

PERFORMING ARTS  
RESEARCH COALITION

The Value of the  
*Performing Arts*  
in Five Communities

A COMPARISON OF 2002  
HOUSEHOLD SURVEY DATA

Alaska

Cincinnati

Denver

Pittsburgh

Seattle

Mary Kopczynski  
Mark Hager  
Urban Institute

THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS

**PERFORMING ARTS  
RESEARCH COALITION**

The Value of the  
*Performing Arts*  
in Five Communities

**A COMPARISON OF 2002  
HOUSEHOLD SURVEY DATA  
IN ALASKA, CINCINNATI, DENVER,  
PITTSBURGH, AND SEATTLE**

*Mary Kopczynski and Mark Hager of the Urban Institute*

A collaborative project of the Association of Performing Arts Presenters, American Symphony Orchestra League, Dance/USA, OPERA America, and Theatre Communications Group, supported by The Pew Charitable Trusts.

MARCH 2003

# Acknowledgments

The authors of this report—Mary Kopczynski and Mark Hager of the Urban Institute—are grateful to Marian Godfrey, Stephen Urice, and Shelley Feist of The Pew Charitable Trusts for their generous and enthusiastic support of this effort.

We are also grateful for the leadership provided by the Performing Arts Research Coalition and its participants: Marc Scorca and Donald Delauter from OPERA America; Charles “Chuck” Olton, Jack McAuliffe, and Jan Wilson from the American Symphony Orchestra League; Sandra Gibson, Jon Durnford, and Shawn Sample from the Association of Performing Arts Presenters; Andrea Snyder and John Munger from Dance/USA; and Ben Cameron, Chris Shuff, and Joan Channick from Theatre Communications Group.

Finally, we wish to thank Elizabeth Boris and Harry Hatry from the Urban Institute for their guidance throughout the project; Sarah Wilson for her assistance in managing key aspects of data collection; and Frank Wilkosz for his assistance with data analysis and table preparation. Errors are those of the authors, whose views do not necessarily represent those of the Urban Institute, the Performing Arts Research Coalition, or The Pew Charitable Trusts.

# Participating Local Organizations

The Performing Arts Research Coalition gratefully recognizes the support and involvement of the participating organizations in each community.

## Alaska

Alaska Center for the Performing Arts  
Anchorage Concert Association  
Anchorage Opera  
Anchorage Symphony Orchestra  
Eccentric Theatre Company  
Juneau Symphony  
Out North  
Perseverance Theatre  
University of Alaska Anchorage,  
Department of Theatre and Dance

## Cincinnati

Cincinnati Arts Association  
Cincinnati Ballet  
Cincinnati Opera  
Cincinnati Playhouse in the Park  
Cincinnati Shakespeare  
Company/Festival  
Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra  
Ensemble Theatre of Cincinnati  
University of Cincinnati,  
Raymond Walters College

## Denver

Arvada Center for the Arts  
and Humanities  
Augustana Arts  
Central City Opera  
Cleo Parker Robinson Dance  
Colorado Ballet  
Colorado Symphony  
Curious Theatre Company at Acoma  
Denver Center Attractions  
Denver Center Theatre Company  
Denver Performing Arts Complex  
Opera Colorado  
St. John's Cathedral

## Pittsburgh

City Theatre  
Dance Alloy  
Manchester Craftsmen's Guild  
Opera Theater of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh Ballet  
Pittsburgh CLO  
Pittsburgh Cultural Trust  
Pittsburgh Irish and Classical Theatre  
Pittsburgh Opera  
Pittsburgh Public Theatre  
Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra

## Seattle

ACT Theatre  
The Empty Space Theatre  
Intiman Theatre  
Northwest Chamber Orchestra  
On the Boards  
Pacific Northwest Ballet  
Seattle Children's Theatre  
Seattle Opera  
Seattle Repertory Theatre  
Seattle Symphony  
Seattle Theatre Group  
Taproot Theatre Company  
UW World Series at Meany

## ABOUT THE PARC PROJECT

The Performing Arts Research Coalition (PARC) brings together five major national service organizations (NSOs) in the performing arts—the American Symphony Orchestra League, the Association of Performing Arts Presenters, Dance/USA, OPERA America, and Theatre Communications Group—to improve and coordinate the ways performing arts organizations gather information on their sector.

The unprecedented collaborative effort is coordinated by OPERA America and supported by a three-year, \$2.7 million grant to OPERA America from The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Working with the Urban Institute, a leading nonprofit research organization in Washington, D.C., the project is collecting data in 10 pilot communities: Alaska, Cincinnati, Denver, Pittsburgh, Seattle, Austin, Boston, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Sarasota, FL, and Washington, D.C.

Information is being gathered on administrative expenditures and revenues of performing arts organizations, the value of the performing arts as experienced by both attenders and nonattenders of arts events, and audience and subscriber satisfaction with performances and related activities.

The findings from these various research activities are expected to help performing arts organizations across the country improve their management capacity, strengthen their cross-disciplinary collaboration, increase their responsiveness to their communities, and strengthen local and national advocacy efforts on behalf of American arts and culture.

Research findings will be available each year of the initiative and a summary analysis will be released in 2004. The national service organizations are regularly sharing findings with their members, policymakers, and the press, indicating how this information could be used to increase participation in and support for the arts, locally and nationally.

For further information, please contact OPERA America at (202) 293-4466.

# Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	6
<i>Highlights of Findings from the Five Communities</i>	7
<i>Section 1: Introduction</i>	12
<i>Section 2: Attendance</i>	15
<i>Section 3: Value to the Individual</i>	24
<i>Section 4: Value to the Community</i>	34
<i>Section 5: Barriers to Attendance</i>	48
<i>Section 6: Methodology</i>	64

# Preface

The Performing Arts Research Coalition—PARC—provides a historic opportunity for five service organizations to work together in an unprecedented three-year project to measure the level of participation in and support for the arts in 10 communities across the country.

The first findings from that project—the results of household surveys conducted in Alaska, Cincinnati, Denver, Pittsburgh and Seattle—are now available. They enable us to draw for the first time a detailed picture of the value of the performing arts to individuals and their communities, and offer a greater understanding of the perceived obstacles to greater attendance.

The findings are extremely encouraging. They reveal an arts audience far larger and more diverse than currently believed, comparable in size to audiences for movies and sports. Support for the performing arts also appears to be broad, with far-reaching cultural, social, and educational implications. Attendance at arts events, for example, was perceived by attenders and nonattenders alike to be of significant value to communities, and especially important to the development and education of children. Several attendance barriers cited were primarily perceptual; for example, potential audiences did not fully appreciate the ease of attending performances and the accessibility of the arts experience.

Such information should be useful to a variety of stakeholders, including policymakers evaluating the role of government in supporting the arts; funders needing hard data on which to base and increase their financial support of the arts; media seeking a wider consumer base; and managers of arts organizations tackling the twin challenges of increasing and diversifying their audiences.

The size and breadth of the performing arts audience also suggest an appetite for expanded arts coverage in newspapers, radio, and television, and that arts coverage should perhaps be considered in broader terms than performance reviews. Grantmakers may be interested in placing their arts support in the larger context of the range of civic benefits that derive from arts attendance.

Local initiatives that improve parking and reduce perceived and real obstacles to convenience and safety could have a significant impact on the size of the arts audience and frequency of attendance, particularly if such efforts are combined with communication strategies that introduce more people to the arts experience.

We invite you to review on the following pages these common threads and to reflect on the vibrant picture they paint of the high levels of participation in and appreciation for the performing arts in these five communities. In closing, PARC wishes to convey how indebted the coalition is to the generous support of The Pew Charitable Trusts and to the outstanding service of the Urban Institute in designing and administering this project.

Marc A. Scorca  
OPERA America President and CEO  
PARC Project Coordinator

# Highlights from the Five Communities

Following are the key findings from the five household surveys for Alaska, Cincinnati, Denver, Pittsburgh, and Seattle. The findings cover participation rates, characteristics of attenders, perceived value of the performing arts to individuals and to communities, and barriers to greater attendance.

## PARTICIPATION RATES

The research indicates that attendance at live professional performing arts events, at least on an occasional basis, is an activity enjoyed by a significant majority of adults in the five communities studied. The notion that the performing arts appeal only to a narrow segment of the general public does not appear to be accurate.

- **Attendance Levels:** Nearly two-thirds of respondents reported attending a live professional performing arts event in the past 12 months. These numbers range from 69 percent (in Alaska) to 61 percent (in Pittsburgh). Frequent attenders, defined as those who attended at least 12 performances over the past year, range from 18 percent of respondents (in Denver) to 12 percent (in Cincinnati).
- **Arts vs. Sporting Events:** In all five communities, more people have attended a live performing arts event at least once in the past year than have attended a professional sporting event. However, arts attenders are active citizens who participate in a wide range of activities and volunteer for a variety of community organizations.
- **Performing Arts and Leisure Activities:** The research confirms that frequent performing arts attenders are also the most frequent attenders of other leisure activities, including sporting events, movies, festivals, museums, and popular concerts. Attenders were generally more involved with these activities than nonattenders of performing arts events. Rather than an “arts” versus “other activities” distinction, the findings suggest that people generally are either involved in community activities (be it attendance at performing arts activities or otherwise) or they are not.



- **Performing Arts and Volunteering:** In all five communities, arts attenders and frequent arts attenders are considerably more likely to volunteer than are nonattenders—not just for arts organizations, but generally in their community. Although there is clear evidence to support this relationship, the data cannot be used to suggest that attendance at performing arts results in higher levels of volunteerism. Nonetheless, arts attenders display characteristics that are conducive to greater civic engagement and stronger communities.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF ATTENDERS

The arts audience is diverse. It includes people from all age groups and income levels and is not limited, as is commonly believed, to older and affluent individuals.

- **Age and Attendance:** The most noteworthy finding from the surveys is the lack of a strong relationship between age and levels of attendance.
- **Household Income and Attendance:** Nonattenders show a trend toward lower incomes and frequent attenders show a trend toward higher incomes. However, the percentage of attenders with moderate household incomes is not greatly different from those in the highest income households.
- **Education and Attendance:** There is a strong relationship between education level and category of attendance. That is, as education level increases, so also does the percentage of respondents who are attenders or frequent attenders.

## VALUE OF THE PERFORMING ARTS TO THE INDIVIDUAL

The research indicates clearly that arts attenders place a very high value on the role of the arts in their lives in terms of enjoyment, their understanding of themselves and other cultures, creativity, and connection to their communities. This holds true across age groups, income levels, and the presence of children at home.

- **Offers Enjoyment:** A strong majority of respondents have strong opinions about the level of enjoyment derived from live performing arts. More than three-quarters of respondents strongly agree or agree that the arts are enjoyable.
- **Factors Unrelated to Enjoyment:** Household income, age and the presence of children at home are largely unrelated to the degree to which respondents find live performing arts enjoyable.
- **Impact of Education on Enjoyment:** In four of the five communities, as level of education increases, so does the percentage of respondents who strongly agree that attending live performances is enjoyable.

- **Stimulates Critical Thinking:** In almost all cities, more than three-quarters of respondents also strongly agree or agree that attending live performing arts is thought provoking.
- **Factors Related to Critical Thinking:** The strong belief that the performing arts are thought provoking does not differ substantially by household income level, age, or the presence of children in the home. However, consistent with expectations, this belief is held most commonly by frequent attenders, and least commonly by nonattenders.
- **Increases Cultural Understanding:** Respondents in each of the five communities have similar views regarding the extent to which live performing arts help them understand other cultures better. Overall, between 68 percent (in Cincinnati) and 76 percent (in Alaska) of respondents strongly agree or agree with this statement. This strong level of agreement holds regardless of education, income, age, or whether there are children at home.
- **Encourages Creativity:** Between 58 percent (in Pittsburgh) and 65 percent (in Alaska) of respondents in each community strongly agree or agree that attending live performing arts encourages them to be more creative. One's education level or household income plays little role in whether one feels strongly that attending live performing arts encourages higher levels of creativity.

## VALUE OF PERFORMING ARTS TO COMMUNITIES

Attenders place an even greater value on the arts in their communities than they do in their own lives. They believe strongly that the arts *improve the quality of life* and are a *source of community pride, promote understanding of other people and different ways of life, and help preserve and share cultural heritage*. Above all, they believe that the arts *contribute to the education of children*. Especially noteworthy is the fact that a majority of nonattenders share similar views.

- **Individual vs. Community Value:** The percentage of respondents with positive opinions about the value of the arts to their community is even higher than that reported in the preceding section. This suggests that people place a higher value on the arts in their communities than they place on the value of the performing arts in their own lives. Combining both the percentage of respondents who strongly agree and agree with each of these statements, a clear and substantial majority are in agreement, in every community, with every statement in the survey about community value.
- **Value to Children:** More than 9 out of 10 respondents in each of the five communities either strongly agree or agree that the performing arts contribute to the education and development of children. These strong opinions about the contributions made by the performing arts to the education and development children are universally strong, regardless of education level, income, age, presence of children, or frequency of attendance.

- **Increased Quality of Life:** More than 8 out of 10 respondents strongly agree or agree that the performing arts improve the quality of life.
- **Preserves Cultural Heritage:** A strong majority of respondents in each of the five communities strongly agree or agree with the statement that the arts help preserve and share cultural heritage. Among these respondents, the research finds no relationship between this belief and education level, income level, or the presence of children at home.
- **Strengthens Local Economy:** In contrast, respondents are less inclined to value the contribution of the performing arts to the local economy.

## BARRIERS TO ATTENDANCE

There are, of course, barriers to arts attendance among nonattenders and barriers to more frequent attendance among those who already attend arts performances. What is particularly interesting is that, despite what some might suspect, the cost of tickets ranks lowest among the three primary barriers.

- **Three Key Barriers:** Of the 11 barriers suggested in the survey, only three are cited by a majority of respondents in the five communities. *Prefer to spend leisure time in other ways* and *hard to make time to go out* are the two most-cited barriers in the various sites. *Cost of tickets* consistently ranks third across the sites.
- **Prefer Spending Time Elsewhere:** About one-third of respondents in each community indicate that their preference to spend leisure time in other ways is a big reason why they do not attend more performing arts events. One of the most notable characteristics of this preference is that it is one of several factors that clearly differentiates attenders from nonattenders in all five communities.
- **Difficulty Finding Time:** Interestingly, attenders and frequent attenders are almost as likely as nonattenders to say that *hard to make time to go out* is a substantial barrier. The one factor that makes this a big factor for more people is the presence or absence of children in the home.
- **Cost of Tickets:** The cost of tickets is the only “big” barrier that attenders cite more often than nonattenders or frequent attenders. Especially noteworthy is the fact that the cost of tickets as a barrier to performing arts attendance is substantially unrelated to education level, age, or whether there are children in the home.

The research makes it clear that attenders and frequent attenders share the same concerns about limited time and the cost of tickets with nonattenders. Yet the first two groups find attendance at the arts sufficiently rewarding to overcome the obstacles. Artists and arts organizations have the challenge of offering performances of sufficient quality, supported by strong customer service and community programs, to help more potential attenders and frequent attenders overcome these barriers.

Other obstacles cited by attenders and nonattenders less often in the surveys also offer arts organizations an opportunity to build audiences by overcoming barriers of perception.

- **Lack of Appeal:** The statement that the *performing arts do not appeal* is cited as a big barrier by between 10 and 14 percent of respondents in the five communities. This barrier is very clearly tied to education level and, as might be expected, clearly differentiates attenders from nonattenders. Performing arts organizations might consider increasing community programs and adult education activities that could help build an interest in the arts among nonattenders.
- **Lack of Comfort:** A number of nonattenders claim they *feel uncomfortable or out of place at performing arts events*, although fewer people cite this as a big barrier and the relationship with education is much weaker in all communities. Performing arts organizations might wish to examine the way audiences are greeted and made to feel welcome upon entering the theater and before performances, during intermissions, and at the conclusion of the event.

Additional barriers, such as *difficulty or cost of getting to or parking at events* are obstacles whose importance varies by community. This particular barrier could be addressed by arts organizations if they are in a position to make special parking arrangements for their audiences. Similarly, the belief that *performances are in unsafe or unfamiliar locations* could be mitigated by improved lighting, more visible security, and general awareness of the needs of the audience beyond the final applause.

## Section 1

# Introduction

In the spring of 2002, residents of Alaska, Cincinnati, Denver, Pittsburgh, and Seattle responded to a telephone survey designed by the Urban Institute in collaboration with PARC. The questions focused on the values residents place on the performing arts in their communities.

This cross-site report is a companion to individual reports produced for the five communities. Most of the essential statistics and findings from these community reports have been aggregated in this report. *The Value of the Performing Arts in Five Communities* is intended as both a synthesis for national audiences and a way for participating communities to compare their findings with findings in other markets. However, these five communities are not intended to be representative of the entire United States, and we caution readers not to extrapolate findings beyond these five communities.

Local arts organizations in each of the five communities defined the counties or towns that constitute their metropolitan areas. The survey results documented in this report are based on the views of 800 respondents from each of these five geographic areas.

- **The State of Alaska:** Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau (including Douglas Island), the urban centers of the state, which constitute over half of Alaska's population.
- **Cincinnati:** Hamilton, Clermont, Warren, and Butler counties in Ohio; Boone, Kenton, and Campbell counties in Kentucky; and Dearborn County in Indiana.
- **Denver:** Adams, Boulder, Denver, Arapahoe, and Jefferson counties, as well as the Highlands Ranch part of Douglas County.
- **Pittsburgh:** Washington, Westmoreland, Allegheny, Armstrong, Butler, and Beaver counties.
- **Seattle:** King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap counties.



## HOW THE REPORT IS ORGANIZED

The report provides a detailed overview of the level of attendance at and appreciation for the performing arts in each community. It is organized around four key topics:

- **Attendance at Performing Arts Events:** How often do residents attend live performing arts events? Does frequency differ by income, age, education, or the presence of children in the household?
- **Perceived Value of the Performing Arts to Individuals:** What do residents think about the value of the performing arts in their own lives? Do attitudes vary by such characteristics as age and income?
- **Perceived Value of the Performing Arts to the Community:** What are residents' attitudes about the value of the performing arts to the community as a whole? Do attitudes reflect income, education, or age characteristics?
- **Barriers to Participation:** What do residents think are the biggest obstacles to greater attendance at performing arts events?

We provide summary comments where we observe interesting relationships (or see none when we might expect something) but do not attempt to provide comprehensive review of implications or applications of results. Some of these comments incorporate feedback provided by PARC local community working group participants during a series of site visits conducted in each community during the summer of 2002.

In short, the report is heavily oriented toward tabular summaries of data and less oriented toward drawing implications from the relationships in the data. We hope this approach offers stakeholders the detailed information necessary to interpret findings in locally relevant ways.

A statistic called Somer's  $d$  is used in a number of tables to show the relationship between two variables. Somer's  $d$  values of less than  $-0.15$  or higher than  $+0.15$  are worth your attention, while values closer to zero indicate a weak or even nonexistent relationship between variables. For more discussion of Somer's  $d$  values, please see page 67 in the section on methodology.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Survey respondents in each site generally reflect the diverse education levels, household incomes, ages, and household compositions represented in each of the five communities. This diversity enables us to compare reported attitudes and behaviors of respondents by these characteristics and search for differences across communities.

The following table shows how these major characteristics are distributed among survey respondents.

Respondent education levels, household income, age, and the presence and age of children in the home are central to the tables and commentary that follow in the remaining sections of this report. The distribution of education levels across communities does not differ substantially. However, on the other characteristics, Pittsburgh stands out in comparison to the other four communities, with generally less wealthy, older respondents who are less likely to have children in the home.

---

Percentage totals in this report may not always add to 100 percent because of rounding. For "children at home," percentage totals always exceed 100 percent because some families have children both under and over 13 years of age.


**TABLE 1.1**
**CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS BY COMMUNITY**

	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	5%	7%	8%	5%	4%
High school or GED	25%	34%	21%	36%	21%
Junior college or tech school	35%	26%	26%	25%	33%
Four-year college or university	24%	24%	30%	22%	26%
Postgraduate	11%	11%	15%	11%	15%
Did not report	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	12%	14%	12%	19%	11%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	25%	29%	23%	27%	25%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	34%	28%	33%	24%	33%
\$100,000 or more	16%	13%	16%	8%	14%
Did not report	12%	16%	17%	23%	18%
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	15%	11%	11%	7%	12%
25-34	21%	17%	22%	14%	19%
35-44	23%	22%	22%	18%	25%
45-54	21%	22%	21%	23%	19%
55-64	11%	13%	11%	15%	10%
65 and over	8%	14%	12%	21%	13%
Did not report	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	52%	60%	58%	66%	62%
Children under 13 years of age	36%	29%	32%	25%	28%
Children 13 years of age and older	20%	19%	15%	14%	17%
Did not report	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

## Section 2

# Attendance

Attendance is a common measure of how much people *value* the performing arts. This section focuses on attendance, but it also considers related behaviors such as listening to recorded media, watching performances on public television, and participating personally in performing arts activities.

### HIGHLIGHTS

- **Arts Attenders Outnumber Nonattenders:** Approximately two in three residents surveyed in each community attended a live, professional performing arts event in the past 12 months. Between 12 and 18 percent are “frequent attenders,” meaning that they have attended 12 or more such events in the past year.
- **Education and Income Matter:** As educational attainment and household income increase, so does attendance at performing arts events.
- **Age Is Not a Factor:** Age is not clearly associated with attendance in the five communities. Within categories of nonattenders, attenders, and frequent attenders, different age groups are represented in substantially similar numbers.
- **Children at Home Are a Minor Factor:** The presence of children in a household also has less influence on attendance patterns than we anticipated. Respondents in households with young children are roughly as likely as those in households with no children to be nonattenders.
- **Performing Arts Compete Well for People’s Time:** In terms of the number of people who venture into the community to enjoy various leisure activities in a given year, attending the performing arts ranks behind attendance of community festivals and going to the movies, and is on a par with visiting museums or art galleries. A larger percentage of people go to performing arts events than go to clubs or sporting events over the course of a year.

We asked respondents about their attendance at performing arts venues and performances over the past 12 months in each of the five communities. However, rather than simply asking people how many times they may have attended a particular art form or been to a particular place during the past year, we prompted them with specific local organizations for each discipline. By doing this, we hoped to achieve two things. One, we expected that mentioning common organizations and venues by name would assist recall. Two, we felt that giving concrete examples of professional performing arts organizations would clarify the intended scope of such categories as dance or plays and musicals.





For example, in Pittsburgh we asked respondents how many times they had attended ballet or modern/contemporary dance performances at or by the Pittsburgh Ballet Theatre, the Pittsburgh Dance Council, or the Pittsburgh Cultural Trust. However, people also go to dance performances presented or performed by other performing arts organizations, whether in Pittsburgh or elsewhere. So, after presenting several specific examples, we also asked how many times the respondent had attended *other* dance performances at any other place, excluding elementary, middle, or high school productions. We used this same procedure to learn about attendance at opera, theatre, and symphony performances.

The measure of attendance for each discipline consists of the number of performances at both the named and other organizations. We also include a catch-all “other discipline” category. The examples we gave to respondents for this “other discipline” category were chamber music, jazz, folk music, or traditional arts and festivals, but we expect that the category includes the full range of performing arts activities that respondents could not group under dance, opera, theatre, or symphony.

**TABLE 2.1**

**RESPONDENTS ATTENDING AT LEAST ONE PERFORMING ARTS EVENT IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY DISCIPLINE**

Discipline	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
Dance	36%	24%	28%	23%	33%
Opera	11%	7%	8%	7%	10%
Theatre	46%	46%	51%	42%	46%
Symphony	20%	19%	19%	16%	19%
Other	38%	22%	34%	33%	35%
<b>Any</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>67%</b>

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

Consistently across all five communities, theatre is the most commonly attended performing arts form. Dance and “other” performing arts vie for second place, followed by symphony and opera. Some members of community working groups felt that various numbers seemed high. For example, some in the Pittsburgh working group felt strongly that an estimate of 23 percent was too high for dance attenders in their metropolitan area. On the other hand, the Seattle working group felt that an estimate of 33 percent of dance attenders in their community was good. “Seattle is known for its dance attendance,” they said.

The attendance numbers reported here are generally higher than those reported over the past 20 years in Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA), a study commissioned by the National Endowment for the Arts. Classical music attendance was reported at 13 percent in 1992 and 16 percent in 1997. Opera attendance was reported at 3 percent in 1985 and 5 percent in 1997. Musical and non-musical plays are reported separately in the SPPA, as are ballet and other dance, but all indicate generally much lower levels of attendance than we report here.



One reason for this discrepancy may be that the data collection efforts occurred in major urban areas, where these five performing arts disciplines are actively represented. The SPPA surveyed respondents across the United States, including rural areas and small towns where opportunities to attend performing arts events are limited. We would expect that performing arts attendance by people in major metropolitan areas would be higher than in less densely populated areas where opera, symphony, dance, and a variety of theatrical performances simply are not available. Further, our method of prompting respondents by naming specific organizations also may have resulted in a greater amount of recall than the method used by the SPPA.

The last row reports the percentage of respondents who said that they had been to any live, professional performing arts event in the past 12 months. These numbers range from 69 percent (in Alaska) to 61 percent (in Pittsburgh), leaving between 31 and 39 percent of respondents who say that they have been to no performing arts performances in the past 12 months. We label these people “nonattenders” and include them in the first row of table 2.2.

TABLE 2.2

FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT LIVE PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS					
Attendance Level	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
Nonattender (0 events)	31%	38%	33%	39%	33%
Attender (1-11 events)	52%	50%	49%	46%	51%
Frequent attender (12 or more events)	17%	12%	18%	15%	16%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

We divided survey respondents into three groups: nonattenders, attenders, and frequent attenders. Attenders are those respondents who have been to 11 or fewer performances in the past year—an average of less than one performance a month. Frequent attenders are those respondents who have been to 12 or more performances in the past year.

The choice of making the break between 11 and 12 performances is based on the search for a reasonable division between attenders and frequent attenders. Nonetheless, we have heard a variety of opinions about where this break should be. The decision to focus on only three categories comes from the arts participation literature that refers to three categories of attenders. However, our meetings with community working groups clearly indicate that more categories would provide useful distinctions for performing arts managers. At a minimum, future research should consider differentiating between people who attend two or three performances a year and those who attend more frequently.

The distinctions among these attendance levels are important because we expect that the way people feel about the performing arts and about factors that keep them from attending performances more often will be related to their frequency of attendance. Thus, in the remainder of this section and in the sections to come, we report differences among these three categories.



TABLE 2.3

**FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT LIVE PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY EDUCATION**

	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
<b>NONATTENDERS</b>					
Elementary school	57%	64%	77%	76%	57%
High school or GED	52%	55%	47%	55%	57%
Junior college or tech school	29%	33%	31%	35%	33%
Four-year college or university	21%	22%	23%	26%	19%
Postgraduate	6%	19%	13%	10%	16%
<b>ATTENDERS</b>					
Elementary school	41%	37%	20%	19%	37%
High school or GED	40%	38%	41%	39%	40%
Junior college or tech school	56%	56%	52%	53%	51%
Four-year college or university	60%	62%	55%	52%	61%
Postgraduate	53%	57%	61%	53%	52%
<b>FREQUENT ATTENDERS</b>					
Elementary school	3%	0%	3%	5%	7%
High school or GED	8%	7%	12%	7%	4%
Junior college or tech school	15%	11%	17%	12%	15%
Four-year college or university	20%	16%	21%	22%	21%
Postgraduate	41%	24%	25%	37%	32%
Somer's d	+0.28	+0.26	+0.24	+0.31	+0.27

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

Respondents with more education attend live performing arts events more often. As education level increases, so also does the percentage of respondents who fall into attender or frequent attender categories of attendance. This finding is also substantiated by the Somer's d values shown in the table above. In all five communities, the Somer's d for the relationship between education level and arts attendance is considerably greater than +0.15.

As described briefly on page 13 and in more detail on page 67 at the end of the report, a measure of association called Somer's d can give us an indication of the strength of the relationship between two variables. The value of Somer's d for education level and the three categories of attendance range from +0.24 to +0.31. The positive sign tells us that there is an overall association between higher education level and higher level of attendance in the performing arts. The magnitude of these statistics is worth paying attention to because they exceed our guideline of 0.15 and above for noting the presence of a relationship between two variables. Thus, we conclude that education level is positively associated with attendance level.



TABLE 2.4

**FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
<b>NONATTENDERS</b>					
Less than \$25,000	47%	53%	51%	57%	48%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	40%	43%	34%	41%	35%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	23%	32%	28%	35%	27%
\$100,000 or more	21%	15%	16%	15%	22%
<b>ATTENDERS</b>					
Less than \$25,000	46%	38%	42%	37%	44%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	46%	47%	47%	50%	53%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	58%	58%	54%	42%	54%
\$100,000 or more	58%	61%	55%	59%	53%
<b>FREQUENT ATTENDERS</b>					
Less than \$25,000	7%	9%	8%	6%	8%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	14%	10%	19%	9%	13%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	19%	10%	18%	23%	20%
\$100,000 or more	22%	24%	29%	26%	25%
Somer's d	+0.17	+0.20	+0.18	+0.26	+0.15

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

Not surprisingly, the relationship between household income and performing arts attendance is nearly as strong as the relationship between education level and performing arts attendance. Nonattenders clearly show a trend toward lower incomes, while frequent attenders exhibit a trend toward higher incomes. The high value for Somer's d in all communities also points to the strength of the relationship between attendance and household income. Nonetheless, higher levels of attendance are not simply a matter of higher levels of income. The percentage of attenders with household incomes between \$50,000 and \$100,000 is not greatly different from that of those with annual incomes above \$100,000.



TABLE 2.5

**FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT LIVE PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY AGE**

	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
<b>NONATTENDERS</b>					
Under 25	38%	28%	42%	37%	32%
25-34	35%	32%	34%	41%	32%
35-44	29%	38%	33%	40%	36%
45-54	23%	29%	27%	32%	27%
55-64	24%	44%	25%	34%	35%
65 and over	50%	62%	43%	51%	37%
<b>ATTENDERS</b>					
Under 25	50%	61%	37%	53%	57%
25-34	52%	59%	54%	48%	52%
35-44	58%	52%	56%	47%	48%
45-54	52%	61%	58%	51%	57%
55-64	52%	37%	38%	47%	39%
65 and over	34%	25%	36%	34%	46%
<b>FREQUENT ATTENDERS</b>					
Under 25	12%	11%	21%	10%	11%
25-34	13%	9%	13%	11%	15%
35-44	13%	10%	11%	13%	16%
45-54	25%	10%	16%	17%	16%
55-64	25%	19%	36%	19%	27%
65 and over	17%	13%	21%	15%	17%
Somer's d	+0.06	-0.09	+0.05	+0.02	+0.02

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

In contrast to education level and household income, age is not strongly related to attendance levels. This finding is interesting because popular discussions often assume that performing arts audiences are mostly composed of older people—a “graying” of attenders. Our findings, however, indicate that the 65 and over age category is the one with the greatest percentage of nonattenders. In most communities we observe only small percentage differences among attenders age 25 to 54. In fairness to the “graying” thesis, the greatest percentage of frequent attenders is generally found among those age 55-64. However, respondents in this age cohort are only a little less likely to be nonattenders than are younger respondents.



TABLE 2.6

**FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT LIVE PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY CHILDREN AT HOME**

	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
<b>NONATTENDERS</b>					
No children at home	31%	41%	31%	39%	31%
Children under 13 years of age	35%	36%	39%	45%	40%
Children 13 years of age and older	23%	29%	33%	35%	30%
<b>ATTENDERS</b>					
No children at home	50%	46%	48%	43%	51%
Children under 13 years of age	53%	58%	51%	46%	48%
Children 13 years of age and older	60%	59%	50%	59%	53%
<b>FREQUENT ATTENDERS</b>					
No children at home	19%	13%	21%	18%	18%
Children under 13 years of age	13%	7%	10%	9%	12%
Children 13 years of age and older	17%	12%	17%	6%	17%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

We might expect to find that children, especially young children, are an inhibitor to attending performing arts events. While respondents in households with young children represent the greatest number of nonattenders in four of five communities, the differences among categories are not pronounced. Indeed, in Cincinnati, the greatest percentage of nonattenders is found among those respondents with *no* children at home.

The idea that children keep their parents from getting out to more performing arts events gains slightly more support when considering only the frequent attenders. Frequent attendance of performing arts events is a more common characteristic of respondents in households with no children at home. However, there is only a marginal difference between these households and households with older children. Young children appear to be an inhibitor to frequent attendance, but certainly do not rule out frequent attendance altogether.



TABLE 2.7

**PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN OTHER ARTS-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

Activity	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
Listen to classical music on radio, tape, or CD	68%	57%	66%	54%	65%
Watch performing arts on television	70%	65%	70%	66%	71%
Play musical instrument	27%	26%	25%	19%	27%
Sing in a choir or singing group	17%	17%	13%	14%	16%
Perform or produce performing arts	22%	22%	18%	18%	21%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

More than half of all respondents also enjoy the performing arts by listening to recorded music or watching televised events. The majority of respondents say they have listened to classical music in the past year, a much higher number than those who went to a live classical musical performance. Even more respondents say they have watched the performing arts on television in the past year.

While community working groups acknowledged that people are likely to listen occasionally to classical music on the radio, they felt that the television numbers were artificially high. “What do these people think they’re watching?” asked one working group participant. “Watching dance or opera on television is *boring*,” she continued. “Why would someone who never comes to a live event choose to watch a performing arts event on television?”

The percentage of respondents who say they have been actively involved in playing an instrument, singing, or performing/producing a performing arts event is somewhat lower. Nonetheless, this points to a substantial minority of the population in our five communities who directly make the performing arts part of their personal lives.



TABLE 2.8

**RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATING IN OTHER LEISURE ACTIVITIES OVER THE PAST 12 MONTHS**

Leisure Activity	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
Attend a community festival, parade, etc.	81%	79%	75%	82%	78%
Go to movies	86%	78%	84%	73%	85%
Go to museum or art gallery	68%	58%	70%	51%	70%
Attend professional sporting event	40%	58%	60%	55%	60%
Go to club to hear live music or dance	53%	48%	52%	46%	50%
Attend amateur sporting event	42%	46%	37%	39%	36%
Attend live pop/rock concert	26%	36%	39%	32%	35%
Attend live comedy show	24%	21%	28%	18%	24%
<b>Percent who attended any live performing arts event in the past 12 months (from table 2.1)</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>67%</b>

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

This table considers how the performing arts compete with other activities. In all five communities, more people have attended a live performing arts event at least once in the past year than have attended a professional sporting event. Only attendance at community festivals and going to the movies are common to more people than attendance at live performing arts. In three of five communities, attending the performing arts is even more common than going to a museum or art gallery.

In the individual community reports, we offer findings on the relationship between attendance at performing arts events and the average number of times respondents participated in other leisure activities. The findings are too complex to illustrate in a cross-site table, but the basic trends are clear. To wit, frequent performing arts attenders are also the most frequent attenders of other leisure activities, including sporting events, movies, festivals, museums, and popular concerts. Attenders are generally more involved with these activities than nonattenders of performing arts events. This finding points to the overlap in performing arts attendance and involvement in other community activities. Rather than an “arts” versus “other activities” distinction, the finding suggests that people generally are either involved in community activities (be it attendance at performing arts activities or otherwise) or they are not.



## Section 3

# Value to the Individual

As reported in the previous section, between 31 and 39 percent of respondents in the five communities had not gone to a live performing arts event in the past 12 months. However, 54 to 71 percent report that they had either listened to classical music or watched performing arts on television. This finding suggests that some people enjoy or value the performing arts even if they do not go to live events. In this section we focus on a series of questions designed to capture information about perceptions of the value of the performing arts to individuals.

### HIGHLIGHTS

- **Positive Attitudes Dominate:** Overall, respondents in each of the five communities share uniformly high opinions about the contribution of the performing arts to their lives. We generally find this to be true regardless of education, income, age, or the presence of children at home. Two exceptions are noted regarding the relationship between education and the extent to which respondents find performing arts *enjoyable* (table 3.2) and *thought provoking* (table 3.3). In both cases, more educated respondents are more likely to strongly agree with each of these sentiments than their less educated counterparts.
- **Attendance is Linked to Positive Attitudes:** As attendance increases so does agreement with the perceived value of the performing arts to individuals. Frequent attenders of the arts are considerably more likely to strongly agree with each of the personal attitudes considered in this study. One exception is noted in table 3.5 where frequent attenders are not necessarily inclined to agree that attending live performing arts is *primarily a social occasion*.



TABLE 3.1

page 27

**Overall Value to Individual.** Most respondents have positive attitudes about the value of performing arts in their lives. Between 54 and 85 percent of respondents either strongly agree or somewhat agree with each statement. We conclude that households in each of the five communities participating in this study generally have high regard for the value of the performing arts.

With few exceptions, a third or more of respondents in each community also strongly agree that attending live performing arts is *thought provoking*, *helps to understand other cultures better*, and is *primarily a social occasion*.

In tables 3.2 through 3.7, we consider whether any of these individual values are differentiated by education, income, age, presence of children in the household, or frequency of attendance at live performing arts events. In these remaining tables we focus only on the percentage of respondents who strongly agree with each statement.

TABLE 3.2

page 28

**Provides Enjoyment.** In four of the five communities, as level of education increases so does the percentage of respondents who strongly agree with the statement that *attending live performing arts is enjoyable*. In Denver, this overall trend is supported even though slightly more of those who completed elementary school strongly agree that the performing arts are enjoyable (48 percent) than do those who completed high school (45 percent). There is a noticeable degree of variation across communities with regard to the percentage of those who completed elementary school who strongly agree that the performing arts are *enjoyable*—20 percent in Pittsburgh compared with 48 percent in Denver.

Household income, age, and presence of children at home are largely unrelated to the degree to which respondents find live performing arts to be enjoyable. Alaska is an exception, where older respondents (up to the age of 64) report increasingly high levels of agreement regarding enjoyment of the performing arts.

As might be expected, the most frequent attenders derive more enjoyment than less frequent attenders. Similarly, attenders are roughly twice as likely as nonattenders to strongly agree that live performing arts are enjoyable. This raises a question of whether lack of enjoyment by some is a *reason* they do not attend the performing arts. We return to this question in the section on barriers to attendance.

TABLE 3.3

page 29

**Stimulates Critical Thinking.** Respondents with more education are more likely to feel that the performing arts are *thought provoking*. Although patterns are clearly present in the data, the strength of this relationship is somewhat weaker than the relationship between education and enjoyment of performing arts (previous table).

The strong belief that the performing arts are thought provoking does not differ substantially by household income levels, age, or the presence of children in the home. However, consistent with our expectations, this belief is held most commonly by frequent attenders, and least commonly by nonattenders.

**TABLE 3.4**

page 30

**Increases Cultural Understanding.** Respondents in each of the five communities share similar views regarding the extent to which live performing arts help them to *understand other cultures better*. Overall, between 31 and 38 percent of respondents strongly agree with this statement. This strong level of agreement holds regardless of education, income, age, or whether or not there are children at home. Moreover, at least half of frequent attenders in all five communities agree. Unlike the previous two statements, however, there is not a substantial gap between attenders and nonattenders regarding the belief that the arts contribute to cultural understanding.

**TABLE 3.5**

page 31

**Offers Opportunity to Socialize.** The literature on arts participation suggests that the most frequent attenders derive different benefits from their arts experience than do less frequent or nonattenders. So, while a more casual arts attender might be motivated to go to an event mostly for social reasons, the more frequent attender might be motivated more by a deeper appreciation for the arts experience or a particular artist. Thus, the use of the word “primarily” in this question was intended to identify the percentage of respondents who feel that attending live performing arts events is mostly a social occasion, rather than some other kind of experience.

This idea gains most support in Alaska where equal numbers of frequent attenders and nonattenders strongly agree that the arts are primarily a social occasion. In Denver, Pittsburgh, and Seattle, the percentages are largely undifferentiated among frequent attenders and attenders. Thus, it seems that frequent attenders in four of the five communities value the performing arts for reasons other than social value.

**TABLE 3.6**

page 32

**Inspires Personal Creativity.** Between a quarter and one-third of respondents in each community strongly agree that attending live performing arts events *makes them feel more creative*. In all communities except Alaska, there is a negative association between creativity and age. That is, younger respondents are more inclined to strongly agree than are older respondents that attending live performing arts events encourages them to be more creative.

On the other hand, education level and household income play little role in whether a respondent feels strongly that *attending live performing arts encourages more creativity*. Frequent attenders are most likely to agree, although less than half of the respondents in this category strongly agree with the personal creative value of the arts.

**TABLE 3.7**

page 33

**Increases Connection to the Community.** Among all the personal values considered, the perception that attending live performing arts *makes people feel more connected to their community* received the lowest levels of agreement. Overall, only about one in five respondents strongly agree with this statement. The percentages in the table provide a small amount of evidence to suggest that respondents from lower income households and older individuals are slightly more likely to agree strongly that performing arts increase their feelings of connectedness.

Again, frequent attenders are most likely to strongly agree that attending live performing arts makes them feel more connected to their community. However, a little more than one in three frequent attenders voice strong agreement with this statement.



TABLE 3.1

**ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PERSONAL VALUE OF THE PERFORMING ARTS**

Attending Live Performing Arts...	...is enjoyable to me	...is thought provoking	...helps me to understand other cultures better	...is primarily a social occasion for me	...encourages me to be more creative	...makes me feel more connected to my community
<b>ALASKA</b>						
Strongly Agree	56%	41%	37%	28%	26%	21%
Somewhat Agree	27%	37%	39%	34%	39%	34%
Neutral	4%	7%	10%	12%	13%	16%
Somewhat Disagree	5%	7%	6%	13%	11%	14%
Strongly Disagree	5%	5%	5%	11%	8%	12%
<b>CINCINNATI</b>						
Strongly Agree	49%	35%	31%	31%	26%	20%
Somewhat Agree	28%	38%	37%	34%	35%	34%
Neutral	7%	10%	14%	14%	15%	19%
Somewhat Disagree	7%	7%	8%	9%	13%	11%
Strongly Disagree	7%	7%	7%	11%	8%	14%
<b>DENVER</b>						
Strongly Agree	59%	41%	36%	35%	29%	21%
Somewhat Agree	26%	38%	38%	33%	33%	33%
Neutral	5%	7%	12%	10%	16%	18%
Somewhat Disagree	4%	7%	7%	12%	11%	15%
Strongly Disagree	4%	4%	5%	8%	9%	11%
<b>PITTSBURGH</b>						
Strongly Agree	51%	35%	34%	37%	26%	20%
Somewhat Agree	26%	37%	40%	34%	32%	35%
Neutral	7%	9%	9%	8%	18%	17%
Somewhat Disagree	5%	8%	6%	9%	12%	14%
Strongly Disagree	6%	6%	6%	8%	9%	10%
<b>SEATTLE</b>						
Strongly Agree	61%	44%	38%	36%	32%	24%
Somewhat Agree	24%	36%	37%	32%	31%	32%
Neutral	4%	8%	11%	10%	15%	15%
Somewhat Disagree	5%	5%	7%	11%	10%	17%
Strongly Disagree	4%	4%	5%	8%	9%	10%

Percentages do not sum to 100 due to a small percentage of respondents who gave no response for each item.  
 Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 3.2**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT ATTENDING LIVE PERFORMING ARTS IS ENJOYABLE TO ME**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	56%	49%	59%	51%	61%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	38%	33%	48%	20%	40%
High school or GED	42%	34%	45%	41%	44%
Junior college or tech school	59%	53%	57%	56%	65%
Four-year college or university	60%	61%	65%	60%	66%
Postgraduate	82%	72%	72%	74%	72%
Somer's d	+0.17	+0.23	+0.14	+0.21	+0.15
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	49%	50%	55%	43%	48%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	52%	46%	59%	52%	66%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	59%	50%	63%	58%	61%
\$100,000 or more	60%	59%	59%	54%	65%
Somer's d	+0.06	+0.06	+0.03	+0.08	+0.03
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	39%	46%	50%	43%	54%
25-34	52%	46%	57%	53%	64%
35-44	55%	49%	56%	52%	58%
45-54	67%	55%	63%	55%	65%
55-64	73%	49%	39%	52%	65%
65 and over	55%	47%	56%	47%	57%
Somer's d	+0.13	+0.01	+0.06	-0.01	+0.02
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	57%	49%	61%	51%	61%
Children under 13 years of age	56%	50%	57%	51%	56%
Children 13 years of age and older	58%	54%	54%	48%	64%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	32%	29%	38%	30%	37%
Attender (1-11)	63%	56%	62%	59%	66%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	79%	86%	89%	84%	91%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 3.3**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT ATTENDING LIVE PERFORMING ARTS IS THOUGHT PROVOKING**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	41%	35%	41%	35%	44%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	35%	35%	36%	17%	40%
High school or GED	32%	27%	32%	23%	30%
Junior college or tech school	46%	38%	45%	39%	49%
Four-year college or university	37%	35%	42%	46%	50%
Postgraduate	53%	56%	50%	51%	46%
Somer's d	+0.09	+0.16	+0.08	+0.22	+0.12
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	40%	34%	41%	27%	38%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	38%	40%	48%	35%	51%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	40%	37%	42%	41%	48%
\$100,000 or more	46%	35%	36%	38%	36%
Somer's d	+0.03	+0.04	-0.04	+0.10	-0.02
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	35%	42%	38%	45%	42%
25-34	41%	37%	43%	39%	46%
35-44	40%	40%	41%	34%	46%
45-54	49%	31%	50%	40%	47%
55-64	45%	30%	36%	32%	42%
65 and over	28%	34%	30%	25%	39%
Somer's d	+0.02	-0.05	-0.04	-0.07	-0.04
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	42%	36%	42%	34%	45%
Children under 13 years of age	38%	33%	42%	37%	42%
Children 13 years of age and older	43%	41%	41%	29%	47%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	25%	24%	31%	23%	27%
Attender (1-11)	45%	36%	42%	36%	48%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	58%	69%	59%	62%	67%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 3.4**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT ATTENDING LIVE PERFORMING ARTS HELPS ME TO UNDERSTAND OTHER CULTURES BETTER**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	37%	31%	36%	34%	38%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	24%	33%	49%	22%	43%
High school or GED	35%	27%	34%	35%	32%
Junior college or tech school	39%	34%	39%	35%	39%
Four-year college or university	33%	30%	33%	35%	41%
Postgraduate	49%	41%	36%	33%	39%
Somer's d	+0.04	+0.06	-0.02	+0.03	+0.06
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	38%	35%	37%	34%	40%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	36%	35%	44%	38%	48%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	39%	30%	36%	36%	36%
\$100,000 or more	37%	24%	29%	25%	36%
Somer's d	-0.02	-0.07	-0.10	-0.01	-0.07
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	32%	36%	36%	43%	38%
25-34	34%	31%	35%	33%	38%
35-44	37%	34%	35%	28%	35%
45-54	40%	30%	40%	34%	41%
55-64	45%	27%	35%	40%	40%
65 and over	34%	29%	35%	35%	41%
Somer's d	+0.04	-0.04	+0.02	+0.01	+0.01
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	36%	30%	35%	35%	39%
Children under 13 years of age	43%	32%	37%	34%	37%
Children 13 years of age and older	43%	35%	44%	27%	40%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	26%	23%	34%	27%	29%
Attender (1-11)	39%	32%	32%	36%	38%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	51%	51%	53%	50%	58%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 3.5**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT ATTENDING LIVE PERFORMING ARTS IS PRIMARILY A SOCIAL OCCASION FOR ME**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	28%	31%	35%	37%	36%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	22%	25%	31%	20%	33%
High school or GED	25%	31%	38%	36%	30%
Junior college or tech school	28%	33%	37%	48%	42%
Four-year college or university	32%	34%	33%	38%	36%
Postgraduate	30%	28%	35%	30%	34%
Somer's d	+0.09	+0.03	+0.01	+0.03	-0.00
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	26%	32%	36%	41%	38%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	29%	28%	35%	34%	35%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	25%	32%	33%	37%	39%
\$100,000 or more	32%	31%	36%	38%	39%
Somer's d	+0.02	+0.03	+0.01	-0.00	-0.02
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	21%	18%	31%	27%	20%
25-34	28%	28%	30%	25%	32%
35-44	27%	32%	38%	37%	36%
45-54	30%	32%	39%	36%	38%
55-64	34%	37%	32%	48%	47%
65 and over	29%	38%	39%	43%	45%
Somer's d	+0.06	+0.11	+0.07	+0.09	+0.08
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	30%	32%	33%	37%	37%
Children under 13 years of age	26%	28%	38%	36%	35%
Children 13 years of age and older	27%	32%	36%	39%	34%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	22%	27%	28%	29%	26%
Attender (1-11)	34%	32%	38%	43%	42%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	22%	41%	40%	43%	39%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.




**TABLE 3.6**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT ATTENDING LIVE PERFORMING ARTS ENCOURAGES ME TO BE MORE CREATIVE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	26%	26%	29%	26%	32%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	30%	31%	34%	22%	33%
High school or GED	26%	19%	23%	23%	28%
Junior college or tech school	29%	30%	29%	26%	34%
Four-year college or university	20%	25%	32%	28%	32%
Postgraduate	32%	36%	33%	32%	31%
Somer's d	+0.03	+0.07	+0.06	+0.10	+0.04
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	38%	27%	41%	23%	34%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	20%	31%	34%	27%	41%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	28%	24%	30%	27%	32%
\$100,000 or more	23%	25%	25%	21%	22%
Somer's d	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	+0.02	-0.09
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	24%	38%	30%	45%	36%
25-34	32%	26%	37%	27%	37%
35-44	21%	28%	33%	28%	36%
45-54	31%	26%	32%	28%	28%
55-64	22%	18%	24%	26%	24%
65 and over	22%	18%	15%	15%	23%
Somer's d	-0.03	-0.14	-0.10	-0.14	-0.14
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	25%	25%	28%	24%	31%
Children under 13 years of age	25%	27%	35%	29%	35%
Children 13 years of age and older	29%	30%	30%	28%	32%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	15%	19%	26%	19%	24%
Attender (1-11)	29%	26%	27%	27%	32%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	38%	46%	43%	41%	48%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 3.7**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT ATTENDING LIVE PERFORMING ARTS MAKES ME FEEL MORE CONNECTED TO MY COMMUNITY**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	21%	20%	21%	20%	24%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	14%	27%	36%	17%	30%
High school or GED	17%	16%	17%	18%	21%
Junior college or tech school	21%	22%	18%	22%	25%
Four-year college or university	22%	19%	21%	19%	21%
Postgraduate	31%	26%	26%	21%	28%
Somer's d	+0.09	+0.07	+0.03	+0.06	+0.07
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	26%	21%	28%	25%	21%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	16%	22%	26%	19%	29%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	21%	17%	17%	19%	21%
\$100,000 or more	25%	16%	18%	13%	23%
Somer's d	-0.01	-0.05	-0.06	-0.04	-0.04
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	12%	19%	14%	12%	22%
25-34	17%	16%	19%	14%	14%
35-44	21%	23%	25%	16%	23%
45-54	28%	21%	19%	19%	24%
55-64	26%	17%	24%	21%	30%
65 and over	26%	23%	27%	29%	34%
Somer's d	+0.11	-0.00	+0.10	+0.08	+0.06
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	22%	20%	20%	21%	24%
Children under 13 years of age	19%	19%	25%	15%	23%
Children 13 years of age and older	22%	19%	26%	14%	26%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	12%	15%	20%	14%	18%
Attender (1-11)	23%	19%	18%	21%	24%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	32%	37%	32%	32%	36%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

## Section 4

# Value to the Community

In this section we continue to explore public perceptions about the value of live performing arts, but shift our focus to specific ways in which live performing arts are believed to contribute to or affect community life. As in the preceding section, respondents were asked to consider a series of value statements and report the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each.

### HIGHLIGHTS

- **Value to the Community is Higher than Value to the Individual:** Household respondents in each of the five communities place an even higher value on the arts in their communities than in their own lives. Even nonattenders place a high value on the arts in their communities. As expected, frequent attenders are more likely to agree than attenders, and attenders are more likely to agree than nonattenders.
- **People Believe Arts Matter for Children:** Overall, about two in three respondents in each of the five communities strongly agree that the performing arts contribute to the education and development of children. These very high opinions are borne out regardless of education, age, income, or presence of children in the household.
- **Attendance Related to Giving and Volunteering:** Attendance at performing arts events is closely related to both volunteerism and inclination to make a financial contribution to an arts organization. These relationships are two of the strongest found in the study.



TABLE 4.1

page 38

**Overall Contributions to the Community.** The percentage of respondents with positive opinions about the contributions made by performing arts to their community is considerably higher than percentages reported in the preceding section. This finding leads us to conclude that people place a higher value on the arts in their communities than they place on the value of the performing arts in their own lives.

For example, while two-thirds of respondents strongly agree that the performing arts contribute to the education and development of children, we also found that more than 9 out of 10 respondents in each of the five communities either strongly agree or agree with this statement. Subsequent tables consider whether these opinions can be differentiated by education level, income, age, children at home, or frequency of attendance. In general, we conclude that these strong opinions about the contributions made by the performing arts to the education and development of children are universally evident.

In contrast, respondents feel less positively about the contribution of performing arts to the local economy. These results suggest either that the general public is not familiar with the economic impact of the arts in their community or that, relative to other industries, they believe the arts are simply not a major contributor.

TABLE 4.2

page 39

**Improves Quality of Life.** A majority of respondents in all communities except Cincinnati strongly agree that performing arts *improve the quality of life in their community*. Not surprisingly, more highly educated respondents are more inclined to agree than less educated respondents. This relationship is seen both in the ascending percentages by education level as well as in Somer's *d* values in the range of +0.13 to +0.21. Although the Somer's *d* values for household income are about one-third to half the levels reported for education, there is some evidence to suggest that opinions about quality of life are related to income. This trend is most clearly observed in Alaska, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh.

Age is a factor affecting how people view the contribution of arts to *community quality of life*, particularly for the youngest respondents. Although there is considerable uniformity among percentages for respondents age 35 or more, large differences are observed between respondents age 25 or less and those age 35 or more.

As expected, very high proportions of frequent attenders strongly agree that the performing arts *improve a community's quality of life*—9 out of 10 in Seattle, and 8 out of 10 in all other communities. More interesting, perhaps, is that roughly one in three nonattenders also strongly agree.

TABLE 4.3

TABLE 4.4

page 40

page 41

**Promotes Understanding of Others and Opportunity to Socialize.** Summary statistics are reported for the statements *promote understanding of other people and different ways of life* in table 4.3 and *provide opportunities to socialize with other people* in table 4.4. With the exception of Denver, respondents in each community were slightly more likely to agree that performing arts *provide opportunities to socialize with others* than performing arts *promote understanding of others*. Overall, these opinions do not appear to be influenced by income, age, or presence of children at home. Table 4.3 shows some modest patterns in the percentages that suggest that respondents with higher levels of education are more inclined to think that the arts *promote understanding of others*, particularly in Cincinnati, Denver, and Pittsburgh.

**TABLE 4.5**

page 42

**Fosters Pride in the Community.** Communities exhibit some interesting variations in respondents' views on whether they feel the performing arts are a *source of pride* for their community. In Pittsburgh, more highly educated people are likely to say that the arts are a *source of pride* in their community. In Alaska and Denver, older people are more likely to feel this way. In Alaska, Cincinnati, and Denver higher percentages of respondents with children over the age of 13 strongly agree that performing arts are a *source of pride* compared with those with children under the age of 13 or those with no children at home.

**TABLE 4.6**

page 43

**Contributes to Education and Development of Children.** About two-thirds of all respondents strongly agree that the performing arts *contribute to the education and development of children*. The *contribution of the performing arts to the education and development of children* is the most highly regarded value among respondents in this study. These high opinions are undifferentiated by education, income, age, or presence of children at home.

**TABLE 4.7**

page 44

**Supports Lifelong Learning for Adults.** In the previous table, we reported that about two-thirds of respondents in each community strongly agreed that the arts contribute to the education and development of children. In contrast, only about half of respondents strongly agree that the arts *contribute to lifelong learning for adults*.

**TABLE 4.8**

page 45

**Preserves Cultural Heritage.** A majority of respondents in each of the five communities strongly agree that the performing arts *help preserve and share cultural heritage*. The only other community value where more than half of the respondents in each community strongly agree is the value of the performing arts to *the education and development of children*. However, we find no relationship between respondents' perception that the performing arts *help preserve and share cultural heritage* and their education, income, age, or whether they have children at home.

**TABLE 4.9**

page 46

**Benefits Local Economy.** The percentage of respondents who strongly agree that the performing arts *contribute to the local economy* is considerably lower than other community values considered in this study. Interestingly, only 32 percent of Alaskans strongly agree with this statement, which is 15 to 34 percentage points lower than any other community value rated by Alaskans.

A weak to moderate relationship is found between age and *contribution to the local economy*. In Denver and Cincinnati, we note a trend suggesting that older people are more inclined to see a positive link between performing arts and the local economy.

Among the eight community values considered, we found that education was most strongly related to perceptions about *quality of life* (table 4.2), and to a lesser degree also related to *promote understanding of others* (table 4.3) and *contribute to lifelong learning of adults* (table 4.7). Age appears to be somewhat related to perceptions about *quality of life* (table 4.2), *source of pride* (table 4.4), and *contribution to the local economy* (table 4.9). Income was not substantially related to any of the values considered in this section.



Performing arts organizations are interested in understanding how and to what extent *volunteerism* and *willingness to make a financial contribution* to an arts organization are related to arts attendance. Tables 4.10 and 4.11 present our findings on these topics.

---

**TABLE 4.10**

page 47

***Volunteering in Community.*** We asked respondents how often they *volunteer in their community* for charity, school, religious congregation, or community activities. In all five communities, arts attenders and frequent arts attenders are considerably more likely to volunteer (even if only occasionally) than nonattenders. Although there is clear evidence to support this relationship, the data cannot be used to suggest that attendance at performing arts results in higher levels of volunteerism. Rather, these findings are consistent with our earlier observations that arts attenders are simply more active in the community than nonattenders.

---

**TABLE 4.11**

page 47

***Contributing Financially to Arts Organization.*** Not surprisingly, frequent attenders were substantially more likely to have *made a financial contribution to an arts organization*. Perhaps more interesting is the percentage of frequent attenders who did *not* make such a contribution. In Denver and Pittsburgh, less than half of frequent attenders supplemented their ticket purchases with a financial contribution to an arts organization.



TABLE 4.1

**ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PERSONAL VALUE OF THE PERFORMING ARTS**

Performing Arts...	...improve the quality of life in the community	...promote understanding of others and different ways of life	...provide opportunities to socialize with other people	...are a source of pride for those in the community	...contribute to the education and development of children	...contribute to lifelong learning for adults	...help preserve and share cultural heritage	...contribute to the economy of the greater community
<b>ALASKA</b>								
Strongly Agree	53%	49%	56%	47%	66%	49%	61%	32%
Somewhat Agree	32%	36%	37%	34%	25%	37%	31%	39%
Neutral	8%	8%	4%	10%	4%	6%	4%	12%
Somewhat Disagree	3%	4%	2%	4%	3%	5%	3%	6%
Strongly Disagree	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%
<b>CINCINNATI</b>								
Strongly Agree	47%	41%	52%	50%	68%	45%	56%	43%
Somewhat Agree	37%	41%	37%	36%	25%	39%	32%	40%
Neutral	9%	9%	6%	8%	4%	8%	6%	9%
Somewhat Disagree	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	4%	3%	2%
Strongly Disagree	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
<b>DENVER</b>								
Strongly Agree	55%	46%	47%	46%	65%	47%	57%	38%
Somewhat Agree	32%	37%	42%	35%	28%	40%	33%	42%
Neutral	6%	7%	4%	8%	2%	6%	5%	8%
Somewhat Disagree	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Strongly Disagree	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%
<b>PITTSBURGH</b>								
Strongly Agree	51%	43%	54%	53%	64%	47%	57%	46%
Somewhat Agree	34%	40%	36%	34%	27%	41%	34%	38%
Neutral	7%	9%	4%	5%	2%	5%	3%	6%
Somewhat Disagree	2%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Disagree	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%
<b>SEATTLE</b>								
Strongly Agree	58%	48%	56%	49%	69%	54%	64%	37%
Somewhat Agree	28%	38%	36%	37%	24%	34%	29%	41%
Neutral	8%	8%	5%	8%	4%	5%	2%	9%
Somewhat Disagree	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%
Strongly Disagree	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%

Percentages do not sum to 100 due to a small percentage of respondents who gave no response for each item.

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



TABLE 4.2

**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THEIR COMMUNITY**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	53%	47%	55%	51%	58%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	35%	42%	33%	27%	40%
High school or GED	42%	35%	43%	39%	40%
Junior college or tech school	55%	45%	57%	49%	57%
Four-year college or university	54%	54%	63%	65%	65%
Postgraduate	81%	72%	66%	77%	75%
Somer's d	+0.16	+0.15	+0.13	+0.21	+0.17
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	44%	44%	51%	44%	48%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	47%	42%	57%	49%	57%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	59%	53%	58%	54%	60%
\$100,000 or more	59%	52%	60%	69%	62%
Somer's d	+0.08	+0.05	+0.03	+0.08	+0.04
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	38%	37%	36%	32%	42%
25-34	45%	40%	50%	51%	53%
35-44	59%	50%	53%	49%	61%
45-54	61%	51%	63%	56%	61%
55-64	64%	51%	65%	56%	57%
65 and over	58%	46%	61%	52%	65%
Somer's d	+0.12	+0.07	+0.12	+0.07	+0.10
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	56%	47%	61%	52%	59%
Children under 13 years of age	48%	44%	47%	48%	54%
Children 13 years of age and older	59%	49%	47%	48%	56%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	28%	32%	35%	34%	36%
Attender (1-11)	60%	51%	58%	56%	62%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	81%	79%	84%	80%	88%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.




**TABLE 4.3**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS PROMOTE UNDERSTANDING OF OTHER PEOPLE AND DIFFERENT WAYS OF LIFE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	49%	41%	46%	43%	48%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	38%	33%	31%	27%	50%
High school or GED	46%	36%	41%	36%	37%
Junior college or tech school	52%	42%	44%	46%	50%
Four-year college or university	46%	43%	52%	52%	51%
Postgraduate	58%	53%	51%	51%	54%
Somer's d	+0.02	+0.09	+0.07	+0.11	+0.07
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	48%	45%	42%	40%	48%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	51%	43%	54%	46%	55%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	50%	43%	45%	49%	48%
\$100,000 or more	49%	32%	49%	38%	45%
Somer's d	-0.03	-0.05	-0.03	+0.01	-0.07
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	49%	52%	38%	45%	44%
25-34	47%	40%	48%	48%	51%
35-44	48%	42%	43%	39%	49%
45-54	51%	36%	49%	47%	46%
55-64	58%	42%	54%	43%	47%
65 and over	43%	38%	41%	38%	49%
Somer's d	+0.02	-0.03	+0.04	-0.01	+0.01
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	48%	42%	48%	43%	46%
Children under 13 years of age	49%	38%	42%	44%	51%
Children 13 years of age and older	56%	40%	46%	39%	54%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	35%	33%	33%	31%	36%
Attender (1-11)	52%	41%	46%	45%	49%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	68%	66%	70%	67%	68%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 4.4**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO SOCIALIZE WITH OTHER PEOPLE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	56%	52%	47%	54%	56%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	41%	52%	51%	39%	50%
High school or GED	52%	46%	50%	52%	51%
Junior college or tech school	62%	63%	49%	61%	64%
Four-year college or university	56%	50%	43%	54%	53%
Postgraduate	57%	54%	44%	48%	52%
Somer's d	+0.04	+0.02	-0.06	+0.01	-0.01
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	58%	52%	44%	55%	58%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	55%	55%	53%	55%	62%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	57%	54%	47%	55%	55%
\$100,000 or more	59%	47%	47%	53%	55%
Somer's d	+0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	48%	60%	56%	57%	57%
25-34	55%	53%	41%	47%	63%
35-44	56%	55%	43%	54%	59%
45-54	62%	50%	50%	56%	55%
55-64	53%	50%	44%	59%	45%
65 and over	62%	50%	36%	51%	47%
Somer's d	+0.06	-0.03	-0.04	+0.01	-0.06
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	57%	52%	47%	54%	52%
Children under 13 years of age	52%	52%	47%	54%	64%
Children 13 years of age and older	63%	55%	49%	48%	56%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	43%	46%	37%	44%	49%
Attender (1-11)	60%	53%	49%	58%	58%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	70%	70%	60%	64%	61%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 4.5**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS ARE A SOURCE OF PRIDE FOR THEIR COMMUNITY**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	47%	50%	46%	53%	49%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	35%	39%	39%	39%	43%
High school or GED	42%	45%	41%	46%	41%
Junior college or tech school	50%	52%	45%	55%	56%
Four-year college or university	45%	52%	50%	61%	51%
Postgraduate	53%	59%	49%	66%	48%
Somer's d	+0.02	+0.06	+0.03	+0.13	+0.03
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	51%	36%	52%	44%	47%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	42%	51%	47%	60%	54%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	46%	52%	45%	53%	48%
\$100,000 or more	52%	54%	46%	62%	42%
Somer's d	+0.02	+0.06	-0.05	+0.04	-0.05
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	37%	40%	36%	35%	44%
25-34	37%	37%	38%	43%	47%
35-44	49%	51%	41%	49%	46%
45-54	53%	56%	58%	65%	52%
55-64	51%	54%	56%	63%	51%
65 and over	63%	53%	48%	50%	57%
Somer's d	+0.13	+0.10	+0.13	+0.08	+0.07
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	46%	49%	45%	57%	49%
Children under 13 years of age	45%	48%	46%	46%	49%
Children 13 years of age and older	54%	56%	51%	45%	50%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	39%	42%	35%	42%	36%
Attender (1-11)	46%	51%	47%	58%	51%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	63%	71%	63%	71%	71%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 4.6**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS CONTRIBUTE TO THE EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	66%	68%	65%	64%	69%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	60%	73%	48%	59%	60%
High school or GED	65%	63%	57%	59%	57%
Junior college or tech school	68%	67%	62%	66%	72%
Four-year college or university	61%	68%	71%	69%	70%
Postgraduate	77%	81%	77%	67%	77%
Somer's d	+0.02	+0.04	+0.11	+0.05	+0.08
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	72%	73%	55%	64%	69%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	64%	66%	72%	66%	70%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	66%	74%	69%	64%	70%
\$100,000 or more	65%	63%	68%	69%	64%
Somer's d	-0.02	-0.02	+0.02	-0.01	-0.02
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	66%	75%	58%	62%	64%
25-34	65%	63%	69%	67%	72%
35-44	65%	68%	67%	66%	70%
45-54	66%	67%	70%	64%	69%
55-64	69%	69%	62%	62%	66%
65 and over	66%	70%	51%	62%	65%
Somer's d	0.01	+0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	63%	67%	65%	66%	68%
Children under 13 years of age	67%	68%	63%	63%	69%
Children 13 years of age and older	74%	72%	65%	65%	68%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	50%	58%	48%	54%	53%
Attender (1-11)	72%	71%	69%	69%	73%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	77%	86%	84%	76%	84%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 4.7**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS CONTRIBUTE TO LIFELONG LEARNING FOR ADULTS**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	49%	45%	47%	47%	54%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	46%	46%	31%	37%	40%
High school or GED	40%	40%	35%	39%	38%
Junior college or tech school	53%	43%	47%	48%	59%
Four-year college or university	49%	48%	52%	55%	62%
Postgraduate	62%	62%	64%	58%	58%
Somer's d	+0.07	+0.07	+0.13	+0.12	+0.12
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	56%	43%	44%	45%	54%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	46%	49%	50%	47%	58%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	50%	48%	47%	49%	53%
\$100,000 or more	54%	42%	53%	49%	52%
Somer's d	-0.01	-0.02	+0.03	+0.02	-0.03
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	45%	53%	41%	40%	42%
25-34	45%	41%	47%	44%	57%
35-44	48%	46%	46%	45%	55%
45-54	50%	48%	54%	52%	59%
55-64	62%	42%	54%	50%	54%
65 and over	54%	43%	38%	45%	52%
Somer's d	+0.07	+0.00	+0.03	+0.03	+0.04
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	49%	45%	48%	50%	55%
Children under 13 years of age	49%	44%	46%	43%	53%
Children 13 years of age and older	53%	51%	48%	43%	52%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	31%	35%	33%	35%	38%
Attender (1-11)	53%	47%	50%	50%	57%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	72%	73%	66%	70%	77%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 4.8**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS HELP PRESERVE AND SHARE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	61%	56%	57%	57%	64%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	68%	60%	53%	32%	57%
High school or GED	59%	50%	50%	54%	54%
Junior college or tech school	62%	57%	54%	59%	68%
Four-year college or university	57%	56%	63%	62%	67%
Postgraduate	66%	66%	61%	67%	64%
Somer's d	-0.00	+0.04	+0.05	+0.09	+0.05
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	64%	50%	54%	52%	59%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	58%	60%	64%	63%	66%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	62%	60%	56%	66%	66%
\$100,000 or more	62%	53%	56%	54%	62%
Somer's d	-0.00	-0.00	-0.03	+0.03	-0.02
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	61%	60%	55%	57%	66%
25-34	62%	54%	58%	60%	69%
35-44	58%	62%	59%	52%	61%
45-54	60%	54%	61%	64%	65%
55-64	67%	55%	58%	60%	60%
65 and over	57%	49%	44%	51%	58%
Somer's d	0.00	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	58%	54%	57%	59%	62%
Children under 13 years of age	62%	58%	57%	55%	68%
Children 13 years of age and older	64%	61%	60%	51%	64%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	48%	48%	45%	46%	51%
Attender (1-11)	65%	57%	59%	60%	66%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	70%	75%	73%	79%	81%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 4.9**
**RESPONDENTS WHO STRONGLY AGREE THAT PERFORMING ARTS CONTRIBUTE TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	32%	43%	38%	46%	37%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	41%	50%	36%	34%	27%
High school or GED	32%	37%	39%	44%	31%
Junior college or tech school	32%	46%	39%	47%	41%
Four-year college or university	28%	39%	37%	47%	40%
Postgraduate	37%	54%	41%	47%	35%
Somer's d	-0.02	+0.02	-0.03	+0.03	+0.04
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	33%	47%	40%	46%	34%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	31%	42%	39%	48%	41%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	32%	46%	40%	43%	37%
\$100,000 or more	35%	43%	37%	43%	36%
Somer's d	-0.00	-0.01	-0.04	-0.05	-0.04
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	23%	33%	26%	43%	30%
25-34	36%	37%	36%	42%	34%
35-44	26%	44%	39%	42%	38%
45-54	38%	47%	41%	47%	41%
55-64	29%	48%	50%	50%	40%
65 and over	42%	44%	40%	47%	38%
Somer's d	+0.08	+0.10	+0.09	+0.07	+0.06
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	30%	41%	41%	48%	38%
Children under 13 years of age	33%	44%	35%	41%	38%
Children 13 years of age and older	36%	41%	30%	40%	37%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	23%	43%	30%	36%	28%
Attender (1-11)	32%	42%	40%	49%	38%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	46%	48%	51%	61%	55%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



TABLE 4.10

**RESPONDENTS WHO VOLUNTEER IN THEIR COMMUNITY, BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT LIVE PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS**

Attendance Level	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	77%	75%	72%	71%	75%
Nonattender (0)	59%	62%	50%	54%	60%
Attender (1-11)	84%	82%	80%	75%	84%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	91%	87%	90%	89%	86%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.

TABLE 4.11

**PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO MADE A FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO AN ARTS ORGANIZATION IN 2001, BY FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT LIVE PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS**

Attendance Level	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	23%	24%	19%	15%	27%
Nonattender (0)	8%	8%	4%	5%	7%
Attender (1-11)	22%	27%	19%	14%	28%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	58%	65%	49%	46%	62%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



## Section 5

# Barriers to Attendance

In each community, we asked a series of questions designed to measure the extent to which different factors get in the way of attending the performing arts more frequently. For nonattenders, the question can be taken to mean “Why don’t you attend?” For attenders, the question can be taken to mean “What keeps you from attending even more?”

We asked respondents whether a particular issue was a big reason, a moderate reason, a small reason, or not a reason why they do not attend the performing arts more often. All of the tables in this section focus exclusively on the percentage of respondents who cite a particular barrier as a “big reason.”

### HIGHLIGHTS

- **Three Primary Obstacles:** The three most often cited barriers to attendance at performing arts performances are *prefer to spend leisure time in other ways*, *hard to make time to go out*, and *cost of tickets*.
- **Different People Face Different Barriers:** Respondents with lower levels of education are more likely to claim that the *performing arts do not appeal* to them. Respondents from lower income families are likely to cite *cost of tickets* as a substantial barrier. Younger people note family obligations, as well as the *lack of publicity or information about performing events or times*. Respondents with children are more likely to cite *family obligations*, while respondents without children say they have *no one to attend with*. However, most barriers are not clearly associated with these respondent characteristics.
- **Nonattenders Have Many Excuses:** Nonattenders are more likely than attenders to say that they *prefer to spend leisure time in other ways*, or that the *performing arts do not appeal* to them. Except in Alaska, nonattenders are also more likely to say that they have *no one to attend with* or that they *feel uncomfortable or out of place at performing arts events*. With the exception of Seattle, attenders are more likely to say that the *cost of tickets is too high*, differentiating them from nonattenders and frequent attenders. In Seattle, nonattenders are more likely than attenders and frequent attenders to say that it is *hard to make time to go out*.



TABLE 5.1

page 52

**Most Frequently Cited Barriers.** Only three of these barriers are cited by a majority of respondents in the five communities. *Prefer to spend leisure time in other ways* and *hard to make time to go out* rank as the two most-cited barriers in these communities. *Cost of tickets* consistently ranks third overall. These general conclusions, however, mask a good deal of variation by household income level, the presence or absence of children in the household, and performing arts attendance levels. In the remaining tables in this section, we consider each barrier and its association with relevant respondent characteristics.

TABLE 5.2

page 53

**Cost of Tickets.** We draw three conclusions about *cost of tickets*. First, as might be expected, the cost barrier is associated with household income level. In short, households with lower levels of income are more likely to cite *cost of tickets* as a barrier to greater attendance. This relationship is strongest in Denver and weakest in Cincinnati, where Somer's  $d$  only reaches a value of  $-0.10$ .

Second, the tendency to claim *cost of tickets* as a barrier to performing arts attendance is substantially unrelated to education level, age, or whether there are children in the home. The highest value of Somer's  $d$  for education or age and its relationship with *cost of tickets* is  $+0.08$  in Alaska. Oddly, the positive sign indicates that respondents with *more* education (who are also those respondents who tend to have higher incomes) are slightly more likely to cite ticket prices as a barrier than their less educated counterparts. While the low level of Somer's  $d$  implies a weak relationship here, we nonetheless suspect a complicated association among income, education, and the attitude toward *cost of tickets* in explaining attendance at performing arts events.

Third, *cost of tickets* is the *only* big barrier that attenders cite more often than nonattenders or frequent attenders. This generalization is not true in Seattle, where the percentages for each attender category are virtually equal, but it is a clear finding in Cincinnati and notable in the other three communities as well.

TABLE 5.3

page 54

**Family Obligations.** Responses to the *family obligations* barrier do not vary by education level or household income level. However, responses do vary considerably by age, with respondents age 25-44 most likely to cite *family obligations* as a big barrier to performing arts attendance. Since the youngest respondents (those under 25 years) are a bit less likely to note *family obligations* as a barrier, one might surmise that this barrier is mostly an issue for respondents who are starting their own families. This hypothesis is supported by the very high differences between people with no children and those with young children in their home. Very few people with no children cite *family obligations* as a big barrier. On the other hand, as many as half of respondents with young children at home say that *family obligations* keep them from going to performing arts events. For some, this translates into nonattendance. Nonattenders cite *family obligations* as a big barrier more often than do attenders and frequent attenders.

**TABLE 5.4**

page 55

**Difficulty or Cost of Getting to or Parking at Events.** We observe interesting variations among different communities regarding *difficulty or cost of getting to or parking at events*.

This issue is clearly a problem in Seattle, where more than twice as many respondents cite transportation and parking as a barrier than do respondents in Alaska. While one might hypothesize that lower income households would consistently rate this cost item as a significant barrier, Pittsburgh is the only community where this hypothesis bears out.

The oldest group of respondents is more likely to cite *difficulty or cost of getting to or parking at events* as a big issue than those respondents under 65 years of age. However, the low Somer's *d* values indicate that there is not a linear relationship between the two variables.

**TABLE 5.5**

page 56

**Unsafe or Unfamiliar Event Locations.** This table reports relatively weak relationships between the feeling that *performances are in unsafe or unfamiliar locations* and demographic characteristics.

However, we see some trends for those citing this factor as a big reason why they do not attend performing arts events more often. In most communities, respondents who are less educated, least wealthy, and older are most likely to note *unsafe or unfamiliar locations* as a substantial deterrent to attendance. Denver and Seattle are notable because more than twice as many nonattenders cite this factor as a barrier than attenders. This suggests that the issue is substantial enough to keep some people away who otherwise might be inclined to attend performing arts events.

**TABLE 5.6**

page 57

**Insufficient Publicity or Information about Events.** While *not enough publicity or information about performing events or times* is more of a complaint among the less wealthy households in Alaska and Seattle, the data indicate that the clearest association is with the various age categories. Younger respondents are more likely to cite lack of publicity or information as an important reason why they do not attend more frequently.

**TABLE 5.7**

page 58

**Prefer Spending Leisure Time in Other Ways.** About one-third of respondents in each community indicate that their *preference to spend leisure time in other ways* is a big reason they do not attend more performing arts events. As noted earlier, it is one of three factors that a majority of respondents in all five communities cited as either a big, moderate, or small reason why they do not attend more often. In Alaska and Denver, we observe a pattern in which respondents with lower levels of education are much more likely to say that they prefer to do other things. In Cincinnati, the effect is much less clear, with respondents at all education levels responding in much the same way. One of the most notable characteristics of the *preference to spend leisure time in other ways* statement is that it is one of several factors that clearly differentiates attenders from nonattenders in all five communities.

**TABLE 5.8**

page 47

**Hard to Make Time to Go Out.** The claim that it is *hard to make time to go out* is the third of three factors cited by a majority of respondents in all five communities as a barrier to attendance. In three of five communities, it is the most-cited *big* reason why people do not attend the performing arts more frequently. Overall, attenders and frequent attenders are almost



as likely as nonattenders to say that *hard to make time to go out* is a substantial barrier. The one factor that makes this a big barrier for more people is the presence or absence of children in the home. Whether the children are younger or older, respondents in households with children are much more likely to say that *time* keeps them from the performing arts.

TABLE 5.9

page 60

**No One with Whom to Attend Event.** Not having anyone to attend with is *not* cited as a big reason for a large number of respondents, but it is clearly a greater problem for respondents from lower income families. In Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, there is a clear relationship between income level and the claim that *no one to attend with* is a barrier to attendance. The finding is nearly as strong in Denver and Seattle, but much less clear in Alaska. Also, again with Alaska as an exception, this barrier differentiates nonattenders from attenders, with nonattenders claiming in larger numbers that *no one to attend with* keeps them from getting out to the performing arts. We also observe that the tendency to claim *no one to attend with* as a barrier is associated with respondents who have no children at home.

TABLE 5.10

page 61

**Lack of Appeal.** The final three barriers to attendance are sometimes referred to as *perceptual* barriers. The first, *performing arts do not appeal*, is cited as a big barrier by 10 to 14 percent of respondents in the five communities. This barrier is clearly tied to education level. Respondents with higher levels of education are decreasingly likely to cite *no appeal* as a reason why they do not attend the performing arts more than they do. Although the relationship with age is not linear as it is with education level, the youngest respondents are much more likely to cite *no appeal* as a barrier. Also, as might be expected, *performing arts do not appeal* differentiates the attenders from the nonattenders. While a few attenders (and even a few frequent attenders) say that they do not attend more because they do not find the performing arts greatly appealing, approximately a quarter of nonattenders say they do not go because of the lack of appeal.

TABLE 5.11

page 62

**Feeling Uncomfortable or Out of Place.** A second perceptual barrier is *feeling uncomfortable or out of place* at performing arts events. The characteristics of this barrier are similar to the characteristics of *performing arts do not appeal*, although fewer people overall cite it as a big barrier and the relationship with education is much weaker in all communities. However, as with *performing arts do not appeal*, the statement *feel uncomfortable or out of place* is a claim that differentiates the nonattenders from the attenders.

TABLE 5.12

page 63

**Past Performances Have Not Been Enjoyable.** A third perceptual barrier captures the experiences of individuals who *have not enjoyed past performances*. Overall, *have not enjoyed past performances* is not a big reason why people do not attend the performing arts.



TABLE 5.1

**RESPONDENTS CITING EACH BARRIER AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Barrier	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
Cost of Tickets	26%	27%	32%	27%	31%
Family Obligations	15%	20%	20%	21%	19%
Difficulty or Cost of Getting to or Parking at Events	14%	17%	19%	23%	29%
Performances are in Unsafe or Unfamiliar Locations	2%	13%	6%	10%	7%
Not Enough Publicity or Information about Performance Events or Times	11%	14%	13%	10%	15%
Prefer to Spend Leisure Time in Other Ways	36%	38%	36%	35%	32%
Hard to Make Time to Go Out	32%	42%	35%	42%	39%
No One to Attend With	8%	12%	8%	12%	8%
Performing Arts Do Not Appeal	12%	14%	10%	14%	10%
Feel Uncomfortable or Out of Place at Performing Arts Events	12%	5%	4%	5%	3%
Have Not Enjoyed Past Performances	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.2**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE COST OF TICKETS AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	26%	27%	32%	27%	31%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	22%	23%	31%	15%	37%
High school or GED	25%	27%	41%	29%	27%
Junior college or tech school	23%	32%	33%	27%	30%
Four-year college or university	30%	27%	28%	26%	37%
Postgraduate	26%	20%	23%	30%	27%
Somer's d	+0.08	+0.05	-0.03	+0.06	+0.03
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	39%	31%	45%	40%	40%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	27%	33%	42%	30%	38%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	24%	25%	29%	22%	25%
\$100,000 or more	12%	9%	18%	13%	21%
Somer's d	-0.13	-0.10	-0.17	-0.14	-0.15
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	16%	20%	31%	20%	32%
25-34	22%	33%	27%	19%	32%
35-44	27%	25%	29%	31%	28%
45-54	25%	26%	33%	29%	37%
55-64	37%	29%	39%	31%	27%
65 and over	32%	30%	35%	28%	25%
Somer's d	+0.06	+0.03	+0.05	+0.02	+0.01
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	25%	26%	34%	27%	29%
Children under 13 years of age	24%	28%	28%	27%	35%
Children 13 years of age and older	31%	30%	30%	32%	33%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	25%	23%	31%	25%	29%
Attender (1-11)	28%	32%	34%	30%	32%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	20%	21%	26%	25%	31%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.3**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE FAMILY OBLIGATIONS AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	15%	20%	20%	21%	19%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	14%	10%	36%	15%	23%
High school or GED	15%	18%	21%	18%	23%
Junior college or tech school	16%	21%	17%	20%	18%
Four-year college or university	15%	23%	23%	27%	21%
Postgraduate	12%	23%	13%	21%	14%
Somer's d	+0.02	+0.05	-0.05	+0.05	-0.02
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	17%	5%	23%	15%	17%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	15%	22%	21%	25%	20%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	14%	26%	22%	24%	21%
\$100,000 or more	15%	24%	16%	28%	19%
Somer's d	-0.00	+0.12	+0.01	+0.10	+0.03
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	13%	12%	18%	10%	13%
25-34	25%	31%	22%	34%	30%
35-44	20%	32%	39%	36%	34%
45-54	9%	16%	19%	19%	10%
55-64	7%	8%	3%	12%	6%
65 and over	8%	12%	4%	10%	7%
Somer's d	-0.09	-0.12	-0.13	-0.15	-0.13
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	3%	9%	5%	9%	5%
Children under 13 years of age	34%	45%	49%	51%	52%
Children 13 years of age and older	17%	25%	27%	35%	30%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	16%	21%	25%	23%	23%
Attender (1-11)	15%	20%	22%	20%	19%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	11%	15%	8%	14%	13%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



TABLE 5.4

**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE DIFFICULTY OR COST OF GETTING TO OR PARKING AT EVENTS AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	14%	17%	19%	23%	29%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	8%	33%	20%	24%	30%
High school or GED	17%	19%	29%	30%	32%
Junior college or tech school	13%	18%	19%	24%	33%
Four-year college or university	11%	11%	13%	15%	23%
Postgraduate	14%	12%	14%	17%	22%
Somer's d	-0.01	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.04
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	14%	23%	30%	38%	33%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	12%	24%	25%	27%	33%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	10%	9%	12%	16%	23%
\$100,000 or more	16%	9%	10%	8%	20%
Somer's d	-0.01	-0.11	-0.13	-0.19	-0.07
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	10%	18%	11%	13%	15%
25-34	11%	8%	11%	16%	20%
35-44	11%	10%	15%	20%	26%
45-54	11%	15%	21%	20%	34%
55-64	24%	16%	22%	23%	33%
65 and over	28%	41%	36%	39%	47%
Somer's d	+0.09	+0.08	+0.13	+0.08	+0.11
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	15%	21%	21%	26%	29%
Children under 13 years of age	10%	8%	15%	16%	26%
Children 13 years of age and older	14%	9%	17%	21%	26%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	15%	21%	22%	29%	34%
Attender (1-11)	12%	15%	17%	23%	24%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	15%	10%	15%	11%	31%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.




**TABLE 5.5**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE PERFORMANCES ARE IN UNSAFE OR UNFAMILIAR LOCATIONS AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	2%	13%	6%	10%	7%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	3%	21%	18%	12%	10%
High school or GED	4%	17%	11%	15%	9%
Junior college or tech school	2%	13%	4%	9%	10%
Four-year college or university	2%	7%	3%	3%	2%
Postgraduate	0%	6%	3%	3%	3%
Somer's d	-0.05	-0.08	-0.04	-0.09	-0.09
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	3%	13%	18%	16%	11%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	3%	15%	7%	9%	8%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	1%	8%	4%	5%	4%
\$100,000 or more	2%	9%	2%	3%	7%
Somer's d	-0.06	-0.05	-0.08	-0.11	-0.10
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	2%	6%	2%	5%	5%
25-34	1%	9%	7%	7%	2%
35-44	1%	8%	8%	11%	5%
45-54	2%	15%	2%	7%	8%
55-64	4%	12%	3%	11%	6%
65 and over	9%	25%	16%	13%	18%
Somer's d	+0.01	+0.09	+0.08	+0.02	+0.06
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	3%	14%	6%	10%	7%
Children under 13 years of age	1%	7%	7%	8%	6%
Children 13 years of age and older	1%	13%	5%	9%	5%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	5%	15%	12%	12%	10%
Attender (1-11)	1%	11%	4%	9%	5%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	2%	11%	3%	3%	4%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.6**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE NOT ENOUGH PUBLICITY OR INFORMATION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVENTS OR TIMES AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	11%	14%	13%	10%	15%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	19%	19%	10%	10%	27%
High school or GED	19%	13%	19%	13%	19%
Junior college or tech school	8%	14%	12%	13%	18%
Four-year college or university	8%	12%	12%	8%	11%
Postgraduate	4%	13%	10%	2%	6%
Somer's d	-0.08	+0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.10
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	17%	17%	22%	12%	21%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	17%	18%	15%	13%	17%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	7%	9%	14%	9%	14%
\$100,000 or more	5%	13%	8%	8%	8%
Somer's d	-0.11	-0.06	-0.01	-0.01	-0.10
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	17%	18%	23%	15%	29%
25-34	15%	17%	14%	14%	18%
35-44	8%	17%	15%	11%	13%
45-54	7%	9%	11%	8%	11%
55-64	6%	10%	6%	9%	8%
65 and over	9%	10%	8%	10%	11%
Somer's d	-0.16	-0.14	-0.15	-0.13	-0.19
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	11%	13%	14%	8%	14%
Children under 13 years of age	11%	15%	13%	17%	16%
Children 13 years of age and older	9%	13%	10%	11%	12%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	11%	15%	15%	12%	15%
Attender (1-11)	12%	12%	12%	12%	15%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	6%	15%	11%	3%	12%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.7**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE PREFERENCE TO SPEND LEISURE TIME IN OTHER WAYS AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	36%	38%	36%	35%	32%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	51%	42%	48%	29%	40%
High school or GED	46%	44%	47%	45%	41%
Junior college or tech school	34%	33%	36%	38%	31%
Four-year college or university	32%	37%	30%	28%	27%
Postgraduate	20%	30%	29%	15%	28%
Somer's d	-0.13	-0.05	-0.13	-0.09	-0.10
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	35%	32%	39%	37%	31%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	39%	37%	33%	38%	27%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	32%	40%	35%	36%	37%
\$100,000 or more	34%	37%	37%	28%	35%
Somer's d	-0.01	+0.06	+0.02	+0.01	+0.07
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	43%	30%	38%	38%	35%
25-34	37%	31%	37%	35%	31%
35-44	35%	40%	45%	36%	33%
45-54	34%	39%	32%	38%	37%
55-64	34%	52%	31%	31%	30%
65 and over	26%	34%	32%	36%	27%
Somer's d	-0.06	+0.05	-0.07	-0.05	-0.05
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	34%	39%	35%	34%	32%
Children under 13 years of age	39%	35%	39%	40%	33%
Children 13 years of age and older	31%	38%	35%	37%	34%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	55%	51%	52%	50%	49%
Attender (1-11)	31%	32%	34%	30%	28%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	15%	20%	15%	14%	10%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.8**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE HARD TO MAKE TIME TO GO OUT AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	32%	42%	35%	42%	39%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	38%	33%	39%	42%	37%
High school or GED	31%	41%	38%	41%	42%
Junior college or tech school	29%	45%	33%	45%	38%
Four-year college or university	35%	40%	37%	40%	37%
Postgraduate	31%	44%	29%	43%	39%
Somer's d	-0.01	+0.06	-0.00	+0.04	0.02
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	34%	33%	37%	36%	32%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	36%	37%	30%	48%	37%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	26%	50%	36%	49%	43%
\$100,000 or more	33%	44%	33%	39%	50%
Somer's d	-0.02	+0.09	+0.03	+0.07	+0.11
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	32%	37%	38%	35%	30%
25-34	37%	43%	31%	51%	41%
35-44	34%	49%	42%	54%	48%
45-54	25%	43%	43%	46%	39%
55-64	27%	40%	25%	36%	40%
65 and over	34%	29%	25%	28%	25%
Somer's d	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.13	-0.06
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	29%	38%	26%	34%	34%
Children under 13 years of age	37%	48%	49%	59%	45%
Children 13 years of age and older	29%	46%	45%	59%	42%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	37%	41%	37%	42%	37%
Attender (1-11)	32%	43%	38%	42%	42%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	19%	37%	23%	39%	31%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.9**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE NO ONE TO ATTEND WITH AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	8%	12%	8%	12%	8%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	3%	21%	10%	17%	13%
High school or GED	9%	11%	13%	17%	14%
Junior College or tech school	8%	18%	7%	12%	8%
Four-year college or university	8%	7%	8%	9%	4%
Postgraduate	3%	5%	5%	2%	2%
Somer's d	-0.01	-0.07	-0.02	-0.09	-0.07
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	9%	18%	15%	26%	19%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	9%	16%	8%	14%	14%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	5%	7%	8%	4%	3%
\$100,000 or more	7%	4%	3%	3%	1%
Somer's d	-0.09	-0.15	-0.12	-0.17	-0.13
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	3%	6%	8%	7%	8%
25-34	7%	7%	5%	7%	3%
35-44	6%	10%	4%	6%	5%
45-54	5%	5%	9%	9%	9%
55-64	18%	14%	13%	13%	8%
65 and over	15%	33%	14%	27%	16%
Somer's d	+0.04	+0.11	+0.07	+0.09	+0.06
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	10%	14%	10%	15%	9%
Children under 13 years of age	5%	7%	7%	8%	3%
Children 13 years of age and older	6%	9%	6%	7%	7%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	8%	16%	14%	17%	13%
Attender (1-11)	8%	10%	6%	11%	16%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	5%	5%	6%	3%	1%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.10**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE PERFORMING ARTS DO NOT APPEAL AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	12%	14%	10%	14%	10%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	19%	21%	21%	24%	33%
High school or GED	19%	21%	17%	23%	18%
Junior college or tech school	11%	10%	10%	13%	9%
Four-year college or university	8%	9%	4%	6%	6%
Postgraduate	4%	6%	3%	3%	2%
Somer's d	-0.11	-0.13	-0.16	-0.18	-0.15
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	13%	13%	12%	17%	13%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	11%	15%	9%	13%	10%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	12%	12%	7%	17%	12%
\$100,000 or more	10%	15%	7%	8%	11%
Somer's d	-0.02	-0.01	-0.05	-0.04	-0.01
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	19%	8%	20%	20%	16%
25-34	11%	11%	8%	5%	8%
35-44	12%	16%	13%	15%	9%
45-54	10%	14%	5%	15%	9%
55-64	7%	20%	6%	15%	11%
65 and over	15%	12%	10%	17%	11%
Somer's d	-0.05	+0.05	-0.06	+0.01	-0.01
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	12%	14%	9%	15%	10%
Children under 13 years of age	13%	14%	11%	13%	11%
Children 13 years of age and older	7%	11%	11%	11%	8%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	28%	25%	23%	29%	22%
Attender (1-11)	6%	8%	4%	6%	5%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	2%	4%	0%	3%	1%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.


**TABLE 5.11**
**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE FEEL UNCOMFORTABLE OR OUT OF PLACE AT PERFORMING ARTS EVENTS AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	3%	5%	4%	5%	3%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	0%	15%	20%	15%	10%
High school or GED	5%	8%	7%	7%	5%
Junior college or tech school	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%
Four-year college or university	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Postgraduate	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Somer's d	-0.03	-0.10	-0.10	-0.12	-0.09
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	6%	6%	9%	10%	2%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	1%	6%	3%	4%	3%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	2%	3%	4%	4%	3%
\$100,000 or more	1%	3%	2%	0%	4%
Somer's d	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	-0.08	-0.05
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	3%	0%	12%	2%	5%
25-34	0%	6%	2%	2%	3%
35-44	4%	2%	6%	5%	3%
45-54	2%	5%	2%	5%	3%
55-64	1%	8%	3%	3%	1%
65 and over	8%	1%	3%	9%	1%
Somer's d	-0.04	+0.02	-0.04	+0.01	-0.02
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	2%	6%	3%	5%	2%
Children under 13 years of age	3%	4%	6%	6%	4%
Children 13 years of age and older	3%	3%	7%	3%	2%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	5%	9%	11%	9%	5%
Attender (1-11)	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	2%	2%	0%	1%	1%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



TABLE 5.12

**RESPONDENTS WHO CITE HAVE NOT ENJOYED PAST PERFORMANCES AS A “BIG REASON” WHY THEY DO NOT ATTEND PERFORMING ARTS MORE**

Demographic Characteristics	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
All Respondents	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary school	3%	6%	7%	5%	13%
High school or GED	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%
Junior college or tech school	1%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Four-year college or university	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Postgraduate	3%	0%	2%	1%	2%
Somer's d	+0.03	-0.01	-0.05	-0.03	-0.04
<b>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</b>					
Less than \$25,000	0%	1%	10%	1%	4%
\$25,000 to under \$50,000	3%	5%	1%	3%	4%
\$50,000 to under \$100,000	3%	1%	2%	4%	3%
\$100,000 or more	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Somer's d	+0.01	-0.00	-0.08	+0.01	-0.05
<b>AGE CATEGORY</b>					
Under 25	5%	0%	6%	5%	2%
25-34	2%	0%	3%	2%	3%
35-44	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
45-54	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%
55-64	4%	4%	1%	0%	2%
65 and over	2%	1%	4%	4%	8%
Somer's d	-0.03	-0.00	-0.02	-0.00	-0.01
<b>CHILDREN AT HOME</b>					
No children at home	2%	4%	2%	3%	4%
Children under 13 years of age	3%	1%	4%	1%	2%
Children 13 years of age and older	3%	1%	5%	3%	1%
<b>ATTENDANCE LEVEL</b>					
Nonattender (0)	3%	4%	5%	4%	6%
Attender (1-11)	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Frequent attender (12 or more)	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



## Section 6

# Methodology

### COMMUNITY SELECTION CONSIDERATIONS

The communities were carefully selected, looking for the following characteristics that were deemed important to the success of the project:

- Representation of three or more of the five disciplines encompassed by the participating national service organizations.
- Financially and managerially strong local arts organizations.
- Established and strong working relationships between local arts organizations and their national service organizations.
- Willingness and ability of the local arts organizations to work as part of a working group.
- Established capacity for collecting data on the part of local arts organizations.
- Willingness on the part of the local arts organizations to administer the surveys developed by the Performing Arts Research Coalition.
- Presence of supplemental funding sources in the community that could be involved in sustaining this research in the future.
- Geographic diversity and a variety of community sizes.

### LOCAL WORKING GROUP RESPONSIBILITIES

The working group of performing arts organizations in each of the communities had six primary project responsibilities: (1) To participate in the design of survey instruments; (2) To collect data from their audiences and subscribers; (3) To use the audience, subscriber, and household data to design concrete strategies for improving the management of their organizations; (4) To use the audience, subscriber, and household data to make an impact on the role the arts play in their community; (5) To provide feedback on or write sections of project reports; (6) To consider ways to maintain local data collection efforts after the completion of the PARC project.



## PARC DATA SOURCES

The PARC research framework relies on four data sources to contribute information toward a more comprehensive understanding of the performing arts. Following is a description of the four sources and the type of information they provide.

**Administrative Surveys:** Each of the participating national service organizations conducted annual surveys of its members, collecting extensive administrative data. Most provided information on the numbers and types of performances, attendance, and a range of financial information, including sources of revenue and types of expenses. Selected items (or their definitions) from the existing surveys have been reviewed and some new items have been added so that key data elements can be captured consistently across all the disciplines.

**Audience Surveys:** Audience surveys provided information on audience demographics, feedback on customer satisfaction and perceived performance quality, and some feedback on audience perceptions of the value of the performing arts. Audience surveys were administered by each of the participating arts organizations in each of the study sites. Two-page surveys were placed on seats in performance venues or handed to audience members in conjunction with performances according to specific procedures established by the Urban Institute.

**Subscriber Surveys:** As with the audience surveys, the subscriber surveys provided information on demographics and feedback on customer satisfaction and perceived performance quality. The subscriber survey contained expanded questions about the perceptions of the value of the performing arts to respondents, their families, and their communities. Participating arts organizations in each study site mailed the six-page survey to a randomly selected group of subscribers according to procedures established by the Urban Institute.

**Household Surveys:** Household surveys, conducted by telephone, collected information to help understand the attitudes of people who attend, or do not attend the performing arts regularly, and to further understand why and how individuals can be motivated to become participants. The telephone surveys of random households in each participating community were conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates according to procedures developed by the Urban Institute.

### A Note about This Report

This report is based only on an analysis of the responses from the household surveys described above. Findings from the administrative surveys will be issued in a separate report. Data from the audience and subscriber surveys have been provided to the participating local arts organizations. Further analysis of these data is in the hands of local arts organizations and working groups.



## HOW THE HOUSEHOLD TELEPHONE SURVEYS WERE CONDUCTED

Survey respondents were selected using random digit dialing. Every active block of telephone numbers (area code + exchange + two-digit block number) was included in the predefined geographic areas. A computer randomly generated the final two digits of randomly selected blocks. Resulting numbers that matched listings in business directories were purged from the list. Calls were conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates in late winter and early spring of 2002.

Table 6.1 provides contact, cooperation, and completion numbers for all five communities. Randomly generated numbers result in a large number of nonworking numbers. The number of working numbers contacted ranged from nearly 2,600 in Pittsburgh to just over 1,800 in Alaska. The substantially higher number of contacts in Pittsburgh was due mainly to the higher proportion of refusals there. Nearly 60 percent of households contacted in Pittsburgh refused to participate, compared with roughly 35 percent in Alaska.

The overall response rate in each community is a function of successful contacts, degree of cooperation, and the ability to complete interviews once they are started. Response rates range from a high of 47 percent in Alaska to a low of 32 percent in Pittsburgh. Despite its reputation as a heavily telemarketed area, Cincinnati achieved the second highest response rate at 37 percent.

While these response rates are not out of line with other studies of this type, they do raise questions of nonresponse bias. That is, one might suspect that people who could not be contacted, would not cooperate with the interview, or did not complete it once started might have responded differently from people who completed the interview. If so, and if the differences are relevant to issues under investigation in the study, then one cannot make reliable inferences from a sample to the population of a given metropolitan area.

TABLE 6.1

CONTACT, COOPERATION, COMPLETION AND RESPONSE RATES					
	Alaska	Cincinnati	Denver	Pittsburgh	Seattle
dialed numbers	3,780	3,610	4,657	3,603	4,103
non-working numbers	-1,977	-1,301	-2,157	-1,010	-1,689
working numbers	1,803	2,309	2,500	2,593	2,414
language/health barrier, incomplete callbacks	- 425	- 831	- 637	484	- 584
<b>contacted numbers</b>	1,378 [76%]	1,478 [64%]	1,863 [75%]	2,109 [81%]	1,830 [76%]
refusals	- 488	- 606	- 950	-1,202	- 920
<b>cooperating</b>	890 [65%]	872 [59%]	913 [49%]	907 [43%]	910 [50%]
ineligible	- 47	- 35	- 81	- 29	- 56
eligible	843	837	832	878	854
interrupted, incomplete	- 43	- 37	- 32	- 78	- 50
<b>completions</b>	800 [95%]	800 [96%]	800 [96%]	800 [91%]	804 [94%]
<b>Response rate = contact % x cooperation % x completion %</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>36%</b>

Source: Urban Institute Analysis of PARC Household Data, 2002.



To investigate the potential for such bias, we compared the characteristics of our respondents with known characteristics of the population. The known characteristics are based on the 1990 Census, with adjustments by information collected from the Current Population Survey in the months immediately preceding data collection. Table 6.2 summarizes these comparisons. Asian/Pacific Islanders and black respondents were underrepresented in most communities, but the survey respondents show a strong correspondence with the population estimates on the race variable. Men are underrepresented in Alaska, Pittsburgh, and Seattle, though not grossly so. Respondents under 30 years of age are underrepresented in all communities except Alaska. However, only in Denver are persons over 65 years of age overrepresented in the sample. Overall, respondents are reasonably similar to the population parameters of sex and age in all five communities. However, this does not guarantee that nonrespondents would not have responded differently than respondents.

### SOMER'S D: LOOKING AT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN QUESTIONS

In reviewing the survey results, we are frequently interested in knowing whether people who answer a particular way on one question also tend to answer a particular way on a different question. For example, past research has observed that people who have acquired more education are more likely to attend arts events than people with less education. This finding comes from looking at the relationship between two different variables—*education level* and *frequency of attendance*.

**Somer's d** is a statistic that shows the strength of the relationship between two variables with a small number of ordered categories. By “ordered,” we mean that the question has categories that run in a meaningful way from low to high. Somer's d indicates the extent to which respondents who report high or low values on one variable also report high or low levels on another variable. For example, if we observe that tall people are very talkative and short people say very little at all, we would expect a high value of Somer's d for the variables *height* and *verbosity*. On the other hand, if tall and short people have roughly the same number of talkative and nontalkative types, we would get a low Somer's d, and we would conclude that there is no relationship between the two variables.

Somer's d runs from a value of 0.0 (no relationship) to 1.0 (perfect relationship), although it is usually quite low because of the conservative way in which it is calculated. A positive sign (+) in front of the number means that there is a *positive relationship* between the variables; that is, high values on one variable are associated with high values on the other. A negative sign (–) indicates a *negative relationship*; that is, high values on one variable go with lower values on the other variable, and vice versa.

A value of Somer's d less than –0.15 or higher than +0.15 is worth paying attention to. For values closer to 0.0, the relationship is probably best thought of as weak or nonexistent. Throughout this report, we note relationships that meet or exceed this 0.15 threshold.

**TABLE 6.2**
**COMPARISONS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS TO POPULATION ESTIMATE ON RACE, SEX, AND AGE**

	Alaska			Cincinnati			Denver			Pittsburgh			Seattle		
	Population Estimate	Survey Resp.	Percentage Difference	Population Estimate	Survey Resp.	Percentage Difference	Population Estimate	Survey Resp.	Percentage Difference	Population Estimate	Survey Resp.	Percentage Difference	Population Estimate	Survey Resp.	Percentage Difference
<b>RACE</b>															
White	600	616	+3%	684	686	+1%	600	607	+1%	723	719	-1%	633	648	+2%
Black	39	34	-13%	89	62	-30%	36	18	-50%	57	41	-28%	35	27	-23%
Asian/Pacific Islander	42	22	-48%	11	10	-9%	25	14	-44%	9	4	-56%	70	37	-47%
Hispanic/Latino	35	37	+6%	8	10	+25%	124	119	-4%	5	8	+60%	36	43	+19%
Other/Mixed	29	27	-7%	7	19	+171%	11	25	+127%	5	10	+100%	22	19	-14%
Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	55	55	0%	1	3	+200%	4	7	+75%	1	1	0%	8	10	+25%
Missing (did not report)	0	9		0	10		0	10		0	17		0	20	
<b>SEX</b>															
Men	407	364	-11%	380	351	-8%	397	382	-4%	374	335	-10%	397	357	-10%
Women	393	436	+11%	420	449	+7%	403	418	+4%	426	465	+9%	407	447	+10%
<b>AGE</b>															
18-29	201	210	+5%	178	160	-10%	191	168	-12%	141	104	-26%	178	162	-9%
30-39	190	167	-12%	169	153	-10%	184	168	-9%	145	131	-10%	183	188	+3%
40-49	198	181	-9%	170	180	+6%	177	192	+9%	166	169	+2%	177	185	+5%
50-65	151	164	+9%	156	188	+21%	152	163	+7%	166	211	+27%	158	151	-4%
65+	60	65	+8%	127	116	-9%	96	109	+14%	182	170	-7%	108	106	-2%
Missing (did not report)	0	13		0	3		0	0		0	15		0	12	

# PERFORMING ARTS RESEARCH COALITION

1156 15<sup>TH</sup> Street, NW, Suite 810, Washington, DC 20005

Association of Performing Arts Presenters • American Symphony Orchestra League  
Dance/USA • OPERA America • Theatre Communications Group



## THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS