

*Contemporary Music in American Symphony Orchestras:
A Guide for Arts Administrators*

*by
Julia R. Katz*

*A MASTER'S PROJECT
Presented to the Arts and Administration Program
of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master's of Science in
Arts Administration*

June 2007

Contemporary Music in American Symphony Orchestras: A Guide for Arts Administrators

Approved: _____

*Dr. Patricia Dewey
Arts and Administration
University of Oregon*

Date: _____

ABSTRACT

This graduate research project serves as a guide for arts administrators programming contemporary symphonic music (music composed by a living composer) in American symphony orchestras. The researcher (1) demonstrates there is a need for contemporary symphonic music to be a part of the standard repertoire in American symphony orchestras, (2) provides resources for arts administrators seeking to incorporate (more) contemporary symphonic music into their programming, and (3) provides tools for arts administrators to bring in new audiences to experience contemporary symphonic music. The document contains a chapter on resources available federally and to Oregon, Washington and California, professional viewpoints about the importance of contemporary music in American symphony orchestras, and recommendations for arts administrators based on literature and field research.

KEYWORDS

- *American symphony orchestra*
- *Contemporary Music in America*
- *American Music and the American Symphony Orchestra*
- *Musical & Aesthetic Taste/Public Appreciation*
- *Contemporary music audience/audience development*
- *Current Trends in Program Repertoire*
- *Grants and contemporary music*
- *Foundations and contemporary music*
- *Contemporary music resources*
- *Contemporary music criticism*

CURRICULUM VITA

NAME OF AUTHOR: Julia R. Katz

PLACE OF BIRTH: Tarzana, California

DATE OF BIRTH: March 31, 1981

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED

University of Oregon

Emory University

DEGREES AWARDED

Master of Science, 2007, University of Oregon

Bachelor of Art, 2003, Emory University

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

*Graduate Teaching Fellow, University of Oregon Arts and Administration
Program, 2006-07*

*Vice-President, Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) University
of Oregon Chapter, 2006-2007*

*Office Assistant, Oregon Bach Festival at the University of Oregon, 2005-
2006*

Logistics Coordinator, Star Asia International in Atlanta, GA, 2004-2005

Office Manager, Probix in Atlanta, GA, 2003-2004

Acknowledgements

There are so many people in my life that have helped me throughout the pursuit of my degree at the University of Oregon, and of course with producing this research. Patricia Dewey, my research and academic advisor, has been there from day one in this process, and provided a gentle but guiding hand in my research and academic progress. Additionally, all of the faculty and staff in the Arts and Administration department at the University of Oregon have deeply influenced my academic and personal growth over the past two years. I hope to take this experience and continue to grow intellectually and professionally using the fundamental knowledge gained through this program. I would also like to thank my peers who I have learned so much from in the past couple of years. Last but not least a special thanks goes to my partner, Andrew Furdell, for his love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
<i>Methodology</i>	11
<i>Research Objectives</i>	12
<i>Limitations</i>	12
<i>Delimitations</i>	13
<i>Benefits</i>	14
<i>Research Design</i>	14
<i>Document Outline</i>	15
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
<i>A short history of American orchestras</i>	16
<i>Programming and tradition</i>	17
<i>Functions of contemporary symphonic music</i>	20
<i>Contemporary music and American symphony orchestras</i>	21
<i>Professionalizing of American Symphony orchestras</i>	23
III. FUNDING SOURCES FOR CONTEMPORARY MUSIC.....	26
<i>Government</i>	26
<i>State funding</i>	27
<i>Foundation</i>	28
<i>Infrastructure Organizations</i>	32
<i>Individual</i>	36
IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	38
<i>Data collection and analysis</i>	38
<i>Informational case study at the Oregon Symphony</i>	43
<i>Notes of interest from interviews</i>	50
<i>Notes of interest from questionnaires</i>	54
V. MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	57
<i>Classical music</i>	57
<i>Contemporary music</i>	58
<i>The audience</i>	60
<i>Sustainability</i>	61
<i>Available resources</i>	62
<i>Insights and final arguments</i>	63
<i>Recommendations for arts administrators</i>	69
VI. APPENDICES.....	
<i>Appendix A: Recruitment letter for interview</i>	72
<i>Appendix B: Recruitment letter for questionnaire</i>	73
<i>Appendix C: In-depth interview questions</i>	74
<i>Appendix D: Questionnaire</i>	76
<i>Appendix E: Consent letter for interviewee</i>	80
VII. REFERENCES.....	81

Chapter I. Introduction and Methodology

American symphony orchestras, a modern context

There are approximately 350-400 professional symphony orchestras in America, and there are more than 1800 orchestras including volunteer, collegiate/conservatory, and youth orchestras within the United States (ASOL, 2005). These orchestras cumulatively reach 15-20% of American households, and generated 1.44 billion in revenue during the 2004/05 season (ASOL, 2005). The professional symphony orchestras represent the best of the industry, and have the most reputable musicians and perform in the best concert halls in the nation. These professional orchestras, which account for only 20% of all orchestras in the United States, keep classical music alive. I believe they also have a responsibility to encourage the creation and performance of new works created for play by a symphony orchestra. This graduate research project operates within this belief, and seeks to demystify the process of programming *contemporary symphonic music*, defined for the purposes of this study as all music intended to be performed by an American symphony orchestra created by a living composer. Additionally, this project will result in recommendations for how arts administrators can facilitate the programming of contemporary symphonic music in American symphony orchestras.

According to the American Symphony Orchestra League's (ASOL's) 2005/06 repertoire report, the vast majority (about 92%) of what is performed in American concert halls across the country is music composed before 1980. The ASOL does not (nor does any source that I have reviewed to date) collect statistics concerning performance of contemporary works. But the percentage stated above, that 92% of music performed was composed before 1980, speaks volumes about the current programming in American

symphony orchestras. Many orchestras are very traditional and committed to “classical” works, defined as music composed in Europe between the late 18th & early 20th century (Horowitz, 2005). This research will focus on contemporary music in America, and specifically how to incorporate it into American symphony orchestras. The research is intended to benefit arts administrators who seek to incorporate contemporary music into their programming, and who want to prepare audiences to take a higher risk in listening to contemporary music.

The majority of what professional American orchestras perform is classical music (Horowitz, 2005). American symphony orchestras have been gradually increasing the amount of classical music they program while simultaneously decreasing the amount of contemporary music that is performed. The breadth of repertoire performed by American symphony orchestras is diminishing and some say it is now stagnant (Lawson, 2003).

The problem with this programming approach is it does not allow for American symphony orchestras to become influential in today’s American culture. Each generation defines and identifies itself in part by the music it produces. Because American symphony orchestras predominantly perform classical music, the process of contemporary music making and identification has been mostly limited to the popular music idiom. “As long as classical music is perceived to be in the preservation business, it should come as no surprise that potential new audiences, who are instinctively drawn to new works in other fields, dismiss classical music as dated and irrelevant” (Tommasini, 2001). While many American symphonies thrive from their steady diet of classical music, there are those that seek out ways to incorporate contemporary programming in an effort to bring in new audiences and provide access to contemporary music. This document is

produced in order to provide guidance for orchestral organizations seeking to incorporate more contemporary music into their programming.

Although many in the field agree incorporating contemporary music is important, orchestras have found it difficult to program these works in practice (Lawson, 2003). For myriad reasons, “many programs that feature contemporary music, particularly of the more ‘difficult’ kind, do very badly at the box office” (Lawson, 2003, p. 255). Difficult music in this context is music that may not follow typical musical notation, and may not follow traditional Western concepts of melody and other classical, or traditional Western musical aesthetic ideals. Apparent in the research is a struggle between artistic direction in American symphony orchestras and their fiscal responsibilities (to meet their quota for earned income). Programming contemporary music is a risk because it may lose money at the box office. American symphony orchestras are prone to playing it safe and sticking with the classical repertoire, especially if they do not have financial stability and can not afford a big box office failure.

American symphony orchestras attract traditional audiences because they play classical music, and until they consistently play contemporary works they will retain their reputation as a kind of ‘living museum’ (Lawson, 2003). This reputation will prohibit new audiences from attending orchestra performances, even if there are performances of contemporary music. If the tradition of symphonic orchestral music is to progress, it clearly cannot rely on a relatively small number of devoted but diminishing concertgoers. Orchestras will suffer from lagging in the status quo and “deprive themselves of the very creative forces that have given the orchestras life over the past two centuries” (Wheatland Foundation, 1990, p. 6).

Towards the end of the 20th century, orchestra managers and musicians realized their organizations were in danger due to diminishing audiences and increasing costs. After decades of growth, American symphony orchestras were experiencing financial crisis appearing to be symptomatic of larger issues (Wolf, 2006). Audience development is one area of research that orchestra managers believe will benefit the overall health of American symphony orchestras. Preparing audiences and making them comfortable with the concert hall experience is certainly an important aspect of audience development, often implemented through marketing strategies. Programming innovation is another avenue of audience development important to explore. Unfortunately, producing atypical repertory is often more expensive to the orchestra for reasons including increased rehearsal time, administrative work hours, and complicated copyright and legal issues. When orchestras do get the chance to perform contemporary works it is often because of external funding from granting organizations such as private foundations, government, or individual donors or also because they have developed a reputation for performances of contemporary repertoire or have a large endowment to support the organization in case of a box office failure.

Risk factors, marketing, and audience development

Marketing and audience development is a very important part of programming and essential for the success of contemporary music in American symphony orchestras. Cultural trends dictate that consumers consider risk factors (Colbert, 2001) as a very important part of making decisions regarding their leisure activities. With more entertainment available in the home, with the price of fuel continuing to surpass inflation

rates, and all those little factors that make it less and less convenient for people to leave their homes; this all amounts to reduced ticket sales not only for the performing arts but for all entertainment that takes place outside the home.

According to the National Endowment for the Arts 2002 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, the American public is becoming increasingly less likely to attend live performances of classical music. People are more likely to experience the performing arts through media than attend a live performance (McCarthy, 2001). Ticket sales have been declining or stagnant in nonprofit performing arts organizations, and as more alternative means of art and entertainment arise, the trend continues. A big problem for nonprofit organizations is reaching their audience and providing access to their product within their communities (Blau, 1989). Niche marketing tactics are increasingly being used by nonprofit organizations to reach nontraditional audiences (Reiss, 1995). These tactics have produced mixed results, and some experts are starting to understand that changes in programming, instead of marketing, may be a more effective way of reaching new audiences (Wakin, 2005). Field research will further address the particular implications and challenges for marketing contemporary music to the base of patrons in an American symphony orchestra.

When a symphony patron buys a ticket to a performance of Mozart's *C Minor Mass*, they have certain expectations and assumptions regarding the performance, which all play into purchasing a ticket and attending a performance (Colbert, 2001). What has proven challenging to American symphony orchestras marketing tickets for a performance of a contemporary work, is that their audience base does not know what to expect or assume about that performance. Therefore there are greater risk factors for

attending the performance (Colbert, 2001). People are not as likely to buy a ticket to a music concert of any kind, whether it is pop music or contemporary music, if they have not heard the music before, which is why pop music relies heavily on radio play and, in recent years, online streaming media to reach fans. Although contemporary symphonic music will probably never be a part of mainstream American taste, the good news is that there is more access to this music than ever before, thanks to online outlets like iTunes. American symphony orchestras have started to familiarize themselves with new technologies, but like many organizations in the nonprofit field, are still behind the new wave of technology already implemented by competing for-profit arts and entertainment organizations (Nonprofit Technology Enterprise Network, 2006).

In this age of recording, and because (as mentioned above) more people experience the performing arts through media than live performance, it is increasingly important for American symphony orchestras to make their music available in multiple digital formats. Rising along with the increase of participation in the arts through media has been the growing demand for greater flexibility in how consumers experience the arts (McCarthy, 2001). Consumers prefer arts experiences on their own terms, at a time they dictate, in an environment of their choosing, which is why they are increasingly reliant on different forms of tailor made media. Currently, American symphony orchestras are not tailoring their website and online presence to benefit their audience. The internet is increasingly becoming a web of interactivity, linking people to one another in an online community. If orchestras are to modernize their community presence, they need to seriously consider investing in these interactive options.

There are so many factors that influence participation in the performing arts and American symphony orchestras; it is nearly impossible to pinpoint the exact causes leading to the consumers' decision-making process (McCarthy, 2001). Likely, this process is different for everyone. Although RAND, Americans for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Arts conduct surveys regularly regarding participation and shifts in cultural participation, the data does not often yield results that conclusively tell arts organizations how they can increase participation. Organizations of course analyze these results from various viewpoints, which have led to informed marketing strategies.

Marketing strategy is by no means the only way to increase participation in the arts. I believe innovative programming is more likely to create life-long interest in arts organizations, and especially professional symphony orchestras in the United States. Symphony orchestras have found, like the Oregon Symphony found out through its series Nerve Endings, that just because you attract new audience members for one performance, does not make it any more likely they will return for the typical programming of classical music (Wolf, 2006). These audience trends suggest that strategic marketing is insufficient as a sustainable method for building new audiences.

Aesthetic ideals

Aesthetic ideals govern what music is worthy of being performed by a symphony orchestra in America. It is a very subjective topic, in which current views will be explored more thoroughly through field research. This introduction will provide some historical background on what aesthetic and philosophical ideals have influenced why the majority of music played by American symphony orchestras is music that comes from

Europe, and specifically produced between the late 18th to early 20th centuries (Horowitz, 2005). A further chapter will deconstruct the evolution of American symphony orchestras and illuminate the present day context. Understanding the historical context will enable arts administrators to clarify their arguments and make a case for contemporary music in American symphony orchestras.

The basis of this argument is that classical music, when first produced, was intended for a contemporary audience. Significantly, there was a market for the new music of the day. In order for contemporary music to prosper, there must be a relationship between composer and audience, and there must also exist a healthy marketplace for composers to flourish, which is why audience development is particularly important to cultivating contemporary music audiences.

Many argue the aesthetic formation of concert music in the mid 20th century was the beginning of a rift between symphony orchestras and contemporary music (Heintze, 1999; Horowitz, 2005; Tischler, 1986). Experimental composers, like Cage, Xenakis, and Reich, were not often performed by the symphony orchestras of their day, often because both audience and critics were offended by this ‘different’ music. There are many explanations for why this music was not aesthetically accepted and I will explore these in my next chapter. One explanation with a good grasp on several factors is this one provided by Barbara Tischler in *An American Music*:

As long as critics lauded music that was “correct” in the context of the standards of nineteenth-century European Romanticism and as long as few composers forged their own independent paths, concert music in general was destined to improve while music that claimed to be “American” was held suspect and rarely performed.
(Tischler, 1986, p.41)

One of the conclusions to be drawn based on this evidence is the relationship between composer and audience in developing a musical aesthetic in American symphony orchestras is not prevalent. The lack or decline of this relationship is why consumers rather experience symphonic music through media than a live performance. The audience no longer feels relevant, or apart of this process of taste formation, and therefore sees little reason to be present for performances. This is one big difference between classical music and popular music, and has a huge impact on the purpose and meaning of the music but little to do with the aesthetic worth of the music itself. It is important to remember, though, that even ticket sales for live performances of popular music are down. One reason for this is the increasing opportunity for consumers to participate with the music and musicians through interactive websites like Myspace instead of attending live performances, an opportunity which does not exist for American symphony orchestras. Future arts administrators working in American symphony orchestras will have the charge of modernizing the operational structures and implementing new technologies.

The role of orchestra managers

For managers running American symphony orchestras, the field continues to become more professionalized as colleges and universities increasingly offer formalized higher education. These programs became available about twenty years ago, as a response to the shortage of competent administrators (McManus, 2005). University trained arts administrators are now academically prepared for challenges in managing American symphony orchestras (Holland, 2003). Future research needs to be done to

understand the influence these changes have had on who chooses repertoire for performance, and also the breadth of repertoire performed (Weber, 2003).

One result of this increase in formal education may be that arts administrators will be more powerful and influential in their organizations, as well as more willing to take risks because of the prestige and security provided by a post-baccalaureate degree. The new wave of arts administrators will, eventually, become the leaders of our American symphony orchestras. I believe they will be less likely to follow the traditions of the past and more likely to experiment with new practices. Orchestras are themselves rather traditional in their outlook on programming (Lawson, 2003). Due to market demands, a new wave of leadership, and technology, the professional American symphony orchestra may look and function very differently in twenty years than it does today. Orchestras have hitherto resisted the tides of change and as a result their organizations are increasingly culturally irrelevant (Lawson, 2003).

Clearly, American symphony orchestras need to explore different avenues for increasing their audiences. One way to do this is through innovative programming approaches including the programming of contemporary symphonic music. The importance of contemporary symphonic music is not merely its proposed ability to bring in new audiences; its aesthetic, educational, and cultural relevance makes it important to maintain as part of the repertoire in American symphony orchestras. This research project seeks to demystify the process of programming of contemporary symphonic music through an understanding of the barriers and will conclude with a list of recommendations for overcoming the barriers proposed by both the literature review and

field research. The field research will also seek an understanding of why contemporary symphonic music is important to American orchestras.

Methodology

The intent of this study is to understand, through historical and field research, how arts administrators can be empowered to facilitate the production of contemporary music in American symphony orchestras. A secondary consideration, which is placed within the context of the primary intent, is what tools are available and important to accomplish this goal, as well as the goal of creating an audience for contemporary music. Demystifying the process of facilitating contemporary music for performance in American symphony orchestras empowers arts administrators to make educated decisions regarding future programming and repertoire choices.

As a researcher I place myself in the interpretive social science (ISS) methodological paradigm. I believe the reason for this research is to make recommendations based on “how ordinary people manage their practical affairs in everyday life, or how they get things done” (Neuman, 2003, p.76). By observing how things get done I can provide accurate recommendations. Historical-comparative research of my topic will provide the framework from which I deduce values, theory, and meaning. By acknowledging this framework I acknowledge, “that facts are not theory neutral” (Neuman, 2003, p. 85) but change depending on context. In other words I believe that facts are relative to the viewpoint I have discovered through historical-comparative research.

Research Objectives

A questionnaire, interviews, and instrumental case study were used to determine barriers to incorporate more contemporary music into programming. Research instruments were also used to determine if arts administrators believe it is sustainable to incorporate more contemporary music into their programming. The intention was to uncover what various resources are available to arts administrators, and make recommendations that will speak to the barriers articulated by participants in the questionnaire. A glossary of resources available for American symphony orchestras either federally or for the states of Oregon, Washington, and California is also included as a guide, which may serve as a research model for professional orchestras across the country.

Limitations

Modern day arts critics do not discuss contemporary symphonic music for its aesthetic content on a national level, and so there are no apparent aesthetic trends or critical debate about contemporary symphonic music. When conducting the literary review, there was not literature on current aesthetic or market trends specific to contemporary symphonic music. There are many reasons why this has happened (some of which are explained in my literature review), but one thing can be concluded: as a consequence contemporary symphonic music is not part of the American artistic and cultural landscape. This is a very serious limitation, because I can not draw from other studies of similar content and because the cannon of arts criticism of symphonic music

seems to drop off dramatically after the atonal upset in the 1960's over composers like John Cage (Pleasants, 1962).

Another limitation is the questionnaire asked participants their opinions about contemporary music. The definition of contemporary music may be different among my participants. I do provide the researcher's definition of contemporary symphonic music at the top of the questionnaire to avoid any misunderstanding.

I did not offer interview participants the choice of confidentiality and therefore there is some risk that participants will not be completely candid regarding their answers, or they may be more cautious in their response. In order to make the interviewee as comfortable as possible I gave them the option, on the consent form (see Appendix E), of reviewing or possibly revising their comments prior to the data appearing in the final version of the study. I conducted in-person interviews with four arts administrators working at the Oregon Symphony, which was also the site of my case study.

Delimitations

This research was completed in a few months. Therefore the amount of data I could reasonably collect, interpret, and analyze during those few months was very limited. In order to make the data collected specific to particular geographic and professional boundaries I am limiting participants to arts administrators with the title of Director who are working in a professional symphony orchestra in Oregon, Washington, or Northern California. To make the amount of data collected more reasonable I sent questionnaires to thirty arts administrators, or five people from six purposefully selected organizations.

Benefits

Arts Administrators working in American symphony orchestras are the group most directly benefiting from this research. More indirectly, though, the entire contemporary music community will benefit. This means that composers writing music, performers playing contemporary music, and the public that listens to contemporary music will all benefit from a study whose the main goal to find resources and make recommendations for how to program and produce contemporary music.

Research design

This project required a mixed methods approach. Triangulation of methods is key to understanding the research question using the Interpretive Social Science (ISS) paradigm, because an empathetic understanding of multiple perspectives are key to discovering the maximum amount of resources for arts administrators (Neuman, 2003). I will obtain qualitative data through a questionnaire (Appendix D), instrumental case study (including interviews), and literature review. All these perspectives are essential to an understanding of this research topic and provide insight into contemporary music in American symphony orchestras.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine what the barriers are to producing and performing contemporary music and how these barriers may be overcome. On the questionnaire I ask that participants rank possible barriers from least to most significant. This gives a good indication of the main barriers to producing and/or performing contemporary symphonic music. I was then able to seek out specific recommendations to overcoming articulated barriers. Interviews conducted at the Oregon

Symphony are also essential to understanding barriers and providing beneficial insights. In addition to making recommendations, the final document provides a chapter dedicated to uncovering resources for American symphony orchestras, some of which are more applicable than others to the barriers procured from field research.

Document outline

Now that I have outlined the problem statement to my research project and the method of inquiry, the remaining chapters will dive into the actual literature and field research. First I give context to the problem by introducing literature written about professional American symphony orchestras, their history, and their relationship with contemporary music and programming. Next I introduce an overview of possible resources available to produce and fund contemporary music in American symphony orchestras nationally, as well as sources specific to California, Oregon, and Washington. Then I introduce my field research including my case study at the Oregon Symphony and the responses from the questionnaire I created and sent to orchestra employees. I finish the study with critical observations and recommendations for American symphony orchestras seeking ways to program contemporary symphonic music.

Chapter II. Orchestras in America and Contemporary Music

A short history of American orchestras

A brief history of American symphony orchestras provides context to some of the over-arching themes of this research. It is important to consider this context when analyzing the progression of program music, contemporary music, and organizational structure of American symphony orchestras. This context gives insight to the reader and myself, because I make recommendations based in part on the history of American symphony orchestras.

There is some debate among musicologists regarding the exact origins of the orchestra. Generally, the orchestra is considered to have first come into being around 1600 and in Western Europe (Spitzer & Zaslav, 2004). In America, the increase of Western European immigrants fueled the creation of the first orchestras in the country by providing both audience and musicians for orchestral music. The first professional symphony orchestra in America is the New York Philharmonic, which is still in operation to this day. Currently there are 350-400 professional orchestras in America (ASOL, 2005). Professional orchestras have, until recently, been proliferating across America. In the early 20th century, professional orchestras were a phenomenon restricted almost entirely to the coastal cultural centers of the country like Boston and New York (Tischer, 1986). Today professional symphony orchestras can be found all over the country, and serve a wider audience now than ever.

American orchestras formed in the shadow of their European counterparts and they were not considered to be very good until WWI (Philip, 2004). There were exceptions here and there. For instance, the Boston Symphony was considered by some

critics to rival the best in Europe pre WWI (Philip, 2004). Many orchestras, performers, and composers in America, had an inferiority complex when compared to and competing with their European counterparts. America, as evidenced by Tocqueville and other scholars/philosophers in early American history, was considered a country more in-tune with the functional than the artistic. In short, American tastes were considered crude and lacking in refinement. In Europe the aristocracy was the height of refinement—this type of aristocracy does not exist in America. Perhaps it is no coincidence then, that it is in the 20th century, when the claims and power of the aristocracy in Europe was falling, that the American entrepreneur became the American aristocracy. Simultaneously, everything American (including our art forms) became more valued internationally.

America began as a land without an American musical tradition, so it seems natural that American orchestras borrowed heavily from the European tradition. “The emergence of America’s musical independence, that is, the creation of a music with a characteristic profile, is thus an entirely twentieth-century phenomenon” (Karolyi, 1996, p.1). During the twentieth century, American music came into its’ own. This is seen not only in the great folk and popular music of the twentieth century, including jazz and rock & roll, but also in American art music (Karolyi, 1996). Naturally, professional symphony orchestras benefited from the cultural prosperity of America and the great amount of talent that developed during this time.

Programming and tradition

Orchestras and orchestra music are an invention of Europe, and so it follows that the majority of what professional orchestras in America perform is European music

(ASOL, 2005). In the nineteenth century, orchestras started proliferating in America and the musical style was dominated by Austrian and German masters in Europe and America (Karolyi, 1996). Many American composers studied in Germany and modeled their music after the German example. A few, such as George Chadwick (1854-1931) made efforts to incorporate American themes and indigenous music including African-American song stylings within the Teutonic musical framework (Karolyi, 1996). Although it is perfectly acceptable and even encouraged to borrow models in art, it is not considered satisfactory when the model is not used to create a different kind of art. Many American composers of this time became imitative instead of inventive (Karolyi, 1996). These composers “represent the bridge between the European classical music heritage which they imported and practiced in their own country and the tentative beginnings of American art music which they pioneered with dedication” (Karolyi, 1996, p.8). Nonetheless, by the end of the nineteenth century, American music was still searching for a purely American voice or music of strong nationalistic characteristics.

At the turn of the twentieth century, American composers continued to struggle when faced with a perceived lack of interest in their work. Cultured society, the supporters of symphony orchestras, held to the belief that orchestral music came from Europe, and it was difficult for American composers and nationalistic music to gain any type of recognition (Tischler, 1986). At this time many composers started incorporating folk music into the European models of composing for symphony orchestras. The critics of the time believed this trend created a weak kind of American music, not deserving or even capable of being the future of American music (Tischler, 1986). Folk melodies, often taken directly from African-American and Native-American sources, had little to

offer a cosmopolitan concert audience accustomed to Beethoven and Wagner (Tischler, 1986). Heading into the twentieth century “the public and orchestra managers persisted in regarding the American composer and the music he created as an inferior product to be offered only on Independence Day and on Washington’s or Lincoln’s birthdays” (Tischler, 1986, p.41).

Many consider the first truly impressive and successful composer of American music to be Charles Edward Ives (1874-1954). Ives was in many ways a Romantic, but also used many of the techniques found in modern music, including polytonality and polyrhythm, quarter tones, and difficult and disjointed melodic lines (Tischler, 1986). Ives is considered a Romantic because he used music to leave an ‘impression’, and was also very interested in the process of creating. Ives took his own independent path, and did not seek any legitimacy through critics (Tischler, 1986). He believed the American people to be his only audience. Fiercely democratic and revolutionary in his composition, Ives innovations led to the experimental spirit American composers embodied in the twentieth-century.

American composers, sometimes because their experimental music is not seemingly suitable for the formalities and traditions of the concert hall (ex. John Cage), have not gained complete legitimacy in American symphony orchestras (Heintze, 1999). There are a handful of American composers who have become part of the standard repertoire, including Ives, Copland, and Adams to name a few. It remains that the majority of music played by American symphony orchestras is European in origin. Increasingly the program music has also tended to narrow to the classical period, defined

as music composed between the mid eighteenth to early twentieth century (Horowitz, 2005).

Functions of contemporary symphonic music

With the twentieth century came great innovation, including the ability to record. Recorded music changed how people experience music and produce music; and completely altered the listening experience. The majority of people who listen to classical music today are people listening to a recording in some form or another (McCarthy, 2001). Recorded music has become a commodity to be sold and traded (as opposed to the ethereal concert hall experience), and its value is determined by its success in the marketplace (Johnson, 2002). It has become increasingly difficult to justify the meaning and significance of music in a marketplace that seemingly has little demand for it. Concert hall music is touted as a form appealing only to the elite (something not welcomed in a democratic society where everything, including art, is created equal) (Tischler, 1986). Art music today, and specifically art music played in the concert hall, with its formal demeanor and traditions, has become marginalized.

This marginalization of art music and therefore American symphony orchestras is a result of its function (Johnson, 2002). Unlike popular music, the function of art-music is to be art for arts sake and therefore is linked to enlightenment and progress of humanity. The function of popular music has become to serve as a background, to fill the void of silence, serve as a form of rebellion for youth culture, and to create a particular mood and feeling (Philip, 2004). Art-music has been appropriated by our society to serve our functional and market needs, but in this act has neglected the true purpose of the music. It

is no wonder then that art-music is seldom understood by the American public and not wholeheartedly embraced.

Contemporary music and American symphony orchestras

There is a broad variation of definitions for contemporary music in the context of an orchestra. The decision of the researcher to define contemporary music as music composed for orchestra by a living composer is somewhat arbitrary, and serves as a delimitation for research and not an ideal philosophy. The scope of contemporary music is large, and participants at the site of the case study at Oregon Symphony provided insight into defining contemporary music, as did respondents to the questionnaire. This portion of the research will discuss the different functions of contemporary music in American symphony orchestras, which is further illuminated by participants' observations collected through field research.

Contemporary music has many functions in American symphony orchestras, and different orchestras use contemporary music for different reasons and at different frequencies. Some orchestras and music directors have made it clear they are committed to performing and producing contemporary works. One of these is Esa-Pekka Salonen, Music Director for the LA Philharmonic, who believes presenting new works is essential to the evolution of orchestra music (Wroe, 2007). Another example is the American Composers Orchestra, an organization committed to supporting American composers, which commissions composers regularly. Although there are plenty of examples of orchestras committed to contemporary music, the majority of professional American

orchestras' mission statements do not list contemporary music as an essential component of their programming within their mission statements.

That being said, many professional American symphony orchestras do incorporate contemporary music (as they define it) into their programming, which means it could be a part of main stage performances or a part of educational programming or even fundraising. There are, of course, professional orchestras specializing in a particular genre of music like Baroque music or Sacred music for example, just like there are those few orchestras that specialize in new and contemporary music. Generally speaking, professional American symphony orchestras play repertoire spanning from the Baroque to the Contemporary.

A popular way to incorporate new music into programming is to have a composer-in-residence program. These programs, typically spanning from one to three years, enable a composer to work on-site with an orchestra, and culminates in the performance of a new work by the composer. Orchestra, opera, and ballet companies all have taken advantage of composer-in residence programs. One example of an extraordinary composer-in-residence program is California Symphony's Young American Composer-in-Residence Program (YACR). "Launched in 1991, the program offers emerging composers the coveted opportunity to develop, refine and premiere a new work during each year of an in-depth three-year residency" (California Symphony, 2007). The YACR also has a community and educational component in that the selected composer is obligated to attend educational programming, including on-site visits to local middle and high schools. The selected young composer also participates in donor cultivation by attending members only events and giving pre-concert talks. Composer-in-

residence programs give American symphony orchestras the opportunity to take advantage of the three big benefits of programming contemporary music, including innovative strategies for education, programming, and fundraising.

Composer-in-residence programs are encouraged and funded primarily by the National Endowment for the Arts as well as a New York nonprofit organization, Meet the Composer. Several foundations fund or otherwise provide resources for composer-in-residence programs, and there is always the possibility of a private gift for the commissioning of a new piece. Funding for commissioning of new works is explored in more detail in chapter three.

Professionalization of American symphony orchestras

The further along we get into the history of western civilization the larger the orchestra becomes (in terms of the number of musical instruments required). What was considered an orchestra in the 17th century would be no more than a large chamber ensemble today, consisting mostly of strings and very few woodwinds (Spitzer & Zaslav, 2004). Today's orchestras are enormous in comparison to Monteverdi's orchestra of the mid 15th century. Even in the mid 18th century the orchestra was still considerably small. Gluck's *Orfeo ed Euridice* (Vienna, 1762) was written for only fifty-three instruments (Spitzer & Zaslav, 2004). Compare that to modern orchestras in America and in Europe, which often employ around one hundred musicians. The increase in size of the orchestral ensemble has coincided with an increase in the requisite infrastructure and professional support.

The New York Philharmonic, formed in 1842, was first known as the Philharmonic Society. Being the first professional orchestra in America was quite an

accomplishment for that period. However, the modern concept of an orchestra as a professional and disciplined body had not yet surfaced into the public imagination (Mueller, 1951). “Like many of its European prototypes, the New York orchestra was a “cooperative” or “communistic body” (Mueller, 1951, p. 40). The only salaried members of the self-governing group were the conductor and the librarian, who were elected by popular vote. Approximately sixty musicians formed the Philharmonic Society, which was top heavy with an excess of twenty-two violins to only four cellos (Mueller, 1951). The society did not represent the principal activity of its members, and the concerts were often lacking in balance because there was no one to fill in for orchestra members in case of their absence. Inevitably the Philharmonic Society changed into what it is today, the modern American symphony orchestra.

The structure of the orchestra and administration at the New York Philharmonic is now emblematic of the majority of symphony orchestras in the United States. The number of players in the New York Philharmonic has increased to more than one hundred players because some orchestral scores require a larger ensemble and because a revolving-seat method is used. The New York Philharmonic now employs 107 musicians for the orchestra, and like all professional orchestras, enjoys a hierarchical type of administration in which players are governed by arts managers and artistic directors. Obviously these changes in orchestral and administrative structure have had a significant affect on program choices.

There are certain conclusions that can be made regarding the professionalization of American symphony orchestras, and what that has meant for the repertoire. One is that the world of professional musicians is now more competitive, and so the musicians in

professional orchestras are more capable of performing difficult music. It also means that these musicians consider the orchestra to be the main focus of their career, and they identify themselves as musicians. For managers running American symphony orchestras, the field continues to become more professionalized and competitive because formalized training is beginning to take the form of higher education offered by colleges and universities. Gone are the days of democratic rule, and nonprofit professional orchestras are increasingly being run like businesses in hopes of increasing efficiency and administrative function. There is increased pressure on arts administrators to bring in audiences and solicit major gifts for professional symphony orchestras. Future research needs to be done to understand the influence that these changes and challenges have had on who chooses repertoire for performance, and also the breadth of repertoire performed (Weber, 2003).

Contemporary music continues to play an important but not a primary role in professional American symphony orchestras. It serves many important functions both for the consumer public and the American symphony orchestra, as outlined above. Every orchestra has its own priorities and mission to abide by, but clearly American orchestras feel some responsibility to produce contemporary music for their community, even if the concert(s) is not well received by the public. Orchestra managers feel some responsibility to perform contemporary music, not only stay current in the art world, but also to progress the art form itself and to inform their audience of new music trends and composers.

Chapter III. Funding Sources for Contemporary Music

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of national funding for contemporary music. The resources listed are by no means comprehensive, but provide a solid foundation for further research. The major forms of funding discussed include government, corporate and private foundations, infrastructure organizations, and individual contributions. General funding trends in American orchestras is also discussed, and is the context within which an understanding of contemporary music funding is achieved. Contemporary music funding is a small portion of the funding available for orchestras, but it is available through many different government, foundation, and infrastructure organizations, which lead one to believe individual contributions to contemporary music are weak.

Government

The National Endowment for the Arts gives a substantial amount of its resources to music in America. This is not surprising considering that the Final Report of the American Assembly (1997, p. 6) states one public purpose of the arts is "... to define what it is to be an American." The production and performance of American music serves this purpose. Grants offered by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) are vague about the purpose of the grant in order to appeal to a wide range of organizations and art forms. The NEA's Access to Artistic Excellence grant is one that symphony orchestras and nonprofit infrastructure organizations like the American Symphony Orchestra league have received consistently. It is apparent, through looking at the music programs the NEA has supported in the last five years, one of the NEA's priorities is to provide funding for commissioning new works. Of the one hundred and thirty-one Access to Artistic Excellence grants given out for music thus far in 2007, forty-two of those, or about 32%,

are in support of commissioning new works or programming contemporary American music (NEA Website, 2007).

The Access to Artistic Excellence category included 53 grants to orchestras, totaling \$1,430,000 in support of projects such as commissions, residencies, workshops, performances, festivals, and professional development programs for musicians. In the first Access to Artistic Excellence announcement, 798 grants were awarded across all arts disciplines for a federal investment of \$18,486,750 (ASOL Website, 2007).

A substantial number of grants are in support of professional development activities like training for arts administrators, musicians, and composers. Professional development grants indirectly account as a resource for contemporary music because of the educational support of new musicians and composers (though were not figured into my earlier percentage of grants for contemporary music). The money the NEA distributes annually is not significant compared to individual giving, but is a symbolic gesture that provides legitimization for arts programming and organizations.

State funding

The state and local arts councils and commissions, and not the federal government, distribute the majority of government funding to the arts and culture. One reason for this is the NEA is required to distribute forty percent of its budget to state arts agencies (NEA, 2005). Every state is different, so it is difficult to generalize the amount of funding provided for contemporary music. There are general funding trends. According to the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (2007) the priority of state arts agencies is to fund initiatives for education, access and advocacy, and in many cases folk culture (cultural experiences unique to the geographic area). In some cases this support results in commissioning new works. These works are apt to be part of the folk culture, which is typically separate from a symphony orchestra or concert hall. A good

fundraising program will research the local and state prospects, as well as federal funding to determine which grants and opportunities are suitable for the organization.

Government grants account for four percent of the revenue for American symphony orchestras (ASOL, 2007). When looking at the distribution of funds from the NEA it is apparent that the majority of this four percent is going to professional orchestras, so their revenue is slightly more reliant on government funding than volunteer and youth orchestras, and their percentage of funding from government sources is therefore also higher. Although these dollars are not a significant source of income, they are disproportionate in their importance because they infuse the grantee with legitimacy, which no other source can provide (Americans for the Arts Monograph, 2003).

National Endowment for the Arts	http://www.nea.gov
National Assembly of State Arts Agencies	http://www. Nasaa-arts.org

Foundation

There are several national foundations that provide funding for the arts and culture. These foundations are usually sponsored by large corporations or by wealthy families who created an endowment upon the time of a family death. Like the NEA, these organizations have vaguely defined grants that fulfill various purposes, and a competitive application process to receive many of these grants. Unlike the NEA, these organizations, and especially corporations, will change their mission, goals, and initiatives on occasion and without much warning. Therefore it can be dangerous to rely too much on these organizations for revenue. That being said, a lot of private foundations, like the Andrew W. Mellon foundation, have made supporting the arts and culture their legacy. Corporate foundations give grants but additionally give ad hoc funds to those organizations with shared interests and goals, like reaching the same audience. Nonprofit

organizations pursue corporate relationships for many reasons, though overall these organizations do not provide a substantial amount of financial support.

Although providing only a small share of what Americans contribute to charitable causes, foundations, corporate giving programs, charity federations, and other vehicles for managing the flow of charitable donations have frequently been among the philanthropic world's most visible and prestigious sources of support. Because of their ability to mobilize resources and expertise, they have often been seen as among the most influential as well (Salamon, 2002, p. 355).

Private foundations

There are a few very consistent and large private foundations I will mention, including the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, The Wallace Foundation, the Argosy Foundation, and The William Randolph Hearst Foundation. These organizations have several granting initiatives, one of which is culture and/or the arts. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation is the only one of these four with a specific granting initiative for the performing arts. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's current initiative in music is its Symphony Orchestra Program. This program has several goals, and one is applicable to the performance and production of contemporary music: "Create coordinated programming across all activities of the organization that reflects and advances the organization's artistic aspirations and that contributes to the advancement of the art form" (Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 2007). Other goals involve professional development for administration and orchestra members. It is impossible at this point, the initiative will be finished in 2009, to determine what amount of funding is going towards programming contemporary music, but it is important to note it is an issue the Foundation has taken notice of and considers important enough to fund.

The Argosy Foundation is another private family foundation with a specific interest in music. It currently has an initiative titled The Contemporary Music Fund, the objective of which is

to “promote the proliferation and awareness of contemporary classical or "non-pop" music” (Argosy Foundation, 2007). This initiative is the only one I found, among private family foundations, that gives funds directly for the promotion of contemporary music. All of these foundations give much more money to their other initiatives (cumulatively) than they do to their arts and culture initiatives.

Argosy Foundation	Mellon Foundation	The Wallace Foundation	The Hearst Foundation
http://www.argosyfnd.org	http://www.mellon.org	http://www.wallacefoundation.org	http://hearstfdn.org

Corporate foundations

A few corporate giving organizations giving to the arts nationally are the Ford Foundation, Omnova Solutions Foundation, and Target Foundation. Nonprofit organizations should note that although these foundations give nationally, they emphasize geographic areas where the organization conducts business.

The Ford Foundation started a new program, in collaboration with the American Symphony Orchestra League and Meet the Composer, titled *Made in America*. The general idea of the program is to commission a work titled *Made in America* and perform it at all sixty-five orchestras involved in the project. This project is not recurring, but is a great example of how corporate foundations interests and image occasionally align with those of symphony orchestras. This project will be described in further detail later on.

In The Foundation Directory Online there were sixteen organizations providing funding to orchestras nationally. I also searched for foundations giving to orchestras in California, Oregon, and Washington because my field research stretches to these states, and there were twenty-two

resources foundations listed. Below are tables providing the name, location, and dollar amount distributed in 2005.

Foundations giving to orchestras nationally (listed alphabetically):

Name	Location	Amount distributed, 2005
Avenir Foundation Inc.	Wheat Ridge, CO	\$4,633,000
Buck Foundation	Incline Village, NV	\$1,546,450
Copland Fund for Music	New York, NY	\$1,429,000
The Field Foundation	San Francisco, CA	\$845,000
Ford Foundation	Roseville, MI	\$94,150
Grant Family Foundation	New York, NY	\$1,728,256
Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	Washington, DC	\$580,681
Meet the Composer Inc.	New York, NY	\$1,000,009
Music Associates of Aspen Inc.	Aspen, CO	\$1,947,403
Nakamichi Foundation	Anaheim, CA	\$223,466
Omnova Solutions Foundation Inc.	Fairlawn, OH	\$1,754,333
Rosenfield Foundation	Carlsbad, CA	\$99,470
Sage Foundation	Brighton, MI	\$2,696,150
Sphinx Organization	Detroit, MI	\$64,479
Sullivan Musical Foundation Inc.	Kent, CT	\$125,150
The Westport Fund	Baltimore, MD	\$267,500

(The Foundation Directory Online, 2007)

Foundations giving to orchestras in Washington, Oregon, and California (listed alphabetically):

Foundation	Location	Amount distributed, 2005
Berberian and Gazarian Family Foundation	Modesto, CA	\$224,475
Bonner Family Foundation	Fresno, CA	\$212,750
Brookshire-Green Foundation	Seattle, WA	\$113,700
Burnett Foundation	Santa Barbara, CA	\$525,000
The Cantus Fund	St. Helens, CA	\$1,401,081
Colburn Foundation	Los Angeles, CA	\$6,552,705
The Corrigan-Walla Foundation	Mountain View, CA	\$402,500
Emmi Foundation	San Francisco, CA	\$249,000
The Field Foundation	San Francisco, CA	\$875,000
The Foster Foundation	Los Angeles, CA	\$113,810

Freedman Foundation	Encino, CA	\$55,000
The Getty Foundation	San Francisco, CA	\$18,097,609
Heller Charitable Foundation	San Francisco, CA	\$1,499,542
Hennings-Fischer Foundation	Santa Monica, CA	\$253,718
Janeway Foundation	Los Angeles, CA	\$1,885,000
Lyons Share Foundation	Newport, CA	\$247,600
Nakamachi Foundation	Anaheim, CA	\$223,466
Philharmonic Society of Orange County	Irvine, CA	\$9,500
Rosenfield Foundation	Carlsbad, CA	\$99,470
Scott Foundation	San Marino, CA	\$1,202,101
Thornton Foundation	Los Angeles, CA	\$1,518,500
Young Musicians Foundation	Beverly Hills, CA	\$312,298

(The Foundation Directory Online, 2007)

When the same search was run without any geographic specification, 222 foundations were found that gave money to orchestras across the country (The Foundation Directory Online, 2007). It is very difficult to glean how much money or exactly which foundations have specifically contributed to contemporary music. There is so much cross-over involved in these funds, and so many possible ways to support contemporary music through both education and professional development, that tracing the exact dollar amounts put towards different initiatives is nearly impossible at the foundation level.

Ford Made in America	http://www.fordmadeinamerica.org
Target Corporation	http://www.target.com/community
Omnova Solutions Inc.	http://www.omnova.com/about/community
Foundation Directory Online	http://fconline.fdncenter.org

Infrastructure organizations

Nonprofit service organizations, also known as infrastructure organizations, provide a myriad of resources for American symphony orchestras seeking resources for contemporary music.

These organizations serve many different purposes including advocacy, funding, professional development resources, education, research, and often compile resources for the organizations they advocate for (Salamon, 2002). Foundations also play many of these roles, but serve a financial support role, as opposed to a professional networking and resource role. Infrastructure organizations are responsible for raising money for the organizations they support and are likely candidates for receiving large grants from government, foundation, and corporate sources.

The big infrastructure organization for American orchestras is the American Symphony Orchestra League (ASOL). The ASOL began in 1942, was chartered by Congress in 1962, and has offices in both New York and Washington DC. The ASOL supports nearly one thousand symphony, chamber, youth, and collegiate orchestras across the US. Their mission is to: provide leadership and service to American orchestras while communicating to the public the value and importance of orchestras and the music they perform (ASOL, 2007). The ASOL has historically been committed to promoting new American music through several different initiatives in their history and created an artistic services department in 1983.

Music for a New Millennium, launched in 1999, is an initiative designed to assist orchestras in programming new American music. The initiative began with an informative web site, performances and sessions at the League's National Conference, and a composer residency program. In the year 2000 the ASOL introduced Music Alive, in partnership with Meet the Composer (MTC), which offers short-term composer residencies to orchestras. Since 2000 Meet the Composer and Music Alive have expanded their assistance and offer multi-year residencies, enabling American orchestras of all sizes to have a composer-in-residence for periods of two to eight weeks over the course of one to three seasons to coincide with performances of their works and other activities. Recently MTC and Music Alive collaborated with Ford Made in America to

produce a major commissioning project, which is a very exciting new project. In the first round of the project, sixty-five small budget orchestras (at least one from each state) collaborated to commission Joan Tower to write a new work entitled *Made in America*. Over the next two seasons every participating orchestra will perform the piece.

These kinds of layered collaborations are becoming increasingly common, and infrastructure organizations like the ASOL have played a very significant role in making connections nationally and enabling these kinds of collaborations. The Made in America program for instance is funded by: Ford Motor Company Fund, the National Endowment for the Arts, The Aaron Copland Fund for Music, JP Morgan Chase, Argosy Foundation Contemporary Music Fund, and The Amphion Foundation (Ford Made in America, 2007). The ASOL and Meet the Composer provide the expertise to guide member orchestras through the duration of the project. No doubt these two organizations have been instrumental to communication and development of the initiative, though they did not directly fund it.

Meet the Composer is an infrastructure organization founded in 1974, and was originally a part of the New York State Council on the Arts. From the MTC website (2007): “Meet The Composer's mission is to increase opportunities for composers by fostering the creation, performance, dissemination, and appreciation of their music.” Note that Meet the Composer’s mission is not specific to American composers, however many of their initiatives, for instance Made in America, are. MTC has several resources on their website to facilitate the commissioning of new works. One really useful resource is their publication, *Commissioning Music: A Basic Guide*. The *Guide* gives useful tips for how to start the process of commissioning music, and is not exclusively for use by orchestras. MTC’s focus is on increasing opportunities for living composers.

Their initiatives are very collaborative in nature because music itself is a very social form that requires the work of many to produce and perform.

Another infrastructural organization worth mentioning is the American Music Center (AMC). AMC was created in 1939 by a group of six composers, educators, performers, and publishers, which most notably included Aaron Copland. From the AMC website (2007), the mission changed recently to: "...the building of a national community for new American music." One way the AMC has contributed to its mission is to create a library of scores and recordings, as well as a comprehensive collection of information and research about American music. Anyone can sign-up to be a member, which you must be in order to benefit from the extensive library holdings. AMC has created a network of people around the country who can start communicating and collaborating.

The significance of these infrastructural organizations, what comes up again and again, is their ability to bring people in the field together to share ideas and implement new strategies and initiatives. It seems natural today, as many large corporations merge to encourage efficiency and cut competition, that infrastructure organizations are doing the same for nonprofit organizations. Often, nonprofit organizations compete for the same funding sources, including the NEA, corporate and philanthropic foundations, and even well known individual donors. Collaboration, especially amongst infrastructure organizations, is gaining recognition as an essential part of arts management. Commissioning new music requires so many different steps and resources that collaboration is essential.

American Symphony Orchestra League	Meet the Composer	American Music Center
http://www.symphony.org	http://www.meetthecomposer.org	http://www.amc.net

Individual

Traditionally, individuals—often aristocracy or royalty—commissioned new works of Western music. Although there is not much royalty or aristocracy left in the Western world, the tradition of arts patronage is still alive and is closely watched and developed by arts managers. Orchestras rely on individual contributions heavily. In the 2004/05 season American orchestras received thirty-nine percent of their funding from individuals (ASOL, 2007). The role of Development officers has become more crucial to orchestras because earned income is about 45% of revenue, and the rest must be acquired by charitable donations, grants, and endowment. Documentation concerning giving from individuals to fund contemporary music has not been documented, so it is impossible to make any educated conclusions, but there is always room for speculation and commentary on current trends.

There have been a few very well known American donors to contemporary music in the twentieth century. One is Francis Goulet who underwrote and commissioned more contemporary American music and opera than any other individual in the twentieth century (American Composers Orchestra, 2007). Another is Betty Freeman who, since 1961, has provided about three hundred grants, commissions and gifts of financial assistance to over 70 composers (Meet the Composer, 2007). These donors are well known because they commissioned works and composers that are well known today. Although there is no guarantee that the commissioned work or composer will go on to be successful, this affiliation with fame and success is one reason why donors commission new works.

MTC provides a resource on the website for individuals seeking to commission music titled: *An Individual's Guide to Commissioning Music*. The *Guide* explains the basics for commissioning music including costs and provides examples of other donors and their stories.

There are endless reasons why the privileged few are attracted to commissioning new works, but it seems reasonable that the more reasons an orchestra is able to advertise and recommend the more likely they are to attract donors. MTC launched a new initiative in 2001, *New Music, New Donors*, which “seeks to transform the landscape of new music commissioning through a reinvigoration and reinvention of individual arts patronage for the twenty-first century” (Meet the Composer, 2007). This recent initiative gives orchestras in America a resource for donor endorsed commissions, as well as providing a framework and examples, which leads to a legitimization of the process.

Conclusion

The resources cited serve as a platform to understanding and further researching contemporary music funding. There is funding available for almost anything, but footwork is required. Orchestras who wish to perform more contemporary music should consider investing in subscriptions to online foundation databases, like The Foundation Directory Online or the Foundation Center, and memberships to the infrastructural organizations mentioned. Individual giving to contemporary music has been an under researched form of giving, but it seems clear that there are many ways to explain and expand the possibilities of individual contributions to contemporary music and especially commissioned works. Every community is different, and funding opportunities in every community will be different. For this reason all resources mentioned are available nationally and future research is needed to understand what is available in different geographic locations.

Chapter IV. Research Findings and Analysis

Introduction

This chapter discusses all field research related to this project. I look first at the procedures undertaken for working with human subjects and also at the methods of data collection and methods for analyzing data. Then I write critically about my findings both in the instrumental case study at the Oregon Symphony and the questionnaires.

Data collection and analysis procedures

After the University of Oregon approved my human subjects application I recruited participants for my questionnaire and interview. I sent out thirty questionnaires to five arts administrators at each of the six organizations, which were purposefully selected. The people receiving questionnaires, five per organization, all work as Executive Director, Music Director, Artistic Director, Director of Development and Director of Education. Organizations were selected based on their geographic location; they all reside in Washington, Oregon, and Northern California (from San Francisco). The cut-off date for receiving questionnaire data was April 13, 2007. I received three completed questionnaires, a 10% response rate.

I interviewed professionals working at the site of the case study, the Oregon Symphony. In early March I collected information from the organization including past programming choices performed in the mainstage concert hall, the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall, from their 1996/97 season to their 2004/05 season. Programming from the 2006/07 season was also considered and compared to the cumulative repertoire performed between 1996/97 season to the 2004/05 season, to see if there had been any

shift in repertoire choices and if there are any new trends emerging. In late March of 2007 I went to the Oregon Symphony to conduct interviews with four individuals including: Mary Crist, Interim Director; Charles Calmer, Artistic Administrator; Emilia Smith, Director of Education and Community Engagement; and Timothy Delaney, Grant Writer. I used semi-structured interview questions, which can be found as Appendix C, and found that all interviews consistently followed the interview questions.

Data collection instruments

A questionnaire was used to determine what arts administrators believe to be the major barriers to programming and producing contemporary symphonic music (see Appendix D). The questionnaire directly asks participants to rank listed barriers; there are ten possible barriers to choose from as well as the option of writing down your own. It asks participants to explain what the significance of contemporary music for American symphony orchestras is. It also asks participants for any specific recommendations they may have for developing audiences for contemporary music, recommendations for how to find resources to fund contemporary music programming, and general recommendations for a sustainable way to incorporate more contemporary music into American symphony orchestras. The questionnaire was designed to help me understand why, currently, the majority of music played in American symphony orchestras is classical music. I identified participants taking the questionnaire by name, organization, and title. This information has given me the option of contacting participants for clarification of their responses to the questionnaire. I only received three completed

questionnaires from targeted participants; therefore, data analysis was focused primarily on information and observations gathered from the case study at the Oregon Symphony.

During the month of March 2007, I collected information for a case study of the Oregon Symphony. I chose the Oregon symphony because it is the largest professional symphony orchestra in proximity to where I live, in Eugene, Oregon. Much of the research gathered was attainable without having to physically visit the Oregon Symphony. For instance I was able to find funding resources for professional symphonies in Oregon, California and Washington by using the Foundation Database available at the University of Oregon library. I was able to use the University of Oregon library to connect into journal and newspaper databases that gave me additional archival information about the Oregon Symphony, for instance I was able to access articles concerning the Oregon Symphony from the archives of The Oregonian online database. By tapping into The Oregonian database, I was able to connect with public opinion of the Oregon Symphony in the Portland area, and compare those attitudes with that of the people I interviewed who are employees at the Oregon Symphony. Similarly, I was able to compare funding resources the Oregon Symphony used with those gathered by my online and database research.

Additionally, I interviewed four participants (Appendix C) at the Oregon Symphony and asked specific questions about their experience in regard to programming contemporary music. In many ways, these interviews asked in-depth questions identical to those within the questionnaire.

Recruitment and consent process

After the Office of Human Subjects Compliance approved my research proposal I sent out questionnaires by mail on February 26. I asked participants to complete the questionnaire within two weeks. If I did not receive the questionnaire within two weeks I contacted individual participants to remind them to complete the survey in the third week and again in the fourth week. I stopped accepting data on April 13, 2007. As of this date I had received three questionnaires out of thirty that I sent out.

Recruiting interviewees took place through regular mail, (Appendix A). Shortly thereafter I contacted them to set up a specific time and place to have the interview. I ended up interviewing all four participants on March 20, 2007. The instrumental case study of a professional symphony orchestra gave me a real life example of how programming decisions are played out in an American symphony orchestra now, specifically in regard to programming contemporary symphonic music. The case study served as an example of some of the challenges and barriers to producing and performing contemporary symphonic music. In addition, it served as an example of how a professional symphony orchestra can overcome these barriers.

Preliminary coding and analysis procedures

In order to make the questionnaire more accessible to participants, I gave possible answers to a few questions, but also gave them the option of providing an alternative answer. Please see Appendix D for specific questions. I only received three questionnaires back, so my sample size is too small to produce statistical data or identify response patterns. Instead, the questionnaire responses provided interesting insight and

opinions about contemporary music in American symphony orchestras that helped to inform my case study analysis. Information gathered from the Oregon Symphony case study was more significant in making recommendations and conclusions for this research project.

Interviews were used to validate findings from the literature review and, to a lesser extent, were used to validate findings from the three returned questionnaires. In addition, interviews allowed the researcher to gain an in-depth response to many of the issues asked in the questionnaire. Interviewees provided their own perspective on the issues. Please see Appendix C for specific interview questions.

Details regarding project

This research project aims to provide resources and recommendations for arts administrators in American symphony orchestras looking to incorporate more contemporary symphonic music into their programming. The research also offers insight into how programming decisions are made at the site of my case study, the Oregon Symphony. However, the decision making process at the Oregon Symphony is not intended to be representative of all American symphony orchestras. Professional American orchestras are so diverse in mission and organizational structure, and therefore no one example can be used to generalize across the entire country. Giving an in-depth example may provide arts administrators a method of analysis that will enable inquiry into their own organizations. Field research and the literature review explain current attitudes and trends, and gauge the perceptions of arts administrators regarding contemporary music in American symphony orchestras.

Informational Case Study at the Oregon Symphony

Organizational background

The Oregon Symphony is the oldest professional symphony in the West, and began in 1896 as the Portland Symphony Society. To this day the Symphony is still located in Portland, but has programming and performances throughout the state and particularly in Salem, which is why they changed their name to the Oregon Symphony in 1967. In 1984 the Oregon Symphony moved to a permanent concert hall, the newly renovated Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall, and went from a part-time to a full-time orchestra. The Oregon Symphony is considered a major American Symphony orchestra, and has all the symptoms of one, including a large concert hall, a long discography of recordings, an orchestra of eighty-eight full time musicians, an administration of about thirty full time staff, and attendance of about 320,000 people annually. The Oregon Symphony performs 120 concerts a year in the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall, and has an annual operating budget of about 15 million.

This last summer 2006 the Oregon Symphony cut ten administrative jobs from their organization; no musicians were affected by the cutbacks. The cuts came after two fiscal years with deficits of more than one million each year. The Oregon Symphony is clearly operating above its means. The strategic consultant, Elaine Calder, reported to the *Oregonian* (2007), “We're operating as a \$15 million operation, and if you look at the income patterns, it's more like a \$13 million operation.” Currently the Oregon Symphony is undergoing an extensive review by the strategic consultant, and is in a period of administrative transition, which has hitherto not affected the artistic operations of the Symphony.

Leadership

Currently the Symphony is in a state of administrative transition. Their current interim Executive Director, Mary Crist, is a former board member of the Symphony who has worked with several orchestras across the country. The former Executive Director, William Ryberg, left at the end of the 2005/06 season for a new position as General Director of the Palm Beach Opera in Florida, after serving at the Oregon Symphony for two years. Currently the Board of Directors is conducting a nationwide search and employed the help of a search firm. The goal of the former Chairwoman Maria Pope was to fill the position by the early Fall 2006 (Oregon Symphony, 2006), but that has not happened.

Although a new Executive Director has not been decided on, the Board of the Oregon Symphony hired a strategic arts consultant last October 2006, Elaine Calder. Calder spent the last five years turning around the Edmonton Symphony as their managing director, and is known as a shrewd businesswoman (Oregonian, 2006). Although the Board of Directors has made clear their intention to hire Calder, because of visa issues they have delayed making her Executive Director (Oregonian, 2007). Since starting her contract with the Oregon Symphony Calder's task has been to resolve serious operational problems without the worry of handling the day-to-day operations. Before the end of the current 2006/07 season Calder plans to present her findings to the Board of Directors, at which point I assume they will either formally hire her or seek out another prospect.

Since 2003, Music Director and Maestro of the Oregon Symphony has been Carlos Kalmar. Currently in his fourth season at the Oregon Symphony Kalmar is also

the Music Director of the Grant Park Music Festival in Chicago. Kalmar was born in 1958 in Austria and keeps a home in Austria and in Portland. He has worked internationally with acclaimed orchestras all over the world, and has been Music Director of Vienna's Tonkünstlerorchester, the Hamburg Symphony, Stuttgart Philharmonic and the Anhaltisches Theater in Dessau, Germany. His contract with the Oregon Symphony extends to the 2008/09 season. Kalmar's programming and his talents have been well received by audiences and critics in the Portland area, however there is always an uncertainty surrounding contract extension.

The make-up of the orchestra roster itself has also been changing rapidly. The start of the 2006/07 season came with the announcement that current concertmaster Amy Schwartz Moretti will be leaving at the end of the season after being with the Oregon Symphony for only two years. She is heading to Mercer University's Townsend School of Music in Macon, GA to become the director and associate professor of the Robert McDuffie Center for Strings, and will hold the Caroline Paul King Chair in Strings. The beginning of the 2006/07 season was also the mark of three new section principles including trumpeter Jeffrey Work, flutist David Buck and oboist Martin Hebert.

Repertoire

Every year the Oregon Symphony performs 120 concerts in the Arlene Schnitzer concert hall. There are also numerous performances given outside their concert hall including outdoor concerts and concerts series in Salem and around the state. This 2006/07 season they have several different series including their Classical Series, Pops

Series, Inside the Score, Kids Concerts, and Special Concerts. The schedule of the 2006/07 concert performances:

- 17 Classical concerts (3 performances each)
- 4 Classical matinee concerts (1 performance each)
- 7 Pops concerts (3 performances each)
- 4 Inside the Score concerts (1 performance each)
- 3 Kids concerts (2 performances each)
- 8 Full orchestra Youth Concerts (Portland, Salem, Estacada)
- 36 Kinderkonzerts (3 Portland area locations)
- 11 concerts in Salem, Ore.
- Specials including: Garrison Keillor, Election Night with the Capitol Steps, Gospel Christmas, Yuletide Spectacular
- 2 Oregon Symphony in the Neighborhoods concerts (Harrison & Waterfront parks)
- 2 Community Concerts in Newberg and Estacada, Ore.

In addition to their concert series the Oregon Symphony has education and community engagement activities outside the Arlene Schnitzer Concert Hall, including:

- 300+ Community Music Partnership residency activities (Estacada and Baker City)
- 36 Kinderkonzert performances (Multnomah and Washington County)
- 16 Symphony Storytime visits (4 residencies in Multnomah County Libraries)

Since Kalmar became Music Director in 2003 the Oregon Symphony has been tagged as an orchestra with a dynamic approach to programming (Oregonian, 2006, 2007). Every year Kalmar incorporates more pieces into the Classical Series that are Oregon Symphony premieres. Before 2003 the typical season would include about a dozen premiere pieces, since Kalmar became director the number of premiere works has about doubled. Almost every classical program in the 2006/07 season contains a work never before performed by the Oregon Symphony. These pieces range from Haydn symphonies to Polish composer Witold Lutoslawski's *Concerto for Orchestra* and Aaron

Copland's jazz-influenced *Music for the Theatre*. Kalmar is not concerned specifically with new music and new composers, but with creating an overall well-rounded season with the opportunity for some diverse programming. Kalmar is credited with keeping enough crowd-pleasing music on the menu to keep traditional concert-goers interested while enriching and deepening musical programming.

As an example of the diverse approach to programming by Music Director Kalmar are the debut performances to be expected in the 2007/08 season. In the coming 2007/08 season the Oregon Symphony will perform forty-five pieces on fourteen programs, and thirteen of these will be debuts for the Symphony, including: Dvorak: *Symphonic Variations*, Haydn: *Symphony No. 93, D Major*, Luciano Berio: *Folk Songs*, John Sibelius: *Symphony No. 6*, Edward Elgar: *In the South*, Bela Bartok: *The Miraculous Mandarin*, James MacMillan: *The Confessions of Isobel Gowdie*, Mendelssohn: *Incidental Music to A Midsummer Night's Dream*, John Adams: *Chamber Symphony*, Samuel Barber: *Souvenirs*, J.C. Bach: *Symphony No. 1* (for two orchestras), Bohuslav Martinu: *The Frescoes of Piero della Francesca*, Oliver Messiaen: *The Ascension*. Although only one of these composers is currently living, James MacMillan (b. 1959), more than half of these composers wrote works in the twentieth century.

Contemporary repertoire

The Oregon Symphony and the Music Director Carlos Kalmar does make some commitment to contemporary repertoire, as one can see from the offerings of the 2007/08 season listed above. The focus since Kalmar's arrival does seem to be performing symphonic works never before heard in Portland, and works composed in the twentieth

century lend themselves very well to that purpose. The Oregon Symphony has commissioned several works and often performs pieces by living composers. Commissioned pieces are often by composers who live in Oregon, and are well acquainted with the Oregon Symphony already. Although the Oregon Symphony regularly commissions pieces, they have never had a composer-in-residence.

As the grand finale of the current season 2006/07 the Oregon Symphony is performing the world premiere of a piece they commissioned by Robert Kyr, currently chair of the composition department at the University of Oregon. The name of the piece is Symphony No. 13 and performances are scheduled for May 19, 20, and 21st 2007. The piece is sandwiched between Schubert's unfinished *Symphony No. 8* and Strauss's *Ein Heldeleben*, a couple of more traditional classical pieces.

Since 2003 the Oregon Symphony has commissioned six works by Michael Hersch, Robert Kyr, John Peel, and Kevin Walczyk. Many of these works were made possible by collaborations with other orchestras and organizations in higher education. For instance Kevin Walczyk's piece, *Corps of Discovery*, celebrating the 200th anniversary of the Lewis & Clark Expedition, was a co-commission with the St. Louis Orchestra. Walczyk is an associate professor of music composition at Western Oregon State University. The first half, *Discovery: Upper Louisiana Territory*, premiered in the fall of 2004 in St. Louis and the second half *Discovery: Pacific Northwest Territory* received its world premiere in the spring of 2005. Along with the new piece a crowd-pleaser, Debussy's tone-poem *La Mer* was performed as well as Mendelssohn's overture, *Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage*. The grand finale concert of the 2005/06 season included one of the most popular classical works of all time, Mozart's *Requiem* with the

Pacific Northwest premiere of John Adam's *On the Transmigration of Souls*, a Pulitzer Prize winning musical memorial written for the one year anniversary of the terrorist attacks in New York on September 11, 2001. At the Oregon Symphony it is customary to pair a new or commissioned work with more traditional programming.

Resources for programming contemporary works

When the Oregon Symphony commissions new works it is typical for them to collaborate with other orchestras and organizations with similar interests. For instance the Oregon Symphony performed the world premiere of a piece by composer John Peel titled *Sinfonia romanza* in the fall of 2005. John Peel has been composer-in-residence at Willamette University since 1990, and the orchestra performed his work first at the University concert hall and secondly at the Arlene Schnitzer concert hall.

The Oregon Symphony has also received some financial support in the form of funding for new music and composers. When the Symphony performed Kurt Weill's *Seven Deadly Sins* in the winter of 2007, they received support from the Kurt Weill Foundation for Music in New York, which gives grants to organizations performing any work by Kurt Weill. Another granting institution they have recently received funds from is the Paul G. Allen Family Foundation through their initiative Artistic Venture Projects, which funds innovative contemporary artistic projects. The grant writer at the Oregon Symphony, Timothy Delaney, also recalls receiving funding for contemporary music from the Argosy Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, and from the French Government. The Symphony is regularly searching for collaborative opportunities to share resources and commit to common goals.

In my literature review I mention both the Argosy Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts, however, both the Kurt Weill foundation and the Paul G. Allen Family Foundation did not show up when I searched for grants for orchestras in America. I assume that these two organizations were not retrieved from the database because they are organizations that do not give specifically to orchestras, however they happen to have other initiatives that may be applicable to professional symphony orchestras. Using key words like “contemporary art” or “contemporary culture” might enhance the search for foundations that give money to perform or produce contemporary music. The more variations and key words used to search foundation databases the more resources will become apparent.

The Oregon Symphony has never received funding from a private donor to perform or produce new works or contemporary works.

Notes of interest from interviews

I performed four interviews with individuals at the Oregon Symphony, and got four different perspectives about contemporary music at the Oregon Symphony. I interviewed Interim President Mary Crist, Artistic Administrator Charles Calmer, Grant Writer/Researcher Timothy Delaney, and Director of Education Emilia Smith on March 20, 2007. Everyone agreed contemporary music is important but is unsure whether or not the Portland audience is comfortable with attending contemporary music concerts.

Crist and Smith agreed with the researcher’s definition of contemporary music as works by a living composer and Delaney believes music written post WWII should be considered contemporary. Calmer does not think that contemporary music should be

defined because the audience does not define it, and he sees the need to be sensitive to people's tastes. For him it does not make any difference in programming if the piece is contemporary or not, he looks at the overall package of the performance and its aesthetic.

When asked why contemporary symphonic music is important all the participants alluded to the idea of carrying on a symphonic tradition and continuing the repertoire not only in benefit of the present but also for posterity. In fact, Calmer made the point that many orchestras feel an obligation and responsibility to present new works and contemporary music. The idea of communicating the ideas and aesthetics of our own time to an audience through symphonic music is also an idea that Calmer and Crist brought up when talking about the significance of new works. Showcasing new works is one way American symphony orchestras can make a case for being culturally relevant and relatable to younger audiences.

One challenge for the Oregon Symphony suggested in multiple interviews is the lack of music education for the youth. Calmer mentioned specifically that most people do not have the musical vocabulary or training to have any interest in attending symphony performances, especially if they are works by composers without any immediate name recognition. This is a setback because new and contemporary works are not as likely to be by famous composers as works by composers long ago.

In terms of the biggest barriers to producing, performing, or commissioning new works all answers had, in one way or another, to do with the lack of money and the fact that the Oregon Symphony is currently under some financial duress. I specifically asked Charles Calmer whether or not lackluster ticket sales are a barrier for the Oregon Symphony to program more contemporary music, and he believes that it is not at all.

Calmer believes in packaging contemporary music and creating an entire program that is attractive to an audience. As an example he spoke of the program last spring 2006 with Mozart's *Requiem* and Adam's *On the Transmigration of Souls*, which sold out all three concerts in the Arlene Schitzer concert hall.

The Oregon Symphony does have a deep commitment to programming contemporary music because of their Musical Director Carlos Kalmar and Artistic Planner Charles Calmer. From looking at programming and speaking with Charles Calmer I've observed there is a focus on integrating contemporary music into the traditional repertoire program as a way of creating a more dynamic experience. The reason for programming contemporary works is purely aesthetic. If the Oregon Symphony had more money they would commission more works and from a more diverse range of composers (according to Charles Calmer).

When I asked about the future of programming contemporary works, Mary Crist mentioned creating an enticing experience for the community is key to programming contemporary works. Orchestras in America currently try their best to market the concert hall as a more casual space than generally believed, and marketing the experience itself as less intimidating and not so serious is important to making a modern audience comfortable and perceptive to buying tickets. The main idea is that orchestras need to prepare audiences for the concert-going experience, and one way to do this is to provide as much information as possible in as many formats as possible.

Charles Calmer believes that in the future contemporary works will be more integrated into concert programs. Back when classical music was first being produced, programs consisted of nothing but new works. I believe it makes sense now, in orchestras

where they already mix and match different historical musical periods, that contemporary works will be similarly integrated. Only time will tell if the present atmosphere in orchestras allows for a depthness and richness of new repertoire which is capable of surviving current American culture, and capable of becoming part of the orchestral cannon.

Conclusions

Although the Oregon Symphony is going through a transition in their administrative leadership, the artistic leadership of the organization has been quite strong and constant. The Oregon Symphony has had only ten Music Directors since 1918, which speaks well for the artistic stability of the organization. Unfortunately, their financial stability has not fared very well for the past couple years. In fiscal year 2005/06 they ran a deficit of about one million dollars, and they were not alone; the Portland Opera also suffered a one million deficit this last fiscal year 2005/06. Despite the financial duress of the organization, the Oregon Symphony has maintained a constant level of artistic achievement.

The Oregon Symphony has proven that creating a program with pieces from different historical periods is one way to appeal to traditional concert-goers while simultaneously attracting another kind of audience member, one who is interested in the opportunity to listen to classics but is also probably more interested in being contemporary (and therefore listening to contemporary music). The programs that integrate contemporary music are probably more likely to attract the latter audience member, who also tends to be more concerned with youth culture and art that is new. It

becomes very much a psychological proposition, to try and figure out what the audience (in this case the Portland audience) is interested in listening to, while simultaneously picking out programs that are interesting and unique.

Mary Crist, the interim director, mentioned during our interview that it becomes very dangerous for the organization (financially risky) to try to tell people what it is they should like. The result, she suggests, is that no one will show up to these concerts because ultimately an orchestra is providing entertainment to many and art to few. The negotiation in programming then becomes how to create concerts of interest to a majority of patrons and also concerts with contemporary music or even music the audience has not heard before.

The artistic staff at the Oregon Symphony tries to create programs that will do just that in order to entice new audiences as well as satisfy traditional ones. The primary intent is not necessarily to incorporate contemporary music but to create a program that is thematic and aesthetically enriching and entertaining for the Portland audience. The artistic staff at the Oregon Symphony believes that part of creating programs that are aesthetically enriching and entertaining, and in a sense complete, is to incorporate contemporary music some of the time.

Notes of Interest from Questionnaires

I received three completed questionnaires from a possible thirty participants working in professional American symphony orchestras in Oregon, California, and Washington. One questionnaire was from a music director, one from an artistic administrator, and one from a development director. One interesting note is that all

participants defined contemporary music differently. The music director wrote that contemporary music is primarily music written by living composers. He writes, “Of course, it does depend on the language the composer uses; any music of the 20th or 21st century that uses a little more severity in its harmonic melodic or rhythmic language we put into this category. That is to say, a composer like Edgar Varèse we would consider contemporary, while Rachmaninoff would not.” The attitude that contemporary music is not necessarily defined by time period but by aesthetic components is one I also found prevailed with artistic staff at the Oregon Symphony. Another definition given by the artistic administrator was given as a time period, as music from the late twentieth century, and again the development director described contemporary music in terms of chronology as music composed within the last 100-150 years.

All three questionnaire participants said they program enough contemporary music. When I asked what is enough the artistic administrator responded, “What we do.” It makes sense that employees directly involved with programming believe they are making the right programming decisions. It should be noted that my observations of those directly involved are not prone to be critical of their organizations, and are skeptical of any entity that would doubt their programming choices, especially when it comes to contemporary music. It is hard to say why many organizations are sensitive about their programming decisions, except to say they are proud of their organization and follow the specific mission of the organization.

Although the music director did not answer question number twenty-one, and rank possible barriers to programming contemporary music, the two that did check-marked the same top three barriers (but not with the same exact ranking). They both cited

aesthetic appreciation of the audience/community, ticket sales and the lack of earned income, as well as the financial risk involved as the top three limitations to programming contemporary music. The music director commented, “Ticket revenue is a major issue, to have a balanced program, which of course relates to the aesthetic appreciation from the audience.” American symphony orchestras are under increased pressure to augment their earned revenue through increasing ticket sales, and of course this affects the programming choices of the organization.

The three respondents work in organizations that have shown an interest in programming contemporary music, and all three work in organizations that have received funding for this purpose from the National Endowment for the Arts and the artistic administrator also mentioned the Allen Foundation (which the Oregon Symphony also mentioned), Meet the Composer, and private funding.

Although I received only three completed questionnaires, the information from the three questionnaires was quite telling about attitudes concerning contemporary music, especially insights gleaned from responses from the musical director. Responses from the artistic administrator and the music director were loaded with a kind of frustration, I think because the term contemporary is really not the important thing for these organizations. It is the music itself that is key to making a complete program and season.

Chapter V. Major Findings and Recommendations

The problem statement in the introduction to this study states that professional symphony orchestras in America are increasing the amount of classical music performed, and as a result performances of other music, specifically contemporary music, is decreasing. This presents a number of problems and questions that have been discussed throughout the study and which I will quickly review. The big problem is that programming a majority of classical works for a symphony orchestra creates a kind of stagnation in both the performance and artistic aspects of the form. American symphony orchestras have gained a reputation as a kind of living museum (Lawson, 2003), and are performing a diminishing amount of repertoire for a small number of devoted but tapering concertgoers. This is not a sustainable approach to programming or progressing the art form. However, there are several barriers to including contemporary music in the regular season repertoire. Contemporary music is more likely to fail at the box-office, be unpopular with audiences, is often more expensive to produce, and ties up valuable resources the orchestra could use in other less risky ways. This study has explored how to reduce the risk factors inherent to programming contemporary works, and in this chapter I will provide specific observations and recommendations for arts administrators seeking to program contemporary music in an American symphony orchestra.

Why classical music?

This study has sought to answer the question: Why has classical music become the majority of repertoire performed in American symphony orchestras? The short

answer to this, the answer I found repeated in the literature and reiterated through participants in my case study at the Oregon Symphony, is that classical music is what the traditional orchestra audience wants to hear. Thus, classical music concerts sell more tickets and generate more revenue for the American symphony orchestra to maintain its operational objectives. Concerts generate even more revenue if they include programming by composers who are historical figures and have instant name recognition like Mozart or Beethoven; similarly, concerts with famous performers with instant name recognition like Yo-Yo Ma or Isaac Perlman generate increased ticket sales/earned income for the American symphony orchestra. This funding model, of programming classical music to attract audiences, has been successful in the past. Recently, since the mid 1990's, American symphony orchestras are finding it harder to attract new audiences with this programming approach.

I suggest throughout the study that contemporary music, and a more dynamic programming approach will be successful in attracting new audiences, but there is no positive way of knowing this until American symphony orchestras take a risk and try it for themselves.

Why contemporary music?

Another important question to ask when seeking to program contemporary music is: Why is contemporary music important to American symphony orchestras? I outline some of the functions of contemporary music in Chapter II, and here I will outline some of the less pragmatic and more philosophical reasons for the significance of contemporary music. Research into both literature and the field revealed a real

investment in continuing orchestra music into the 21st century. American symphony orchestras feel it is their responsibility to perform new works as a way of perpetuating the art form itself, as well as the repertoire, into the future. It is this sense of responsibility, more than the aesthetic sensibility of the music, which has motivated contemporary music performances in American symphony orchestras.

Classical music is tried and true, there is no doubt of its artistic merit. With contemporary music, there is no telling whether individual pieces will pass into the orchestral cannon and be played for years to come, or only played once or even never at all. Because of this, contemporary music invariably has more risk factors concerning performance than classical music. One way American symphony orchestras and music directors have avoided these risks is by avoiding music and contemporary composers who are experimental and tamper with atonality or polytonality. In my questionnaire, the music director speaks of this music as “severe”, saying, “We do not program extremely severe, avant-garde music on our regular subscription concerts. I suspect that’s the reason the audience is excited by what we do with new music.” Music is an aural experience, and the audience, whether they are versed in musical history and theory or not, know what they like based on what they hear. Typically, and what American symphony orchestras are finding is, people like music with melodies that are easy to follow and rewarding for the listener. If professional orchestras play music that is all ‘severe’ or contemporary then they will not attract as diverse and wide an audience. Conversely, if they program only classical music, their audience will also shrink. Including contemporary music in the regular season is one way for American symphony orchestras to create a balanced, well-rounded experience for the audience.

The audience

Another question inherent to this research topic is: What kind of audience is interested in attending contemporary symphonic music concerts? Before orchestras take a risk in programming contemporary music, it would be useful to know if an audience for this kind of music exists in their community. There's not much sense in spending time and money on performances nobody will attend. Every community is different, so it is impossible to generalize and say that audiences exist for contemporary music performances by American symphony orchestras everywhere.

Orchestras that have more success with contemporary music are often those that have an audience who are truly fans of the orchestra and music director, and not necessarily the music they perform. If the audience trusts the orchestra and music director to present an entertaining evening, then they are more likely to attend concerts of music they may not have heard of before. The music director affirmed this suspicion; he writes in his questionnaire, "I would say that we have a very vibrant audience for contemporary music because the audience trusts what we program." The stronger the relationship between the orchestra and their audience, the more likely they are to attend concerts filled with music by composers they have not heard of before.

The crux of the question changed during the study from whether or not there is an audience for contemporary and new music to whether or not there is an audience for music the audience has never heard of before. This change is just because it became apparent audiences do not differentiate between new or contemporary music and music from a different era that they have no relation to or understanding of. I tend to think that the more diverse programming the orchestra presents, the wider an audience they will

appeal to. Therefore, programming an increasing amount of nothing but classics is detrimental to the sustainability of American symphony orchestras. It is important to provide performances of classical music. However, I think it is also important to balance out programming choices with a dynamic range of work from different musical periods. If an orchestra establishes a reputation for having diverse programming, and become consistent with their programming choices, they will be able to attract a wider audience.

The question of sustainability

Is programming an increasing amount of contemporary music sustainable for professional symphony orchestras? Besides the box-office risk orchestras take programming contemporary music, contemporary music also often involves added expenses for the orchestra, which can range from added rehearsal time to buying sheet music, to copyright protection. Many orchestras do not find it worthwhile to perform contemporary music because of all the risks involved. Although a lot of literature refers to this struggle between artistic and budgetary demands of programming contemporary music, my field research is contrary to that evidence.

At the Oregon Symphony, contemporary music concerts are almost always well attended. I think this has a lot to do with how contemporary works are presented in a program. Music Director Carlos Kalmar and Artistic Planner Charles Calmer package programs so they include a diverse range of music, which Calmer referred to during our interview as “a meal”. Each program has to be palatable for the audience and represent a complete and enjoyable event. The Oregon Symphony also has a record for commissioning works to local composers who are well known in the community. For

example, their Grand Finale Concert for the 2006/07 season includes a world premiere by Oregon composer Robert Kyr, of his Symphony No. 13. Creating a dynamic concert program for audiences, and giving audiences the opportunity to attend premieres of new composers, creates a more vibrant atmosphere for the orchestra and the audience.

Ultimately, every orchestra has to be fiscally responsible and maintain stability. Only the administration and the community can determine what risks the orchestra is capable of taking. To a large extent it is the audience that determines, through their ticket purchasing, what is repeatedly performed and what is not. The orchestra has to be sensitive to the needs of its audience, and find some compromise with the artistic needs of the organization.

Available resources

Are there resources available for American symphony orchestras seeking to program contemporary music? The answer to this is yes and no. There are resources available to those organizations with the determination and the will to find them. Resources for contemporary music are limited, and those that are well known (for instance, grants offered by the National Endowment for the Arts) are extremely competitive and hard to get. The orchestras who have the resources (i.e., the employees and time) to look for possible funds for contemporary music are those that are more likely to attain them. Increasingly, as I discuss in Chapter III, orchestras are collaborating across the country to commission works in partnership, which is often necessary in order to attract exemplary composers and talent. The importance of infrastructure organizations, like the American Symphony Orchestra League, is increasing because

there is a huge need for communication across the field and collaboration amongst organizations.

At the Oregon Symphony, the individuals I interviewed felt they had been able to find resources when need be, but do not count on receiving grant money. Many organizations look at grants as being a kind of icing on the cake. Grants do not determine program choices, especially because most orchestras program concerts two seasons in advance. Generally speaking orchestras rely more on ticket revenue than they do on any granting organizations. Non-monetary resources, like how-to guides provided by Meet the Composer, have recently become available and many orchestras are grateful for these resources and find them to be valuable.

One untapped resource for contemporary music is private donors. Aristocrats most likely commissioned classical music that is still performed today, so it makes sense to prolong the tradition. The Meet the Composer website introduced this idea to me, and it doesn't seem that many orchestras take advantage of this opportunity. Perhaps involving a third party would complicate the commissioning process, or perhaps the orchestra would not attain the kind of prestige they enjoy when privately commissioning works. I do not know why development offices in American symphony orchestras are not experimenting with commissioning pieces to private donors, but it seems like a great way to connect people to new and contemporary music.

Insights and final arguments

I want to end this study with a description of observations and insights resulting from my literature and field research. The below observations synthesize information

gained from literature, the case study at the Oregon Symphony, and responses from questionnaires. In many ways, these observations inform many of the major findings conveyed above. I conclude this chapter with a list of practical recommendations, practical steps for arts administrators seeking to incorporate contemporary music into the programming of American symphony orchestras.

Describing contemporary music

It makes more sense to categorize music based on aural qualities rather than on chronology, especially in the context of programming for an audience. Often, however, funding organizations, including all those mentioned in Chapter Three, have funding requirements that have seemingly nothing to do with aural characteristics because these characteristics cannot be measured and are not understood en masse, and are relatively different. Funding organizations have specific guidelines for what they will and will not fund, and for good reason, they have to have uniform standards for applicants and a way of delimiting applicants. Similarly, I defined contemporary music as music composed by a living composer as a means of delimiting this research study.

Contemporary music has been necessarily compartmentalized as a genre with common characteristics, but increasingly it is defying any uniformity that would qualify it as a genre. This is an inherent barrier to programming contemporary music in American symphony orchestras because often audiences hear the term contemporary music and think of “severity” as mentioned by the music director above, or think experimental, because of a decisive break with tonal harmony that started with composers like John Cage in the 1960’s, which is explored in my introductory chapter. When

programming contemporary music, artistic staff is well aware that their audience does not want to hear atonal music; the music director reports, “If we program a lot of severe music, it would have a detrimental economic effect on ticket sales, no question.” Contemporary music has been typecast as a particular aural experience, which is unfortunate and ultimately damaging to the symphonic music tradition. In fact contemporary music is a pool of very diverse work, maybe more so than any other historical period simply because of the use of technology.

The role of the press

The press (particularly the New York Times) has recently been critical of American symphony orchestras and their unwillingness to modernize both administratively and artistically (Holland, 2003; Tommasini, 2001; Wakin, 2005). I think that professional orchestras in America have become defensive of their operational and artistic methods. Terms like cultural relevance, or the lack thereof, are used in the press, and contemporary music programming is being suggested as a means of becoming more culturally relevant and so attracting new audiences. It is difficult to say whether or not contemporary symphonic music would make professional symphony orchestras culturally relevant, and not only because the term cultural relevance is so fluid. I could easily argue that it is the musical language itself that has become difficult to understand in our modern society, and is therefore not as relevant. The idea that if symphony orchestras only played contemporary music then they would somehow become wildly popular and relevant to dominant culture is completely false.

Although the press recognizes contemporary music as a tool for modernizing American symphony orchestras, the public at large (the public that does not already attend orchestra concerts) does not necessarily differentiate baroque from classical or classical from contemporary. It is hard to market contemporary music or any kind of symphonic music to a public who is not familiar with the conventional terms of the form itself. The challenge for marketing departments in American symphony orchestras is to adopt the current cultural language, a language the majority of the public can understand, and apply it to orchestral performances without it seeming too unnatural or inappropriate.

A listening experience

Many people attend orchestra concerts to hear music they enjoy, and not to hear premieres of music, no matter the time period, that are foreign to them. Often people associate the music they enjoy listening to with certain composers. There are a handful of composers that attract audiences based on name recognition. Often these composers, like Mozart and Beethoven, have a film made about their lives, or are otherwise circulating in mass culture. These composers have been set apart from the rest and are recognized as being culturally significant. If anyone wants to be considered culturally knowledgeable then they will have to know about these composers. This is not the case with the majority of composers, especially contemporary composers who do not often have access to large audiences.

Whether or not a person is interested in classical music, they are probably somewhat interested in being informed culturally about an artistically and historically significant figure like Mozart, and are therefore more likely to buy a ticket to go see an

orchestra performing music written by Mozart. This explanation, in my opinion, is the most persuasive for why American symphony orchestras are more likely to sell a lot of tickets to a performance with a well-known performer or composer as opposed to a concert without. Accordingly, American symphony orchestras are increasingly likely to program performances with well-known composers and performers in order to sell more tickets. The consequence of this series of happenings is that the amount of repertoire performed by American symphony orchestras is diminishing.

I believe that one way to subvert this consequence is to program contemporary works. Programming contemporary works brings in a different audience from people who are interested in becoming familiar with classical repertoire and famous performers; it brings in an audience that is interested in discovering new art and new performers; it brings in a more adventurous and often a younger demographic. This untapped audience needs to be convinced that what they will see at an American symphony orchestra has the potential of being new and will be presented in a dynamic way. When orchestras do program contemporary works, it is too hard a sell to convince this audience to attend, because the American symphony orchestra has not made a persuasive case to the American people that it is an art form capable of change and presenting something new and dynamic. When it comes to performing contemporary works, the typical format of performance, everything from stage to sound design, needs to be representative of the contemporary work. Too often we find contemporary works being staged exactly like works from the classical era, and while this is sometimes appropriate, it is also sometimes not.

The role of arts administrators

Traditionally, arts administrators in American symphony orchestras have little or no say in making programming decisions. The music director and/or the Maestro and an artistic planner and researcher are usually the only people in the organization controlling what is performed and what is not. The rest of the staff is not involved with artistic decisions, and is there merely to support the organization in its operational objectives, including fundraising, marketing, and educational initiatives. American symphony orchestras are content with this arrangement.

As a result, the artistic staff, the musicians, and the administration are completely separate. There is not much of a conversation regarding repertoire choices; usually only praise and support are expected from the administration. I do not know if this is going to be maintained, simply because of cultural trends. Let me explain: cultural trends tell us that the time of being expert in something has passed. Anybody can get their opinion out there, typically through electronic communication of some kind, and have it taken as seriously as the expert's. This is especially true concerning arts and entertainment. For example movie critics are now found to be no more expert than anyone who writes an opinion of the movie on their blog. After all, who is to say one person's opinion is somehow more right or correct than another's? It's hard to say if this trend will affect the "high-arts", but I have seen indicators that it is. For instance, the Seattle Opera held their first International Wagner Competition in the summer of 2006, and they had a jury decide the winner. Additionally, they had an audience vote on who should be the winner and this person received the audience award. There is an increasing need for people to be a part of the process of art making. I think arts administrators also feel a need to be a part of this

process, especially since they are so involved in the operational aspects of the organization and because the field is professionalizing and administrators have more power to shape their careers.

Arts administrators are becoming increasingly influential in their work environments because of the opportunities for higher education in the field, and because of cultural trends. Administrators in symphony orchestras may not be professional musicians, but chances are they have some interest in symphonic music, and an interest in shaping the experience and the form. I believe that in the future arts administrators will have the chance to affect change in symphony orchestras because the form itself is so traditional, and ready for a fresh perspective.

Recommendations for arts administrators

These recommendations are based on all of the observations and field research gathered during this research process. I divided recommendations according to the different categories and main points of interest introduced in Chapter I. Arts administrators working in American symphony orchestras may find these recommendations useful in the process of programming contemporary or new works.

Marketing

1. Instead of classifying music by historical period, i.e. classical, describe it based on aural qualities.
2. In marketing, focus on selling an overall experience, not a specific piece, composer, or performer.
3. Do not use musical terms and conventions to describe symphonic music, instead use terms that people can understand and that are inviting. For instance, most people do not know what a symphonic piece consists of. Describe parts instead of the whole, ex: this piece has four movements.
4. If you are promoting a new or contemporary music concert, emphasize the composer. Include details like where he/she is from and what influences his/her music.

5. Try to get people to listen to the program music before they attend a concert. Exposing as many people as possible to the program ahead of time will make it easier for them to decide if they want to attend. The goal is to take away as many risk factors as possible.

Management

1. Work on how to create an overall experience and not just an aural experience.
2. Think about the possibility of creating concert series just to attract a contemporary audience (people who are interested in being contemporary). The bottom line is, if you don't program consist programs for a contemporary audience they will not be aware of the Symphony as an arts/entertainment option.
3. Come up with appropriate terms for describing aural qualities of music that are easily understandable to the public and cohesive with your mission and goals.
4. Work on creating relationships with composers who are currently working in the field. This is important not only for cultivating talent, but also is important to attain an understanding of the composers' talents and see how that functions within your organization.
5. Speak to your donors about contemporary music. Donors in the community may be interested in commissioning a piece, and not many symphonies have used this angle to commission new pieces.

Aesthetic

1. Symphony orchestras need to work with their space and musicians to present a new and dynamic experience. This is part of presenting and selling an overall experience to the consumer. Consider changes to concert halls, musician formation, instrumental arrangements, and programs. You have to make a case for why the consumer should listen to music in a concert hall as opposed to in their car or at home on their computer.
2. Technology is changing, but orchestras are not—think of ways to modernize the symphony orchestra and make it accessible to a contemporary audience without compromising the form itself.
3. Do not be afraid of change, embrace it. Symphonic music is an aural art form living in a culture that is driven by visual art. Use of multi-media components, especially in conjunction with contemporary music and composers, is a dynamic way of presenting music.
4. When it comes to commissioning new pieces, be bold. New composers may not write music that fits within the rigid framework of a full orchestra. Think about commissioning pieces that defy orchestral conventions, which will challenge a symphony orchestra and provide a dynamic experience for an audience.
5. Look for inspiration in chamber groups who often have more flexibility in the works they perform, arrangements of music, and sometimes incorporate new instruments and technology. Are there ways a full-symphony can do this at a low cost?
6. Encourage creating a relationship between living composers and audience. It is important to understand the composer's intentions and influences, and this will make the music itself more relatable and understandable to an audience.

7. Create as many interactive experiences as possible for audience to interact with musicians and composer.

Final thoughts

To conclude, this study has delved into various concerns and barriers to programming contemporary music in American symphony orchestras, with the purpose of explaining the root cause of these and providing resources and suggestions for overcoming them. My hope is that arts administrators find these recommendations helpful not only for programming contemporary music, but also for demystifying the entire process of programming in American symphony orchestras. It is important for participants, audience members, volunteers, and employees to feel they have some impact on programming choices, and therefore a higher stake in the organizations' artistic mission and vision. Providing a reasonable explanation for the decision making process in these organizations is one way to let participants be informed and interested in the process, and may increase the overall sustainability of American symphony orchestras.

This document provides some general insights and guidelines into programming in American symphony orchestras, and specifically in regard to contemporary music. Every organization has its own process and they vary dramatically depending on the size and mission of the symphony orchestra. The observations and recommendations in this research project are not necessarily applicable to every organization, but may be modified and further researched to come to conclusions regarding individual organizations.

Appendix A

Recruitment Letter for Interview

Date

Name

Address

City/State/Zip

Dear <POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT>:

You are invited to participate in a research project titled *Contemporary Music in American Symphony Orchestras: A Guide for Arts Administrators*, conducted by Julia Katz from the University of Oregon's Arts and Administration Program. The purpose of this study is to understand what the perceived barriers are to producing and performing contemporary symphonic music and what potential resources exist to overcome these barriers.

This research will seek to find why contemporary symphonic music is important to American symphony orchestras and what role it plays in American symphony orchestras, which gives context to understanding perceived barriers to producing and performing contemporary symphonic music. A literature review is conducted to understand the historical and economic contexts, and it is also vitally important to understand various perspectives of arts administrators working in American symphony orchestras. This research project aims to provide resources for arts administrators seeking to incorporate (more) contemporary symphonic music into their programming, and provide tools for arts administrators to bring in new audiences to experience contemporary symphonic music. In order to understand how programming decisions are made in American symphony orchestras in a real world context I have selected <NAME OF RELEVANT ORGANIZATION> as the site of my in-depth case study.

If you decide to take part in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in an in-person interview, lasting approximately one hour, during March 2007. Your responses during the interview will be attributed directly to you, and only used in my final research document. If you wish, interview questions will be provided beforehand for your consideration. Interviews will take place at <NAME OF ORGANIZATION>, or at a more conveniently located site. Interviews will be scheduled at your convenience. In addition to taking handwritten notes, with your permission, I will use an audio tape recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 404-697-1958 or jkatz@uoregon.edu. You may also contact my research advisor Dr. Patricia Dewey at 541-346-2050 or pdewey@uoregon.edu. Any questions regarding your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Office of Human Subjects Compliance, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510.

Thank you in advance for your interest and participation. I will contact you shortly to arrange a time to conduct the interview.

Sincerely,

Julia Katz
1313 Lincoln St. #901
Eugene, OR 97401

Appendix B

Information/Consent Letter for Questionnaire

Date

Name

Address

City/State/Zip

Dear <POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT>:

You are invited to participate in a research project titled *Contemporary Music in American Symphony Orchestras: A Guide for Arts Administrators*, conducted by Julia Katz from the University of Oregon's Arts and Administration Program. The purpose of this study is to understand what the perceived barriers are to producing and performing contemporary symphonic music and what potential resources exist to overcome these barriers.

This research will seek to find why contemporary symphonic music is important to American symphony orchestras and what role it plays in American symphony orchestras, which gives context to understanding perceived barriers to producing and performing contemporary symphonic music. A literature review is conducted to understand the historical and economic contexts, and it is also vitally important to understand various perspectives of arts administrators working in American symphony orchestras. This research project aims to provide resources for arts administrators seeking to incorporate (more) contemporary symphonic music into their programming, and provide tools for arts administrators to bring in new audiences to experience contemporary symphonic music. In order to gain multiple perspectives and resources on contemporary symphonic music I have selected seven professional symphony orchestras where I will send a questionnaire to senior management.

All you need to do is complete this short questionnaire, which should take 35 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate, simply discard the questionnaire. Although information you provide will not be directly attributed to you, it will be attributed more vaguely to an arts administrator with your job title who works in an American symphony orchestra in Oregon, Washington, or Northern California. The responses you provide will be securely maintained and only included in my final research document. Completing and returning the questionnaire constitutes your consent to participate. Due to time constraints I ask that you complete the signed questionnaire within two weeks and return it to me in the enclosed self addressed and stamped envelope.

Please keep this letter for your records. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 404-697-1958 or jkatz@uoregon.edu. You may also contact my research advisor Dr. Patricia Dewey at 541-346-2050 or pdewey@uoregon.edu. Any questions regarding your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Office of Human Subjects Compliance, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510.

Sincerely,

Julia Katz
1313 Lincoln St. #901
Eugene, OR 97401

Appendix C

In-Depth Interview Questions (In-Person and Semi-Structured Interview)

Participants: Two to five senior managers at the site of my case study

Name:

Job Title:

Organization: Oregon Symphony

Size of Organization: \$15 million budget

Location of Organization: Portland, OR

How long have you worked at the Oregon Symphony?

For the purposes of this research study contemporary symphonic music is music composed for an orchestra by a living composer.

How do you define contemporary symphonic music?

Is contemporary symphonic music important to the Oregon Symphony?

What role does contemporary symphonic music play at the Oregon Symphony?

Do you think contemporary symphonic music is important to American symphony orchestras?

Why do you think it is important or not important?

Do you think the Oregon Symphony programs too little or too much contemporary music?

In your opinion, what is the “right” amount?

Is there an audience in Portland for contemporary symphonic music? Can you describe the make-up of this audience?

Do you have any recommendations for how to build stronger audiences in Portland for contemporary music?

Do you think your audience would benefit from more contemporary programming?

Do you think it is economically viable for the Oregon Symphony to program more contemporary music? Why or why not?

Can you tell me what some of the (funding) resources Oregon Symphony uses to incorporate more contemporary music into their programming?

What do you think are the top three barriers to producing and performing contemporary symphonic music?

Do you have any recommendations for overcoming the stated barriers?

Appendix C

In my research, so far I found that lackluster ticket sales for performance are cited as a barrier to producing/performing contemporary works. Do you agree? Why?

Do you know of any resources I can include in my document for audience development for contemporary music?

Do you know of anyone else in the field that has done research on addressing these issues?

Switching gears now...

What do you think the future of programming contemporary works will be in American symphony orchestras?

How about in this organization?

Implications/Alternative questions?

Will there be more competition for funding or less?

More need for the document I am producing or less?

Questionnaire for Arts Administrators

Thank you for your participation in my research study. Please take as much space as you need to answer the questions. If you need additional space please write on the back of this questionnaire by first indicating the question number you are responding to. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed and stamped envelope within two weeks of receiving it. If I have not received this questionnaire within two weeks I will contact you to confirm the status of participation in this study. Your participation is vital to the success of my research study, so thank you again for your interest and participation.

The completed questionnaire should be returned to: Julia Katz, 1313 Lincoln St. #901, Eugene, OR 97401. If you have any questions you may contact me at jkatz@uoregon.edu or 404-697-1958.

What is contemporary symphonic music?

For the purposes of this research study, contemporary symphonic music is music composed for an orchestra by a living composer.

1. Name _____
2. Job Title _____
3. Organization _____
4. Email _____
5. Phone _____

6. Are you willing to answer follow-up questions to clarify responses on this form? (Please Circle) Yes/No

7. How do you define contemporary symphonic music for the [THIS] Symphony?

8. Why is contemporary symphonic music important to American symphony orchestras?
Please put a check next to those reasons you agree with.
 Educational aspects
 Development of contemporary audiences
 Development of new repertoire
 Development of new composers
 Contemporary music training for orchestra musicians
 Contemporary symphonic music is necessary if American symphony orchestras wish to be culturally relevant.
 Contemporary symphonic music is important for the long-term sustainability of American symphony orchestras.
 Other:

Appendix D

9. How important is programming contemporary symphonic music to the organization you work for?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important

10. What role does contemporary symphonic music play for the orchestra you are employed by? Check all that apply.

- Educational
- Programming
- Artistic
- Fundraising
- Other:

11. Please explain why the roles you identified above are important to your organization:

12. Is there an audience in your community for contemporary symphonic music? Yes/No

13. If you answered Yes to question #12 then please describe the make-up of this audience below:

Appendix D

14. What specific recommendations do you have for building a stronger audience for contemporary symphonic music? Check all that apply.

- Targeting a younger demographic
- Employing innovative marketing strategies
- Performing in nontraditional venues
- Community outreach/engagement
- Other:

15. Do you think [THIS] Symphony programs enough contemporary music? Yes/No

16. In your opinion, what would be “enough”?

17. Do you think it is economically viable for [THIS] Symphony to program more contemporary symphonic music? Yes/No

18. Why did you answer Yes or No to question #16?

19. Has [THIS] Symphony received funding through grant distributing institutions to perform and/or produce contemporary symphonic music? Yes/No

20. If Yes, then what organizations do you know of that have distributed funds to you for producing and/or performing contemporary symphonic works?

Appendix D

21. Please rank (1-11) the below stated barriers to producing/performing contemporary symphonic music (1 being the most significant and 11 being the least significant).

- Lack of financial support from community and local or federal granting sources
- Ticket Sales (lack of earned income)
- Aesthetic Appreciation—Audience/Community
- Aesthetic Appreciation—Orchestra Members
- Aesthetic Appreciation—Administration
- Financial risk involved in programming contemporary symphonic music (extended rehearsal time, or other sources of additional expenses that are not an issue when performing classical repertoire)
- Copyright and/or legal complications to performing/producing contemporary symphonic music
- Lack of contemporary symphonic music available to perform
- Lack of composers to write symphonic works
- Diminishes the amount of other symphonic works the symphony can perform
- Other:

Comments:

22. Do you have any recommendations for overcoming these barriers?

Thank you!

Appendix E

Dear (*insert name*)

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Julia Katz, a graduate student in arts administration from the University of Oregon. I hope to learn of the various resources available to arts administrators seeking to produce and program contemporary music in American symphony orchestras. You are selected as an interview participant for this study because your organization has generously agreed to be the case study example in my research.

The interview itself will take 1 hour to complete. Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with the University of Oregon's Arts Administration Department. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

By signing this consent form you agree to be identified by name and organization, and all the information that you provide regarding the organization where you work may be included in the research study. There are additional options for consent provided below, and you can put a check next to those to which you agree.

I hope that this research project will benefit contemporary art worlds, composers, audience members, and administrators in American symphony orchestras. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 404.697.1958 or jkatz@uoregon.edu and you can contact my research advisor Patricia Dewey at 541.346.2050 or pdewey@uoregon.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510. You have been given a copy of this form to keep. Please read and initial each of the following statements to indicate your consent:

_____ I consent to the interviewer taking notes during my interview.

_____ I consent to the interviewer recording the interview and transcribing the interview

_____ I consent to the potential use of quotations from the interview.

_____ I wish to have the opportunity to review and possibly revise my comments and the information that I provide prior to these data appearing in the final version of any publications that may result from this study.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

Print Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

References

- American Assembly (1997). The arts and the public purpose. Retrieved February 16, 2007, from University of Oregon Electronic Reserve readings for Cultural Policy winter term 2007 Web site: <http://libweb.uoregon.edu/reserves/index.html>
- American Composers Orchestra (n.d.). *The Francis Goulet legacy*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.americancomposers.org/goelet.htm>
- American Music Center (2007). *Website*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.amc.net/>
- American Symphony Orchestra League. (2006). *Orchestra repertoire reports: Top ten from 2005-2006*. Retrieved May 31, 2006, from ASOL website. http://www.symphony.org/research/pdf/ORR_05-06_top10.pdf
- Andreasen, A. (1991). *Expanding the audience for the performing arts*. Washington D.C.: Seven Locks Press.
- American Symphony Orchestra League (n.d.). *Website*. Retrieved February 21, 2007, from, <http://www.symphony.org/>
- American Symphony Orchestra League (2007). *Quick orchestra facts 2004-2005*. Retrieved February 21, 2007, from <http://www.symphony.org/research/facts/musicmatters.pdf>
- Americans for the Arts Monograph (November, 2003). *Cultural Development in Creative Communities*.
- The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (2007). *Performing arts grant programs & research*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from http://www.argosyfund.org/what/what_show.htm?doc_id=376786
- Argosy Foundation (2007). *Contemporary music fund*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from http://www.argosyfund.org/what/what_show.htm?doc_id=376786
- Blau, J. (1989). *The shape of culture: a study of contemporary cultural patterns in the United States*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. (1988). *Doing research in organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Colbert, F. (2001). *Marketing culture and the arts*, 2nd ed. Montreal: 'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales.
- Conquest, R. (1993). *History, humanity, and truth: The 1993 Jefferson lecture in the humanities*. Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. Stanford University.

- Cresswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crawford, R. (1985). *Studying American music*. Brooklyn, New York: Institute for Studies in American Music Conservatory of Music.
- Ford Made in America (n.d.). *Website*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://www.fordmadeinamerica.org/>
- The Foundation Directory Online (2007). Search for orchestras and national grants. Search for orchestras and grants in CA, OR, and WA. Retrieved February 19, 2007, from <http://fconline.fdncenter.org/>
- Foundation Search America (2007). *Website*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.foundationsearch.com/>
- Freeman, R. (1996). New perspectives on audience development. *Arts Education Policy Review* 97 (5), 22 (7). Retrieved April 14, 2006, from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Heintze, J. (1999). *Perspectives on American music since 1950*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Holland, B. (2003, June 29,) How to kill orchestras. *New York Times*. Retrieved June 1, 2006, from LexisNexis Database.
- Horowitz, J. (2005). *Classical music in America: A history of its rise and fall*. New York: W.W Norton.
- Johnson, J. (2002). *Who needs classical music? Cultural choice and musical value*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karolyi, O. (1996). *Modern American music: From Charles Ives to the minimalists*. London: Cygnus Arts, a division of Golden Cockerel Press.
- Lawson, C. (2003). *The Cambridge companion to the orchestra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahiri, J. (2001). Pop culture pedagogy and the end(s) of school. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 44(4), 382(4). Retrieved April 13, 2006, from Academic Search Premier Database.
- McQuillin, J. (2007). Symphony review 'not quite classical' proves to be quite satisfying. *The Oregonian, February 19, 2007*. Retrieved April 21, 2007, from

<http://www.oregonlive.com/oregonian/stories/index.ssf?/base/entertainment/1171842931240840.xml&coll=7>

Meet the Composer (n.d.). *Commissioning music: A basic guide*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://www.meetthecomposer.org/resources.htm>

Meet the Composer (n.d.). *An individuals guide to commissioning music*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://www.meetthecomposer.org/resources.htm>

Meet the Composer (n.d.). *Commissioning music*. Retrieved February 23, 2007, from <http://www.meetthecomposer.org/resources.htm>

Mueller, J. (1951). *The American symphony orchestra*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mueller, J. & Hevner, K. (1942). *Trends in musical taste*. Bloomington Indiana. Indiana University Publications Humanities Series NO. 8.

Music Alive (n.d.). *Website*. Retrieved February 21, 2007, from <http://www.meetthecomposer.org/musicalive/home.htm>

National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (2007). *Website*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/>

National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (2007). *Website*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/>

National Endowment for the Arts (n.d.) *Website*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.nea.gov/>

National Endowment for the Arts (2005). *2005 Annual report: State and regional partnerships*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.nea.gov/about/05Annual/State.pdf>

Neuman, W.L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches, (5th ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education.

Newman, F. (1968). *Explanation by description: An essay on historical methodology*. The Netherlands: The Hague.

Nonprofit Technology Enterprise Network. (2006). *Nonprofit IT Staffing Survey: Salaries, IT Investments, and An Organizational Digital Divide*. Retrieved October 15, 2006, from website <http://nten.org/itstaffing>.

- Omnova Solutions Inc. (2007). *Webpage: Omnova Foundation Grant Categories*. Retrieved February 18, 2007, from http://www.omnova.com/about/community/foundation_categories.aspx
- Philip, R. (2004). *Performing music in the age of recording*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Pleasants, H. (1962). *The agony of modern music*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Reis, C. (1974). *Composers conductors and critics*. Detroit, Michigan: Detroit Reprints in Music.
- Reiss, A. (1995). *Don't just applaud—send money!* New York: Theatre Communications Group, Inc.
- Salamon, L. (2002). *The state of nonprofit America*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Spitzer, J. & Zaslaw, N. (2004). *The birth of the orchestra: History of an institution, 1650-1815*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stabler, D. (2006). Newcomer zeroes in on symphony's woes. *The Oregonian December 17, 2006 Sunday Features, p. O18*. Retrieved March 21, 2007, from NewsBank Database.
- Target Corporation (2007). *Website: Target Community*. Retrieved February 18, 2007, from <http://sites.target.com/site/en/corporate/page.jsp?contentId=PRD03-001811>
- Tischler, B. (1986). *An American music: The search for an American musical identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tommasini, A. (2001). What's new in classical music? Not much. *The New York Times April 19, 2001 Sunday Late Edition – Final. Section 2; Column 5; Arts and Leisure Desk*. Retrieved January 10, 2007, from LexisNexis Database.
- Wakin, D. (2005). New overtures at the symphony. *The New York Times August 21, 2005 Sunday Late Edition – Final. Section 2; Column 3; Arts and Leisure Desk*. Retrieved May 6, 2006, from LexisNexis Database.
- The Wallace Foundation (2007). *Website*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/>
- Weber, W. (2003). Consequences of canon: The institutionalization of enmity between contemporary and classical music. *Common Knowledge* 9(1) 78-99. Duke University Press. Retrieved April 15, 2006, from Project MUSE online database.

Werner, M. & Zimmermann, B. (2006). Beyond comparison: Histoire Crois'ee and the challenge of reflexivity. *History and Theory*, 45(1), 30-50. Wesleyan University Press. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from Blackwell Synergy Online Database.

The Wheatland Foundation. (1990). *The evolution of the symphony orchestra: History, problems and agenda. A conference sponsored by the Wheatland foundation chaired by Isaac Stern*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.