



VALUE & IMPACT STUDY

SUPPLEMENTARY RESEARCH

Additional Insights on Donors, Ticket-Buyers & Audiences

Commissioned by Major University Presenters with funding support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

WolfBrown
808A Oak St., San Francisco, CA 94117
(415) 796-3060
www.wolfbrown.com

Research Background

In 2004, fourteen members of the Major University Presenters (MUP) consortium - without foundation support - commissioned WolfBrown to conduct a two-year study of the values and motivations driving performing arts attendance and donation. The findings of *The Value & Impact Study* are available in three public reports, which are available for free download at www.wolfbrown.com/mup:

- *Assessing the Intrinsic Impacts of Live Performance*
- *A Segmentation Model for Performing Arts Ticket Buyers*
- *A Segmentation Model for Donors to 12 University Presenting Programs*
- *Value & Impact Study Supplemental Research: Additional Insights on Donors, Ticket-Buyers & Audiences*

While the study concluded in 2007, much knowledge remained to be harvested from the substantial data sets that the study produced. Recognizing the opportunity, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation funded a \$50,000 proposal from the MUP consortium to extend the value of the study's two major datasets by commissioning 10 focused research papers.

WolfBrown oversaw a competitive selection process starting in October 2007 and welcomed proposals from faculty, research staff and students from all colleges and universities, and all disciplines. The proposals were evaluated based on the significance and relevance of their topic and research questions, the extent to which the research was likely to yield practical applications for the study partners – particularly in the areas of marketing and fundraising, and overall quality and rigor of the proposal.

The funded proposals went to both faculty members and graduate students; five proposals had faculty members serving as the principal investigator (PI), and five had graduate students as PI. The funded researchers represent a broad range of academic departments – public policy; sociology, tourism, recreation and sports management; arts administration; marketing; and business – and a variety of universities.

On behalf of the MUP consortium, we extend our appreciation to the Mellon Foundation for their foresight in allowing *The Value & Impact Study* to pay additional dividends. We encourage other researchers who would like to examine the original data files to be in touch with us, in the spirit of learning.

Sincerely,



Alan S. Brown, Principal



Jennifer L. Novak, Consultant

Overview of Papers

The supported research papers fall into three general topics: Donors, Ticket-buyers & Demand, and Impact. In addition, three papers cover special areas of interest: the relationship between Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences and ticket-buying, the affect of pre-performance enhancement events on impact, and the relationship between political views and both donation and ticket-buying behavior. Below are brief summaries of each paper, which are followed by more detailed abstracts, organized by general topic.

Donors

1. **The Influence of Marketing Messages and Benefits Received On Attributions of Donation Behavior to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations** - *Jennifer Wiggins Johnson & Bret Ellis*. This paper seeks to better understand what influenced the degree to which donors perceive extrinsic benefits as the motivations for giving.
2. **Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits** - *May Kim, Yong JaeKo & Heather Gibson*. This paper provides a review of theoretical frameworks that guide current perspectives on donor motivation.

Ticket-Buyers & Demand

3. **Preferences and Purchase Behavior: Survey Evidence on the Relationship between Stated Interested in the Performing Arts and Ticket Purchase History** - *Sarah Lee*. This paper examines the relationship between individuals' stated preferences for performances and their actual history of ticket-buying.
4. **Community Contexts of University Presenters and Their Audiences** - *Tanya Koropecjy-Cox, Charles Gattone, William Jawde, & Deeb-Paul Kitchen*. This paper offers broader sociological perspective to the understanding of audience values and preferences, by considering the larger community contexts of the presenter-audience relationship.
5. **Anticipation: Exploring its Origins and Effects on the Live Arts Experience** - *Jara Kern*. This paper examines the causal factors and relationships underlying high levels of anticipation for performing arts programs.

Impact

6. **How We Feel About Art: Motivation, Satisfaction, and Emotional Experience in Performing Arts Audiences** - *Shelly Gilbride & David Orzechowicz*. This paper explores performing arts audiences' self-reported emotional experiences and how they relate to reasons for attending, expectations for, and satisfaction levels with a performance.
7. **Social Influences on Intrinsic Impacts of Performance** - *Trina Rose*. This paper examines the relationships between social and emotional factors and attendance, subscription and post-performance impact.

Special Interest Topics

8. **Analysis of Multiple Intelligences in Understanding the Relationships between Ticket Buyers and Their Participation in Performing Arts Programs** - *Mark Creekmore & Sarah Rush*. This paper examines the validity of using the Values & Impact data to study Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences and investigates relationship between intelligences and preferences for types of performances.

9. **Characterizing Program Enhancement Events** - *Yael Zipporah Silk & Jordan Raphael Fischbach*. This paper profiles the enhancement event audience base, examines the impact of enhancement events on patrons who self-select to attend, and identifies characteristics that are predictive of pre- or post-performance event preferences.

10. **How Beliefs Matter: Views, Motives and their Relation to Buyer and Donor Behavior** - *Ximena Varela*. This paper investigates audiences political beliefs and explores the relationship between political views and both ticket-buyer and donor behavior.

Abstracts

Donors

1. The Influence of Marketing Messages and Benefits Received On Attributions of Donation Behavior to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations

Jennifer Wiggins Johnson & Bret Ellis

Wiggins Johnson and Ellis examine the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of donors to performing arts organizations using the data from the 1,771 donor respondents from the *Value Study* conducted in October 2006. The authors use the twenty items measuring different motivations to donate from these respondents, along with information on their donations from 2003-2006 and their relationships with the presenters to which they had donated. This paper seeks to better understand what influenced the degree to which respondents would perceive extrinsic benefits as the motivations for their donations. Additional data on the communications messages that respondents were likely to experience and the benefits that they were likely to receive in exchange for their donations is used to establish that the messages and benefits that donors receive can influence their attributions of their donation behavior to intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. This suggests that organizations can deliberately or inadvertently influence donor motivations through their communications.

2. Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits

May Kim, Yong Jae Ko & Heather Gibson

In this paper, the authors offer a review of theoretical frameworks that guide current perspectives on donor motivation and its influence on donor amount or donor benefits. Using this review to structure their analyses, the authors explore donor motivations, the influence of gender and age on donor motivations, the relationship between donor motivations and donor behavior, and the relationship between donor motivations and donor benefits.

In addition, these authors wrote a second paper utilizing the Value & Impact Study data entitled *An examination of factors that influence donor behavior: The case of University art museums in the US*, and is available upon request.

Ticket-Buyers & Demand

3. Preferences and Purchase Behavior: Survey Evidence on the Relationship between Stated Interest in the Performing Arts and Ticket Purchase History

Sarah Lee

In this paper, Lee uses the Major University Presenters' *Value Study* dataset to examine the relationship between individuals' stated preferences for performances across a variety of performance types and their actual history of purchasing tickets to performances of those

same types. The author finds that there is a substantial proportion of the arts-going population who exhibit strong preferences for various types of performances, but whose ticket purchase behavior alone would not reveal those preferences (“high-demand non-purchasers”). Lee then develops a profile of high-demand non-purchasers in each performance type, focusing on the differences between high-demand non-purchasers and purchasers in demographic and background characteristics, cultural attitudes, and motivations. This paper briefly surveys the literature on participation, audience-building, and marketing in the arts; discusses the data used for this analysis; presents simple statistical evidence on the relationship between stated preferences and ticket purchase history; profiles high-demand non-purchasers, and uses these profiles to draw conclusions about potential barriers to attendance among high-demand non-purchasers.

4. Community Contexts of University Presenters and Their Audiences

Tanya Koropeckyj-Cox, Charles Gattone, William Jawde, & Deeb-Paul Kitchen

This paper builds on the original *Value & Impact Study* analyses by adding two important sociological perspectives to the understanding of audience values and preferences, taking into account the larger community contexts of the presenter-audience relationship. First, focusing on social and cultural characteristics, the authors construct an alternative audience segmentation model that draws more specifically on sociological research on social capital and engagement, socioeconomic dimensions of taste, and subculture affinities. The authors examine how an audience segmentation model based on social attributes and cultural affinities can help to elucidate audience preferences and potential attendance. Second, they incorporate data on the specific community contexts of the Major University Presenters (and their potential audiences) to examine the influence of contextual dimensions on the relations of audience characteristics with preferences and attendance. Specifically, the research addresses the following research questions:

- 1) What kind of audience segmentation results from an explicit emphasis on measures of social engagement, institutional connection, and cultural affinities?
- 2) How is this socially based segmentation related to socio-demographic characteristics and to particular audience preferences and potential attendance at performances?
- 3) How does this relationship intersect with characteristics of the larger communities in which the audience members and the University Presenters are located?

The findings offer a nuanced assessment of audience preferences within their particular communities and inform strategies for planning, marketing, and outreach that take into account contextual variations. The findings also help to inform policy and arts development by considering the interrelations of communities, institutions, and audience populations.

5. Anticipation: Exploring its Origins and Effects on the Live Arts Experience

Jara Kern

For almost any presenter of the live performing arts, *captivation, satisfaction, and remembered value* are the gold standards of a job well done. Audience members and artists who experience a powerfully positive impact during the event, and remember the moment vividly for years to come, become the favored stories of success among most arts presenters. These remembered experiences provide the catalyst for future attendance and increasing connection to the organization and its work. Yet, despite the core importance of captivation,

satisfaction, and remembered value, precious little specific research has explored where these experiences come from, how they work, and how they might be more thoughtfully encouraged. This paper is an effort to encourage such understanding and strategy. Its particular focus is on the role and influence of anticipation on the perceived satisfaction and remembered value of a live performance experience. This paper suggests and tests a causal model, examines findings from relevant literature, and incorporates interviews with audience members, practitioners, and content experts. The paper aims to provide performing arts practitioners with actionable insights on anticipation, and its central function in fostering satisfaction and remembered value in the live performing arts. This paper focuses on the relationship between cause and effect, or the causal flow, for the creation of high levels of anticipation for cultural content.

Impact

6. How We Feel About Art: Motivation, Satisfaction, and Emotional Experience in Performing Arts Audiences

Shelly Gilbride & David Orzechowicz

Using data collected from the *MUPS Value & Impact Study*, Gilbride and Orzechowicz explore the dimensions of self-reported emotional experiences in performing arts audiences. Specifically, the authors look at how these emotional experiences relate to the reasons people attend productions, the expectations they bring with them, the relevance of the performing arts to their daily lives, and their satisfaction with a show. Gilbride and Orzechowicz conduct the first analyses of the qualitative emotions data available from the study and construct ten broad categories of emotional experiences, with an additional six subcategories to provide a more nuanced understanding. These categories are based on the work of Robert Plutchik's categorization of basic and secondary emotions, as well as other research on emotion typologies. The authors then explore the relationship between these experiences and audience demographics, performance genres, and reported levels of captivation and satisfaction. Much of the analysis focuses on five specific emotional experiences: anger, dissatisfaction, fear, inspiration, and joy. The research reveals that certain emotional experiences often seen as negative in most social situations, such as fear and anger, are associated with higher levels of satisfaction and repeat arts consumers. "Positive" emotions like joy, on the other hand, are associated with lower levels of satisfaction and audience members who were out of their comfort zone. The authors speculate on the meaning of these associations and their relevance to the performing arts community.

7. Social Influences on Intrinsic Impacts of Performance

Trina Rose

There have been a number of studies regarding audiences of cultural arts. Lacking, however, is the knowledge of social and emotional factors of these audience members. What social and emotional factors predict attendance and subscription? For example, is the person or persons one attends a performance with related to their post performance impacts? The author explores this question and other gaps in the literature in more detail. To engage in this investigation, this paper uses cross-sectional data from *The Value & Impact Study* and conducts a series of path analyses to gauge whether these social factors are related with post-performance impacts, and whether these emotional factors are associated with subscription

and attendance. Results indicate that patrons' reasons for attending a performance, social factors, and ticket price were significantly related to post-performance impacts. Additionally, post-performance impacts were significantly related to attending live performances and performance discipline.

Special Interest Topics

8. Analysis of Multiple Intelligences in Understanding the Relationships between Ticket Buyers and Their Participation in Performing Arts Programs

Mark Creekmore & Sarah Rush

The concept of multiple intelligences (MI) has been used in educational settings, but it can also be used to differentiate arts' patrons by their different abilities, sensibilities and orientations. The hope is that this knowledge may be used to create more specific communication and marketing tools and identify ways to understand and address the preferences among different kinds of patrons. Using the Values Survey from *The Value and Impact Study*, nine forms of MI (Linguistic, logical-Mathematical, Bodily-Kinesthetic, Musical, Spatial, Naturalist, Interpersonal, Intrapersonal, Existential) are examined in relation to other patron characteristics, including demographic information, inner-directed values, outer-directed values and performance preferences. A considerable portion of this research focused on validating the nine intelligences, identifying relations with performance preferences and investigating differences across the study sites.

9. Characterizing Program Enhancement Events

Yael Zipporah Silk & Jordan Raphael Fischbach

Offering enhancement events is often viewed as a way to draw in casual audiences, provide them with knowledge they may not already have, and in turn positively impact their future participation. This paper profiles the enhancement event audience base, examines the impact of enhancement events on patrons who self-select to attend, and identifies characteristics that are predictive of pre- or post-performance event preferences. Utilizing data from two patron surveys, the authors analyze mean preference for enhancement events to create profiles of enhancement event attendees. Next, they examine mean outcomes for patrons who attended specific pre-performance events and performed a difference-of-differences analysis taking enhancement event attendance frequency into account and, finally, develop several simple prediction models to identify characteristics associated with preferences for enhancement events. The authors find that enhancement events are primarily serving patrons who are have strong allegiances to presenters, are frequent ticket buyers, and donate. Pre-performance attendance also correlates with a number of intrinsic outcome measures, though the effect appears to be greater for patrons who rarely attend enhancement events. Finally, age, appetite for new works, risk taking, personal creativity, allegiance to presenter, and seeking a connection to artists are all associated with preferences for enhancement events. These results point to an opportunity to deepen performance audiences by broadening and diversifying enhancement event audiences, which could in turn affect future participation decisions.

10. How Beliefs Matter: Views, Motives and their Relation to Buyer and Donor Behavior

Ximena Varela

The connection between beliefs, values and the *production* of art has long been acknowledged. Whether it is the artist's intent to make a political or value statement, or whether art is used as a vehicle for political messages or channel for values, the arts convey ideas, emotions, and elicit thought, feeling, and even action. But what happens on the side of *consumption*? Can the public's value systems and political beliefs be linked to specific patterns of arts attendance or even support for the arts? Put another way; are audiences who self-identify as conservative more likely to attend a particular arts event over another? Do their motivations to provide support for the arts vary from those who are more liberal? Do liberals and conservatives expect different things in return for their support of the arts? What are the implications for arts presenters? The paper begins with an overview of the audiences surveyed for the study in terms of their political beliefs, and provides additional descriptive statistics for age and sex distributions. This is followed by an explanation of the methodology used for the analytical process. The paper then divides into two sections: the first discusses the relationship between political views and ticket buying, while the second focuses on political views and donor behavior. It concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for performing arts presenters.

Community Contexts of University Presenters and Their Audiences

Paper #4

Tanya Koropecyj-Cox, Charles Gattone, William Jawde, & Deeb-Paul Kitchen

Abstract

The original MUP Value and Impact Study and audience segmentation analyses present a detailed view of audience characteristics based on a variety of factors, including core values, preferences, and tastes. The study provides a rich collection of valuable information and offers a comprehensive view of the range of psychological, social, and cultural factors that shape audience preferences and actual behaviors.

The current study adds two important sociological perspectives to the understanding of audience values and preferences, taking into account the larger community contexts of the presenter-audience relationship. First, focusing on social and cultural characteristics, we construct an alternative audience segmentation model that draws more specifically on sociological research on social capital and engagement, socioeconomic dimensions of taste, and subculture affinities. We examine how an audience segmentation model based on social attributes and cultural affinities can help to elucidate audience preferences and potential attendance. Second, we incorporate data on the specific community contexts of the University Presenters (and their potential audiences) in order to examine the influence of contextual dimensions on the relations of audience characteristics with preferences and attendance.

Specifically, our research addresses the following research questions:

- 1) What kind of audience segmentation results from an explicit emphasis on measures of social engagement, institutional connection, and cultural affinities?
- 2) How is this socially based segmentation related to socio-demographic characteristics and to particular audience preferences and potential attendance at performances?
- 3) How does this relationship intersect with characteristics of the larger communities in which the audience members and the University Presenters are located?

The findings of this research will allow for a more thorough understanding of the dimensions of community contexts that influence engagement with the performing arts. Audience members' social locations and relationships are directly connected to their various cultural tastes and practices. At the same time, larger communities (and the place of presenting organizations within them) define the opportunities, constraints, and potential allegiances of audience members. Our findings offer a nuanced assessment of audience preferences within their particular communities and inform strategies for planning, marketing, and outreach that take into account contextual variations. The findings will also help to inform policy and arts development by considering the interrelations of communities, institutions, and audience populations.

Background

Cultural tastes are often seen as internal and individual attributes. Yet, societal contexts can also play an important role in shaping patterns of taste and engagement in various forms of cultural expression. Sociologists have had a long history of interest in culture and the arts, particularly with regard to the role of artistic production and (as reflected increasingly in more recent literature) cultural consumption. We review this literature below, with an emphasis on the ideas and perspectives that arise uniquely out of sociological theory and research. We review existing scholarship on the place of culture in defining and reinforcing social class distinctions, and we examine recent studies of attendance and cultural consumption that emphasize diversity and openness to variety, the social significance of the “creative class,” and an “omnivore” model of arts consumption.

Arts, Social Class, and Cultural Affinities

Sociological research on taste and preference has begun from the premise that cultural patterns both reflect and reinforce the social structure and stratification within a society. Because there are various forms of art that constitute archetypal expressions of culture, this literature has been occupied with questions pertaining to the relationship between social structure and patterns of culture.

Generally there is a consensus among sociologists of culture that recognizes that different modes of cultural consumption are indicators of social status (Bourdieu 1984; Veblen [1899] 1994; Weber [1968] 1978). Taste is theorized to be both a marker of societal standing and a basis for exclusion (Weber [1968] 1978; Bourdieu, 1984, Lamont and Lareu 1988; Bryson 1996; Peterson and Kern 1996) whereby privileged groups are able to distinguish themselves from others, and thus prevent the latter from acquiring access to social resources such as educational qualifications (Bourdieu and Passerson 1977; DiMaggio 1982), marital partners (Kalmijn 1994), or business associates (Kanter 1977). From this standpoint, access to social capital can influence market position and political standing in society in broad and significant ways. Markers such as upper-class etiquette are considered signs of wealth, prestige, and power. These indicators may also serve as a passkey that opens doors into elite circles. Bourdieu (1984) refers to this passkey as *cultural capital* because it is cultural understanding that can be transformed into material gain.

Observers of elite culture have put forward the proposition that as social status increases, cultural distinction also increases. Cultural distinction is a process by which other, non-elite forms of cultural expression are characterized as lowbrow for being ugly, crude, vulgar (Bourdieu 1984; Veblen [1899] 1994) or even shameful (Weber [1968] 1978). This rejection materializes as a dislike for or shunning of particular forms of cultural expression associated with common, popular culture (Levine 1988; Murphy 1988; Beisel 1990; Bryson 1996).

More recently scholars have posited that in contemporary society, the basis for marking elite status has shifted from snobbish exclusion to omnivorous consumption and appropriation (Peterson 1992; Bryson 1996; Peterson and Kern 1996). In other words, being fluent in multiple forms of cultural expression can be a marker of privileged status. Peterson and Kern (1996) and Richard Florida (2002) link these patterns of culture to fundamental changes in the economic and political organization of society. Contemporary notions of cultural capital, particularly in the U.S., may thus be more accurately conceptualized in terms of “cultural affinities” where participation in various cultural performances can be seen as a way for people to connect with others in their own group or across diverse social groups. This is less of an economic or class consideration than it is a matter of belonging to a specific sub-cultural group and wanting to be a part of the activities of that group -

including attending certain kinds of performances – though higher levels of education and a predisposition toward creativity and embrace of diversity are important factors at both the individual and community levels.

The empirical research examining cultural engagement and consumption has tended to focus on issues of audience composition, patterns of cultural choice (Baumol and Bowen 1966; DiMaggio and Useem 1978; Hughes and Peterson 1983; Peterson and Simkus 1992) and the ways in which various forms of cultural consumption can serve as indicators of social exclusion (Bryson 1996; Peterson and Kern 1996). Moving beyond individual indicators, some of these studies have also looked at how cultural consumption (and its social meanings) reflect relationships between community features and the types of arts that flourish within them (Blau, Blau, and Golden 1985; Blau 1986). In spite of nearly forty years of increasingly complicated empirical research examining the relationship between demographic factors and performing arts, many unanswered questions still remain with regard to explaining attendance patterns.

The Audience

In general, people who attend performing arts productions – regardless of the particular art form – are of relatively high social status in terms of earnings, education, and occupation (with education being the most significant) and therefore they are not representative of the broader population (Baumol and Bowen 1966; DiMaggio and Useem 1978; Throsby and Withers 1979; Andreason and Belk 1980; Peterson and Simkus 1992; Colbert, Beauregard, and Vallee 1998). These patterns are consistent across many different countries, cultures, and educational systems. Yet contrary to historical research (Levine 1988; Murphy 1988; Beisel 1990), contemporary studies have increasingly shown that elite subpopulations do not shun forms of cultural expression that are lowbrow. Rather, relatively elite individuals have a high likelihood of attending a variety of cultural events, including those traditionally seen as low status.

It is important to note, however, that relations between social status and cultural patterns are complex. Not only do income, education, and profession have quite intricate effects on the composition of arts audiences, but the significance of age varies and is less stable over time than one might expect. Moreover, scholars tend to disagree on the importance of price of the product and its substitutes as well as other factors such as the apparent quality of the performance and a range of lifestyle characteristics. These factors regularly offset the influence of income, occupation, and even education in terms of shaping patterns of cultural consumption.

Baumol and Bowen's (1966) original conclusion that audience traits are similar across all performing arts types is relatively solid, but this does not suggest that the same people comprise the principal audience for all art forms. The early evidence on patterns of cross-attendance or audience overlap, finds only limited overlap and a strong propensity for audiences to segment themselves. Still, more recent evidence suggests that audience segmentation may be decreasing. This is particularly the case among younger patrons who seem much less concerned with the social status of diverse forms of entertainment extending further than performing arts (Peterson 1992); these findings underscore the importance of specifically examining cultural affinities, openness to diversity, and other social characteristics as they relate to artistic tastes and preferences.

Researchers have noted the importance but relative lack of studies examining audience segmentation and overlap within the performing arts (Belk, Semenik, and Andreason 1980). DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown's (1978) examination of 270 audience studies since 1970 recognized only eight studies concerned with the co-patronage of different forms of cultural expression. In order to determine the expected extent of audience overlap across differing art forms, Throsby and Withers (1979) assessed data from a 1976 Australian population survey concerning arts exposure in

both Australia and the United States. They identified the overall population exposure to the arts as ranging from 17 percent at full audience overlap (if all performing arts attract exactly the same audience) to 42 percent (if each art form attracts a completely exclusive audience). Their overall conclusion that the performing arts reach about a quarter of the population above age 14 indicates reasonably strong audience overlap for Australia.

This neglect of audience overlap has been the case even in the wake of newer sociological research within the so-called “culture of consumption research stream” (Fisher and Preece 2003: 69; Bryson 1997; Fisher and Preece 2002; López Sintas and García Álvarez 2002; López Sintas and García Álvarez 2004). This research was inspired by Peterson’s (1992) introduction of the concepts “omnivore” (one whose cultural consumption is so expansive and diverse as to resist an elitist classification) and “univore” (an individual with a much narrower range of preferences) to replace the standard concepts of highbrow and lowbrow as categories of cultural differentiation. Although some of the empirical research is of minimal relevance to the question of audience overlap, Fisher and Preece (2002) directly measure this among the five major types of the performing arts and report a significant degree of overlap.

The audiences that regularly attend performing arts productions are slightly more educated and affluent than the general population, and they tend to have more prestigious occupations. However, the same can be said of the audiences at events that have historically been conceived of as lowbrow by scholars. Each of these factors are intricately mediated by other important dynamics such as cost and perceived quality of productions and age.

Taste and Exclusion

Scholars studying elite culture have proposed that as the social status of a group grows, their cultural distinction also increases. Cultural distinction is the product of practices by which non-elite or lowbrow forms of cultural expression are cast off as being sub-par relative to highbrow forms (Weber [1968] 1978; Bourdieu 1984; Veblen [1899] 1994). This denunciation becomes visible as a dislike for particular modes of cultural expression associated with common, popular culture (Levine 1988; Murphy 1988; Beisel 1990; Bryson 1996).

More recently scholars have posited that in contemporary society, the basis for marking elite status has shifted from snobbish exclusion to omnivorous consumption and appropriation (Peterson 1992; Bryson 1996; Peterson and Kern 1996). In other words, being fluent in multiple forms of cultural expression is considered a sign of privileged status. Peterson (1992), Peterson and Kern (1996), and Richard Florida (2002) link these transformations in cultural consumption to deep-seated changes in economic and social life in a mass-mediated world.

To recognize this shift in culture from snobbish exclusion to omnivorous appreciation is not to say that most elites have become complete omnivores or that this trend is limited to elite patterns of consumption. While it is true that those in the higher status occupational groups are more inclined to enjoy symphonic music and take part in traditionally elite cultural activities, they are also more apt to appreciate a number of other more popular musical genres and engage in a broad array of non-elite activities. Simultaneously, those in the lowest occupational categories have a tendency to participate in fewer activities generally and to have a strong affinity for a single non-elite type of music (Peterson 1992; Bryson 1996; Peterson and Kern 1996). These findings contradict Bourdieu’s (1984) prediction that cultural exclusiveness necessarily increases with education.

It is important to note, however, that the trend toward omnivorous consumption, even though most pronounced among elites, spans all classes. Peterson and Kern’s (1996) research on changing highbrow taste reveals that “non-highbrows” have become omnivorous as well, but this shift has occurred at a slower rate. When taken together, these observations seem to suggest an

ongoing transformation from a highbrow / lowbrow dichotomy to an omnivore / univore status hierarchy.

Furthermore, the empirical reality of omnivorous cultural consumption on the part of elite members of society does point to a decline in the use of culture as a basis for exclusion. As Bryson (1996) showed, people in general tend to use cultural tastes to reinforce symbolic boundaries between themselves and those they dislike. For example, researchers have shown that political tolerance is correlated with musical tolerance and people who are racially prejudiced also tend to dislike music associated with the members of ethnic groups that they dislike or those with whom they feel less comfortable.

Even those with diverse musical tastes exhibit specific patterns of exclusiveness. Bryson (1996) observes that the musically tolerant tend to most frequently reject musical genres whose fans are among the least educated: gospel, country, rap, and heavy metal. This suggests that cultural tolerance is a type of “(multi)cultural capital,” for it is unevenly distributed among the population and points to systematic class-based exclusion (p.894).

Theorists attempting to make sense of this shift have offered various explanations, but for the most part, they agree that major changes in social power relations are involved. Peterson and Kern (1996) identify five factors linked to the shifting cultural markers of social status: structural change, value change, art-world change, generational politics, and status-group politics. Structural changes, brought about by multiple processes, have rendered exclusion progressively more difficult. Rising levels of education, the presentation of the arts via mass media, and geographic migration – which locates people of various tastes together – have made elite aesthetics more accessible to wider segments of the population and lessened the extent to which the arts can serve as markers of exclusion. These structural changes have led to new opportunities for omnivorous cultural consumption.

Value changes pertaining to ethnic, racial, religious, and gender differences provide the rationalization for this shift from snobbishness to omnivorous consumption. Previously, particularly in the 19th century, prejudices against groups and social hierarchies were validated and perpetuated by the best science of the day. This is now very rare. The change can be read as part of a broader historical drift towards tolerance of those holding different values, recognition of an increasingly diverse and pluralistic American society, and a greater awareness of the socially constructed nature of group differences.

Changes in the art-world also provided an aesthetic basis for this shift. Elitist aesthetic theories produced in the royal academies of Europe were transformed by market forces that swept through the arts over the past century and a half. These economic forces brought with them new aesthetic entrepreneurs who placed positive value on newer, increasingly exotic and diverse modes of expression. The elitist theorists of the early 19th century typically disagreed as to the particular mode of cultural expression that was supreme, but in general they agreed that only one single standard existed and that all other expressions were vulgarities. In this context, cultural snobbery flourished. Nevertheless, this single standard has failed to withstand the numerous, wide-ranging challenges that have emerged in the realm of culture over the course of the 20th century.

Generational politics have also factored into this equation. Beginning in the 1950s, young, white people of all classes tended to embrace the popular African American dance music called Rock’ n’ Roll. Previously, young people had been expected to outgrow pop music, but by the late 1960s, youth culture had emerged as a viable alternative to established elite culture. This has had the effect of discrediting elite exclusion and giving a greater degree of legitimacy to diverse patterns of participation.

Dominant status groups typically define popular culture in ways that promote their own interests. Although snobbish exclusion worked well to mark social status in a relatively homogenous

world, omnivorous inclusion seems to work better in an increasingly global society. There is an elective affinity between the business-administrative class and the rise of cultural omnivorousness. Globalization has thus fostered conditions in which the modes of domination and social stratification, and their relation to arts production and consumption, have changed.

Richard Florida (2002) offers a different explanation for the shift from snobbery to inclusiveness. He credits this shift to the emergence of what he calls the creative class. Florida's interest has been in tracking the ascendance of a particular occupational class that spans multiple sectors of the economy. The creative class constitutes one of the four primary occupational groups in the new, contemporary economy (the others being the agricultural, service, and working classes). The creative class is composed of a core of workers in the sciences, engineering, architecture and design, education, arts, music, entertainment, business, and law who create "new ideas, new technology, and/or new content" (p. 8). The work these people do involves complex problem solving, independent judgment, high levels of education, and human capital. This emergent creative class is bound together by a shared *creative ethos* that values "every aspect and every manifestation of creativity" (Florida 2002: 8). This stands in contrast to the elitist ethos of the exclusive univores who value particular types of creativity while viewing all others with disdain.

According to Florida (2002) the creative ethos affects the choices of the creative class at work, in leisure, when consuming, and where they choose live. Because this ethos applies to all aspects of the creative class's lives, they prefer living in cities that offer them abundant ways to be creative and appreciate creativity. Cities that score high on measures of technology, talent, and tolerance draw members of the creative class in larger numbers in a self-reinforcing cycle, thus creating conditions favorable for omnivorous consumption. This is the logic behind cultural policy that understands the arts as a means of creating economic growth (Tepper 2002).

Social Contexts, Cities, and the Performing Arts

Research examining the relationship between social structure and the prevalence of the arts has identified size and inequality as being keys to understanding this phenomenon. In general, both high and lowbrow performing arts do well in metropolitan areas with high levels of economic inequality and low levels of educational inequality (Blau et al. 1985). A metropolis is necessary for this to occur because performing arts productions need to be located in close proximity to their audiences in order for the latter to have adequate access. The significance of the other three structural features – economic inequality, occupational inequality, and educational equality – helps shed light on some of the segmentation research discussed above.

Economic inequality expands the prevalence of artistic activity in a metropolitan area. This is due to the fact that a high degree of income inequality accounts for more variation in patterns of taste, which then diversifies the demand for cultural services and products. Furthermore, performing arts are consumed publicly. With greater distance between economic classes, public consumption serves as a means of delineating class boundaries (Blau et al. 1985). This type of diversity interacts with the size of the metropolis, for if the subgroups with distinct tastes are not sufficiently large then demands for such productions will dissipate and cannot effectively engender a supply. Thus, in large markets, diversity in taste mobilizes demand, increasing the prevalence of performing arts generally, whereas in smaller markets it fragments demand so that the critical mass needed to stimulate supply is never reached (Blau 1986).

Inequality in occupational status has a similar influence on the pervasiveness of performing arts in a metropolitan area (Blau et al. 1985). This works in a manner similar to economic inequality. Occupational inequality is associated with diversity in taste that drives diversification of demand.

This need for diversity also suggests an explanation for the lack of performing arts in places with large, homogenous manufacturing sectors.

Educational inequality has an opposite influence on the performing arts than economic and occupational inequality. Educational inequality limits opportunities for artistic activities in a metropolis (Blau et al. 1985; Blau 1986). Although on the surface this appears to be explained by the degree of learning required to appreciate the arts, this relationship holds true for performing art forms typically considered lowbrow or associated with the working class. This relationship is more likely a product of the diversifying effects on taste of high levels of educational inequality. When there is equality in levels of education, overlapping groups with similar tastes are formed which then push demand towards the critical mass needed to prompt supply. Essentially the performing arts flourish in metropolitan areas where there is a large, homogenous, upper-middle class (Blau 1986).

Research Plan

Our research focused on the following specific analyses:

- 1) We assessed the data on social engagement and subculture affinity using factor analyses and cluster analyses to construct a socially focused segmentation model. Specifically, we used measures of subcultural affinities (#10, 11, 12, 13), social motivations (#19), artistic activities (parts of #20), social engagement (parts of #25 & 26), and social ties (#44).
- 2) a) We examined the relations of these segments to sociodemographic characteristics, including gender, age, presence of children, and status as student or faculty.

b) We examined the links between the new segmentation model and audience preferences and attendance. Specific items included measures of allegiance (#4 & 5), risk taking (#15), preferences (#16, 21-24), and attendance variables (#29-34). The analyses in #2a and #2b used correlational analyses, comparisons of means, and cross-tabulations.
- 3) We collected and incorporated data from published sources on the community contexts of the university presenters. Specific variables included demographic characteristics as well as factors specifically related to cultural characteristics. These contextual variables are listed below, and specific data are included in Appendix A).
 - Size and type of location: metropolitan area or smaller city
 - Context of university: university town vs. larger metro area
 - Economic measures (per capita income, cost of living; economic diversity or inequality; educational attainment distribution in the community with regard to the proportion of college graduates)
 - Cultural characteristics of the area, particularly arts and creativity indices for metropolitan areas

We analyzed cross-tabulations of audience segments and preferences by contextual features, and we examined the distributions of clusters across the MUP venues.

Analyses and Results

Our research explored audience members’ social locations and affinities and how they related to preferences and performing arts engagement. Specifically, we produced socially focused segments of the ticket buyers, clustered the respondents based on these segments, analyzed various socio-demographic and community context characteristics of these clusters, and examined how these clusters were related to audience preferences and attendance. We also examined the distribution of these clusters with regard to specific MUP venues and more general contextual characteristics. Since we are focused on the ticket-buyers, and since many of the questions we used were only asked of the ticket-buyers, we omitted the donor subjects from the current analyses.

Social Segments

The first step was to create segments based on the survey measures related to the respondents’ social engagement and sub-cultural affinities. We selected 58 questions from the survey regarding engagement and affinities. We used factor analyses to identify variables that were closely associated with one another to construct a parsimonious set of factors for creating our segmentation model. The input variables for this factor analysis were as follows:

<i>Survey Question</i>	<i>Variable</i>
Do you take a special interest in one or more specific cultures that are not limited by geography?	Q11 (yes/no)
Hip hop/contemporary urban culture	q11a
African-American Culture	q11b
African Cultures	q11c
Latin cultures	q11d
Asian Cultures	q11e
Arab or Middle Eastern Cultures	q11f
Native American Cultures	q11g
Indigenous or aboriginal cultures round the world	q11h
To what extent does your religious background or faith influence the types of arts programs that you choose to attend?	Q13 (scaled)
How much do you agree with each of the following statements?	Q19a-Q19h
I love that art these days can be digitized and remixed, sampled and quickly adapted.	q19a
I attach a high value to the authenticity and historical accuracy of art.	q19b
I tend to avoid performances of works that may leave me feeling sad or disturbed.	q19c
I take a strong interest in the artistic legacy and cultural heritage of my ancestors.	q19d
I seek out performances that will expose me to a	q19e

broad range of world cultures.	
I'll go see just about any performance, even if I'm not sure I'll enjoy it.	q19f
I tend to avoid performances with a strong political message.	q19g
I tend to be offended by vulgar language or sexually suggestive content in a theatre or dance performance.	q19h
Which of the following activities are vital interests for you?	T_q20a – h (yes/no)
Acting (performing for others)	t_q20a
Book clubs, literature or poetry groups	t_q20b
Going out dancing socially *	t_q20c
Movement for exercise/health	t_q20d
Playing an instrument	t_q20e
Singing	t_q20f
Downloading music from the Internet	t_q20g
Visual arts (any medium) *	t_q20h
Craft-making (any type)	t_q20i
How important to you are each of the following?	Q25a – l (scaled)
Supporting environmental causes and conservation efforts *	q25a
Doing activities that keep you physically active and contribute to your health	q25b
Developing your creativity	q25c
Always exploring, discovering and looking for new experiences	q25d
Keeping up with world events and why things happen	q25e
Sharpening your mind; intellectual pursuits	q25f
Being on the bleeding edge of new art and ideas	q25g
Reflecting upon, and processing, your emotions	q25h
Feeling the extremities of emotion through art	q25i
Having a spiritual life	q25j
Rejecting authority and making your own rules *	q25k
Pushing yourself to excel and achieve	q25l
How important to you are each of the following?	Q26a – j (scaled)
Strengthening family relationships	q26a
Making new friends and expanding your social network	q26b
Being involved in civic affairs and working on	q26c

behalf of your community	
Voicing your political views	q26d
Social justice and equal opportunity	q26e
Re-paying society for the opportunities and good fortune that you've had	q26f
Working to alleviate other people's suffering	q26g
Gaining control over your destiny	q26h
Escaping to a make-believe world *	q26i
Adopting new technologies as quickly as possible	q26j
Which of the following types of groups or associations do you belong to, if any?	Q44a – i (yes/no)
Health club, athletic league or program	q44a
Neighborhood association or a block group *	q44b
School or youth-oriented group *	q44c
Faith-based organization or group	q44d
Library group or book club	q44e
Cultural organization volunteer group	q44f
Community gardening, park, or nature group	q44g
Community service or civic group	q44h
Political organization or campaign	q44i

We ran several factor analyses using the oblique varimax rotation. We factored the variables several ways. When factoring without a specified number of factors, 14 factors were retained. We also ran the analyses with specific, pre-set numbers of factors, ranging from 7-14. The best results appeared to be the 14-factor solution.

From the results of the various factor analyses, it became apparent that several variables needed to be dropped before categorizing the final factors (the dropped variables are denoted in the above table by an asterisk *). These seven omitted variables were not associated with the factor categories either conceptually or statistically. The variable measuring interest in gay and lesbian culture was not as strongly correlated with the other sub-cultural affinity (diversity) measures so we did not include it in the cluster analyses, but we retained it with the preference items in our analyses of cluster characteristics. One factor in the 14-factor solution was also omitted because it consisted of only one item and was unrelated to any of the other factors: the respondents' desire to escape to a make-believe world (Q26i) constituted its own factor. As this item was not essential to our overall social segmentation model, our subsequent analyses omitted this item and retained the other 13 factors.

We named and constructed a scale for each factor. The scales were as follows: diversity, individual motivations, social motivations, religious motivations, political interest, artistic engagement, new technology, openness, health interest, authenticity and roots interest, books, community service groups, and craft-making/nature interests. These factors and their component variables are summarized below, including the factor loadings of individual items and the Cronbach's alpha for each scale.

Engagement and Affinity Factors – including Cronbach’s alphas and factor loadings

<u>Diversity</u>	alpha = .80	n = 7,645
Q11a Hip hop/urban		.4634
Q11b African American		.6815
Q11c African		.7429
Q11d Latin		.6618
Q11e Asian		.5837
Q11f Arab/Middle Eastern		.6290
Q11g Native American		.5641
Q11h Indigenous/aboriginal cultures around the world		.6232
<u>Individual motivations</u>	alpha = .84	n = 7,571 – 7,608 [some missing; most for q25i]
Q25f life of the mind		.6636
Q25c development of the creative self		.6440
Q25l achievement		.6391
Q25d gregariousness		.5671
Q25h emotionally reflective		.5336
Q25i emotionally experiential		.5113
Q25g thought leader		.4657
<u>Social motivations</u>	alpha = .81	n = 7,580 – 7,598 [some missing; most for q26e]
Q26a family cohesion		.5654
Q26b socially gregarious		.4608
Q26c civic engagement		.5938
Q26e social justice		.6224
Q26f philanthropic obligation		.6749
Q26g sense of duty to mankind		.7184
<u>Religious motivations</u>	alpha = .72	n = 7,563 – 7,645 [missing; most for q19h]
Q13 influence of faith on arts choices		.7802
S44d faith-based organization or group		.7750
Q25j spiritual life		.7167
<u>Political interest</u>	alpha = .61	n = 7,535 – 7,645 [missing; most for r19g]
S44i political organization or campaign		.6242
Q25e sense-making – keeping up with world events		.4882
Q26d inclined toward political expression		.6973
<u>Artistic engagement</u>	alpha = .40	n = 7,645

T_q20a	acting/performing		.5878	
T_q20e	playing an instrument		.5826	
T_q20f	singing		.6817	
<u>New technology</u>		alpha = .48		n = 7,129 – 7,645 [missing; remixers]
Q19a	remixers		.6947	
Q26j	embrace technology		.6076	
Sq20g	downloading music from internet		.5807	
<u>Openness</u>		alpha = .63		n = 7,516 – 7,563
Q19f	experience seekers		.6510	
R19c	serenity-seekers (reversed)		-.5684	
R19h	decency standard (reversed)		-.4256	
Q19e	diversity seekers (reversed)		-.4241	
R19g	avoid political content (reversed)		-.4231	
<u>Health interest</u>		alpha = .64		n = 7,619 – 7,645
Sq20d	movement for exercise/health		.6531	
S44a	health club, athletic league		.7269	
Q25b	health & physical activity		.6827	
<u>Authenticity and roots interest</u>		alpha = .51 (r = .34)		n = 7,347 – 7,401
Q19b	authenticity seekers		.7217	
Q19d	strong cultural roots		.6486	
<u>Books</u>		alpha = .67 (r = .51)		n = 7,645
T_q20b	book clubs, lit. groups		.8185	
Q44e	library group or book club		.8165	
<u>Community service groups</u>		alpha = .32 (r = .19)		n = 7,645
Q44h	community service or civic group		.6422	
Q44f	cultural organization volunteer group		.6164	
<u>Craft-making and nature interests</u>		alpha = .12 (r = .06)		n = 7,645
T_q20i	craft-making		.5895	
Q44g	community gardening, nature group		.4686	

The factor scores were computed by calculating the average of the component items for each respondent (i.e., computing the sum of the component items divided by the number of items). Using the average scores allowed us to retain the original metrics of the component scales and simplify the interpretation of the scale values. For the diversity scale, however, we found that the sum of the diversity items provided the most informative measure, as all the attribute variables inquiring about the respondents' interests in various subcultural categories were yes/no binary variables. Thus, the diversity scale was computed using the sum of the positive responses, i.e., the categories in which the respondent reporting taking interest.

In reporting our results, we have further adjusted these scales by computing their values relative to the overall sample means and standard deviations for the sample (Z-scores). Thus, in comparing cluster characteristics, the factor scores indicate the extent to which each cluster's mean values deviated from the overall mean (in terms of the number of standard deviations above or below the mean).

Clustering Respondents

The next step was to group the subjects by developing a socially based segmentation model. We used a K-means cluster analysis method, based on the respondents' scores for the affinity/engagement scales. K-means clustering is a non-hierarchical method that partitions the clusters and assigns respondents based on distance from the cluster center (measured in terms of the arithmetic mean). Relatively homogenous clusters are generated for grouping the subjects, in this case based on their scores from the 13 affinity/engagement scales. The convergence criterion was .02.

We used several iterations of the cluster analysis to reach the optimum model. We tested iterations ranging from two to 14 clusters. The final model contained ten clusters. When interpreting the results, it became apparent that three of the 13 scales (books, community service, and the craft-making/nature) had minimum if not negative effects on the outcome clusters based on the various R-squares for each scale as well as the R-squares and Cubic Clustering Criterion scores for the entire model.

Table 1 summarizes the mean levels of each component factor by cluster. The attributes are reported in terms of their Z-scores (deviations from sample means). Higher values are highlighted in shades of green; lower values are highlighted in red. Below we summarize the main features of each cluster, based on the relative means of the component scales. We present them here in order from most progressive and open to most conservative or reserved, and we will return to these clusters to compare their socio-demographic characteristics, preferences, and actual ticket-buying behavior.

- **Artistic Progressives** – This cluster scored highest with regard to interests in diverse cultures and openness to a variety of new experiences and performances. They tend to search for cultural ideas outside the mainstream and are highly likely to be artists themselves or to engage in various types of artistic expression. They are strongly motivated to seek out the arts, scoring highest on their average values for both individual and social motivations. They score highest on interest in new technologies and remixing, but also show great interest in authenticity and roots. They show a moderate level of religious involvement and interest.
- **Entrepreneurial Networkers** – This group is open to new experiences and artistic expression and has a high interest in authenticity and cultural roots. They are highly motivated by both individual and social considerations, and they are one of the most politically engaged groups (tied with the Artistic Progressives). They are interested in new technologies, but are relatively uninterested in world cultures and diversity. Their connection to religion is relatively weak.
- **Connected and Involved** – This cluster is quite open to new experiences and art forms, but express little interest in diverse cultures or authenticity and cultural roots. They have some moderate political interest, but show little interest in or connection to religion. They are

somewhat less likely to be engaged in artistic expression compared to average, and their motivations and interest in new technologies are about average.

- **Individualist Explorers** – Members of this cluster have a high interest in diverse world cultures and are open to new art forms and experiences, though they have much less interest in authenticity and cultural roots. They are not particularly motivated by social concerns but have a moderate level of individual motivation. Their political engagement, interest in new technology, and artistic expression are about average. They have a moderately low level of religious interest or engagement.
- **Progressive Lite** – This cluster is interested in diverse cultures and open to new artistic experiences, but members are about average in their level of political interest or involvement. They are also close to average with regard to their individual and social motivations, artistic engagement, and interest in new technologies.
- **Religious Mainstreamer** – Members of this cluster are highly motivated by social concerns and religious connection and interest; they have the highest religious interest of all of the groups. They are not particularly interested in new experiences or diverse cultures. They seek out authentic art forms and cultural roots and have a moderate interest in new technologies.
- **Open Mainstreamer** – Individuals in this cluster are interested in diverse cultures, authenticity, and cultural roots, but their openness to new experiences is about average. They are highly motivated by both individual and social considerations, and they also have a high level of religious interest and involvement. Their political interests and artistic engagement are above average but moderate.
- **Cautious Individualist** – This group scores significantly below the average on nearly all of the measures, with low openness, low interest in diversity, and the second lowest scores with regard to individual and social motivators (after the Safe and Reserved). Both their political and religious interest are low, though their artistic engagement is just below average and their interest in new technologies is relatively low.
- **Religious Traditionalist** – Members of this cluster have the second highest religious interest, but have low scores on both individual and social motivations. They have the lowest scores with regard to openness and score well below average on all of the other factors, except artistic engagement, which comes in around the average.
- **Safe and Reserved** – This group has very low, negative scores on all of the component factors. They express the lowest interest in diversity and in authenticity and roots. Like the Religious Traditionalists, they have low scores on individual and social motivations as well as openness to new experiences, but they also score low on religious motivations. It is important to note that although this group seems relatively uninterested compared to the other groups, their presence in the sample nonetheless indicates that they have in fact attended at least one performance and have voluntarily completed the survey.

Each cluster had at least two distinct scale averages that differed sharply from the scores of other clusters. These distinct scores allowed for separation into different clusters. For example, the two clusters which identified as “Religious” scored similarly on scales such as the religion, diversity, and openness measures, but were relatively distinct with regard to motivations and authenticity values. Similarly, the Artistic Progressives and the Entrepreneurial Networkers scored high with regard to political interest, individual and social motivations, openness, and interest in new technologies, but the Artistic Progressives were much more interested in world cultures and in artistic engagement. The Individualistic Explorers, though interested in diversity and a variety of artistic experiences, were uninterested in cultural roots and close average in their motivations and artistic engagement. Importantly, these clusters reflect considerations of openness to variety, interest in diverse cultures, progressive ideas about arts and society (or their converse), and preference for a “univore” or “omnivore” style of arts consumption, concepts that resonate with existing theory and research.

Factoring Preferences

The third step was to create scaled measures of preferences and attendance, based on factor analyses of related individual items. Initially, 41 variables were selected for the factor analysis.

The input variables were as follows:

<i>Survey Question</i>	<i>Variable</i>
How strong of an allegiance or bond do you have with the University?	q4 (scaled)
How strong of an allegiance or bond do you have with the presenter?	q5 (scaled)
Interest in Gay or Lesbian Culture	Q11i (binary)
Preference for safe/sure choice vs. risky choice *	q15 (binary)
What is your appetite for new work by living artists in each of the following disciplines?	q16a – c (scaled)
Classical music - new compositions by living composers	q16a
Dance - new dances by living choreographers	q16b
Theater - new plays by living playwrights	q16c
What is your level of interest in attending concerts featuring the following types of music?	t_q21a – l (scaled)
Classical music concerts (symphonic or prominent recitalists)	t_q21a
Chamber music concerts (intimate scale)	t_q21b
Opera (fully staged productions)	t_q21c
Jazz concerts – New Orleans jazz or Dixieland	t_q21d
Jazz concerts – Swing or big band music	t_q21e
Jazz concerts – Bebop	t_q21f
Jazz concerts – Latin jazz (Afro-Cuban or Brazilian jazz)	t_q21g

Jazz concerts – Jazz fusion or avant-garde jazz	t_q21h
World music concerts (i.e., concerts that feature the music of diverse cultures)	t_q21i
Bluegrass or Appalachian folk music concerts	t_q21j
Gospel music concerts	t_q21k
Hip Hop or Rap concerts*	t_q21l
What is your level of interest in classical music from each of the following time periods? [t_q22a - t_q22c]	t_q22a – c (scaled)
Music from the Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque periods	t_q22a
Music from the Classical and Romantic periods	t_q22b
Classical music from the 20th century	t_q22c
What is your level of interest in attending the following types of dance performances?	t_q23a – e (scaled)
Ballet	t_q23a
Modern/contemporary dance	t_q23b
Ethnic or folk dance of diverse cultures	t_q23c
Jazz or tap dance	t_q23d
Acrobatic or circus	t_q23e
What is your level of interest in attending the following types of theater performances?	t_q24a – g (scaled)
Stage plays – contemporary drama	t_q24a
Stage plays – Shakespeare	t_q24b
Broadway musicals *	t_q24c
Performances by comedians or comedy troupes	t_q24d
Multi-media theatrical programs or performance art	t_q24e
Lectures on current topics by distinguished speakers	t_q24f
Spoken word events featuring literature, poetry, etc.	t_q24g
How much do you agree with each of the following statements?	t_q29a – c (scaled)
Going to live performances is a social occasion for me, not something I would do alone.*	t_q29a
I prefer to keep my options open, stay flexible and make plans closer to the event.	t_q29b
I usually buy the best seats available, without thinking too much about the cost.	t_q29c
How often do you pass up going to performances because of cost concerns?	t_q30 (scaled)
How often do you pass up going to performances because of time constraints or schedule conflicts?	t_q31 (scaled)
How often do you pass up going to performances because you can't find someone to go with?	t_q32 (scaled)

Inclination to Subscribe	t_q33 (scaled)
Level of agreement with Initiator statement *	t_q34 (scaled)

Similar to the methods used for the social engagement and sub-cultural affinities, we ran several factor analyses using the oblique varimax rotation. When factoring without specifying the number of factors, 11 factors were retained. Five variables displayed no association and were thus left out of the factors. Further, two of the 11 factors were dropped: Broadway musicals and level of agreement with the initiator. Each of these formed its own separate factor, and conceptually it seemed prudent to omit these factors, as they had little or no relation to the overall measures (variables that were omitted from the resulting categories are denoted above with an asterisk*). However, we analyzed the individual items and their relation to the clusters, and they appear in the summary table describing the clusters (Tables 3a and 3b).

Based on the results of the factor analyses, we recoded variables as needed (e.g., reversing negatively loading items) and converted the categorical variables into scales. The scales were based on means of the respondents' scores for each category.

We developed the following scales indicating audience preferences:

Interests and Performance Preferences:

- Classical Music
- Jazz
- Folk
- Dance
- Theater (including spoken word performances, but not including Broadway shows)
- Broadway
- Media/Comedy
- Interest in Gay or Lesbian Culture

Attendance Considerations:

- Cost (how much ticket cost is a concern)
- University Allegiance
- Time/Social Context

Omnivorous Consumption Measures

The notion of omnivorous consumption of the arts was a key of interest in these analyses, reflecting concerns raised in prior studies and theoretical work. We examined three measures of omnivorous consumption. First, the diversity scale mentioned above was regarded as a measure of omnivorousness, representing the sum of the number of specific sub-cultures in which the respondent had an interest. Second, we created an omnivorous purchasing scale, based on the sum total of categories in which the respondent had actually bought a ticket. The third measure used the various “latent demand” variables. For each category, a value of “1” denoted that the respondent

displays a high interest in the respective category (greater than 5 on the 1-7 interest scale) yet did not actually buy a ticket for a show in that category. The meanings of latent demand may vary depending on respondents' characteristics as well as programming variations across the presenting organizations; some types of shows with latent demand may have been offered sparingly or not at all. The latent demand omnivorous scale was the sum total of categories which fit the criterion for latent demand for individual respondents.

Examining and Describing the Cluster Groups

Sociodemographic Characteristics

Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of people in each cluster. We highlight some key results below:

- *Gender Distribution.* Several of the more progressive or open groups (Artistic Progressive, Connected & Involved, and Individualist Explorers) have larger than average proportions of females, whereas the Entrepreneurial Networkers, Cautious Individualists, and Safe & Reserved are disproportionately male.
- *Age and Work Status.* The more progressive or open groups are generally younger, and the more traditional and safe/reserved persons are older. Similarly, the retirees are more likely to be Cautious Individualists, Religious Traditionalists, or Safe & Reserved, but students are more represented among the Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, and Progressive Lite. These findings support the idea that younger populations reflect greater openness to variety and progressive ideas.
- *Type of Affiliation.* Interestingly, both faculty and alumni are over-represented among the Entrepreneurial Networkers, but faculty are also prominent among Open Mainstreamers and Cautious Individualists whereas alumni are among the Religious Mainstreamers and Religious Traditionalists. People with no university affiliation are a diverse group, including Artistic progressives and Individualist Explorers, on the one hand, and Safe & Reserved and Religious Traditionalists, on the other.
- *Family.* The Religious Mainstreamers, Artistic Progressives, and Connected & Involved are the most likely to have at least one child at home.

Thus, age and its correlates (e.g., retiree or student status) are closely related to social engagement and affinities. Other factors, including university affiliation, gender, and presence of children, have a more complex relationship with affinities and engagements and may therefore be less informative in predicting artistic preferences and attendance.

Artistic Tastes and Preferences

Table 3a summarizes our findings regarding the relations between the socially based segmentation and various measures of taste and preferences. These results highlight the generally

greater involvement in performing arts among the more progressive groups on the left-hand side of the table and the lower involvement among the less open and more traditional groups on the right side of the table.

- *Interest in a Variety of Performing Arts Genres.* The Artistic Progressives showed the highest levels of preference for each of the performing art genres, except for Broadway shows. They reported high interest in classical music and jazz, dance, theater, folk music, and multi-media shows and comedies. The Connected & Involved also reported varied interests, including classical music, jazz, dance, theater, and folk music. The Entrepreneurial Networkers expressed a preference for more classic and mainstream genres – classical music, theater, and media/comedy – whereas Individualist Explorers preferred more alternative or cutting-edge genres – jazz, dance, and folk music.
- *Mainstream Interests.* These groups are around average in their reported preferences for each genre. The Progressive Lite were least interested in Broadway shows. Religious Mainstreamers, on the other hand, were most enthusiastic about Broadway shows and close to average on their other preferences. The Open Mainstreamers scored close to average on all of their artistic preferences, but were particularly uninterested in folk music.
- *Interests Among More Cautious Audience Members.* On the more cautious and less open side, the Religious Traditionalists and Safe & Reserved were well below average in their preferences for each of the genres. The Cautious Individualists mainly preferred classical music. All three groups were around the average with regard to their interest in Broadway shows.
- *Gay and Lesbian Culture.* The Artistic Progressives, Individualist Explorers, and Progressive Lite expressed the most interest in gay and lesbian culture, whereas the two more religious groups (Mainstreamers and Traditionalists) and the Safe & Reserved were least interested.
- *Preference for Safer or Risky Art Choices.* The question about preferences for safer vs. riskier art forms further confirms the split among the clusters, with high ratings for risky art among the Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, Individualist Explorers, and Progressive Lite. The lowest tolerance for risk was found among the Religious Mainstreamers, Cautious Individualists, Religious Traditionalists, and Safe & Reserved. Although interested in a variety of genres, the Connected & Involved were right at the average level of risk preference, suggesting that they were curious but fairly safe in their artistic choices.
- *Other interests and hobbies.* Other measures of interests showed that the Artistic Progressives and other more progressive and open groups were also more engaged in a variety of other activities, including books (book clubs and libraries), community service, health and fitness activities, and crafts/nature activities. The three most conservative groups, on the other hand, were least engaged in all of these activities.

These results confirm the usefulness of these socially derived clusters in highlighting the progression among them from more open and diverse to more cautious and conservative. The variety among the groups underscores the value of providing a wide range of performance options with regard to genres and risk.

Other Ticket-Buying and Attendance Considerations

Table 3b outlines the results of our analyses regarding other considerations that shape ticket-buying and attendance among audience members. Again, we see a gradient in these characteristics, with the more progressive groups expressing greater connection to the arts, allegiance to the university and presenter, and an embrace of more liberal political views more generally. The two least open groups on the right-hand side are predictably on the negative side of each of the variables. Interestingly, the five middle groups (from Individualist Explorers to Cautious Individualist) are closer to the middle but also somewhat more complex in their responses. We summarize these observations below.

Cultural Omnivores: Actual Behaviors and Latent Demand.

- As might be expected, the Artistic Progressives exhibited the most omnivorous ticket-buying behavior, purchasing tickets across a wide variety of performance types. At the same time, however, their latent demand was also highest, suggesting an even greater, unmet desire for attending performances.
- Both the Entrepreneurial Networkers and Connected & Involved showed a high latent demand for varied cultural forms, but their actual purchase behaviors were close to average. These results indicate either an unmet demand or a disjuncture between more adventurous interests and relative safe purchase choices.
- Also in the middle but revealing an opposite pattern were the Individualist Explorers and Progressive Lite. Like the Artistic Progressives, these groups showed a highly omnivorous purchase pattern – they bought tickets for a wide variety of performances. Their latent demand levels varied and hovered at the middle for the sample, however, with Individualist Explorers indicating a somewhat higher latent demand whereas Progressive Lite were about average. These results reveal that these groups are quite varied in their attendance choices but somewhat more satisfied with their current level of arts consumption.
- The Open Mainstreamers and Cautious Individualists were at the average levels with regard to both ticket-buying and latent demand. Despite their relative conservatism on other measures, the Cautious Individualists appeared to be more mainstream in their level of variety than might otherwise be expected.
- The Religious Mainstreamers had relatively narrow purchase histories, with the lowest score on omnivorous purchase behavior of all of the groups. Interestingly, however,

their latent demand was on par with the Individualist Explorers, suggesting a level of interest and curiosity that was not reflected in their actual ticket-buying choices.

- The Religious Traditionalists and Safe & Reserved had the lowest levels of omnivorous latent demand and generally engaged in more ‘univore’ consumption of the performing arts – they preferred a narrow set of genres and performance types.

Personal Artistic Pursuits

- The Artistic Progressives were most likely to describe themselves as visual or performing artists, indicating that their interest in performances was linked to a high level of personal engagement and commitment in the arts more generally.
- Individualist Explorers were on average more likely to describe themselves as performing artists compared to other groups, with over 30% engaging in some kind of performing arts.
- Again, the Religious Traditionalists and Safe & Reserved were least likely to be artists themselves. Their attendance at performances was therefore more motivated by other considerations and was more limited to a specific, narrower range of experiences.
- It is useful to note that the more mainstream groups reported average levels of personal artistic activity; ranging from 12 to 24%, their representation among visual and performing artists was notable.

Institutional Allegiance

- Of all of the clusters, the Entrepreneurial Networkers expressed the greatest allegiance to both the university and presenter. Over half of the Entrepreneurial Networkers reported a very high allegiance to the university.
- The Artistic Progressives and the Connected & Involved noted a high level of allegiance to the presenter but less so to the university.
- The lowest university allegiances were found among two very different groups – the Individualist Explorers and the Safe & Reserved.
- The lowest presenter allegiance was seen among the Religious Traditionalists and Safe & Reserved.
- The remaining groups had average levels of university and presenter allegiance.

Political Views and Other Considerations

- The Artistic Progressives and Individualist Explorers were most likely to describe themselves as politically liberal. However, the Entrepreneurial Networkers, Progressive

Lite, and Open Mainstreamers were also at the more liberal end in their political views. The most conservative were the Religious Mainstreamers and Religious Traditionalists. Three very different groups – the Connected & Involved, Cautious Individualists, and Safe & Reserved – described themselves as being at the middle of the political spectrum.

- The remaining two variables, cost considerations and concerns about time and social opportunity, showed relatively little variation across the groups. Only the Entrepreneurial Networkers noted that they had few concerns about cost whereas the Individualist Explorers felt most constrained.

Ticket Buying Behaviors

The results in Table 4 reinforce the findings and provide additional detail about ticket-buying behaviors. Aligning with the more general omnivorous consumption measure, the proportions of respondents who bought tickets in only one performance category were highest among the Religious Mainstreamers, Cautious Individualists, Religious Traditionalists, and Safe & Reserved. More than half of respondents in each of these groups pursued ‘univore’ ticket-buying in only attending one category of performance.

The list of actual categories for which respondents bought tickets is also included in Table 4. The more progressive groups showed more varied performances and more reflective of world cultures and new forms. The Artistic Progressives and Individualist Explorer in particular sought out the leading edge of art, whereas the more cautious clusters preferred classical music performances, Broadway shows, and family or child-oriented shows. The Progressive Lite appeared to sample a variety of performances, including both classical and more modern. Stage plays were chosen by Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, Progressive Lite, and Open Mainstreamers. These same groups were attracted to world music, except for the Entrepreneurial Networkers, whose choices were somewhat safer (ballet, symphony) or more cerebral (jazz, plays).

The preferences for riskier art are summarized in terms of the proportions who reported preferring more risky performances. Close to half of the Entrepreneurial Networkers and Progressive Lite preferred risky choices, as did about 60% of Artistic Progressives and Individualist Explorers. The more progressive groups were also more likely to attend performances by themselves or with friends.

At the other end of the spectrum, the more conservative groups preferred safer choices and were much more likely to prefer to attend shows with someone else. They seemed to regard attendance at performances as a social opportunity, particularly as a social occasion with their spouse or partner, rather than as an intrinsically motivated individual pursuit. These results also suggest that the more cautious respondents may have been more influenced by other people’s choices even as their own preferences appeared safer and more limited.

Three groups reported a preference for seeking out performances with their children – Connected & Involved, Religious Mainstreamers, and Religious Traditionalists. This may reflect their greater odds of having children at home, whereas the younger, student-focused groups and the retirees were less likely to be around children. The wide range of preferences reflected by these three groups, however, indicates that family and children’s programs need to appeal to a relatively broad array of families, from the more progressive Connected & Involved to the Religious Mainstreamers and the more conservative Religious Traditionalists. Importantly, about one-fourth or more in nearly every group reported attending with children, again reinforcing a need for variety in family-oriented

programs and an opportunity to reach out to the interests of those who pursued the arts with (or because of) their children.

Social Contexts of Presenters and Audience Members

Table 5 summarizes the analyses of contextual variables and how they related to the cluster groupings. These analyses used data from published sources, including U.S. Census Bureau estimates and indices developed by Florida (2004) and Sperling and Sander (2004). The prior tables are all organized by column, so that each cell in the table describes the characteristics of people in the vertical groupings, i.e., the clusters. Tables 5 and 6, on the other hand, can be read across the rows: the figures indicate the proportions in the row that are in each cluster. For example, reading across the first row of Table 5, we see that 13.3% of those living in college towns and 13.6% of those in larger metropolitan areas are in the Artistic Progressive cluster. Proportions in a given cluster that are higher than the overall proportion in that cluster (see bottom row) are highlighted in green. Thus, we see that the Connected and Involved and the Religious Mainstreamers and Religious Traditionalists are over-represented in the college towns. Open Mainstreamers and the Safe and Reserved are more likely to be found in larger metropolitan areas. It is important to note, however, that all ten clusters are distributed across both college towns and larger metropolitan areas.

There were few differences related to the educational attainments of residents, except that areas with more college educated residents had higher than average proportions of Entrepreneurial Networkers but lower proportions of Religious Mainstreamers.

Having a high proportion of Creative Class residents was linked with having more audience members in the Entrepreneurial Networker, Connected and Involved, Individualist Explorer, and Open Mainstreamer groups. It is important to note that the Creative Class is defined as including a variety of creative occupations, including high-tech and science fields, not creative artists or performers per se. Interestingly, the Artistic Progressives were equally found in both high and low Creative Class populations. Having a smaller Creative Class in a location, however, was associated with a stronger representation of Religious Mainstreamer and Religious Traditionalist audience members.

Higher levels of inequality, as measured by the gini coefficient for a city or metropolitan area, were connected with higher proportions of Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, Progressive Lite, and Open Mainstreamers, whereas areas with lower levels of inequality had more Religious Mainstreamers and Religious Traditionalists. We see similar patterns with per capita income, cost of living, and arts index for each area. The Safe and Reserved group was found in greater numbers in areas with a lower per capita income, lower cost of living, and lower arts index but higher diversity and higher creativity index. In general, the Religious Mainstreamer and Religious Traditionalists appeared in greater proportions in areas with a smaller creative class, lower inequalities and per capita incomes, younger age, and lower levels of diversity and arts and creativity indices.

The median age for an area was also associated with the distribution of clusters. Older populations seemed to have somewhat higher contingents of Artistic Progressives, Individualist Explorers, Progressive Lite, Open Mainstreamers, and Cautious Individualists, whereas the two more religiously motivated groups (Religious Mainstreamers and Religious Traditionalists) were more highly represented in areas with lower median ages.

Lastly, Table 6 summarizes the proportions of audience member respondents for each MUP venue that are distributed across each cluster group. Again, the proportions should be read across the row, so that, for example, the figures in the first row represent the proportions of the University

of Florida Performing Arts audience respondents that are in each cluster. Green is used to highlight proportions that are higher than average, whereas lower than average proportions are highlighted in yellow. We summarize the overall patterns across the venues in the next section, along with a discussion of some possible implications of these findings.

Summary and Discussion

The current project used respondents' stated affinities and engagements to identify socially-based clusters of audience members. This cluster analysis provides an informative framework for understanding and predicting audience characteristics, artistic preferences, and actual ticket-buying behavior. The specific clusters are described in terms of their component factors on pages 13-14. Socio-demographic characteristics are outlined on pages 17-18, followed by artistic tastes and preferences (pages 18-19) and other ticket-buying considerations (pages 19-21). These findings are presented in detail in the tables (Appendix A), and a complete summary of the specific clusters and their characteristics is included as Appendix C.

This summary and discussion section focuses on the distribution of the clusters across the specific MUP organization samples and possible implications of these findings for performing arts presenters. Two important caveats, however, need to be stated up-front. First, although we highlight overall trends among the MUP organization samples, we note that all of the clusters are represented in each of the samples. Their relative sizes vary across samples, but no cluster is absent or minimally present in any sample. Thus, readers should consider the particular balance among the clusters in their own sample within the context of their own communities, institutions, and programs. Second, we note that since the data for this study are based on questionnaires administered to existing patrons, the descriptions of cluster proportions for each venue are not representative of the entire audience nor are they generalizable to their surrounding communities. Instead, the data present the interests and potential attendance patterns of current patrons of the arts (i.e., the subset who volunteered to complete the questionnaire) in each setting.

Organizing the Clusters into Three Larger Groups

To identify the larger patterns and summarize the key findings of this study, we have arranged the clusters into three larger umbrella groups based on their shared characteristics and artistic preferences. We find that the clusters tend to fall into the following three groups: Progressive, Mainstream, and Cautious. Organizing the clusters in this way enables us to see their commonalities as well as some of the more subtle differences among individual clusters in each setting. It also allows us to more sharply define the patterns among audience members of different MUP venues. The breakdown of each of these larger groups is outlined below.

Progressive

This group consists of the following four clusters: Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, Connected and Involved, and Individualist Explorers. Respondents in these clusters tend to be more progressive in their orientation; more open to diverse cultures, and more omnivorous in their interests and attendance patterns, when compared to the other groups. They comprise approximately one third of the overall sample. They tend to be more curious and willing to attend performances of artists or genres with which they are not directly familiar. They also show a

high latent demand, meaning that they appear to be interested in an even greater variety of performances.

The distributions of audience members across the progressive clusters are summarized in the table below:

Distribution of Progressive Clusters by Performing Arts Venue

	Artistic Progressive s	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Total Progressive
Cal Performances Berkeley	6.95	13.26	14.53	6.32	41.06
Univ. Mus. Soc. Michigan	5.67	13.41	12.21	4.13	35.42
Lied Center of Kansas	7.57	12.62	12.3	2.84	35.33
Univ. of Florida Perf. Arts	5.29	12.19	13.66	3.23	34.37
Krannert Center (Illinois)	4.24	13.13	11.8	4.91	34.08
Annenberg (Penn)	9.2	11.2	10	4.4	34.8
Mondavi Ctr. (UC Davis)	6.03	9.77	11.02	6.03	32.85
Clarice Smith Ctr. (Md.)	4.52	10.92	12.05	4.9	32.39
Stanford Lively Arts	3.49	15.24	9.52	3.81	32.06
Lied Center (Nebraska)	4.26	9.04	15.25	2.13	30.68
Hancher Aud. (Iowa)	3.73	13.14	9.41	3.2	29.48
Penn State	3.82	13.03	8.09	2.47	27.41
Hopkins Ctr. (Dartmouth)	4.98	9.73	9.95	3.62	28.28
ASU Gammage	2.71	11.3	8.73	0.9	23.64
Overall %	4.97	12.07	11.52	3.75	32.31
N	380	923	881	287	2471

The key findings of this table are outlined below:

- Cal Performances (University of California – Berkeley)** – Audience members in this location showed the highest proportion of progressive audience members overall (41%). This is the only venue that has high proportions of all four of the progressive, omnivorous clusters among their audience member respondents. The Cal Performances sample suggests a relatively large audience for diverse and riskier artistic offerings.
- University of Florida Performing Arts, Krannert Center for the Performing Arts (University of Illinois), University Musical Society (Ann Arbor, Michigan), and Lied Center of Kansas (University of Kansas, Lawrence)** -- These MUP audience samples are

similar to each other and are above average in their proportions of progressive respondents, at about 34%. Each of these venues has high proportions in three of the four clusters. Michigan, Kansas, and Florida have proportionately fewer Individualist Explorers; they have larger than average proportions of Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, and Connected and Involved, three clusters with relatively diverse tastes and strong commitments to the performing arts. Illinois has fewer Artistic Progressives than the other three venues but relatively high proportions of Entrepreneurial Networkers, Connected and Involved, and Individualist Explorers.

- **Annenberg Center for the Performing Arts (University of Pennsylvania) and Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts (University of California – Davis) --** These two venues have high proportions of Individualist Explorers and Artistic Progressives, but have fewer of the Entrepreneurial Networkers and Connected and Involved. This suggests that their respondents are more open to risky and diverse arts choices and somewhat more interested in gay and lesbian culture, but there are fewer of the more socially involved progressive clusters. Both venues have slightly higher overall proportions of progressive respondents than average.
- **Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center (University of Maryland), Stanford Lively Arts, and Lied Center for Performing Arts (University of Nebraska – Lincoln) –** These MUP venues have average proportions of progressive audience members in their samples, but each venue has a higher than average proportion of respondents in one of the progressive clusters. Specifically, Stanford has a high concentration of Entrepreneurial Networkers, a group that may reflect the larger concentration of high-technology workers in this area. Nebraska has a higher proportion of the Connected and Involved, a cluster that is community and family oriented. Maryland, on the other hand, has more Individualist Explorers, a group that is more independent and prefers riskier arts options.
- **Hancher Auditorium (University of Iowa), Center for the Performing Arts at The Pennsylvania State University, Hopkins Center for the Arts (Dartmouth College), and ASU Gammage –** These MUP audience samples are comprised of smaller proportions of progressive respondents. Iowa and Penn State both have relatively high proportions of Entrepreneurial Networkers, a group that is open to diverse arts performances and socially connected. Dartmouth and ASU Gammage, on the other hand, have lower than average proportions in each of the progressive clusters.

Mainstream

The mainstream group comprises about 36% of the overall sample and consists of the following three clusters: Progressive Lite, Religious Mainstreamer, and Open Mainstreamer. Respondents in these clusters tend to be middle-of-the-road in their orientation, with each cluster varying in the specific domains that distinguish mainstream audience members. The Progressive Lite are similar to the progressive groups described above, but they are less committed to specific performing arts genres or to artistic expression themselves. However, like the progressives, they demonstrate omnivorous tastes and ticket-buying and tend to be open to diverse cultures, gay and lesbian culture, and riskier choices. Religious Mainstreamers are more family-oriented and religiously motivated. They are more likely than average to seek out Broadway shows, but tend to avoid risky

choices and gay or lesbian content. Open Mainstreamers fall right at the average with regard to their tastes, preferences, and ticket buying. They seem to prefer classic, mainstream performances.

The distributions of audience members across the mainstream clusters are summarized in the table below:

Distribution of Mainstream Clusters by Performing Arts Venue

	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Total Mainstream
Annenberg (Penn)	18.8	5.6	17.2	41.6
Hopkins Ctr. (Dartmouth)	13.57	10.18	17.19	40.94
Stanford Lively Arts	14.29	6.35	18.41	39.05
Cal Performances Berkeley	14.32	4.42	18.53	37.27
Lied Center (Nebraska)	6.38	21.1	9.57	37.05
Univ. Mus. Soc. Michigan	14.19	8.51	14.27	36.97
Mondavi Ctr. (UC Davis)	13.93	8.11	14.76	36.8
Clarice Smith Ctr. (Md.)	10.17	10.17	15.82	36.16
Penn State	10.34	9.21	16.4	35.95
Krannert Center (Illinois)	11.41	7.43	15.65	34.49
Hancher Aud. (Iowa)	9.24	11.9	14.21	35.35
ASU Gammage	7.08	13.7	13.25	34.03
Lied Center of Kansas	11.04	10.09	11.99	33.12
Univ. of Florida Perf. Arts	9.69	10.57	12.48	32.74
Overall %	11.43	10.07	14.68	36.18
<i>N</i>	874	770	1122	2766

Key findings of this table are discussed below:

- Annenberg Center for the Performing Arts (University of Pennsylvania), Stanford Lively Arts, Cal Performances (University of California – Berkeley), and Hopkins Center for the Arts (Dartmouth College)** -- These four venues have relatively high proportions of mainstream respondents -- about 40% of their samples have mainstream tastes and preferences. They have particularly large contingents of Progressive Lite and Open Mainstreamers, who are relatively open to new experiences and are politically liberal. These venues have smaller proportions of the more conservative Religious Mainstreamers, except for Dartmouth, which is closer to average.

- **Lied Center for Performing Arts (University of Nebraska – Lincoln)** – The Lied Center at Nebraska is distinctive among the MUP venues in its relatively large concentration of Religious Mainstreamers (21%) and overall large proportion of mainstreamers (37%). This group has a strong affinity for mainstream performances, including Broadway shows, and is less likely to venture out to riskier or more controversial offerings. They are also more likely than other groups to have children and to bring them to performances.
- **Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts (University of California – Davis) and University Musical Society (Ann Arbor, Michigan)** – These two venues are just above average with regard to the proportion of mainstreamers in their samples (37%). They are similar to Berkeley, Stanford, and Penn in having high proportions of the Progressive Lite and lower proportions of Religious Mainstreamers, but they have average levels of Open Mainstreamers in their audience samples. The Progressive Lite tend to be more open to diversity and new experiences, and they attend a wide variety of performances.
- **Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center (University of Maryland), Center for the Performing Arts at The Pennsylvania State University, and Krannert Center for the Performing Arts (University of Illinois)** – These three MUP venues have higher than average proportions of Open Mainstreamers, but are close to average with regard to the other two mainstream groups, with the exception of the disproportionately low contingent of Religious Mainstreamers in the Illinois sample. The Open Mainstreamers are highly likely to attend with a spouse or partner. They prefer less risky material, but they attend a variety of performances, including Classical music, stage and Broadway plays, and more family or student shows.
- **Hancher Auditorium (University of Iowa) and ASU Gammage** – These venues each have average to high proportions of religious mainstreamers, but lower than average in each of the other two subgroups (Progressive Lite and Open Mainstreamers). This suggests that although their audiences have a strong mainstream contingent, they lean toward more religious, univorous, and family-oriented respondents. The tastes of Religious Mainstreamers are likely to be more conservative and risk averse, favoring mainstream Broadway shows, symphonic music, and offerings that reflect authenticity and cultural roots.
- **University of Florida Performing Arts, Lied Center of Kansas (University of Kansas, Lawrence)** – These two venues are below average in the proportions of mainstreamers in their samples. They have lower than average proportions of Open Mainstreamers and are both close to average with regard to the Religious Mainstreamers. Florida has a lower proportion of Progressive Lite. Both venues have higher than average proportions of progressives in their samples, suggesting somewhat more diverse tastes overall with a smaller contingent of mainstream audience members (though still about one-third of their samples).

Cautious

The cautious group makes up about 31% of the overall sample, but the distributions across the venues varies most widely among of the three umbrella groups. The proportions of cautious respondents range from a low of about 22% in the Cal Performances (University of California – Berkeley) sample to 42% at ASU Gammage in Arizona. The cautious group consists of the

following three clusters: Cautious Individualist, Religious Traditionalists, and Safe and Reserved. Respondents in these clusters tend to be more conservative in their tastes, preferences, and behaviors. They are generally older, tend toward univorous ticket-buying, and prefer to attend performances with their spouse or others. The Religious Traditionalists are distinctive in the strength of their religious motivations, their political conservatism, and their preference for attending with family members. The other two groups are somewhat more secular in their orientation and differ from each other mainly in their degree of caution and conservatism, with the Safe and Reserved rating as most cautious of all the groups. The Safe and Reserved are the also most likely to be male and retired.

The distributions of audience members across the cautious clusters are summarized in the table below:

Distribution of Cautious Clusters by Performing Arts Venue

	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalist	Safe & Reserved	Total Cautious
ASU Gammage	16.87	14.91	10.54	42.32
Penn State	14.61	10.34	11.69	36.64
Hancher Aud. (Iowa)	12.26	14.92	7.99	35.17
Lied Center (Nebraska)	8.51	17.73	6.03	32.27
Univ. of Florida Perf. Arts	14.1	10.13	8.66	32.89
Lied Center of Kansas	12.62	11.04	7.89	31.55
Krannert Center (Illinois)	13.53	11.27	6.63	31.43
Clarice Smith Ctr. (Md.)	12.81	9.79	8.85	31.45
Hopkins Ctr. (Dartmouth)	14.48	6.33	9.95	30.76
Stanford Lively Arts	14.6	4.44	9.84	28.88
Mondavi Ctr. (UC Davis)	15.18	7.9	7.28	30.36
Univ. Mus. Soc. Michigan	13.93	8.17	5.5	27.6
Annenberg (Penn)	11.2	5.6	6.8	23.6
Cal Performances Berkeley	10.32	3.16	8.21	21.69
Overall %	13.37	10.12	8.01	31.5
<i>N</i>	1022	774	612	2408

- ASU Gammage and Center for the Performing Arts at The Pennsylvania State University** – These two venues have the largest proportions of cautious audience members in their samples, making up 42% of the ASU sample and nearly 37% at Penn State. They are also above average in their proportions across all three subgroups, though Penn State is close to average with regard to Religious Traditionalists. These audience members tend to be relatively cautious and univorous in terms of their artistic choices, and they approach

performances as social, family occasions to be shared with their spouse or partner and others.

- **Lied Center for Performing Arts (University of Nebraska – Lincoln) and Hancher Auditorium (University of Iowa)** – Nebraska and Iowa show above average proportions of cautious audience members in their samples and are distinguished by their particularly high contingents of Religious Traditionalists. This group is characterized by their social and political conservatism and univorous ticket-buying, but they attend safer, family-oriented productions with family members.
- **University of Florida Performing Arts, Lied Center of Kansas (University of Kansas, Lawrence), Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center (University of Maryland), Krannert Center for the Performing Arts (University of Illinois)** -- These university presenters are about average in terms of their representation of cautious respondents, with Florida showing a somewhat higher proportion of Cautious Individualists, a group with the highest likelihood of attending symphonic, chamber, and opera or vocal performances.
- **Stanford Lively Arts and Hopkins Center for the Arts (Dartmouth College)** – The proportions of cautious respondents are below average for both of these venues, with higher than average proportions of Cautious Individualists and Safe and Reserved, but small proportions of Religious Traditionalists. Combined with the above results for mainstreamers, these results show that both Stanford and Dartmouth have fewer religiously motivated audience members, and have a stronger mainstream than cautious representation.
- **Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts (University of California – Davis), Cal Performances (University of California – Berkeley), University Musical Society (Ann Arbor, Michigan), and Annenberg Center for the Performing Arts (University of Pennsylvania)** -- These university presenters have the lowest proportions of cautious audience members in their samples. Davis and Michigan are somewhat higher in cautious representation, mainly because of an above average percentage of Cautious Individualists. Berkeley and Penn score relatively low with regard to all three cautious clusters, which make up only 24% and 22% of their samples, respectively. The results suggest that these venues' audiences are relatively open to new artistic programming, or they may not be reaching and attracting more cautious individuals to their performances.

Implications for Arts Programming and Marketing

In interpreting our findings for MUP presenters, it is important to reiterate that all ten of the clusters are represented in each sample. This audience diversity should be underscored. Each venue is characterized by a mix of progressive, mainstream, and cautious audience members. Further, since the samples are not randomly selected from the total pool of audience members or the total populations of their surrounding areas, we must be careful in making any generalizations from these findings. However, we expect that the MUP partners and other readers will bring their own knowledge of the venues and their programs and audiences into these interpretations of the findings.

Below, we discuss the study implications as they potentially relate to programming choices, marketing strategies, and audience- and community-building activities.

- *Array of performance options.* Overall, our findings reinforce the importance of providing a diverse program of performance options that may appeal to a wide variety of potential audience members. Offering consistent options that attract audience members in each group may help to encourage repeat attendance as audience members seek out the performances that reflect their own ‘comfort zones.’
- *Exploring and Addressing Latent Demand.* From the perspectives of both programming and marketing, the relatively high levels of omnivorous latent demand among the most progressive audience clusters (Artistic Progressives, Entrepreneurial Networkers, and Connected and Involved) merit further exploration. Such latent demand suggests an untapped resource with regard to increasing attendance and ticket sales. Learning more about the nature of this demand may therefore provide insight into possible adjustments that may address this latent interest and increase actual attendance. These adjustments could include programmatic changes as well as more pragmatic considerations, such as concerns about cost, timing, and schedule (e.g., start times of shows, time conflicts, or how related shows or genres are staggered throughout the calendar). Discounts for frequent attendance, flexible ticket-buying options, or tie-ins and discounts with other community institutions may also stimulate more frequent attendance among those with a high latent demand.
- *Encouraging More Omnivorous Attendance.* Although sociologists have connected omnivorous arts consumption with socio-economic and social capital variations, our findings suggest that omnivorous tastes are not necessarily concentrated among the social or economic elite. This diversity represents potential opportunities for cultivating omnivorous attendance among a variety of audience members. Cross-marketing across population groups and artistic genres may help to introduce people to related performances that are just beyond their usual fare. For instance, among groups that are inclined to gravitate toward only one genre – as in the case of the more cautious clusters – an effort might be made to promote related performances in other genres (the “recommendations” generated by on-line bookstores come to mind). Marketing materials might include links among performances that cut across genres as well as providing series options within genres. Stimulating omnivorous attendance might also involve efforts to educate potential audiences about art forms with which they may be less familiar through newspaper and media outlets, on-line resources, or specific events oriented toward students, retirees, or families.
- *Cultivating the Social Bases of Attendance.* Going to a performance is in many ways an inherently social event, bringing people together for a shared experience or offering an opportunity for friends, couples, or families to engage in the arts together. Across the clusters, we find that the more progressive groups are likely to attend performances alone or with friends, whereas the more cautious groups attend with their spouse or partner or their children (or grandchildren). An option for expanding the audience and encouraging more omnivorous attendance might involve offering incentives for current patrons to bring a friend or family member with them to performances. Some performances may also offer opportunities for different kinds of social interaction, including informal pre-or post-show discussion formats, tie-ins with university or community education programs, or tie-ins with particular community groups, religious organizations, or lifestyle/personal interest groups.

- *Tapping into Similarities Across Different Groups.* Although we have presented an audience segmentation with ten different clusters, we are as much struck by the commonalities across the groups as by their differences. For example, risky art choices and omnivorous ticket-buying characterize the progressive groups as well as the more mainstream Progressive Lite. The respondents who reported attending with children represent divergent clusters: the more progressive Connected and Involved, the Religious Mainstreamers, and the cautious Religious Traditionalists. Exploring these commonalities may offer insights into the synergies among clusters in cultivating audiences.
- *Exploring Audience Members Within Their Relationships.* Lastly, we are intrigued by the social observations suggested in these individual-level data, including the social motivations for ticket-buying and the preferences with regard to attending performances with other people. These findings hint at the potential value of exploring these social relationships and processes. Rather than being separate, atomized groups, our clusters represent the characteristics of individuals who are in turn linked with friends, spouses, family members, coworkers, and acquaintances that cut across the various clusters. It would therefore be interesting and informative to examine the interrelations and interactions among members of different clusters. For instance, one might ask, for a given show (or genre), what is the distribution of clusters among audience members? How are clusters distributed within couples, families, or groups of friends? How might differences within couples or groups influence their shared co-attendance and the interactions among them in making decisions about future performances? Which family or group members initiate the pursuit of artistic engagement, and how do they motivate others to participate?

Conclusion

In conclusion, our research highlights the usefulness of identifying specific clusters and their larger umbrella groups for understanding audience preferences and behaviors. This approach may facilitate a greater understanding of the interests, preferences, and attendance patterns of arts patrons in a variety of contexts. Our findings indicate that there are notable differences from one setting to the next in terms of the characteristics of current patrons and their tastes regarding artistic performances. It also shows that there are some similarities among the various university presenters, not all of them expected based on superficial factors such as community size, regional variations, and socio-economic resources. Uncovering these patterns may provide new insight into the existing audiences of each presenting organization and future considerations about programs, education, and marketing.

Our suggestions above are thus derived from patterns in audience participation and interests, and are designed to clarify some of the underlying motivations for attendance. Our observations are limited to existing audience members. A potential direction for future research would be to examine the surrounding communities to develop a deeper understanding of the latent demand among those who are not currently attending performances. This would enable the MUP to learn more about potential audiences and to interpret their current audience clusters within the context of their larger communities, particularly asking, to what extent do the observed clusters reflect characteristics of larger communities? What particular opportunities and challenges are presented by the specific cluster patterns in each community?

References

- Aldenderfer, Mark S., and Roger K. Blashfield. (1984). *Cluster Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Andreason, A., and R.W. Belk. (1980). Predictors of attendance at the performing arts." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7, 112-120.
- Baumol, William J., and W.G. Bowen. (1966). *Performing Art: The Economic Dilemma; a Study of Problems Common to Theater, Opera, Music, and Dance*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- Beisel, Nicola. (1990). Class, Culture, and Campaigns against Vice in Three American Cities 1872-1892. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 44-62.
- Belk, R.W., R.J. Semenick, and A. Andreason. (1980). Co-Patronage Patterns in Arts Related Leisure Activities, in E.C. Hirschman and M.B. Holbrook (eds.), *Symbolic Consumer Behavior*, (Pp. 95-100), Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Stratification of Taste*. Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blau, Judith R. (1986). The Elite Arts, More or Less de Riguer: A Comparative Analysis of Metropolitan Culture. *Social Forces*, 64, 875-905.
- Blau, Judith R., Peter Blau, and Reid Golden. (1985). Social Inequality and the Arts. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 309- 331.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean- Claud Passeron. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bryson, Bethany. (1996). "Anything But Heavy Metal:" Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 884- 899.
- Bryson, Bethany. (1997). What About the Univores? Musical Dislikes and Group-based Identity Construction among Americans with Low Levels of Education. *Poetics*, 25,141-156.
- Colbert, F., C. Beauregard, and L. Vallee. (1998). The Importance of Ticket Prices for Theater Patrons. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 1, 8-15.
- DiMaggio, Paul. (1982). Cultural Capital and School Success: The impact of cultural capital on the grades of U.S. high school students. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 189- 201.
- _____. (1987). Classification in Art. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 440-55.
- Dimaggio, Paul, and Michael Useem. (1978). Social Class and Arts Consumption: The Origin and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America. *Theory and Society*, 52, 141-161.
- Dimaggio, Paul, Michael Useem, and Paula Brown. (1978). *Audience Studies of the Performing*

- Arts and Museums: A Critical Review*, Research Division Report #9. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Fisher, C.G., and S.B. Preece. (2002). Evaluating Performing Arts Audience Overlap. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 4, 223-241.
- Fisher, C.G., and S.B. Preece. (2003). Evolution, Extinction, or Status Quo? Canadian Performing Arts Audiences in the 1990s. *Poetics*, 31, 69-86.
- Florida, Richard. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Hughes, Michael, and Richard Peterson. (1983). Isolating Cultural Choice Patterns. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 26, 459- 478.
- Kalmijn, Matthijs. (1994). Assortative mating by cultural and economic status. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 422- 452.
- Kanter, Rosabeth. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Harper.
- Kaufman, Leonard, and Peter J. Rousseeuw. (1990). *Finding groups in data: An introduction to cluster analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Lamont, Michele, and Annette Lareau. (1988). Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps, and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Development. *Sociological Theory*, 6, 153- 168.
- Levine, Lawrence W. (1988). *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lorr, Maurice. (1983). *Cluster Analysis for Social Scientists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lopez Sintas, Jordi, and Ercilia García Álvarez. (2002). Omnivores Show up Again: The Segmentation of Cultural Consumers in Spanish Social Space. *European Sociological Review*, 18, 353-368.
- Lopez Sintas, Jordi, and Ercilia García Álvarez. (2004). Omnivore versus Univore Consumption and its Symbolic Properties: Evidence from Spaniards' Performing Arts Attendance. *Poetics*, 32, 471-491.
- Murphy, Raymond. (1988). *Social Closure: The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion*. Oxford, England: Clarendon.
- Peterson, Richard A. (1992). Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore. *Poetics*, 21, 243-258.
- Peterson, Richard, and Roger Kern. (1996). Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 900- 907.
- Peterson, Richard, and Albert Simkus. (1992). How Musical Taste Groups Mark Occupational

Status Groups. In M. Lamont and M. Fournier (Eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making Of Inequality*, (Pp. 152-68). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tepper, Steven J. (2002). Creative Assets and the Changing Economy. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 32, 159-168.

Throsby, C.D., and G.A. Withers. (1979). *The Economics of the Performing Arts*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Veblen, Thorstein [1899] 1994. *Theory of the Leisure Class*.

Webber, Max. [1968] 1978. *Economy and Society*. Translated by G. Roth and C. Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Appendix A – Detailed Tables

Table 1. Clusters by Engagement and Affinity Factors (Z-scores)

	Artistic Progressive s	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalist	Safe & Reserved
Diversity	2.44	-0.34	0.87	2.15	0.72	-0.52	-0.65	-0.55	-0.65	-0.71
Individual motivations	1.06	0.75	0.51	0.26	0.11	0.2	0.08	-0.44	-0.83	-1.46
Social motivations	0.96	0.66	0.55	0.01	-0.06	0.47	0.05	-0.6	-0.43	-1.47
Religious influence	0.22	-0.29	0.58	-0.23	-0.51	1.36	-0.57	-0.64	1.17	-0.78
Political interest	0.71	0.71	0.25	0.19	0.07	0.13	0.19	-0.42	-0.66	-1.07
Artistic engagement	0.47	0.05	0.23	0.06	-0.07	0.25	-0.25	-0.12	0.07	-0.35
New technology	0.6	0.53	0.15	-0.1	-0.03	0.2	0.03	-0.28	-0.42	-0.67
Openness – novelty, experience	0.96	0.72	0.1	0.54	0.53	-0.75	0.42	-0.46	-1.03	-0.7
Authenticity and roots	0.95	0.73	0.83	-0.45	-0.58	0.7	-1	-0.44	-0.56	-1.09
N	380	923	881	287	874	770	1122	1022	774	612

Note: Green highlighting = higher than average ratings on component factors; Gold = lower than average ratings on component factors.

Table 2. Clusters by Socio-demographic Characteristics

	Artistic Progressive	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalist	Safe & Reserved
Female %	71.1	61.2	72.3	75.2	69.5	68.3	63.0	61.6	69.0	58.3
Age Mean	40.3	43.1	44.4	43.6	42.0	46.5	44.1	46.9	46.9	47.6
Age %										
18-34	40.4	33.3	29.1	28.1	36.1	22.4	29.8	22.9	18.7	20.4
35-44	18.2	16.2	17.9	22.5	16.7	16.5	18.2	17.1	21.4	21.3
45-54	22.5	24.2	25.0	25.3	25.4	29.3	25.1	26.6	29.4	22.6
55-64	15.2	19.1	20.1	18.6	15.5	23.0	18.5	20.2	19.5	22.1
65 +	3.7	7.2	7.9	5.6	6.2	8.9	8.3	13.2	11.0	13.7
Retired %	6.7	10.6	10.7	8.5	8.7	13.1	11.0	15.9	14.3	18.8
Working full-time %	59.7	57.7	56.1	60.6	59.5	56.7	59.4	55.9	56.4	57.0
Full-time student %	19.5	19.2	16.5	16.3	18.4	10.9	15.6	12.9	9.5	10.1
Affiliation – Student %	22.6	21.6	17.8	17.4	23.5	12.9	17.6	14.6	10.6	12.1
Affiliation – Faculty %	8.2	10.7	6.8	9.8	9.3	7.9	11.0	10.8	5.8	7.5
Affiliation – Alumni %	28.2	30.7	28.0	23.3	24.8	31.3	27.3	26.9	31.4	24.0
No affiliation %	36.6	28.5	33.6	41.5	32.8	33.0	34.5	33.5	37.2	41.5
At least one child at home %	14.2	11.3	13.9	10.8	9.3	15.2	10.6	11.3	13.7	11.3
N	380	923	881	287	874	770	1,122	1,022	774	612

Note: Green highlighting = higher than average ratings; Gold = lower than average ratings. Except for age, where green highlighting denotes younger age and gold denotes older; retired, where gold = more likely to be retired; and no affiliation, where gold = more likely to have no affiliation.

Table 3a. Clusters by Tastes, Preferences, and Other Interests

	Artistic Progressive	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalists	Safe & Reserved
Classical - Z	.28	.29	.24	-.07	-.11	.19	-.14	.10	-.29	-.57
Classical %										
Jazz - Z	.77	.23	.34	.30	.16	-.04	-.11	-.28	-.36	-.62
Jazz %										
Dance - Z	.82	.23	.45	.40	.24	-.03	-.08	-.35	-.53	-.63
Dance %										
Theater - Z	.81	.57	.28	.21	.12	-.03	.12	-.35	-.67	-.84
Theater %										
Folk - Z	1.00	.17	.62	.46	.22	.15	-.29	-.41	-.33	-.90
Folk %										
Broadway - Z	.06	.07	.09	-.46	-.26	.32	-.02	-.05	.19	-.22
Media/comedy - Z	.60	.31	.19	.01	.01	.06	.09	-.26	-.31	-.51
Media/comedy %										
Gay/Lesbian Culture - Z	1.33	-.07	.02	1.04	.28	-.30	-.10	-.20	-.28	-.26
Risky Art - Z	.56	.31	.09	.48	.29	-.44	.16	-.26	-.48	-.32
Other										

Interests	.20	.07	.19	.14	.06	.05	.03	-.14	-.15	-.35
Books	.41	.17	.28	.09	.02	.12	-.07	-.18	-.13	-.31
Service	.25	.20	.16	.15	.06	.13	.03	-.17	-.18	-.51
Health	.29	-.01	.17	.13	-.01	.12	-.11	-.02	-.08	-.13
Crafts/Nature										

Note: Green highlighting = higher than average ratings or proportions; Gold = lower than average ratings or proportions.

Table 3b. Clusters by Other Considerations

	Artistic Progressive	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalists	Safe & Reserved
Omnivorous Purchase	2.82	2.47	2.38	2.78	2.82	1.90	2.52	2.27	1.96	2.29
Omnivorous Latent Demand	7.18	5.59	5.77	4.89	4.45	4.80	4.08	3.68	3.02	2.55
Visual Artist - Z	.46	.12	.16	.14	.05	.03	-.09	-.11	-.21	-.23
Visual Artist - %	32.5	20.2	21.9	20.9	17.8	17.2	12.9	12.1	8.5	7.7
Performing Artist - Z	.35	.07	.10	.20	.01	.06	-.12	-.04	-.04	-.25
Performing Artist - %	36.7	25.0	26.3	30.3	22.5	24.4	17.0	20.3	20.5	11.5
University Allegiance - Z	.13	.26	.12	-.22	-.03	.14	-.05	-.04	-.11	-.35
Hi Univ. Allegiance - %	34.8	50.5	42.2	29.0	35.6	41.0	36.2	34.8	31.3	26.3
Presenter Allegiance - Z	.35	.30	.24	-.01	-.01	.12	-.10	-.10	-.24	-.49
Hi Presenter Allegiance - %	38.8	35.1	31.6	23.9	20.3	25.6	19.4	18.5	14.1	10.1
Liberal Political Views - Z	.50	.39	.03	.56	.44	-.75	.33	-.18	-.79	-.22
Cost no issue - Z	-.12	.23	-.04	-.32	-.14	-.02	.13	.08	-.12	-.06
Cost no issue %										
Time/social context	3.66	3.54	3.25	3.65	3.41	3.37	3.49	3.53	3.44	3.54

Time/social context hi %	39	35	26	37	32	31	33	34	32	36
<i>N</i>	627	980	572	611	999	1,024	608	811	715	698

Note: Green highlighting = higher than average ratings or proportions; Gold = lower than average ratings or proportions.

Table 4. Clusters by Ticket Buying Behavior

	Artistic Progressive	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalists	Safe & Reserved
Bought in 1 Category - %	44.2	46.4	48.1	43.1	43.9	53.5	48.3	52.3	51.4	51.4
Bought Tickets - %										
Ballet	8.2	11.8	10.3	8.4	9.6	9.0	9.7	9.7	8.1	10.1
Mod.	22.1	18.3	19.0	31.4	24.5	9.0	20.1	12.7	10.6	15.2
Dance	7.6	7.7	6.4	6.6	6.2	6.1	7.9	5.3	6.6	7.5
Other	39.7	27.5	34.9	40.8	38.4	19.4	26.4	25.5	18.2	23.2
Dance	11.3	16.5	12.0	7.7	12.9	15.2	14.6	20.1	11.8	12.4
World	10.0	12.4	10.9	12.5	14.5	9.3	13.6	16.3	8.0	13.1
M&D	15.3	17.2	16.9	16.0	19.2	16.9	18.2	20.2	14.3	19.1
Symphonic	9.7	8.7	7.6	9.4	10.1	6.6	8.2	7.5	7.6	8.2
Chamber	25.5	19.5	17.2	19.9	23.7	11.3	18.2	16.7	14.2	15.5
Opera/vocal	14.0	18.2	14.5	9.4	11.4	23.1	19.1	20.8	27.7	24.4
Contemp	12.6	11.7	10.3	10.8	14.2	7.0	12.8	10.1	6.1	10.1
Jazz/Blues	14.2	10.3	8.6	16.0	14.2	4.2	10.6	6.0	5.2	6.1
Broadway	3.9	3.1	2.9	3.8	3.9	2.7	4.5	2.4	2.7	4.4
Stage plays	6.3	4.8	2.4	4.5	4.8	2.3	3.7	2.1	1.7	2.9
Multimedia	20.8	19.2	18.4	19.5	22.9	19.0	20.9	18.2	21.2	23.7
/Perf.	9.0	4.7	4.4	7.3	6.9	1.8	4.1	2.2	2.3	1.6
Art	35.3	19.4	24.3	31.0	29.2	12.5	21.9	16.1	15.1	16.2
Comedy	16.1	15.9	16.6	22.7	15.2	15.1	17.4	14.8	14.6	15.5
Speakers										
Fam./Child										
Urban										
African/AA										
Student										
Perf.										
Prefer Risky Choice - %	62.0	49.7	39.5	58.2	48.7	13.7	42.7	22.4	11.8	19.5
Prefer to go with someone	21.7	32.6	33.1	21.3	19.0	47.0	31.3	37.1	46.9	36.3

- %										
Attend										
Alone	37.1	24.6	25.7	32.8	27.8	15.4	19.8	18.9	13.1	16.5
w/ Spouse/ Partner	61.1	67.9	68.2	67.6	66.0	72.7	72.0	73.2	76.1	69.1
w/ child	29.0	25.5	33.7	27.5	23.8	39.5	26.5	29.2	37.6	25.5
w/ Friends	75.5	63.5	66.4	71.8	64.5	58.1	59.1	48.9	48.2	42.8
N	627	980	572	611	999	1,024	608	811	715	698

Note: Distinctive levels generally related to higher diversity or attendance are highlighted in green. 'Univore' ticket buying highlighted in gold.

Table 5. Clusters by Characteristics of Larger Social Context

	Artistic Progressive	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalist	Safe & Reserved
Coll. Town	13.3	12.0	11.7	3.7	11.3	10.5	14.1	13.3	10.7	7.5
Large Metro	13.6	12.2	11.0	3.8	11.7	8.9	16.2	13.6	8.7	9.1
College educ.										
Hi (> 35%)	4.8	12.9	11.5	3.8	11.5	9.2	14.7	13.6	10.1	7.8
Low	5.2	10.7	11.7	3.6	11.3	11.4	14.6	13.0	10.2	8.3
Creative class										
Hi (>35 %)	4.9	12.7	12.5	4.6	11.6	8.1	15.7	13.5	8.5	8.2
Low	5.0	11.7	11.0	3.3	11.3	11.2	14.1	13.1	11.0	7.9
Inequality										
Hi (gini>.45)	5.3	13.1	11.5	3.9	12.6	8.6	15.2	13.2	8.7	7.9
Low	4.6	11.2	11.8	3.6	9.8	11.8	13.7	13.4	12.4	7.9
Per capita income										
Hi (>30K)	5.4	13.1	12.3	4.7	13.4	7.8	15.9	13.1	7.1	7.3
Low	4.8	11.8	11.3	3.3	10.2	11.3	13.8	13.4	12.1	8.2
Cost of living										
Above avg	5.8	12.4	11.9	4.8	13.9	7.7	15.9	13.2	7.1	7.3
Below avg	4.3	12.0	11.4	2.9	9.2	12.0	13.4	13.3	13.0	8.4
Median age										
Hi (>33)	5.3	12.3	11.4	4.2	12.7	8.7	15.4	13.9	8.4	7.8
Low	4.6	12.2	11.9	3.3	9.7	11.6	13.5	12.6	12.6	8.0
Diversity										
Hi (>50%)	5.4	12.0	12.0	5.4	13.0	7.4	16.7	13.1	6.6	8.4
Low	4.8	12.3	11.5	3.2	10.7	10.9	13.8	13.4	11.6	7.7
Arts index										
Hi (>80)	5.7	12.4	12.2	4.6	13.1	8.2	15.3	13.4	7.6	7.5
Low	4.1	12.0	10.9	2.8	9.1	12.3	13.6	13.2	13.6	8.4
Creativity Index										
Hi (>.80)	4.5	12.1	10.8	4.0	11.0	9.6	15.5	13.8	10.0	8.8
Low	5.3	12.3	12.2	3.6	11.5	10.4	13.8	13.0	10.6	7.2
N	380	923	881	287	874	770	1122	1022	774	612
Overall %	4.97	12.07	11.52	3.75	11.43	10.07	14.68	13.37	10.12	8.01

Cluster characteristics based on metropolitan area of venue. Tabulations exclude Dartmouth. Green highlighting = higher values.

Table 6. Clusters by Specific MUP Venue

	Artistic Progressive	Entrepreneurial Networkers	Connected & Involved	Individualist Explorers	Progressive Lite	Religious Mainstreamer	Open Mainstreamer	Cautious Individualist	Religious Traditionalist	Safe & Reserved
UFPA	5.29	12.19	13.66	3.23	9.69	10.57	12.48	14.10	10.13	8.66
Univ. of Maryland	4.52	10.92	12.05	4.90	10.17	10.17	15.82	12.81	9.79	8.85
Arizona State Univ.	2.71	11.30	8.73	0.90	7.08	13.70	13.25	16.87	14.91	10.54
UC Davis	6.03	9.77	11.02	6.03	13.93	8.11	14.76	15.18	7.90	7.28
Univ. of Michigan	5.67	13.41	12.21	4.13	14.19	8.51	14.27	13.93	8.17	5.50
Univ. of Nebraska	4.26	9.04	15.25	2.13	6.38	21.10	9.57	8.51	17.73	6.03
Univ. of Iowa	3.73	13.14	9.41	3.20	9.24	11.90	14.21	12.26	14.92	7.99
Univ. of Illinois	4.24	13.13	11.80	4.91	11.41	7.43	15.65	13.53	11.27	6.63
Univ. of Kansas	7.57	12.62	12.30	2.84	11.04	10.09	11.99	12.62	11.04	7.89
Penn State Univ.	3.82	13.03	8.09	2.47	10.34	9.21	16.40	14.61	10.34	11.69
UC Berkeley	6.95	13.26	14.53	6.32	14.32	4.42	18.53	10.32	3.16	8.21
Stanford Univ.	3.49	15.24	9.52	3.81	14.29	6.35	18.41	14.60	4.44	9.84
artmouth College	4.98	9.73	9.95	3.62	13.57	10.18	17.19	14.48	6.33	9.95
Univ. of Penn.	9.20	11.20	10.00	4.40	18.80	5.60	17.20	11.20	5.60	6.80
N	380	923	881	287	874	770	1122	1022	774	612
Overall %	4.97	12.07	11.52	3.75	11.43	10.07	14.68	13.37	10.12	8.01

Note: Green highlighting = higher proportions than for group within overall sample; Gold = lower proportions.

Appendix B – Sample Contextual Variables

Center, Location	Sperling & Sander (2004)						R. Florida (2004)				
	Population	Per capita income	Median home	Cost of Living Index	Median age	Diversity	% 4+ years of college	Arts & Culture Index	Size (pop.)	Creativity Index	Creative Class - Share
University of Maryland, College Park, MD [Washington metro]	5,162,000	\$35,242	\$258,700	125.4	35.2	58.8%	41.8%	99	>1 million	.897	39.81%
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA	5,149,000	\$27,811	\$152,000	105.2	36.8	45.8%	27.7%	97	>1 million	.778	32.43%
ASU Gammage, Tempe, AZ [Phoenix metro]	3,500,000	\$24,777	\$145,800	98.7	33.5	49.3%	25.1%	18	>1 million	.809	29.99%
University of California, Berkeley, CA [Oakland] [San Francisco]	2,465,000 1,715,000	\$32,763 \$41,686	\$455,630 \$516,400	179.3 196.4	35.5 37.9	66.9% 63.2%	34.8% 45.0%	63 99	>1 million	San Fran. .958	36.08%
Stanford University, Stanford/Palo Alto, CA [San Jose metro]	1,684,000	\$39,175	\$478,000	184.1	34.2	66.9%	40.4%	75			
Mondavi Center, University of California, Davis, CA [Sacramento metro]	1,749,000	\$25,059	\$224,200	123.4	35.3	53.3%	25.9%	67	>1 million	.895	32.95%
University Musical Society, Ann Arbor, MI	603,000	\$30,509	\$206,900	110.3	33.8	28.4%	36.9%	86	>1 million	Detroit .557	30.89%
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE	258,000	\$26,315	\$126,300	93.9	32.3	20.5%	33.3%	85	250-500,000	.790	31.75%
University of Florida, Gainesville, FL	222,000	\$21,510	\$130,800	91.1	29.1	46.0%	39.6%	82	<250,000	.682	37.02%
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL	183,000	\$22,753	\$114,900	92.1	28.6	37.5%	38.0%	66	<250,000	.775	35.59%

Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA	139,000	\$19,594	\$133,970	92.5	28.7	17.3%	36.3%	70	<250,000	.611	22.31%
University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA	114,000	\$27,299	\$150,860	97.7	28.6	20.4%	47.6%	7	<250,000	.847	31.67%
University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS	102,000	\$20,301	\$142,860	95.6	26.9	27.7%	42.7%	1	<250,000	.564	28.61%
Overall U.S.		\$23,420	\$160,100	100.0	35.5	35.2%	36.9%				

Color key: blue = large city
green = capital city
yellow = college town

Note: The smaller size of the Dartmouth College location created some difficulties in finding equivalent contextual data. This venue was therefore excluded from the summary contextual measures presented in Table 5. The Ontario Presenters Network was also excluded because the complexities of comparing American and Canadian contexts were beyond the scope of the current project.

Sources:

Florida, R. (2004). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books. (updated paperback edition).
Spurling, B., & Sander, P. (2004). *Cities ranked & rated*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing.

APPENDIX C: Cluster Descriptions

PROGRESSIVE

Artistic Progressives

The Artistic Progressives score highest with regard to reporting interest in diverse cultures and openness to a variety of new experiences and performances. They tend to search for cultural ideas outside the mainstream. They are highly likely to be visual or performing artists themselves or to engage in various types of artistic expression. They are strongly motivated to seek out the arts, scoring highest on their average values for both individual and social motivations. They score highest on interest in new technologies and remixing, but also show great interest in authenticity and roots. They show a moderate level of religious involvement and interest.

With regard to sociodemographic characteristics, they are disproportionately female (71%), have a large concentration of students but also a high concentration of people with no university affiliation. A relatively high proportion of this group (14%) has at least one child at home. They are also the youngest cluster, with over 40% being under the age of 35.

In terms of artistic tastes and preferences, the Artistic Progressives show the highest levels of preference for all of the performing art genres, except for Broadway shows. They report high interest in classical music and jazz, dance, theater, folk music, multi-media shows and comedies. Along with Individualist Explorers and Progressive Lites, this group expressed the most interest in gay and lesbian culture. This group shows a higher than average interest in risky art, and they are most likely to describe themselves as politically liberal, along with the Individualist Explorers.

The ticket buying and attendance of Artistic Progressives reflects the highest degree of omnivorous consumption as well as the highest levels of latent demand. They seek out the leading edge of art and prefer stage plays and world music. Most attend performances with their spouse/partner or friends (they are most likely to attend with friends of all the clusters, 75%), though they also have the highest likelihood of attending alone (37%). Their interest in performances is linked to a generally high level of personal engagement and commitment in the arts. Artistic Progressives, like the Connected & Involved, note a high level of allegiance to the presenter but less of a connection to the university compared to other groups.

Entrepreneurial Networkers

The Entrepreneurial Networkers are open to new experiences and artistic expression and have a high interest in authenticity and cultural roots. They are highly motivated by both individual and social considerations, and are one of the most politically engaged groups (tied with the Artistic Progressives). They are interested in new technologies, but less interested in world cultures and diversity. Their connection to religion is relatively weak. Compared to the Artistic Progressives, they are somewhat more likely to be male (nearly 38% among the Entrepreneurial Networkers compared to 29% of Artistic Progressives). The Entrepreneurial Networkers have large concentrations of students, faculty, and alumni.

In terms of artistic tastes and preferences, this group expresses interest in a variety of artistic genres, preferring more classic and mainstream genres – classical music, theater, and media/comedy. They are drawn to risky art, but are less interested in gay or lesbian culture or personal artistic expression. Their ticket buying and attendance, like the Connected and Involved, shows high levels of latent demand, but their actual purchasing behaviors are close to average. They attend stage plays, ballet, symphonies, and jazz. They are likely to attend performances with friends or with their

spouse/partner, and they express a high allegiance to both the university and presenter. Their political views are relatively liberal, and they note few concerns about cost.

Connected and Involved

The Connected and Involved group members are interested in diverse cultures and authentic cultural roots. Their political interest is moderate, but they have higher than average religious interest and social motivations. They are somewhat less likely to be engaged in artistic expression compared to the average, and their interests in new technologies and novel experiences are about average. They are disproportionately female and are somewhat more likely than other clusters to have at least one child at home, along with the Artistic Progressives, Religious Mainstreamers, and Religious Traditionalists.

In terms of artistic tastes and preferences, the Connected and Involved (like the Artistic Progressives) report varied interests, including classical music, jazz, dance, theater, and folk music. Their reported level of risk preference is average, suggesting that they are curious but fairly safe in their artistic choices. Still, they express interest in a variety of genres. Like the Entrepreneurial Networkers, this group shows high levels of latent demand, but their actual purchasing behaviors are close to average. Like the religious groups, the Connected and Involved report a preference for seeking out performances to attend with children. Like the Artistic Progressives, they note a high level of allegiance to the presenter but less so to the university. They describe themselves as being at the middle of the political spectrum.

Individualist Explorers

The Individualist Explorers have a high interest in diverse world cultures and are open to new art forms and experiences, though they are much less interested in authenticity and cultural roots. Their individual and social motivations are near the average, as are their political engagement, interest in new technology, and artistic expression. They have a relatively low level of religious interest. They are disproportionately female and are least likely among the clusters (along with the Safe and Reserved) to be affiliated with the university.

In terms of artistic tastes and preferences, this group is interested in a variety of artistic genres, preferring more alternative or cutting-edge genres – jazz, dance, and folk music – but expressing little interest in Broadway shows. Along with Artistic Progressives and Progressive Lites, this group expressed the most interest in gay and lesbian culture and in riskier art.

Their ticket buying and attendance, like that of the Artistic Progressives and Progressive Lites, shows a highly omnivorous purchasing pattern. They seek out the leading edge of art. Their latent demand is around the middle of the sample, however. A relatively high proportion seeks out performances alone (32%), though most attend with a spouse/partner (68%) or friends (72%). They are somewhat more likely to describe themselves as performing artists compared to other groups. Along with the Safe and Reserved, this group registers the lowest levels of allegiance to the universities but average levels with regard to the presenters. With the Artistic Progressives, they are most likely to describe themselves as politically liberal. This group reports feeling the most constrained about cost.

MAINSTREAM

Progressive Lite

The Progressive Lite group is interested in diverse cultures and is open to new artistic experiences, but is close to average in their level of political interest and their individual and social motivations. This group includes a large concentration of students. They express little interest in Broadway shows or authenticity and cultural roots (similar to the Individualist Explorers), but are otherwise close to the average in their preferences. This group shows the most interest in gay and lesbian culture along with Artistic Progressives and Individualist Explorers. They also score high with regard to risky art.

With regard to ticket buying and attendance, the Progressive Lites show a highly omnivorous purchasing pattern, similar to the Artistic Progressives and Individualist Explorers. They tend to sample a wide variety of performances, including both classical and modern. They typically choose stage plays and world music. Their latent demand is around the average. They are least likely to indicate a preference for attending performances with others, though close to two-thirds attend with their spouse/partner or with friends. This group registers average levels of allegiance to both the universities and presenters. Progressive Lites, like Entrepreneurial Networkers and Open Mainstreamers, tend to be more politically liberal.

Religious Mainstreamer

The Religious Mainstreamers are highly motivated by social concerns and religious connection; they express the highest religious interest of all of the groups. They are not particularly interested in new experiences or diverse cultures. They seek out authentic art forms and cultural roots, but their interests in new technologies and artistic engagement are average. This group is characterized by the prominent representation of alumni, middle-aged adults, and parents with at least one child at home.

With regard to artistic tastes and preferences, this group is the most interested in Broadway shows, but is otherwise close to the average in their preferences. This group expresses low tolerance for risk and little interest in gay or lesbian culture, along with the Cautious Individualists, Religious Traditionalists and Safe and Reserved. Their ticket buying demonstrates relatively narrow purchasing histories, with the lowest score on omnivorous purchase behavior of all the groups. More than half of respondents pursue 'univorous' ticket-buying in that they only attend one category of performance. They are similar to the Religious Traditionalists and the Connected and Involved in that they report a preference for seeking out performances to attend with children (nearly 40%). They are also likely to attend with their spouse or partner. This group registers average levels of allegiance to both the universities and the presenting entities. Religious Mainstreamers and Religious Traditionalists are the most politically conservative groups.

Open Mainstreamer

The Open Mainstreamers are less interested in diverse cultures, authenticity, or cultural roots, though their openness to new experiences is above average. Their individual and social motivations are average, and they have a low level of religious interest. Their political interests and artistic engagement are about average. University faculty are prominently represented in this group.

The Open Mainstreamers demonstrate mainstream artistic tastes and preferences and score close to average on all of their artistic preferences, with the exception of low interest in folk music. Their ticket buying and attendance displays average levels of both ticket-buying and latent demand, similar to the Cautious Individualists. They enjoy classical music, stage plays and family and student performances. This group registers average levels of allegiance to both the universities and the

presenting entities. Open Mainstreamers, like Progressive Lites and Entrepreneurial Networkers, tend to be more politically liberal. They are likely to attend with their spouse or partner.

CAUTIOUS

Cautious Individualist

This group scores significantly below the average on nearly all of the measures, with low openness, low interest in diversity, and the second lowest scores with regard to individual and social motivators (after the Safe and Reserved). Both their political and religious interests are low, though their artistic engagement is just below average and their interest in new technologies is moderately low. They are disproportionately male (38%), and include a high percentage of retirees and faculty.

In terms of artistic tastes and preferences, this group prefers classical music and Broadway shows, but scores low with regard to other genres. The Cautious Individualists avoid risky art. Their ticket buying and attendance is similar to the Open Mainstreamers and displays average levels of both ticket-buying and latent demand. More than half of respondents pursue ‘univorous’ ticket-buying in that they only attend one category of performance. Their allegiance to both the universities and the presenting entities is average, and they are at the middle of the political spectrum. They are also likely to attend with their spouse or partner.

Religious Traditionalist

The Religious Traditionalists have the second highest level of religious influence, but have low scores on both individual and social motivations. They have the lowest scores with regard to openness and score well below average on most of the other factors. They include a high proportion of retirees and alumni as well as people with no university affiliation. A relatively high proportion (14%) has at least one child at home.

In terms of artistic tastes and preferences, this group scored well below average in their preferences for each of the genres except Broadway shows, like the Safe and Reserved. They express a very low tolerance for risk, similar to the Religious Mainstreamers. Along with the Safe and Reserved, their ticket buying and attendance demonstrates the lowest levels of omnivorous latent demand. They generally engage in ‘univorous’ consumption, with the majority pursuing ‘univorous’ ticket purchases (i.e., they only attend one category of performance). They frequently seek out performances to attend with children or with their spouse or partner, but are less likely than other clusters to attend with friends. This group and the Safe and Reserved are least likely to be artists themselves. Their attendance at performances is therefore motivated by other considerations and limited to a specific, narrow range of experiences. This group has average levels of allegiance to the university and low levels of allegiance to the presenting entities. Religious Traditionalists and Religious Mainstreamers are the most politically conservative groups.

Safe and Reserved

The Safe and Reserved group expresses the least interest in diversity and in authenticity and roots. They have the lowest scores on individual and social motivations as well as openness to new experiences, and are similar to the Religious Traditionalists in this regard, but they also score low on religious motivations. It is important to note that although this group seems relatively uninterested in the arts compared to the other clusters, their presence in the sample nonetheless indicates that they have in fact attended at least one performance in the last year. This group is disproportionately male (42%) and includes high concentrations of retirees and people with no university affiliation.

Their artistic tastes and preferences, like those of the Religious Traditionalists, score well below average in their responses to each of the genres except Broadway shows. They express a low tolerance for risk, along with the Religious Mainstreamers, Cautious Individualists, and Religious Traditionalists. Their ticket buying and attendance demonstrates the lowest levels of omnivorous latent demand and reflects 'univorous' consumption, similar to the Religious Traditionalists, with most attending only one category of performance. They are more likely than average to have attended ballet, chamber and opera performances, Broadway shows, and family-oriented performances. Along with the Religious Traditionalists, they are least likely to be artists themselves. Their attendance at performances is therefore largely motivated by external considerations and limited to a narrow range of experiences. They register the lowest levels of allegiance to the university and to the presenters, and their political views are moderately conservative.