this group did not comprise a large portion of the audience, it reported the highest percentage of attending School of Music concerts very often (18%).

If one excludes the under 18 and 18-25 age groups, the pattern of participation is as follows: 26-35 (9%), 36-50 (20%), 51-64 (12%) and 65 and over (6%). Due to age groupings, it is not possible to determine the median age of the average patron (excluding those 25 and under), but it is probably close to 35-40 years of age.
DiMaggio, Useem and Brown (1977) cited 35 as the median age of attenders at performing arts events, and 40 as the median age for Americans 16 or older.

The decline in participation from the 36-50 age group to the 51-64 group, and the low participation of the 65 and over age group probably reflect the nationwide trend of older audiences attending arts events less frequently.

In examining the participants' relationships to the university, the large percentage of students is not surprising. What is somewhat surprising, is the high attendance by relatives (25%). The number of relatives combined with the average number of minutes taken to get to the concert (29) might indicate that many students at the university are from nearby suburbs and towns.

The percentage of visitors to the campus was 20%. This category includes community members. The number of visitors was highest at the Men's Glee Club Concert, probably due to publicity for recently having won a choral award (Choir of the World, International Music Eisteddfod, Llangollen, Wales).

Given the central location of the university and Weigel Hall, the relative ease of accessibility by car, foot, or bus, and no admission charge, it seems that the number of visitors could easily be greater. One might expect, however, that community attendance at campus arts events would be lower at a university in a metropolitan area that has a variety of sophisticated arts offerings in a downtown area, than at a university that is some distance from a large metropolitan area or is in a rural town or relatively isolated area. For example, the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts at the University of Illinois in Urbana, is the primary source of performing arts events for people in the towns of Champaign and Urbana, Illinois (Nielsen, Nielsen, & McQueen, 1974).

Another factor that may influence visitor attendance at campus arts events is the source of publicity information. The majority of all survey respondents received
information from a friend or relative. Although major sources of publicity will vary with communities, this finding is supported by previous research which indicates that most information on arts events comes from word of mouth (Hanneman & Weinberg, 1977; Tauber & Weissenberg, 1971).

This "word-of-mouth advertising" is highest among the under 18 age group and the two groups with the highest percentage of relatives (36-50 and 51-64). It would seem that word of mouth advertising would be more prominent in the "university community" on and near campus, and among relatives than in the metropolitan area at large.

Posters and the School of Music marquee comprised the next highest percentage of publicity information (due to the high number of student responses). Again, this is strictly campus-oriented advertising. In fact, it is even more contained, since most flyers are usually posted only in the two music buildings. It is rare for posters for free, School of Music performances to be displayed off campus.

Sources of common off-campus advertising include the city newspaper, the Columbus Dispatch, arts and entertainment newspapers such as Columbus Alive, and The Other Paper, and radio. The information received from the Dispatch increased with age from 2% for the 18-25 age group, to 31% for the 65 and over age group. This is supported by Strang and Gutman (1980) who state that newspapers are most likely to be read by older, well-educated groups.

Another source of information for the community is the Calendar of Events put out by the arts communications office at the university. The overall percentage of respondents receiving information from this calendar is small. It is interesting to note, however, that the percentage of individuals receiving information from this source is two times higher for the 26-35 age group than for any other group.
The two most frequently mentioned sources of information from non-student respondents were word-of-mouth and the city newspaper. This is similar to findings of a study conducted in the University of California, Los Angeles community (Scalberg [cited in Strang and Gutman, 1980]). The study found that newspapers were the most important source of information about entertainment events, followed by word-of-mouth, then brochures, magazines, and radio and television.

The mean number of concerts attended in the past 12 months by the 65 and over age group was more than twice that of any other age group. This may be an indication of increased leisure time as one gets older (retired, semi-retired). Although the percentage of the 65 and over age group in audiences at School of Music concerts was small, they reported attending many concerts. This may be an indication of a small core of active arts patrons in this age group.

The four types of concerts most often attended across almost all age groups were classical, concert band, jazz, and rock. This is supported by research on artistic preference. Studies have found that there are at least five major types of activities that appeal to particular market segments: theater, classical music, contemporary music, voice, and dance (Strang and Gutman, 1980). Subgroups of contemporary music include jazz, band and rock. The subgroups of classical music are similar to those listed in the audience analysis survey: symphony, chamber music and instrumental recitals.

The results indicate that patrons who attend one of the events (whether classical or jazz) also attend other "main" types of musical events such as concert band and opera concerts. This is supported by the 1985 Survey of Participation in the Arts which found that, in general, people who attend one of the seven types of core arts events are considerably more likely to attend each of the others. The study
further states that there is considerable overlap rather than a pattern of segmentation of the arts audience into jazz fans, opera lovers, etc.

One finding of the current study suggests that while patrons may exhibit cross-over behavior, some remain loyal to a particular type of performing arts event. It was interesting to note that patrons attending the various band concerts indicated the highest rate of attendance at band concerts, and patrons attending the two jazz concerts indicated the highest attendance rate at jazz concerts. While attendance at classical music events was high for patrons of orchestra concerts, it was not significantly higher than for other groups. This may be due to a lack of other, known opportunities to hear live concert band and jazz music, and greater knowledge of the other orchestral offerings in the community such as the Columbus Symphony or the Pro Musica Chamber Orchestra.

The highest number of those who reported that they attended School of Music concerts often was seen at the concert Band and Wind Ensemble/Concert Band concerts and was lowest at the University band and jazz concerts. This may be due to a greater number of concerts of the concert band genre (i.e., wind ensemble, concert and symphonic bands) being offered per quarter than of the jazz bands. Also, the audiences at the University Band concerts tend to be mostly friends and relatives of performers.

Seventy-eight percent of all survey respondents gave a high rating (1 or 2) when evaluating their enjoyment of the concert. It is interesting to note that the levels of enjoyment were high, although many individuals were experiencing a particular genre of music for the first time. This speaks well of the quality of performance and programming of the performing groups. The general increase of enjoyment with age may indicate increased exposure to, or acceptance of a variety of music.
The majority of respondents responded positively to the question regarding the possibility of a pre-concert talk. Those who responded positively often indicated that they felt it would help because it would provide information that would enhance the experience. Their desire for more information is supported by previous research that found that information about the experience prior to the event may increase the patrons’ understanding and enjoyment of the event (Andreasen and Belk, 1980; Houston Symphony; Guthrie Theater, [cited in Morrison and Dalgleish, 1987]).

The highest percentage of a positive response to the pre-concert talk was seen at the Wind Ensemble concert. This may be the least familiar genre to the average audience, therefore requiring more explanation. The positive response was also high at the Choir and Chorale concert. This may be due to lack of experience with more formal choral music, and the fact that some songs are not sung in English.

Those who expressed negative opinions about the pre-concert talk perhaps reflected in their comments unfortunate preconceived notions of, or previous bad experiences with pre-concert talks.

The increase of positive responses with age may be due simply to “life experience.” In other words, having had more experience and finding that further knowledge does indeed increase enjoyment and understanding.

The section on comments was generally taken quite seriously by the respondents. The researcher received the impression that people enjoyed the opportunity to express themselves and wanted to make the most of it. Overall, the comments were positive. The negative comments on aspects that respondents felt detracted from the experience are generally easily remedied. For example, opening the doors to begin seating sooner, printing more programs (so they do not run out), regulating the temperature in the auditorium, and cleaning the stage floor. The floor
may present more of a problem than the others, since it appears dirty, but is actually water damaged.

Other problems such as concert-goers' etiquette may be more difficult to remedy. It may be possible to post signs in prominent areas to remind concert-goers not to enter and leave during the performance, or to print reminders in the program. This would have to be done very carefully, so as not to insult anyone.

Perhaps the best and most practical solution would be to have ushers at every event. The men's and women's music service organizations of the School of Music (Phi Mu Alpha and Prelude) are trying to provide ushers at many events. Perhaps they can be supplemented by students from other organizations or from another ensemble. It is important that ushers themselves be aware of proper concert etiquette, and that they remain throughout the concert to open and close doors, and to handle any problems that arise.

Arts Outreach Survey

The results of this survey must be interpreted differently than those of the audience analysis survey, since participants in the outreach program included intact student groups and the majority of participants attended the concerts as part of a class requirement (84%). Attendance at the pre-concert talk, however, was usually voluntary.

It is interesting to note that even though some intact student groups participated in the study (therefore somewhat determining the male-female ratio), females still constituted a higher percentage of the responses than did males. The percentage of male responses (42%) is very close to the median male participation rate (43%) at arts events cited by DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (1977).
Ninety-eight percent of the respondents were students. All respondents aged 18-50 were students. Of the respondents (5%) over age 50, one was a student, and two were visitors to the campus. The response rate by student rank is different than that in the audience analysis survey. In the previous survey responses decreased with higher rank. In the arts outreach survey, the responses followed a bell-shaped curve, from freshmen (9%), sophomore (25%), peaking at 34% the junior year, then decreasing to 27% for seniors and to 5% for graduate students. This is most likely due to the the level of the targeted courses in the study.

Eighty-four percent of the participants attended the concert as a class requirement. Unlike the audience analysis survey, the majority of students attended the concert to satisfy a requirement for a fundamentals of music class, not a music appreciation class. The percentage of students attending for the fundamentals of music class for elementary education majors (Music 270) was much higher in the arts outreach survey (48%) than in the audience analysis survey (11%). This may be due to differences in concert attendance requirements from Autumn to Winter quarters. It may also be due, in part, to a section of Music 270 holding a pre-concert talk during class time early in the course of the outreach program. This may have contributed to student awareness of the concerts and talks, and to attendance at the School of Music concerts.

It is interesting to note that many students who attended for a class requirement, commented that they would return in the future even though it would not be a requirement. For many, this was their first concert experience at the university. Lorek, Robinson, and Pembrook (cited in Kuhn and Sims, 1990) found that a good initial concert experience for nonmusic major students may be a factor in their future concert attendance.
Hyman (1987) believes that one cannot rely on attendance requirements for concert attendance, however, they should not be entirely discounted. Concert attendance is one effective means of getting the student to have the first concert experience. It is encouraging that Kuhn and Sims (1991) found that concert attendance was generally a positive experience for students and one that students thought was valuable. Kuhn and Sims also found that enrollment in music courses (with or without a concert attendance requirement) appeared to result in students expressing enjoyment in attending concerts and a stronger intention to do so in the future.

Participants reported attending an average of three musical events in the past 12 months. The four types of concerts most frequently attended were similar to the findings for the 18-25 age group on the audience analysis survey. This time, however, rock led, followed by classical, concert band, jazz, and pop. This slight change in the ranking may be due to the fact that during the arts outreach program more students attended the concerts for a class requirement than during the audience analysis survey.

Again, probably due to concert attendance being a requirement for the majority of the participants, there were no indications of segmentation as in the audience analysis survey (i.e., reported attendance at concert band concerts highest at various band concerts). In fact, this survey showed almost the opposite, with attendance at concert band concerts being lowest for respondents at the Wind Ensemble and Concert and Symphonic bands concert.

An important result is the surprisingly low level of attendance at other types of live performing arts events (e.g., drama and dance). Respondents indicated attending a mean of only one other type of performing arts event (on or off campus) in the past 12 months. This finding corresponds with the figures from the survey
conducted at The Ohio State University in 1986 (CSEQ) which examined undergraduate student attendance at arts events on campus. The study found that 52% of students had never attended a musical event, and 65% had never attended a play, ballet or theater production.

More respondents reported attending performing arts events off-campus (52%) than on (49%). The percentage reporting attendance at off-campus events is probably higher due to students including attendance at pop and rock concerts in their answers. Most of these concerts are held off campus. If students had included only the "core-type" of arts events (e.g., classical music, jazz, drama, dance) in their answers, it is likely that more would have reported attending on campus events. The only concert at which there was a significantly larger number of respondents who attended events on campus was the Concert and Symphonic Bands concert. This may be due to the fact that for many, the university is probably one of the few, known sources of this type (concert band music) and quality of event. It is possible that patrons may be more aware of varied opportunities to hear some of the other musical forms such as orchestra (The Columbus Symphony Orchestra, Pro Musica Chamber Orchestra), opera (Opera Columbus, Columbus Light Opera), and jazz (the Jazz Arts Group).

It is interesting that although the majority did not attend arts events on campus, they indicated strong preference for doing so. Fifty-nine percent indicated they preferred to attend arts events on campus primarily because of the low cost, short travel distance and easy accessibility. Students also appear to enjoy the social atmosphere with other students and watching their peers perform.

Sources of publicity information were more evenly distributed in this survey due to the homogeneity of the population. Still, the most often cited source of publicity information was word-of-mouth. This is supported by other studies which
indicated word-of-mouth as a primary source of arts information (Hanneman & Weinberg, 1977; Tauber & Weissenberg, 1971). Also rated highly was campus-oriented advertising such as the campus newspaper and posters and flyers.

Except for word-of-mouth, these findings are supported by a study done at the University of Southern California (Gutman [cited in Strang & Gutman, 1980]). In this study, students were asked to recall the media in which they had seen advertising for performances. The two most frequently mentioned were the campus newspaper (18%) and on-campus posters (85%). No other medium (flyers, city newspapers, brochures, or campus radio) scored as much as 20%.

Unlike the audience analysis survey, the question on publicity information did not refer to the particular School of Music concert the students attended when they completed the survey. Instead, it asked where students usually received information on arts events in general. It is possible, however, that at least some of these data may relate to the specific School of Music concerts they attended as part of the outreach program.

If so, most of the trends in publicity information for individual concerts are probably due to timing of news releases, and meeting printing deadlines (e.g., a noticeably higher percentage of patrons at the Concert and Symphonic bands and Jazz Lab Ensemble concerts reporting that they received information from the Dispatch). The high percentage of respondents who saw information about the two Orchestra concerts on posters is probably due to the number and quality of the posters displayed.

Participants indicated that they enjoyed the concerts, giving an overall mean of 1.89 on a scale of 1 (enjoyed very much) to 5 (did not enjoy much). Mean scores for almost all concerts ranged from 1.50 to 2.0. The most positive rating was 1.50 for the Concert and Symphonic Bands concert, which was probably also the most familiar
type of ensemble and music. The next highest rating (1.76) was given to the first Orchestra concert and the Jazz Ensemble concerts. The lowest rating was given to the Wind Ensemble (2.44) which, based on comments and subsequent ratings, was probably the least familiar form of ensemble and music for the participants.

Results suggest that further knowledge can enhance one's enjoyment and understanding of a concert, and can also contribute to feeling comfortable as an audience member. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents indicated that the talk definitely or probably contributed to their enjoyment of the concert. This percentage was highest at the first Orchestra concert and the Wind Ensemble concert, and lowest at the Jazz Lab Ensemble concert. Similar results were obtained when the participants were asked if the talk contributed to their understanding of the concert. Again, percentages of positive answers were highest at the Wind Ensemble and first Orchestra concert, and lowest at the Jazz Lab Ensemble concert.

The speaker and the content of the pre-concert talk obviously play a major role in the responses on patrons' enjoyment and understanding of the concert. The type of concert may also be a factor. It is possible that the talk was thought to be especially helpful for the orchestra and Wind Ensemble concerts since participants were less familiar with these more formal types of concerts, and with the music being played. The Jazz Lab Ensemble Concert may have provided a more relaxed atmosphere and may have been a more familiar genre. Within that genre, the music may have been what they expected or associated with jazz music.

The talk was also considered to be helpful in making participants feel more comfortable as audience members. The percentage of positive responses to this question was highest at the Wind Ensemble and first Orchestra concerts and lowest at the Men's Glee Club and second Orchestra concerts. Again, the participants probably were less familiar with the type of music played by the Orchestra and Wind
Ensemble, as well as the formal concert settings for these ensembles. The Men's Glee Club may have been perceived as more familiar and accessible. This may be due, in part, to the programming of recognizable, or known songs in addition to more formal choir music. In the case of the second orchestra concert, the response is probably due to the pre-concert speaker. This was the only instance in which participants expressed reservations about the quality of the talk and the knowledge and delivery of the speaker.

The need for the pre-concert talk to help audience members know what to expect and to help make them more comfortable is reinforced by Cassidy and Speer (1990). They studied written comments on concerts attended to fulfill course requirements in a music class for elementary education majors. They found that students' concerns with things such as the performer's dress, concert etiquette or confusion about when to applaud seemed to indicate a lack of experience in attending formal concert programs.

The participants were asked if they would have enjoyed the concert just as much without the pre-concert talk. The percentage of positive answers (definitely or probably would have enjoyed it as much) was highest at the Men's Glee Club concert, the two jazz concerts, and the second Orchestra concert. Again, the Glee Club and the Jazz Ensembles may be perceived as more familiar and accessible experiences. The response to the second Orchestra concert again may be attributed to the effect of the pre-concert speaker.

The tendency to be more comfortable with or prefer things that one is familiar with is seen in the choice of sites for the pre-concert talk. Individuals tended to select the site that they had attended during the outreach program.
Overall the response to the program was positive. Participants felt that the experience was educational, yet fun and enjoyable, and most expressed interest in participating in a similar experience in the future.

No major suggestions for improvement were given. In general, suggestions centered around providing even "more of the same"—more talks, and longer talks to provide more detailed information.

When asked what would get them more involved in arts events on campus, the majority of the students responded with suggestions regarding publicity and communications.

Following are sections which provide suggestions for modifying and expanding the arts outreach program in order for it to be successful on a larger scale. The suggestions are drawn from research, the participants' comments and the researcher's experience with the project.

**Modification of the Arts Outreach Program**

It is the researcher's opinion that if this program were sponsored by the university (as opposed to being a dissertation project), that recognition and credibility would be higher, and more people would be willing to participate in it. It is an instance of an institution versus an individual. It would be helpful for the individuals directing the project to be able to say they represent the School of Music or College of the Arts. It is, perhaps, especially important at such a large institution.

Student social, service and professional groups should be targeted. Although participation by social, service, and professional groups was low, these groups still represent a viable target population for the outreach program. To help ensure opportunities for participation, the groups should be contacted earlier in the quarter or during the previous quarter. When arranging the experience, it would be helpful
to speak to the faculty or staff adviser of the group, in addition to or instead of the
group's president. This might assist the student groups in organizing their agendas
to include the experience. If the outreach program was sponsored by the university,
dormitory groups could be included without special permission being obtained.

Music classes for nonmusic majors should also be targeted. The pre-concerts
talks appeared to enhance the students' understanding and enjoyment of the
concerts, and helped them be more comfortable as audience members. The talks also
provided information that many students were able to use in reports for class.
Humanities or art education classes may also wish to invite speakers to classes.

The low percentage of graduate student attendance at concerts indicated in the
audience analysis survey, points to a need for targeting this population as well as
undergraduates. Graduate level professional, social, and service groups, and
donmitories should be invited to participate in the program.

Another form of student group that has great potential for this type of project
is any group of new students. For example, the outreach program could be an
exciting part of orientation to the campus for undergraduates in University College
classes, foreign graduate students, or transfer students.

Talks could be open to the student body at large. Students need not be a
member of a group to attend the talks. This would require publicity at various
locations on campus such as the dormitories, libraries, and class buildings.

Taking the targeting aspect one step further, it would be effective to
coordinate certain programs with special interests. For example, it would be possible
to help computer and electronics majors become aware of contemporary music
concerts that utilize technology in their fields. Likewise, certain ethnic groups could
be contacted if a concert features compositions of special interest to that group.
Regardless of the student group participating, it is important to retain the concept of peers relating to peers. Students in music education could again be trained to give pre-concert talks. A newly revised music education course, Oral and Written Communications in Music Education, will provide opportunities for students to prepare and deliver pre-concert talks as part of the class requirement. Other classes may wish to use this program as an optional assignment or extra-credit.

This docent opportunity should be extended to students in other areas of music such as music history, theory, and performance, at the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is essential that all musicians, regardless of specialty area, be able to communicate effectively about music with people who possess a variety of levels of musical knowledge. The outreach program could provide a unique opportunity for music majors to develop important professional communication and interpersonal skills.

An important factor in this aspect of the program is the monitoring of the speakers for the pre-concert talks. It does not have to be as formal as in this study, however, some screening should be done to ensure that the speaker is well-prepared and delivers the talk effectively.

If possible, the talks should be held at the site of the concert. In most circumstances, the performance hall itself would be too large and would lend an impersonal feeling to the talk. A rehearsal room would be large enough to accommodate participants, yet would allow a more personal, informal atmosphere to prevail. Holding the talk in a rehearsal room would also allow participants to see where the performers rehearse and get a glimpse of what goes on "behind the scenes."

The pre-concert talks do not have to be limited to large ensemble concerts. They may also be provided for concerts such as guest performances, student recitals,
and the faculty recital series. This program could be expanded to include talks for selected events at Mershon Auditorium and the Wexner Center for the Arts. It should be noted that while the format of the talk may remain the same, the content and level of the talk may vary due to differences among student groups and concerts.

Encouraging awareness of and interest in the arts outreach program will require publicity efforts. Most of the following suggestions for publicity are relatively inexpensive. The first suggestion is to capitalize on the impact of word-of-mouth advertising on the campus. This is also related to students wanting a personal touch in advertising of arts events. Perhaps the simplest way to do this would be to ask each member of an ensemble to invite five people to the concert. Other possibilities include asking music students to invite other students to a pre-concert talk and concert by: (1) attending a meeting of a student group; (2) distributing small cards with a printed invitation to students in their classes or dormitory, or even to students they see on their way to class; and (3) telephoning students or student groups.

It would be helpful for student groups and their advisers to receive general written information on the outreach program. The information should be no more than two pages in length, and perhaps could be in the form of a pamphlet. General information should include a brief statement of the purpose of the program, a description of the program, and a schedule of pre-concert talks and concerts. General information should also be posted in the lobby of the performance hall, and in the concert programs. Flyers advertising the program or a specific concert should be posted in various locations across campus (e.g., libraries, dormitories, class buildings).

Publicity should stress the informal nature of the talk, and the fact that one does not need musical training in order to understand and enjoy the talk. The
social aspect of the experience should also be promoted. Attending the pre-concert talk and concert can provide an opportunity to meet and socialize with other students who share similar interests.

It is possible that student groups could make the experience more of an "event" by going out to dinner before the talk and attending the concert as a group. Perhaps there could be an occasional cooperative effort with the student union to provide a dinner with a pre-concert talk prior to the concert.

Obviously there is a need for personnel to coordinate and supervise such a program. The number of personnel will depend upon the commitment to, and the scope of the program. In its initial stages, it would be an ideal position for a graduate teaching associate in the School of Music. Ideally, there should also be a faculty committee or panel to serve as liaisons with divisions within the School of Music and upper administration in the College of the Arts.

Expansion of the Arts Outreach Program

Results of the audience analysis survey indicated that patrons at School of Music concerts responded positively to the idea of a pre-concert talk. They felt it would enhance their appreciation and enjoyment of the concert. Some respondents thought it was the responsibility of the university to offer such talks.

The arts outreach program could be extended to the Columbus, Ohio community, providing benefits for both community members and the university. Again, undergraduate and graduate music students could present talks for School of Music concerts and possibly events at the Wexner Center for the Arts and Mershon Auditorium. Talks could be presented to groups such as: (1) community groups (neighborhood groups, women's clubs, church groups, etc), (2) business groups (a business or business organizations such as the Jaycees or Kiwanis), (3) senior citizens
(retirement homes, adult day care), and (4) public and private schools (elementary, middle, and high schools).

As in the campus portion of this program, talks may be held at the group’s meeting place or at the concert site. Since many community and business organizations meet in the evening, the speaker may have dinner with the group, then present the talk. For some businesses, a “brown-bag” lunch talk held in the lobby or lounge may be a popular option.

Some larger corporations have special interest groups such as the stereo or record club. Directly targeting some special interest groups within corporations may be beneficial.

As mentioned earlier, many arts education efforts are aimed at pre-school and elementary-aged children. Middle school and high school students should also be included in these efforts. General classrooms may be targeted, as well as special groups such as bands, orchestras, or choirs, honor societies, and Future Teachers of America.

Schools often prefer to arrange for field trips during the school day. Rather than students coming to a concert at night on a school bus, or trying to arrange transportation independently of the school, the university could offer programs during the day.

The ensembles at the university could present a brief concert in Weigel Hall during their regularly scheduled rehearsal time. Depending upon attendance, this program could be several days each quarter, or one week during the year, with the ensembles rotating concert commitments. The talk could be presented either at the schools or at the university, immediately prior to the concert. The groups would not have to adjust their programming to fit the needs of the students, although they may chose to prepare some familiar pieces or selections from the standard repertoire.
The arts outreach program and the concerts given by the university ensembles could expand and enhance the School of Music’s PIME (Partnership in Musical Excellence) program and other partnership programs with the public schools.

Benefits of participation in this program for community members include:

• increased awareness of arts events held at the university;

• access to some arts events that are free of charge (some School of Music concerts);

• accessibility—there is usually ample parking, and the university is on the bus line;

• feeling that the university cares about the community and is promoting community involvement;

• experiences in the arts for many who otherwise would be unaware of, or unable to afford them;

• presentation of information that will enhance their understanding and enjoyment of events.

Benefits for the university include:

• enhancing the cultural life of the community;

• presenting a more balanced image to the community;

• promoting community education and involvement (something some community members believe is a responsibility of the university);

• building larger and more educated audiences for current and future musical events on campus;

• increasing the likelihood that along with greater community awareness and involvement, will come greater community support (perhaps financial, as well as in terms of attendance at events).

The arts outreach program could easily be adapted to drama and dance. Future teachers and performers in the mediums could provide talks prior to events. If there was interest in and support of this program, the departments could
collaborate to produce an arts outreach series consisting of events from each area of the performing arts.

Conclusion

Results of the arts outreach program are encouraging. Survey responses indicated strong interest in the program. The majority of students felt the experience was both informative and enjoyable. Overall, responses were very positive and the majority of respondents expressed interest in participating in a similar program in the future. Results of the study also suggest that further knowledge may indeed increase enjoyment and understanding of a musical event.

Future efforts in this area may examine the benefits of such a program over time. It would be interesting to conduct follow-up surveys of participants to determine the impact of the program on their attendance at arts events. It would also be interesting to find out if the experience influenced their attitude toward the performing arts.

Extending the program beyond free, School of Music concerts would provide other areas for study. For example, one could examine the effect of concert admission fees on participation in the program. It may also be interesting to determine if having to pay an admission fee influences a student's perception of the quality or value of the performance or total experience (pre-concert talk and concert).

After the program has been in place for a period of time, one could conduct an audience analysis survey of patrons at musical events on campus. This survey could provide information on the impact of the outreach program on attendance at these events. It would be interesting to see what percentage of the audience is, or has been, involved in the outreach program.
The arts outreach/audience development program could provide college students with accessible educational experiences in the arts, while developing larger, more educated audiences for performing arts events on campus. The program could also give undergraduate and graduate students opportunities to develop important professional skills. Extending this program to the community could provide more people with the opportunity to gain insight into the performing arts.

It is hoped that the exposure to the performing arts would increase awareness of the importance of the arts in a society. It is also hoped that students in the arts outreach program would continue to explore the performing arts during their college careers and in the future. This exploration may take the form of participating both financially and experientially in live arts events. This awareness and support are critical to the survival of the performing arts.
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APPENDIX A

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS SURVEY
THREE-MINUTE
AUDIENCE SURVEY

Help us get to know our audiences
(See reverse side for valuable retail price information)

A. Female ___ Male ___

Age: Under 18 ___ 18-25 ___ 26-35 ___ 36-50 ___ 51-64 ___ 65 and over ___

Occupation __________

B. What best describes your relationship to OSU? (✓ all that apply)

Faculty/Staff___ Relative of Performer___

Student___ Visitor___

C. Students Only: (If you are not a student, please skip to section D)

▲ Full Time ___ Part Time (less than 12 hours) ___

▲ Degree ___ Non-Degree ___

▲ Rank: Fresh ___ Soph ___ Jr ___ Sr ___ Grad ___

▲ Where do you live?

___ Residence Hall

___ Fraternity/Sorority

___ Apartment/House

▲ What is your major? ________________________

▲ Are you here to fulfill a class requirement? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, for what class? ________________________

D. How did you get to the concert tonight?

Car ___ Bus ___ On foot ___ Bicycle ___

Approximately how many minutes did it take you to get to Weigel Hall tonight? _____________

E. How did you find out about tonight's concert? (✓ all that apply)

____ Read about it in the Columbus Dispatch

____ Read about it in the Lantern

____ Saw it on the School of Music Marquee/saw it on a poster

____ A friend/relative told me

Other: (specify) ___________________________________________

- OVER PLEASE -
F. Approximately how many concerts have you attended in the past 12 months? _____

What types of concerts have you attended in the past 12 months?
(✓ all that apply)
___ Classical (e.g., symphony, chamber music, choral)
___ Concert Band
___ Country and Western
___ Folk
___ Jazz
___ Opera
___ Pop
___ Rock
___ Other (specify) ____________________________

How frequently do you attend OSU School of Music Concerts?
very often ___ often_____ occasionally ____ rarely ___

G. Overall, how did you enjoy tonight's concert?
very much 1 2 3 not much 4 5

Comments:

To what extent do you think that a brief, pre-concert talk about the music on tonight's program would have increased your enjoyment and appreciation of the music?
definitely ___ probably ___ not sure ___ probably not ___ definitely not ___

Comments:

As an added incentive for completing this survey, there will be raffle prizes for those interested. Prizes will include a gift certificate for a la carte restaurant, discount coupons for Peasant on the Lane restaurant, and tickets to the final concert of the OSU Mozart Festival. The drawing will be held on December 5, 1990. Winners will be notified by mail. If you would like to be included, please provide the necessary contact information to receive your prize. If not, thank you for completing this form. Survey responses will remain confidential.

(Complete for raffle only)
Name: ________________________________
Address: ______________________________
City____________State____Zip Code_________

PLEASE RETURN SURVEYS IN THE BOX LOCATED IMMEDIATELY OUTSIDE THE AUDITORIUM

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
APPENDIX B

ARTS OUTREACH FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear Members of

I am writing to ask for your participation in a project for the School of Music. I am designing an arts outreach program for college and university students. This is part of my dissertation study and is also a service for the School of Music. The purposes of this project are:

- To design an arts outreach prototype that can be used by music and other performing arts (e.g., drama and dance) at The Ohio State University and other colleges and universities.
- To increase student awareness of, and participation in, live music performances on the Ohio State University campus.
- To provide students with preparation for live music performances on the Ohio State University campus.
- To develop current and future audiences for music performances on the Ohio State University campus by providing an outreach/education program to students.

Benefits of your participation include: (1) a good musical and social experience, and (2) the opportunity for you to provide input that will help design this arts outreach model that may be a part of your student life at OSU, and a part of student life at other colleges and universities.

Your participation in the project involves arranging for your group (or part of the group) to attend one of the School of Music large ensemble concerts this quarter. These concerts include performances by the orchestra, concert bands, jazz bands, and choirs. The concerts are performed in Weigel Hall on the OSU campus, and there is no admission charge.

Prior to the concert, a student from the School of Music will attend one of your regularly scheduled meetings and present a brief (20-30 minute) pre-concert talk. This talk will provide information on the ensemble you will see, the music you will hear, and some tips on listening to the performance. The talk will be informal and informative—not overly technical or didactic. Depending on your meeting time, the talk may be held the night of the concert, or one or two nights in advance.

Your group will then attend the concert, and complete a short survey after the performance. The survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete.

I hope that your group will be able to participate in this project. I believe that it is a very worthwhile project that will not only provide a pleasant social and musical experience for students, but also a chance for them to shape the direction of student involvement in the arts on college and university campuses.

If you would like to participate in the project, please select a concert from the attached list of concerts, and call me as soon as possible so that I can arrange the pre-concert talk. If you would like more information or have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me. Off: 292-7940/Home: 267-4001 (If I am not available, please leave a message indicating when I can return your call.)

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Single
Graduate Teaching Associate
School of Music
SCHOOL OF MUSIC
LARGE ENSEMBLE CONCERTS
WINTER, 1991

All concerts are held in Weigel Hall Auditorium, 1866 College Rd. on the OSU campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Concert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wind Ensemble and Concert Band ♦ Friday, 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orchestra ♦ Tuesday, 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Symphonic Band ♦ Wednesday, 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jazz Ensemble ♦ Friday, 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jazz Lab Ensemble ♦ Sunday, 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men’s Glee Club ♦ Sunday, 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wind Ensemble ♦ Thursday, 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Concert Band and Symphonic Band ♦ Sunday, 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra ♦ Wednesday, 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

ARTS OUTREACH FLYERS FOR MUSIC CLASSES
You are invited to attend pre-concert talks for selected School of Music large ensemble concerts. These concerts include performances by the orchestra, concert bands, jazz bands, and choirs. All concerts are held in Weigel Hall on the OSU campus, and admission is free.

This is part of an arts outreach program designed for college and university students (non-music majors). It is part of a dissertation study and is also a service for the School of Music. The purpose of this project is to increase student awareness of, and participation in, live music performances on the OSU campus by providing students with preparation for these events.

Perhaps the most practical reason for you to attend one of these talks is that it will provide useful information for your concert report. Other benefits include a good social and musical experience, and the chance for you to provide input into the design of this outreach program.

Prior to the concert, a student from the School of Music will give a brief (20-25 minute) pre-concert talk. This talk will provide information on the ensemble you will see, the music you will hear, and some tips on listening to the performance. The talk will be informal and informative—not overly technical or didactic.

After the concert, you will be asked to take 5-10 minutes to complete a short survey. This is your opportunity to provide input that will help design this arts outreach program that may be a part of your student life at OSU, and a part of student life at other colleges and universities.

Large ensemble concert dates and pre-concert talk locations are listed on the back of this letter.

PLEASE JOIN US!
School of Music Large Ensemble Concerts
with Pre-Concert Talks

All concerts are held in Weigel Hall Auditorium, 1866 College Rd.
on the OSU campus

February 5 (Tuesday) Orchestra 8:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 7:15 p.m., Hughes Hall Rm. 13
15 (Friday) Jazz Ensemble 8:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 7:15 p.m., Hughes Hall Rm. 109
17 (Sunday) Jazz Lab Ensemble 3:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 2:15 p.m., Hughes Hall Rm. 109

March 3 (Sunday) Men's Glee Club 3:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 2:15 p.m., Hughes Hall Rm. 109
  7 (Thursday) Wind Ensemble 8:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 7:15 p.m., Hughes Hall Rm. 109
  10 (Sunday) Concert and Symphonic Bands 3:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 2:15 p.m., Hughes Hall Rm. 109
13 (Wednesday) Orchestra 8:00 p.m.
  • Pre-concert talk: 7:15 p.m., Weigel Hall Rm. 177
     (rehearsal room)
APPENDIX D

DOCENT MATERIALS
Dear

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project. As you know, this project is part of my dissertation research on audience development. I am designing an audience development/arts outreach model for concerts on college and university campuses. The purpose of this model is to increase student awareness of, and participation in, live music performances on college and university campuses. I hope that in the future the model will be applied to other areas of the performing arts, in order to increase attendance at all live arts events on campuses. A brief summary of my dissertation research is attached.

Your contribution is essential to this audience development model. As we discussed, your duties include: preparation of a pre-concert talk (for a School of Music Large ensemble performance), a practice session during which you will receive feedback on your presentation, one or two pre-concert talks (locations to be determined), attending the concert, and distributing and collecting the survey. You will receive an honorarium of $75.00 or $100.00 (depending upon the number of talks) upon completion of your portion of the project.

Enclosed are materials that will assist you in preparing for your role as a docent: (1) guidelines for the pre-concert talk, (2) a list of tips that will help you present a successful talk, (3) the evaluation form that will be used at the practice session, and (4) a copy of the program that you will be discussing. If, at any time during the project you need assistance in your research or other preparation, please do not hesitate to call me (home: school:).

Thank you again for your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Nancy Single
Summary of Dissertation Research

Introduction:

The survival of the performing arts in a society depends upon the support of committed groups and individuals who participate experientially and financially in live arts events. Audiences must be developed and maintained through active efforts on many fronts and at many levels.

Many performing arts organizations seek to develop audiences through outreach and education programs. Much of this effort is directed at the preschool and elementary levels. There is a tremendous age difference between these young children and the current patrons of the arts. This age gap presents a problem in providing continued support for the performing arts. Early exposure to the arts is necessary and worthwhile. It is not, however, a practical strategy to wait for young children to be of ticket-buying age in order to save the performing arts from extinction.

Senior citizens comprise another group that is often targeted by performing arts organizations. This, too, is a worthwhile and necessary outreach. But again, it does not help to ensure the future of the performing arts. What appears to be largely ignored is the middle ground between young children and senior citizens.

Performing arts organizations are dependent upon audiences for their present and their future. Arts organizations must expand the scope of their outreach and education programs in order to involve a greater number and variety of people. Most importantly, these programs should seek to involve individuals who will, either immediately or in the near future, carry on the support of the current patrons of the performing arts.

One strategy that has the potential to reap more immediate benefits for performing arts organizations is to extend outreach or education programs to college and university students. These students will likely have been exposed to arts programs at the elementary school level. Unfortunately, these programs often taper off during the middle school and high school years. When these students are in college, they often do not participate in the fine arts experiences available to them.

In 1986, one of the studies commissioned by The Ohio State University Office of Academic Affairs in conjunction with the institutional self-study for re-accreditation by the North Central Association was based on Robert Pace's College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). Undergraduate students enrolled at The Ohio State University completed the CSEQ during winter quarter, 1986. One section of the CSEQ asks students to indicate how often they engage in particular kinds of academic related college experiences. One of these areas included art, music, and theater experiences. Students were asked how often they read about or discussed various visual art forms, artists, music and theater, and how often they attended exhibits or performances. Student responses were summarized by major field of study and student class. As might be expected, the percentage of students participating in all these activities was highest in the the majors of humanities and the arts. Even so, an average of 32% of students in the arts and humanities never attended an art gallery or art exhibit on campus, 38% never attended a musical concert on campus, and 55% never attended a play, ballet, or theater production on campus. Looking at attendance of campus events across all students, 60% never attended an art gallery or art exhibit, 52% never attended a musical event, and 65% never attended a play, ballet or theater production.
Rationale for including the arts in the college experience often focuses on the development of the aesthetic domain, humanism, and the senses and emotions. "The development of the senses and the education of the emotions through the arts are not simply desirable aims. They are essential both for balanced behaviour and the effective use of the intellect" (Blacking, 1982). Study of the arts provides an individual with another dimension; it aids in producing a complete, whole individual.

I am convinced that the quality of our individual lives and the quality of our society are directly related to the quality of our artistic life. . . . What does it profit us if we solve the great problems but lose our humanism in the process? If we really care about the dignity of the individual, about his potential for self-fulfillment, then we must have a deep and rich sense of the place of the arts in our individual lives. We need the arts if we are to be whole human beings—fully alive and vital and in control of ourselves and our environment. We need the arts as the key to the higher order of things—our faculty, our sense of beauty. We need the arts if we are to have discriminating taste, the ability to judge levels of quality in all the works of man. And we need them if we are to have the truth—if we are to understand the problems that beset us and if we are to understand ourselves. (Rockefeller [cited in Fowler, 1980])

Many individuals believe that colleges and universities provide the ideal climate and opportunity for students to be exposed to the arts, whether formally (through a class) or more informally, through university sponsored student programs and activities. "The American system of higher education contains unparalleled resources for teaching the arts. Because of a national commitment to the training of professional artists within our institutions of higher education, there exists on most campuses both the resources and commitment to provide education in the arts for those who will find their life's work in other professions" Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education, 1988).

College and university students represent a significant component of our future; a future that ideally will include active support of the performing arts. As future teachers, parents, or community and business leaders, students should be aware of and participate in live performing arts experiences during their college careers. An effort should be made to cultivate these future patrons of the arts, and to emphasize their unique role, whether individually or collectively, in the survival of the performing arts.

Purpose:

The purposes of this study are:

1) To design and implement an arts outreach/audience development program for school of music events at The Ohio State University that can also be a prototype for music and other performing arts (e.g., drama and dance) at other colleges and universities.

2) To increase student awareness of, and participation in, live music performances on the Ohio State University campus.
3) To provide students with preparation for live music performances on the Ohio State University campus.

4) To develop current and future audiences for music performances on the Ohio State University campus by providing an outreach/education program to students.

Auxiliary purposes of this study are:

1) To establish a profile of patrons of School of Music large ensemble concerts.

2) To provide advanced undergraduate students in music education with opportunities to develop professional oral communication and interpersonal skills.

Method:

Autumn Quarter, 1990

An audience analysis survey will be conducted at School of Music large performance ensemble concerts during Autumn quarter. The large ensembles will include: the Symphony Orchestra, Wind Ensemble, Concert, Symphonic, and University Bands, Jazz Bands, Concert Choir and Chorale, and Men's and Women's Glee Clubs. Information from this survey will provide a profile of the patrons of the School of Music Concerts.

Attendance data will be gathered at each of the concerts to determine average attendance at events and the survey return rate.

Winter Quarter, 1991

The researcher will identify established students groups on the Ohio State University campus. Students groups may include service and honor organizations, fraternities, sororities, dormitory groups, and classes for non-music majors. The researcher will contact the group and arrange for the group (or a portion of the group) to attend one of the School of Music large performance ensemble concerts during Winter quarter.

Prior to the concert, a docent will attend a meeting of the student group and give a brief presentation on listening to music, and the specific program that group will be hearing. Pre-concert talks may also be held in the music building just prior to the concert. Docents will be advanced undergraduates in music and will be trained by the researcher.

After the concert, the students will complete a brief survey. The survey will provide information on (1) student age, rank, major, etc., (2) student attendance at concerts and other live arts events, and (3) the students' reactions to the outreach program. Students will be asked comment on the effect of the pre-concert talk on their enjoyment and understanding of the performance.
PRE-CONCERT TALK GUIDELINES

Purpose Statement:

As you know, one of the basic purposes of the liberal arts portion of degree programs is to provide opportunities for individuals to participate in a variety of experiences. These experiences involve certain things that educated people consider to be important—such as the arts, various cultures, current events, etc. The idea is to have people examine their ideas and their actions, to experience new opportunities and choose alternatives for the future. It is commonly thought that greater information about a particular subject can enhance not only one’s knowledge of it, but also one’s interest in and appreciation of it. Participation in arts events, for example, might be increased if individuals were exposed to information that may enhance the experience. These pre-concert sessions have been designed with that purpose.

Reasons/benefits of participation:

A. The School of Music and the College of the Arts would like to get more students involved in arts events on campus. They are interested in this project and may use this approach to attract students to arts events in the future. We’re asking your help in shaping this program. You have the opportunity to help design this model by participating in the project and expressing your opinions on a survey.

B. This provides you with an opportunity to learn about music and to have a good musical and social experience.

C. It is also a dissertation project for graduate student in the School of Music. She is designing an arts outreach program to increase student awareness of, and involvement in, arts events on campus.

D. The talk will provide useful information for those of you who have to write concert reports.

The Uniqueness of Live Music:

Experiencing live music is much different than hearing music on recordings, tapes, or the radio. One obvious difference is that you can see, as well as hear, the performers. This visual aspect can provide a whole new dimension to the musical experience. A live performance is a unique form of communication. You, as an audience member, are an integral part of this communication process. The performance ensemble communicates to the audience. However, in order to have the total experience and to complete the communication process, the audience must communicate to the ensemble through its response to the performance. There is also a form of communication among audience members. Being in an audience at a concert provides a sense of community—everyone is part of a larger, total experience. You can look around and see, or sense, the reactions of others to the music. Your involvement and communication are essential to the experience.
Background of the Group to be Heard:

Some suggestions:
Name of group, a brief description (such as percentage of music majors, class rank of performers, conductor’s name, basic instrumentation, etc.)

Concert Etiquette:

"Conventions" of a formal concert (Ensemble attire, concertmaster or equivalent, conductor’s entrances/exits, podium, multi-movement works, clapping after solos in jazz concerts, but not during others, etc.) **use sense of humor** (For example: "When a piece has several movements, there is usually a brief pause between movements--the performers can catch their breath, and the audience members can re-cross their legs or cough and sneeze to get it out of their system. Applause is saved for after the last movement, so the flow of thought in the music is not disturbed.")

Other audience tips: no talking during performance, no kissing, no feet on chairs, stay awake, cough during breaks--common courtesy **sense of humor especially important in this section so you don’t offend anyone!** (Maybe an approach like: “I’m sure you all know this, but..."

Provide an opportunity for questions

Music:

Comment briefly on selected pieces. Which pieces depends on the program and the ensemble. For example, if you are doing an orchestra concert with only three pieces, you should say something about all three. If you are doing a choir concert with over ten pieces, you will not have time to comment on each. You may want to group them into categories and talk about several in more detail.

• Provide interesting, and accessible bits of information on the music, composer, etc. (humorous information/anecdotes would be nice when possible and appropriate)

• You may want to relate the year the piece was written with some time period or event the students would know about.

• Is the piece representative of a particular style?

• Is there something unusual/interesting to listen for?

• Is the piece programatic? (explain)

• Is there a guest soloist? If so, provide a little information on the soloist.

• You may want to talk to the conductor about the program, especially if one of the works is very recent.

Again, provide an opportunity for questions.
**I will give each of you some ideas on topics and resources for your particular program. If you need assistance, don't hesitate to ask.**

**Listening to music:**

Music may inspire feelings, images, emotions, and sensations—it depends on a lot of things: the person, the music, the time, etc. It's a very individual experience. If it happens to you, go with it! The point is that you don't have to think about, react to, or talk about music in strictly "musical" terms or think that you can't talk about music or experience it because you don't have specialized musical knowledge.

A variety of things are communicated on different levels during a performance, and the same things are not necessarily communicated to the same people at the same time. Responses to music are very personal.

Convey to them that you hope that the information you provided on the concert will enhance their experience at the concert. Tell them to keep in mind that however they respond to the music, they are making a unique and important contribution to the communication process.

Provide opportunity for questions.

Tell them you'll meet them at the concert at 7:45 at _____________(specific place) and that you will hand out the surveys at that time. Ask them to please take a few moments after the concert to complete the survey (it should only take about 5-10 minutes). Let them know where you'll be after the concert to collect the surveys.

Thank them for letting you talk to them, and for participating in this project.
DOCENT TIPS

One goal of the pre-concert talk is to build rapport with the student group you are speaking to. What you say is obviously important, but how you say it may be equally as important. You need to be very positive, enthusiastic, and outgoing. Emphasize the positive aspects of attending concerts, show enthusiasm for music, and encourage the students' attendance at other concerts.

Remember that the pre-concert session is called a "talk" not a lecture. Be sure to provide opportunities for students to ask questions (as indicated in the talk guidelines). Also try to provide creative opportunities for students to become involved in some way (answering a questions, show of hands, etc.). Since the time is short (20-30 minutes), only a small amount of student involvement will be possible.

Following are some tips for establishing rapport with the student group and for presenting a successful pre-concert talk. These tips are derived from research on behaviors of effective teachers, and will assist you in preparing for your role as a docent. Many of these behaviors should come naturally to you, since you were selected for this project, in part, on the basis of your communication skills. These behaviors will be evaluated by a small group of your peers during your practice session.

• **Maintain good eye contact with the group while you are speaking.** Be sure to make eye contact with as many people as possible. If/when you refer to notes, please do so discreetly!

• **Speak clearly, and project your voice so everyone can hear you.** Although this is an informal talk, please avoid using too many words that clutter your speech (e.g., "like," "okay," "uh" and "um").

• **Communicate the subject matter effectively.** This is mostly preparation and practice on your part. Remember that the talk is designed for people who know little or nothing about music. Avoid technical information and specific musical terms. Provide information that is interesting and appropriate for a novice listener, and present it in a manner that will make the students feel comfortable.

• **Provide an opportunity for questions** as indicated in the pre-concert talk guidelines (e.g., "Do you have any questions?"). Avoid letting a question disrupt the flow of the talk or get you too far off your agenda. If someone asks question that is difficult to answer or very odd, you might say, "That's a good question, and I'm sorry that I don't have time to answer it right now. Why don't we talk for a few minutes after I'm done with this presentation."

• **Provide creative ways of involving students** (rather than "lecture" only). You may want to ask "Who has played an instrument?" Did anyone ever play in a band?" How many of you have attended an orchestra concert before?" "Have some of you taken Music 141?" etc. You may verbally or nonverbally cue a show of hands, etc. You may preface something by saying, "many of you probably know that..." and they may naturally give a nonverbal response such as a nod.

• **Keep the presentation moving at an appropriate pace.** You will want to check your watch to be sure you are running on time. The talk should take no more than 20-30 minutes.
• **Show enthusiasm.** This can be done through:
  
  • **the use of positive comments** (on music, concerts, the experience, etc.)
  • **the use of humor.** This is especially important in the concert etiquette section. The use of humor will help get the point across without offending anyone.
  • **the use of facial expressions.** There is no need to overdo the facial expressions, but try not to be "dead pan."
  • **the use of vocal inflections.**

• **Use some nonverbal communication.** You may want to gesture with your hands occasionally, and move about a little bit (rather than standing still in one place all the time). Take care not to overdo in this area!
Docent Evaluation Form

Docent Name:

- The speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience
- The speaker demonstrates clarity of speech
- The speaker communicates the subject matter effectively
- The speaker provides opportunities for questions
- The speaker uses creative ways of involving students rather than just lecturing
- The presentation moves at an appropriate pace.
- The speaker shows enthusiasm
- The speaker uses positive comments
- The speaker demonstrates a sense of humor
- The speaker uses appropriate facial expressions
- The speaker uses appropriate vocal inflections
- The speaker uses nonverbal communication (such as talking with hands, moving about a little, etc)

Comments or suggestions:
APPENDIX E

ARTS OUTREACH SURVEY
ARTS OUTREACH SURVEY

Student Group or Class: ____________________________

When was your pre-concert talk held? (e.g., during class, during your group’s meeting, just prior to the concert) ____________________________

A. Female _____ Male _____

Age: Under 18 _____ 18-25 _____ 26-35 _____ 36-50 _____ 51-64 _____ 65 and over _____

Rank: Fresh. _____ Soph. _____ Jr. _____ Sr. _____ Grad. _____

Where do you live? Residence Hall _____ Fraternity/Sorority _____ Apartment/House _____

What is your major? ____________________________

Will attendance at this concert fulfill a class requirement? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, for what class? ____________________________

B. Approximately how many minutes did it take you to get to Weigel Hall tonight? _______

Was it easy for you to get to Weigel Hall tonight? easy neutral difficult
1 2 3 4 5

C. Approximately how many concerts have you attended in the past 12 months? _______

What types of concerts have you attended in the past 12 months? (✓ all that apply)
✓ Classical (e.g., symphony, chamber music, choral)
✓ Concert Band
✓ Country and Western
✓ Folk
✓ Jazz
✓ Opera
✓ Pop
✓ Rock
✓ Other (specify) ____________________________

How many other live performing arts events (e.g., drama, dance, performance art) have you attended in the past 12 months? _______

Are most performing arts events that you attend held on or off campus? On _____ Off _____

Do you prefer to attend arts events that are held on (vs. off) campus? Yes _____ No _____
Why or why not?

-OVER PLEASE-
How do you usually find out about arts events both on and off campus? (✓ all that apply)

___ The Columbus Dispatch
___ The Lantern
___ Other newspapers ("The Other paper," Columbus Alive," etc.)
___ Posters/flyers
___ Marquees
___ Friend/relative
___ Calendar of events from an organization

D. Overall, how did you enjoy tonight's concert? very much not much

1 2 3 4 5

Did the pre-concert talk contribute to your overall enjoyment of the concert?

definitely _____ probably _____ not sure _____ probably not _____ definitely not _____

Would you have enjoyed the concert just as much without the pre-concert talk?

definitely _____ probably _____ not sure _____ probably not _____ definitely not _____

Did the pre-concert talk help you to better understand the concert?

definitely _____ probably _____ not sure _____ probably not _____ definitely not _____

Did the pre-concert talk make you feel more comfortable as an audience member?

definitely _____ probably _____ not sure _____ probably not _____ definitely not _____

What aspect of the pre-concert talk was most enjoyable?

What aspect of the pre-concert talk would you change?

At which of the following locations would you prefer to attend a pre-concert talk?

___ at the concert hall ___ at your dormitory or fraternity/sorority
___ at your group's meeting place ___ in class

Would you be interested in participating in another experience like this one? Yes ___ No

Why or why not?

What suggestions do you have for this experience? (both the pre-concert talk and the concert)

What would get you more involved in arts events on campus?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
APPENDIX F

LANTERN ARTICLE
Art program aimed at younger audience

By Dave Bennett
Lantern arts writer

An OSU graduate student has designed a new arts outreach program intended to get college students more involved in the performing arts.

Nancy Single, a Ph.D. candidate in music education, created the program as part of her dissertation and as a reaction to the shrinking number of performing arts patrons.

"Audience development is a big issue right now, not only on college campuses, but also with performing artists all over the country," Single said. "The current arts patrons are getting older, and they’re dying off. We’re not getting people to replace them right away."

"A lot of arts education programs are aimed at pre-schools and elementary schools. So you have that, plus the people in their sixties and seventies who attend the events. If those people don’t attend anymore, then it’s not realistic to wait for the preschoolers to buy tickets to the concerts. So basically, the outreach program is about the survival of the performing arts," Single said.

"To me, it makes sense to target undergraduate college students since they will be able to make an impact immediately and also because it’s a major part of the liberal arts curriculum," Single said.

"I also think it’s important for the university to present a balanced image to the community," Single said. "Football and sports are very important, especially to a Big Ten school, but I think the arts are of equal importance in people’s lives in the long run."

Statistics collected during a 1996 study by the OSU Office of Academic Affairs show that most students fail to take advantage of Ohio State’s performing arts opportunities. Sixty percent of all students never attended an art gallery or exhibit, 52 percent never attended a musical event, and 65 percent never attended a play, ballet, or theater production.

Single plans to recruit advanced music education undergraduates to assist her in the program. The volunteers will give informal talks about music appreciation to interested student organizations on campus. Participants will then attend the concerts and give their reaction to the program by filling out a questionnaire.

"I think it is important for anybody who is going to be in music, especially music education, to be able to speak clearly and articulately about music. And also to be able to communicate at the level of someone who has never really listened to music before," Single said.

The concerts that we’re focusing on are the large ensemble concerts at the School of Music which are the concert bands, jazz bands, orchestras, and choirs, so there’s quite a variety for people to choose from," Single said.

The program will take place Winter quarter only, but Single says that if it’s a success, it could become the model for something that can be used for all of the performing arts.

"I’m just sort of pilot testing this in the area of music because that’s my specialty, but I’m hoping that if there is student interest, we can modify the program so that it can become something that student groups can do once a year is any of the other performing arts," Single said.

Single said the student reaction to her program has been positive.

"It hasn’t been done to this extent before, and it’s a little hard to pull off single-handedly, but everyone I have talked to said it’s a good idea," she
Nancy Single, a TA in music education from Chicago, reviews a piece of music in preparation for her “Outreach” program. The program is designed to get the younger audience to enjoy the performing arts.

said.

Single’s program is not officially connected with the School of Music, but a music professor said that the results of her study will benefit the school.

Dr. Craig Kirchhoff, a professor of music and chairperson of the division of music performance, said that Single’s work is helping to uncover who actually comes to the concerts.

“I think that we’re dealing with a lot of mystery,” said Kirchhoff. “Right now, we send out announcements and keep our fingers crossed. But this will help us discover who our audiences are, which will help us to better market our events.”

The music education students recruited to help with the program are also enthusiastic.

Richard Boettner, a senior majoring in music education, says that talking to groups informally will make the program a success.

“One of the best things you can do to get people interested in music is to talk to them about it face-to-face,” Boettner said. “The personal interaction should definitely make people come to the concerts.”
APPENDIX G

RESULTS OF AUDIENCE ANALYSIS SURVEY:
ANALYSIS OF AUDIENCE FOR EACH CONCERT
Table 31

**Number and Gender of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>% Responses</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1764</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

**Code:**
- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
- Sym Band = Symphonic Band
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
- NA = No answer

**Con Band = Concert Band**
- Un Band = University Band
- Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- Un Chorus = University Chorus
Table 32

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-50</th>
<th>51-64</th>
<th>65 &amp; over</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:

- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
- Sym Band = Symphonic Band
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
- NA = No answer

Con Band = Concert Band

- Un Band = University Band
- Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- Un Chorus = University Chorus
### Table 33

**Relationship to the University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Visitor</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

**Code:**  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band  
Sym Band = Symphonic Band  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale  
NA = No answer  
Con Band = Concert Band  
Un Band = University Band  
Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
Un Chorus = University Chorus
### Table 34

**Transportation to the Concert**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Foot</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

**Code:**

- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
- Sym Band = Symphonic Band
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
- NA = No answer

- Con Band = Concert Band
- Un Band = University Band
- Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- Un Chorus = University Chorus
- Minutes = Mean number of minutes
Table 35

Publicity Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Dispatch</th>
<th>Lantern</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Fr/Rel</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band  
Sym Band = Symphonic Band  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale  
NA = No answer  
Fr/Rel = Friend/Relative  

Con Band = Concert Band  
Un Band = University Band  
Jazz Lab Ens = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
Un Chorus = University Chorus  
M/P = Marquee/Poster
### Table 36

**Concert Attendance Patterns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>#Con</th>
<th>Cls</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>Flk</th>
<th>Jazz</th>
<th>Op</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Rk</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orch#1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orch#2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding*

**Code:**

- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- Orch = Orchestra
- WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
- Sym Band = Symphonic Band
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
- # Con = Mean Number of Concerts
- Cls = Classical
- CW = Country & Western
- Op = Opera
- Oth = Other
- Con Band = Concert Band
- Un Band = University Band
- Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- Un Chorus = University Chorus
- NA = No answer
- CB = Concert Band
- Flk = Folk
- Rk = Rock
### Table 37

**Attendance at School of Music Concerts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

**Code:**  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
Orch = Orchestra  
WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band  
Sym Band = Symphonic Band  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale  
NA = No answer  

Con Band = Concert Band  
Un Band = University Band  
Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
Un Chorus = University Chorus
Table 38

**Level of Enjoyment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Mean Level of Enjoyment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ensemble</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Band</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ensemble/Concert Band</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonic band</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Band</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ensemble</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ensemble</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir/Chorale</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Chorus</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale: 1 very much, 2 3 4 5 not much
Table 39
Pre-Concert Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Prob Not</th>
<th>Def Not</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:
- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- Orch = Orchestra
- WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
- Sym Band = Symphonic Band
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
- NA = No answer
- Con Band = Concert Band
- Un Band = University Band
- Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- Un Chorus = University Chorus
Table 40

**Student Hours and Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

**Code:**
- Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
- Orch = Orchestra
- WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
- Sym Band = Symphonic Band
- Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
- Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
- NA = No answer
- Part = Part-Time
- SO = Sophomore
- SR = Senior

**Con Band = Concert Band**
- Un Band = University Band
- Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble
- Un Chorus = University Chorus
- Full = Full-Time
- FR = Freshman
- JR = Junior
- GR = Graduate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Residence Hall</th>
<th>Frat/Sor</th>
<th>Apt/House</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code:  
Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble  
Orch = Orchestra  
WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band  
Sym Band = Symphonic Band  
Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble  
Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale  
NA = No answer  
Apt/House = Apartment/House

Con Band = Concert Band  
Un Band = University Band  
Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble  
Un Chorus = University Chorus  
Frat/Sor = Fraternity/Sorority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>270</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #1</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra #2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Ens</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Band</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE/Con</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym Band</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Band</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Ens</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Lab Ens</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch/Chor</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glee Clubs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Chorus</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding

Code: Wind Ens = Wind Ensemble
      Orch = Orchestra
      WE/Con = Wind Ensemble/Concert Band
      Sym Band = Symphonic Band
      Jazz Ens = Jazz Ensemble
      Ch/Chor = Choir/Chorale
      Un Band = University Band
      Jazz Lab = Jazz Lab Ensemble
      Un Chorus = University Chorus
      NA = No answer
      141 = Music Appreciation
      270 = Fundamentals of Music for Elementary Education Majors