



The Jazz Education Network presents

Jazz Audiences Initiative

*A research project of the
Jazz Arts Group*

JazzEdNet.org/JazzAudiencesInitiative

A Literature Review of Research on Jazz Audiences

Produced for the Jazz Audiences Initiative



Produced by:

Bijan Warner
bijanwarner@gmail.com
August 7, 2010

A Literature Review of Research on Jazz Audiences – Outline

INTRODUCTION	3
SECTION I: Jazz Audience Demographics	4
SECTION II: Venues and the Importance of Place	7
SECTION III: Why People Listen to Jazz	9
SECTION IV: Brain Research, Neuroimaging, Experimental Psychology and Jazz	12
SECTION V: Jazz Education and Audiences	15
SECTION VI: Proprietary Research on Jazz Audiences	16
APPENDIX: General Arts Participation and General Jazz Literature	17

INTRODUCTION

The Jazz Audiences Initiative (JAI) seeks innovative solutions to the challenge of audience development and engagement. In order to support this effort, this literature review has been conducted to bring together insights from multiple academic and practitioner sources.

Academic research on arts participation offers several insights into ways to think about jazz audiences. Unfortunately, there are few studies that address the vital questions for developing jazz audiences: *What does “jazz” mean for different audiences? How do different people come to appreciate jazz? What is the effect of different venues and settings audience experience? What are the ways in which personal practice leads to increased engagement with jazz performance?* Although no studies have been found that provide conclusive answers to these questions, the research on jazz and arts participation offers several ways to think about these problems.

This review has been organized into six sections. The first section reviews large scale studies of jazz audiences to provide a general picture of audience demographics and characteristics. The second section reviews research on the importance of setting in determining audience experience. Although no studies have been found that provide a detailed breakdown of the advantages and disadvantages of different venues for jazz performances, this section encourages thinking about how place and context are an integral part of the jazz experience. The third section addresses some of the reasons why people listen to jazz—this section emphasizes that listening to jazz and identifying as a consumer of jazz music is about more than a narrowly conceived aesthetic experience. The fourth section shifts to brain and psychological research into arts participation and experience. The fifth section reviews what is known about the importance of education in promoting arts audiences. The final section briefly discusses proprietary research on jazz audiences.

In addition to the academic literature on jazz audiences, there are two other vital sources of information that can help jazz organizations. First, there is the proprietary research conducted by individual venues and organizations to better understand their audiences and how to connect with them. While this research is of immediate relevance to jazz organizations, it is unfortunately not as readily available as the academic literature (see Section VI). A second source of vital information is the knowledge and experience possessed by practitioners, organizers, producers, educators, and program developers who have worked to develop jazz audiences, strengthen cultural institutions, and encourage new generations of jazz performers and audiences. Thus, although this literature review was conducted with a broad scope to highlight the accessible information on jazz audiences, it is not a final authority on the question of how to promote jazz audiences. Rather, this review can be of best use when combined with findings from proprietary research and with the guidance of individuals who have experience in jazz audience development.

SECTION I: Jazz Audience Demographics

Who listens to jazz? This section summarizes data from national surveys to provide a broad-brushstroke picture of jazz audiences.

Before looking closer at the issues surrounding jazz audiences, it is useful to see what large-scale surveys of American adults reveal about actual and potential jazz audiences. The NEA’s Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) provides invaluable data on jazz audiences. Surveys were conducted in 1982, 1985, 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2008. Of particular interest are the surveys of 2008, as the most recent, as well as 1992, because it functioned as the basis for Deveaux’s (1995) review of jazz audiences.

According to the 2008 SPPA, in the 12 months prior to the survey, 8% of the U.S. adult population attended a jazz performance, 14% watched or listened to a recording or broadcast of jazz, 1% performed jazz, and 24% reported that they liked to listen to jazz. There was a substantial decline in the percent of adults who attended a jazz performance at least once, from 10.8% in 2002 to 7.8% in 2008 (see table 1).

Table 1: Percent of adults attending various arts events at least once in past 12 months*

	Percent of adults attending at least once in past 12 months				Millions of Adults
	1982	1992	2002	2008	2008
Jazz	9.6%	10.6%	10.8%	7.8%	17.6
Classical Music	13.0	12.5	11.6	9.3	20.9
Opera	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.1	4.8
Latin Music	NA	NA	NA	4.9	10.9
Performing Arts Festivals	NA	NA	NA	20.8	46.7

*Adapted from SPPA 2008, p.3

Additionally, the 2008 SPPA reveals that live jazz audiences consist of 48% men and 52% women, and although women are a larger proportion of the jazz audience, a larger proportion of men attend jazz performances than any other benchmark activity. Half of jazz performance attendees had a college or graduate degree. Likewise, 48% of adults attending jazz performance were in the highest income groups (\$75,000 and over). African Americans were as likely to attend as non-Hispanic whites. Residents of the Pacific region were more likely to attend jazz performances. Additionally, there is a correlation with other performances: one third of adults who had attended one of the other benchmark activities also attended a jazz performance (80).

Scott Deveaux (1995) used 1992 SPPA data to draw a more detailed picture of jazz audiences. While the data is somewhat dated, he presents several interesting figures:

- One third of Americans say they “like jazz” and 1/4 desire to attend performances
- 10% of adults (or 19.7 million) attended a jazz performance in the previous year; 20% listened to a jazz recording
- Jazz audiences are predominantly affluent, well educated, young, and ethnically diverse.
 - However, “frequent” attendees tend to be male, well educated, well off, and black.
 - Education: Nearly half of those attending jazz performances are college educated
 - Age: two-third are under 45 years old

- Gender: slightly more men (52-54%) among attendees
- Race: African Americans are 16-20% of audiences, but only 11% of adult population
- Frequent attendees: 1/4 of those who attend as many as 9 performances a year are black, and 3/5 are male.
- Personal Practice: 1.7% of Americans reported performing or rehearsing jazz over the previous year. Less than half performed jazz in public. Performers are predominantly male, white, and young. 93% have had some formal musical education
- Venues: Little change since 1982 in where people view jazz
 - Jazz Venues in 1992:
 - 30% concert hall/auditorium
 - 7% College facility
 - 26% night club/coffee house
 - 7% dinner theater
 - 20% park/open-air facility
 - 10% other facilities
- Media
 - Recordings
 - A stable 20% of Americans have reported listening to jazz recordings in past year
 - Radio
 - Growth from 30 to 52 million Americans
 - May be due in part to rise of jazz/pop fusions (New Adult Contemporary)
 - TV/Video
 - Slight increase, from 18 to 21% in 1992
- Musical Preferences
 - 34% of respondents like jazz
 - 5% of respondents like jazz “best of all” (9.5 m Americans)

Given the age distribution of jazz audiences, it is worth looking at how age influences arts participation (Peterson, et al. 1996). Peterson et al. (2000) find that, compared to other benchmark activities, the jazz audience is aging most rapidly: while in 1982, the jazz audience was on average 11 years younger than the sample of interviewees, by 1997 it was only two years younger.

Independently of the SPPA, Ostrower’s (2005) study, conducted by the Urban Institute and with support of the Wallace Foundation, provides useful data not contained within the SPPA. Their questionnaire includes questions on the most recent cultural event attended, as well as questions about motivations and experiences. The study finds that African American (50%) and Hispanic adults (43%) are more likely to cite a desire to celebrate a cultural heritage as a reason for attending a cultural event, as compared with whites (15%). Additionally, 60% of adults stated that “socializing” was a major reason to attend a music performance. Music performance was cited as the most recent cultural event, and 13% of respondents who reported attending a music performance most recently reported that the performance was a jazz event.

Jeffri (2002) studied the lives and activities of jazz musicians, relying on a survey of musicians in four metropolitan areas: Detroit, New Orleans, New York, and San Francisco. One of Jeffri’s findings is that although New York has the largest number of jazz musicians (an estimated 33,000), San Francisco has a higher proportion of jazz musicians (2.8 out of every 1,000). Jeffri also finds that only 15.6% of jazz performers are women, a finding that can be better understood in light of Huxley and English’s (1998) study of the barriers to women jazz audiences and performers in the UK. While Jeffri’s report provides

an overview of jazz musicians, Howard Becker (2004) argues that it is important to think about jazz musicians more in terms of activities of performers instead of categories of performers:

“[...]it is not accurate to divide musicians into such groups as jazz players, commercial players, and so on. These are better thought of as ways of playing, ways of doing the job. Some people might have engaged in only one form of that activity, like the "honorable" one that is called "jazz" and never participated in the less honorable versions of the trade, the playing for weddings and bar mitzvas and fashion shows and dances that were the customary fare of someone who made a living playing popular music.”

Parallel to the study of jazz audiences in the US, there have been detailed studies of jazz audiences in the UK. In a study conducted by The Jazz Development Trust (McIntyre, 2001) potential audiences were studied in four cities: Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham. Relying on from 700 telephone interviews and 8 focus group sessions, the study explored the demographics, arts consumption habits, and attitudes toward jazz of the potential jazz audience in the UK. In related research, Maitland (2009) used the “Mosaic” profiling system to describe the audiences that attend jazz events at two venues in Nottingham. She relied not only on demographic information, but also analyzed the geographic locations of potential jazz audiences in particular neighborhoods. Her study thus allows for targeted marketing of this region. Nicholson et al. (2009) compare jazz representation on BBC public radio to jazz on public radio elsewhere in Europe. They explore the history of jazz on BBC public radio and the amount of airtime given to local artists. The report argues for a stronger link between the BBC and local jazz resources. And finally, Riley and Laing (2006) provide an overview of the economics of jazz in Britain, discussing its economic impact in terms of ticket sales, royalties, sponsorship, etc. Additional online resources on jazz in the UK can be found at The Jazz Site, run by Jazz Services, Ltd.

Section 1, Select Readings:

Becker, Howard. 2004. “Jazz Places,” pp. 17–27 in Andy Bennett and Richard A. Peterson, eds., *Music Scenes: Local, Translocal, and Virtual*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press. Available online: <http://home.earthlink.net/~hsbecker/articles/places.html>

DeVeaux, Scott. 1995. *Jazz in America: Who’s Listening?* Research Division Report #31. National Endowment for the Arts. Carson, CA: Seven Locks Press.

Huxley, Ros and Sue English. 1998. *Women and Jazz: Research Project Report*. Commissioned by South West Jazz, Exeter, in partnership with Chard Festival of Women in Music, Somerset.

Jazz Services, Ltd. *The Jazz Site*. <http://www.jazzservices.org.uk>

Jeffri, Joan. 2002. *Changing the Beat: A Study of the Worklife of Jazz Musicians*. NEA Research Division Report #43.

Maitland, Heather. 2009. *Understanding Audiences for Jazz: Briefing 3e: What kind of people attend Nottingham Jazzsteps gigs*. Available online: http://www.jazzsteps.co.uk/emjazz_report/3e%20Mosaic%20report%20Nottingham.pdf

- McIntyre, Morris Hargreaves and the Jazz Development Trust. 2001. *How to Develop Audiences for Jazz*. Report prepared for the Arts Council of England. Available online: <http://www.creativenorthyorkshire.com/documents/DevAudJazz1.pdf>
- Nicholson, Stuart, Emma Kendon, and Chris Hodgkins. 2009. *The BBC—Public Sector Radio, Jazz Policy and Structure in the Digital Age*. Jazz Services Ltd. Available online: <http://www.jazzservices.org.uk/Portals/0/BBC%20-%20Jazz%20policy%20and%20Structure%20V7.pdf>
- Ostrower, Francie. 2005. *The Diversity of Cultural Participation: Findings from a national survey*. The Urban Institute.
- Peterson, Richard A. et al. 1996. *Age and Arts Participation: with a Focus on the Baby Boom Cohort*. NEA Research Division Report # 34.
- Peterson, Richard A., Pamela Hull and Roger Kern. 2000. *Age and Arts Participation: 1982-1997*. NEA Research Division Report #42.
- Riley, Mykaell and Dave Laing. 2006. *The Value of Jazz in Britain*. Commissioned by Jazz Services Ltd. Available online: <http://www.jazzservices.org.uk/Portals/0/ValueofJazzReportDec2006.pdf>
- Williams, Kevin and David Keen. 2009. *2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. National Endowment for the Arts, Research Report #49.

SECTION II: Venues and the Importance of Place

Where do audiences go to listen to jazz? What effect does the setting have on the experience?

As mentioned in Deveaux (1995), the distribution of attendance across jazz venues is 30% for concert halls/ auditoriums, 26% for a night club/coffee house, 20% park/open-air, 10% other facilities, 7% college facility, and 7% dinner theater. *But how does context change the experience of listening to jazz?* Anecdotally, Marty Ashby (personal communication) cites smaller venues as more effective in achieving meaningful experiences for audiences, with occasional exceptions for larger performances. And Roueff (2002) explores how interaction among the musicians, audiences, and employees of a jazz club leads to a collectively produced aesthetic experience. Unfortunately, there are few comparative studies that explore how different venues produce different meanings and levels of engagement for audiences; hopefully further research and communication among jazz organizations will help fill this gap.

Andy Bennett and Richard Peterson's concept of "music scene" helps us look beyond the context of individual venues to the larger "contexts in which clusters of producers, musicians, and fans collectively share their common musical tastes and collectively distinguish themselves from others." (2004:1; see also Bennett 2000). Their stress on the "music scene" encourages us to think beyond the scale of individual venues, to what makes a successful—that is, healthy and vibrant—music scene. It may be helpful to examine different historical "jazz scenes" to understand what made them so successful: for example, the New York scene of the 1940's out of which bebop emerged, (DeVeaux, 1999; Gillespie and Frasier, 2009) or the lively jazz scene of mid-century Detroit, (Bjorn and Gallert, 2001).

Howard Becker, sociologist and jazz pianist, also provides several concepts with which to think about how place becomes important in jazz experiences. In a recent publication, Becker (2004) reflects on his experiences to examine the relationship between jazz as a musical form and the concrete places (both as physical and social) its performance takes place. For example, Becker discusses how Dave Brubeck's wife, Iola, pioneered the organizing of college campus tours, and how these concerts (as opposed to playing at dances) both created an audience for records as well as were made possible by prior record sales. Becker also discusses his experience as "jobbing" musician, and how bands would tailor their performance to the types of events, as well as the age and ethnicity of the audience. In his other writings on jazz and music performance, Becker discusses tensions that arise between performers and audiences that lack the knowledge necessary to properly judge the work (1951) as well as the structure and importance of the jazz repertoire (2005).

Independently of the academic literature on the importance of venues, online communities and jazz publications offer a lively discussion of current venues. For example, AllAboutJazz.com maintains a database of jazz venues, and in a recent article, Miller (2010) reviews a set of jazz venues in New York, discussing the ambience, histories, and regular musicians at different venues.

Section 2, Select Readings:

Becker, Howard. 1951. "The Professional Dance Musician and His Audience." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 57(2):136-144.

- Becker, Howard and Robert Faulkner. 2005. "The Jazz Repertoire," *Sociologie de l'art*, pp. 15-24.
Available online: <http://home.earthlink.net/~hsbecker/articles/montreal.html>
- Bennett, Andy, Richard A., Peterson (Eds.). 2004. *Music Scenes: Local, Trans-local, and Virtual*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Bennett, Andy, 2000. *Popular Music and Youth Culture: Music, Identity and Place*. St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Bjorn, Lars and Jim Gallert. 2001. *Before Motown: A History of Jazz in Detroit, 1920-1960*. University of Michigan Press.
- Deveaux, Scott.. *The Birth of Bebop: A Social and Musical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999
- Gillespie, Dizzy and Al Frasier. 2009. *To Be or Not to...Bop*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Miller, Matthew. 2010. "AAJ's Guide to NYC Jazz Venues in the New Decade." AllAboutJazz.com
Available online: <http://www.allaboutjazz.com/php/article.php?id=35101>
- Roueff, Olivier. 2002. "Faire le jazz: La coproduction de l'expérience esthétique dans un jazz-club."
Revue de Musicologie, T.88e, No. 1er:67-93.

SECTION III: Why People Listen to Jazz

Why do people listen to jazz? Is it purely about need-satisfaction, as consumers purchase goods and services in accordance with their predetermined tastes? For what other reasons might individuals listen to jazz? In his characteristic wit and clarity, Duke Ellington offers a typology of reasons why people might listen to jazz:

“Jazz became popular in one way and unpopular in another. Some people enjoy listening to jazz because somebody told them that they should. Others have more valid reasons: (1) to dance to; (2) to give one’s sitting stance the dash and swank that match a ringside old-fashioned (of course, one must never tilt on the beat as one pats one’s foot); (3) it’s an art form, discovered by the neo-intellectuals, and some find it something to listen *down* to, like taking the ear slumming; (4) others use it for social advancement in that world of hipsters who believe everything in their lives must swing; (5) those who enjoy monetary participation; (6) professional courtesy; (7) those who genuinely get torn up emotionally when listening to an extraordinary rendition; and (8) some young people like to dig it because it is not associated with juvenile delinquency, which brings us now to those who prefer *not* to listen to jazz...”
(Duke Ellington. *Music is My Mistress*, p. 413)

Ellington underscores the diverse reasons individuals may have for listening to jazz. One trend within arts research emphasizes how art consumption and knowledge serve as a way to both strengthen group identity via shared cultural objects, as well as to exclude other groups. In a recent review of arts participation, McCarthy et al. (2001) note that this idea can be traced to the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1984) and Thorstein Veblen (1899). Within this trend, DiMaggio and Useem (1978) review empirical research on arts consumption, paying close attention to issues of class—both the different exposures to and experiences of art forms across classes, and how knowledge of art helps reinforce class distinctions. They offer four propositions: 1) Arts appreciation is *trained*, 2) Arts appreciation is *contextual*, 3) Arts consumption *enhances class cohesion*, 4) Arts consumption is *a form of cultural capital*. Likewise, Bryson (1996; 1997), relying on data from the 1992 General Social Survey, evaluates the relationship between musical exclusiveness, education, political tolerance, and musical tolerance. She finds that musical exclusiveness decreases with education—which may correspond with data from the SPPA that shows adults with higher education are more likely to listen to jazz, and other genres.

Depending on the historical context, place, and audience in question, jazz has been both a “subculture” understood against more mainstream or “legit” musical forms, as well as a mainstream form in its own right. David Riesman (1950) conducted an early study into the many meanings associated with musical preferences. He identifies a common trajectory for white University students who like “hot jazz”—while in high school their preference for jazz made them unique and stand out from others, once at the University they found many others with similar preferences and this changed the social significance of their musical taste. Such students could choose to develop a new “mainstream” among their peers, or seek further differentiation by listening to less popular forms of jazz. Dick Hebdige’s (1981) study into subcultures, while not directly referencing jazz, provides a richer image of how subcultures form, and how politics and social meanings are steeped in aesthetic choices.

Peterson and Berger (1975) explore the cycles that cultural forms go through—from “normal” periods where markets are highly concentrated with a small diversity of forms, to brief “revolutionary” periods marked by a high level of competition and creativity. The history of jazz (see sources in appendix)

follows this general pattern—innovations in new styles tended to occur over brief periods in particular locations. Attention to such “cycles” of music change raises the question of where jazz is as a form at the current moment.

The above studies emphasize how listening to music is about more than just music. In contrast to this, one might ask about “authentic” jazz and “authentic” experiences that are free from such considerations. Although some jazz audiences may seek out “authentic” jazz experiences, it is not clear what an “authentic” jazz experience consists of. In his study of the history of country music, Richard Peterson (1997) illustrates the manufacturing of what consumers felt was an authentic experience—“authenticity” is one of the central factors that country music fans seek, yet the development of the country music industry sought new ways to construct such “authentic” experiences. In a related vein, David Grazian (2003) explores the construction of “authentic” blues experiences in Chicago blues clubs, as well as how the City of Chicago branded itself as an authentic blues place in a bid to attract tourism. While neither of these studies focuses on jazz music per se, they offer insight into how meaning and authenticity are contested.

Section 3, Select Readings:

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction*. London: Routledge.

Bryson, Bethany. 1996. “Anything but heavy metal: symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes.” *American Sociological Review* 61, 884–899.

Bryson, Bethany. 1997. “What about the univores? Musical dislikes and group-based identity construction among Americans with low levels of education.” *Poetics* 25, 141–156.

DiMaggio, Paul and Michael Useem. 1978. “Social Class and Arts Consumption: The Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America.” *Theory and Society*, 5:141-161.

Fox, William S. and James D. Williams. 1974. “Political Orientation and Music Preference among College Students.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 38(3):352.

Grazian, David. 2003. *Blue Chicago: The Search for Authenticity in Urban Blues Clubs*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hebdige, Dick. 1981. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge.

McCarthy, Kevin F., Elizabeth H. Ondaatje and Laura Zakaras. 2001. *Guide to the Literature on Participation in the Arts*. RAND.

Peterson, Richard A., Berger, David G., 1975. “Cycles in symbol production: the case of popular music.” *American Sociological Review* 40, 158–173.

Peterson, Richard A. 1997. *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, Richard A. and Roger M. Kern. 1996. "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61(5):900-907.

Riesman, David. 1950. "Listening to popular music." *American Quarterly* 2, 359–371.

Veblen, Thorstein. 1899. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: New American Library.

SECTION IV: Brain Research, Neuroimaging, Experimental Psychology and Jazz

What can cognitive neuroscience, neuroimaging, and experimental psychology tell us about jazz audiences?

Zatorre (2007) provides an introduction to how neuroscientists understand music, as at once a universal cultural phenomenon, as well as an extraordinarily demanding cognitive challenge that requires precise interaction between multiple brain centers. He reviews some of the processes involved with music perception and production, and suggests ideas about how these functions are integrated. Blood and Zatorre (2001) study the relationship between intensely pleasurable response to music and brain regions associated with reward and emotion. Grahn and Brett (2007) explore the areas of the brain associated with the perception of rhythm and beat. For both trained musicians and non-musicians, rhythm elicits a response in the same region of the brain. And finally, Levitin and Menon (2003) find that musical structure is processed in what were traditionally understood as language centers of the brain—this finding will be of interest to jazz performers and educators who refer to jazz as a “language.”

How are tastes or preferences for different musical genres developed? This is a central question for the Jazz Audiences Initiative, but one for which there is no clear answer. Slovic (1995) provides a brief introduction to the issues at hand in preference construction, from the perspective of a social and cognitive psychologist. One approach to the question of preference construction stresses the importance of social interaction (for a general introduction, see Collins 2004). Preferences are often constructed as individuals gauge the preferences of their peers. The importance of perceived popularity of music and individual rating has been explored by Berns, et al. (2010). This study replicates the finding that music perceived to be popular is ranked higher by adolescents (the perception of popularity was controlled by providing a star-rating system to an experimental group, and no information on popularity for the control group. Unsurprisingly, when information on song popularity was given to subjects, adolescents were more likely to state that they preferred the song). However, Berns et al. extend prior research by focusing on the specific areas of the brain that are activated when popularity influences song perception. In their model, anxiety over mismatched preference with others is a driving force toward conformity among teenagers’ musical preference.

Holbrook and Huber’s 1983 study, as well as follow-up work by Blowers and Bacon-Shone (1994) refine methods for measuring how well individuals’ perceptions of musical qualities correlates with its objective characteristics. While both studies use jazz music as their test case, their findings are oriented toward refining research techniques, and do not have obvious policy implications.

A recurring question in research on jazz audiences is whether general knowledge about jazz is necessary for appreciating live performances—must audiences be schooled in the jazz tradition to have positive experiences? While the importance of prior knowledge and effective curatorship has been little studied regarding jazz, there has been related work on the visual arts. Studies by Russell (2003), Temme (1992), Leder (2006), and Millis (2001), demonstrate the importance of general knowledge about art in enabling its appreciation. However, Bordens’ (2010) study of how contextual information influences art perception provides a counterpoint to the assumption that more active curatorship and education is necessary to produce engaged audiences. Bordens finds that providing contextual information to a group of artistically naïve college students changes how they evaluate the match between the artwork and their own internal concept of art: in the absence of contextual information, subjects had a higher perceived match between the artwork and their concept of art: too much information can change audience’s experiences.

And finally, given the recent interest in the intrinsic benefits of and motivations for arts experiences (see McCarthy's 2004 *Gifts of the Muse*), it is worth citing Deci and Ryan's (1985) early work which led to renewed interest in the relationship between intrinsic motivation, behavior, and performance (see also Deci, 1971). A related literature centers on the concept of, "flow," or optimal experiences when individuals are immersed in experiences where their capabilities are matched with the challenges, and in which the activity is inherently meaningful (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). These studies underscore the psychological characteristics of intense, rewarding, and meaningful experiences. Applied to the field of jazz audience development, they pose the question of how more intrinsic rewarding and "flow" experiences can be promoted for jazz audiences.

Section 4, Select Readings:

Berns, Gregory S. et al. 2010. "Neural mechanisms of the influence of popularity on adolescent ratings of music." *NeuroImage* 49:2687-2696.

Blood, A.J., Zatorre, R.J., 2001. "Intensely pleasurable responses to music correlate with activity in brain regions implicated in reward and emotion." *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the United States of America*. 98, 11818–11823.

Blowers, Geoffrey H. and John Bacon-Shone. 1994. "On Detecting the Differences in Jazz: A Reassessment of Comparative Methods of Measuring Perceptual Veridicality." *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 12(1).

Bordens, Kenneth S. 2010. "Contextual Information, Artistic Style and the Perception of Art." *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 28(1): 111-130.

Collins, Randall. 2004. *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. 1990. *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

Deci, E. L. 1975. *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L. and R. M. Ryan. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Grahn, J.A., Brett, M., 2007. "Rhythm and beat perception in motor areas of the brain." *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 19, 893–906.

Holbrook, Morris B. and Joel Huber. 1983. "Detecting the Differences in Jazz: A Comparison of Methods for Assessing Perceptual Veridicality in Applied Aesthetics." *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 1(1).

Leder, H., Carbon, C-C., & Ripsas, A-L. (2006). "Entitling art: The influence of title information on understanding and apperception of paintings." *Acta Psychologica*, 121, 176-198.

- Levitin, D.J., Menon, V., 2003. "Musical structure is processed in "language" areas of the brain: a possible role for Brodmann Area 47 in temporal coherence." *NeuroImage* 20.
- Millis, K. (2001). "Making meaning brings pleasure: The influence of titles on aesthetic experiences." *Emotion*, 1, 320-329.
- Russell, P. A. (2003). "Effort after meaning and the hedonic value of paintings." *British Journal of Psychology*, 94, 99-110.
- Slovic, Paul. 1995. "The construction of preference." *American Psychologist* 50, 364–371.
- Temme, J. E. (1992). "Amount and kind of information in museums: Its effects on visitors satisfaction and appreciation of art." *Visual Arts Research*, 18, 28-36.
- Zatorre, R.J., Chen, J.L., Penhume, V.B., 2007. "When the brain plays music: auditory–motor interactions in music perception and production." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 8, 547–558.

SECTION V: Jazz Education and Audiences

How important is early exposure to jazz and jazz education for subsequent participation?

Jazz education for children and young adults promotes future jazz participation. This is something many educators know intuitively, but it has also been confirmed experimentally (Orend, 1989). Kracman (1996) has demonstrated the impact of arts instruction on future attendance at arts events, even after controlling for parents' education. Bergonzi and Smith (1996) argue for the importance of arts education, using SPPA 1992 data to demonstrate unequivocally that more arts education leads to greater arts participation. Zakaras and Lowell (2008) provide useful suggestions for how state arts programs can help cultivate art participation.

Aside from musical instruction, jazz history instruction provides further educational benefits. Allen (1996) discusses his experience in teaching the history of American music. He finds this history to be a rich context in which to discuss race, class, and culture, as well as the connections between jazz, folk, soul, and other popular forms. And as Beattie (1995) points out, music education is just as important for the educator as it is for the student—in teaching musical traditions, educators relearn and develop new understandings of art forms.

And finally, with the recent creation of the Jazz Education Network (<http://www.jazzednet.org/>), new opportunities exist for jazz educators to share their experience and resources in teaching and supporting jazz education.

Section 5, Select Readings:

Allen, Ray. 1996. "Unifying the Disunity: A Multicultural Approach to Teaching American Music." *American Studies* 37(1): 135-147.

Beattie, Mary. 1995. "The Making of a Music: The Construction and Reconstruction of a Teacher's Personal Practical Knowledge during Inquiry." *Curriculum Inquiry* 25(2):133-150.

Bergonzi, Louis and Julia Smith. 1996. *Effects of Arts Education on Participation in the Arts*. NEA Research Division Report #36.

Kracman, Kimberley. 1996. "The effect of school-based arts instruction on attendance at museums and the performing arts." *Poetics* 24:203-218.

Orend, Richard J. 1989. *Socialization and Participation in the Arts*. NEA Research Division Report #21.

Zakaras, Laura and Julia F. Lowell. 2008. *Cultivating Demand for the Arts: Art Learning, Arts Engagement, and State Arts Policy*. Rand Corporation.

SECTION VI: Proprietary Research on Jazz Audiences

Large scale organizations as well as smaller groups have conducted research into audience demographics, preferences, and habits, and the findings of such research can potentially benefit other organizations as well as the broader jazz community. For example, individual organizations have looked into what kinds of experiences different audiences seek, how they find out about events, which events make audiences want to return and which steer them away, as well as other useful information.

Ultimately, a healthier national jazz audience is a *collective* good—with more individuals listening to jazz and active in jazz events, all jazz organizations can benefit. This section serves first to identify that such proprietary research exists, and secondly, to encourage the communication and sharing of results across jazz organizations.

Jazz Organizations (including partners of the Jazz Arts Initiative)

Jazz at Lincoln Center
San Francisco Jazz
Cleveland Jazz Orchestra
University of Florida Performing Arts
University of Iowa Hancher Auditorium
Wexner Center for the Arts
The Chicago Jazz Ensemble
American Jazz Museum in Kansas City
The Jazz Education Network (JEN)
AllAboutJazz.com
Manchester Craftsmen’s Guild Jazz
Jazz Arts Group

APPENDIX: General Arts Participation and General Jazz Literature

Given the limited research on jazz participation specifically, it is important to reference the general literature on arts participation. While much of this literature focuses either on the arts generally, or on particular, non-jazz forms, it offers many insights that can be applied to the problem of jazz audiences.

While there are limited resources on jazz audience participation, the broader literature on jazz—biographies of musicians, histories of places and moments, and jazz criticism—is enormous. A handful of notable texts has been selected below as an introduction to this field.

General Arts Participation, Select Readings:

Jenkins, Willard. 1999. "Where's the Jazz Audience?" *The Antioch Review* 57(3):355-362.

McCarthy, Kevin F. and Kimberly Jinnett. *A New Framework for Building Participation in the Arts*.

McCarthy, Kevin et al. 2004. *Gifts of the Muse: Reframing the Debate About the Benefits of the Arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Pettit, Becky. 2000. "Resources for studying public participation and attitudes towards the arts." *Poetics* 27:351-395.

Pickett, Georgianna. 2007. *Report on Jazz Conversations, 2007*. Hosted by the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation and Chamber Music America.

Wolf Brown, Major University Presenters, Value and Impact Study. The Mellon Papers (available online at <http://www.wolfbrown.com/index.php?page=supplementary-research-the-mellon-papers>):

- Johnson, Jennifer Wiggins and Bret Ellis. "The Influence of Marketing Messages and Benefits Received on Attributions of Donation Behavior to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations."
- Kim, May, Yong JaeKo, and Eather Gibson. "Study of MUP Donors Motivation, Behavior, and Benefits."
- Lee, Sarah. "Preferences and Purchase Behavior: Survey Evidence on the Relationship between Stated Interested in the Performing Arts and Ticket Purchase History."
- Koropecjy-Cox, Tanya et al. "Community Contexts of University Presenters and Their Audiences."
- Kern, Jara. "Anticipation: Exploring its Origins and Effects on the Live Arts Experience."
- Gilbride, Shelly and David Orzechowicz. "How We Feel About Art: Motivation, Satisfaction, and Emotional Experience in Performing Arts Audiences."
- Rose, Trina. "Social Influences on Intrinsic Impacts of Performance."
- Creekmore, Mark and Sarah Rush. "Analysis of Multiple Intelligences in Understanding the Relationships between Ticket Buyers and Their Participation in Performing Arts Programs."
- Silk, Yael Zipporah and Jordan Raphael Fischbach. "Characterizing Program Enhancement Events."
- Varela, Ximena. "How Beliefs Matter: Views, Motives and their Relation to Buyer and Donor Behavior."

General Jazz Literature, Select Readings:

Baraka, Amiri. 2010. *Digging: The Afro-American Soul of American Classical Music*. University of California Press.

Davis, Miles with Quincy Troupe. 1990. *Miles: The Autobiography*. Simon and Schuster.

Ellington, Edward Kennedy. 1976. *Music is My Mistress*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Giddins, Gary and Scott DeVeaux. 2009. *Jazz*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Hasse, John Edward and Tad Lathrop. 2000. *Jazz: The First Century*. William Morrow.

Hasse, John Edward. 1993. *Beyond Category: The Life and Genius of Duke Ellington*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1993. *The Jazz Scene*. Pantheon.

Ratcliff, Ben. 2009. *The Jazz Ear: Conversations over Music*. St. Martin's Griffith.

- Ratcliff conducted listening interviews with jazz performers. The performer selected a few songs, and then spoke to Ratcliff about them. Some of the interviews are revealing, but the discussions tend to veer away from the listening experience. Interviews with: Wayne Shorter, Pat Metheny, Sonny Rollins, Andrew Hill, Ornette Coleman, Maria Schneider, Bob Brookmeyer, Bebo Valdes, Dianne Reeves, Joshua Redman, Hank Jones, Roy Hanyes, Paul Motian, Branford Marsalis, and Guillermo Klein.

Shorter, Wayne. 1968. "Creativity and Change" *Downbeat*.

Sidran, Ben. 1995. *Talking Jazz: An Oral History*. DeCapo Press.

Stokes, W. Royal. 1993. *The Jazz Scene: An Informal History from New Orleans to 1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Studies that use jazz performance as a way to shed light on other forms of social interaction and creativity:

- Grant, Adam and James Berry. "The Necessity of Others is the Mother of Invention: Intrinsic and Prosocial Motivations, Perspective-Taking, and Creativity" *Academy of Management*
- Voyer, John J. and Robert R. Faulkner. 1989. "Organizational Cognition in a Jazz Ensemble." *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 7(1).