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Abstract

Performing arts’ sectors have been struggling to build up and retain a solid base of young attendees, due to the disruptive impact of the ongoing socio-cultural, economic and technological changes on Millennials’ consumption patterns.

This thesis dives into the specificities of the Italian music panorama, acknowledging the precarious situation which most music institutions are experiencing, being the declining and ageing audience the toughest, yet most urgent, issue to tackle. However, if classical music institutions strive on a daily basis to reach out to Millennials, popular music concerts’ providers effectively succeed in doing so. Therefore, the purpose of the thesis is to investigate the antecedents behind Millennials’ live music consumption, in order to unveil the factors which mostly impact on their concert attendance.

While early literature on audience development mainly focuses on socio-demographic factors, such as age and gender, recent knowledge sheds light on elements never before considered, which are strictly related to the experience economy theorization. Through the adoption of the Motivation-Ability-Opportunity Model as conceptual framework of the research, five relevant sets of antecedents emerged from the available body of knowledge are holistically assessed: socio-demographic and experiential factors as motivation’s determinants, personal resources as ability’s determinants, environmental and marketing mix factors as opportunity’s determinants.

The insights gained from the qualitative strand of the analysis suggest the necessity for concerts’ providers and youngsters to meet halfway, the former through consistent communication and appealing programmes, the latter through openness and dedication towards (un)familiar music genres. The results of the quantitative research, in turn, confirm the relevance of socio-demographic variables, experiential variables, personal resources and marketing mix variables as significant antecedents to Millennials’ concert participation, while confute the impact of environmental variables. Moreover, factors such as solid music education and hands-on music experience emerge as strong enhancers of classical music concerts’ attendance among Millennials. The study, however, fails in identifying specific antecedents to popular music concerts’ participation, opening up to future endeavours.
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1. Introduction

This first introductory section offers a general overview of the subject matter and aids the reader in familiarising with the topic through the assessment of the thematic area, the purpose and the relevance of the study. Specific relevance is attributed to the paragraphs dedicated to the research questions and the limitations of the fieldwork.

1.1 Problem Area

The deep technological, socio-cultural and economic changes occurred over the past 30 years have nurtured a growing competition among arts’ organizations, which strive to find innovative ways to retain their current audience and – above all – to widen it, by reaching out to new target segments (Pegg & Patterson, 2010). First of all, technological endeavours have outstandingly broadened the choice for leisure activities, making consumers’ decision about how to spend their own spare time more and more selective and attentive (Hyun & Byun, 2016). Secondly, factors such as the growing multi-ethnicity and the widespread ‘graying’ audience trend set up new challenges on how to attract new diversified audience segments, in terms of age and cultural background (Turrini, Soscia & Maulini, 2012). Thirdly, the progressive transformation of artistic institutions into private entities, in order to lighten their structure and endow them with managerial tools able to ensure enduring sustainability and boost financial contributions from private sectors, opened up to new challenges for the arts’ field (Turrini & Cancellieri, 2012; 2016).

All the aforementioned phenomena unveil the urgency for arts’ organizations to reach out to their community of reference in a renovated way. To do that, particular care should be taken of a strategic discipline which acquired legitimacy only in recent times: audience participation building. Audience development does represent a primary concern especially when it comes to performing arts’ institutions, which find their raison d’être in accomplishing their creative mission through the staging of live performances in front of – physically present – attendees.

Data show a general amelioration of both the average education level and living standards in Western countries, factors which allow for a wider exposure and easier access to different forms of art to a larger amount of people. Nevertheless, the arts’ sector has recorded an unprecedented fall in audience participation over the past few decades, with a systematic decrease in the number of attendees (NEA, 2015). As a consequence, this worrisome situation has caused the re-qualification, the down-sizing
or – in many cases – the closure of numerous arts’ institutions that could not sustain further their activity. These two opposite statements raise an undoubtedly tricky issue, which stimulates a heated debate among academics and practitioners.

Given the breadth and complexity of the topic, it is also necessary to make a premise on the new patterns of arts’ consumption in today’s digitized and globalized world: technology has, indeed, brought to life newer ways to access arts, no longer dependent on physical presence, but only requiring for a digital device, be it a phone, a tablet or a computer. As a result, participation through media is currently the most widespread form of arts’ participation, whilst participation through attendance and ‘hands-on’ participation are slowly, but steadily, losing their appeal (Madden, 2009). For this reason, building audience participation must be a priority for arts’ institution.

In particular, the youth generation, which is enrooted in today’s world in terms of values, lifestyle, priorities and needs, is the most troublesome segment for arts’ institutions to attract. Therefore, it is paramount to investigate the main drivers that impact on Millennials’ consumption patterns, in order to enable art practitioners to elaborate tailored strategies and techniques to properly address the youth target.

Despite the existence of empirically grounded studies around arts’ consumption antecedents, it still remains a relatively unexplored and fuzzy topic within the artistic and cultural field. Additionally, the present study is specifically conducted within the boundaries of live music and uniquely addresses the segment of Millennials, as far as the Italian panorama is concerned.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

As already anticipated, this dissertation aims at investigating the drivers beneath Millennials’ consumption of music concerts in its main antecedents and determinants, with a specific focus on the two macro-genres of classical and popular music. Hence, it is delimited in its scope to youngsters’ live music consumption patterns within the Italian context.

The research is based on both primary and secondary data, with the purpose of obtaining a relatively complete understanding of the topic in its multiple facets (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2007). Primary data convey concreteness and substantiality to the fieldwork. They have been collected through a mixed-method study, which entails both qualitative and quantitative research. The choice to triangulate different research methods finds its rationale in the researcher’s willingness to conduct a multi-level study in order to critically assess the subject matter. On the one hand, qualitative
research deeply grasps perceptions, perspectives and opinions of skilled practitioners within the music field, providing meaningful insights to enrich the available literature and to develop a coherent questionnaire. On the other hand, quantitative research constitutes a relevant follow-up to the qualitative part, as it is specifically tailored to reach out to Millennials’ consumer behaviour and, thus, to provide an answer to the research questions.

Secondary data coming from previous research, in turn, provide the necessary theoretical basis able to significantly and reliably support the whole study. Specifically, these latter offer a broad perspective over the topic analysed, suggesting viable models and frameworks to be adopted when conducting similar studies and shading light on yet unexplored and unanswered subject matters.

1.3 Relevance of the Study

The present study offers significant insights that can meaningfully contribute to the discipline of audience development with respect to the offerings of live music performances in Italy. More specifically, it unfolds new perspectives for what concerns Millennials’ participation choices, which could fill the gap in the currently available literature around the topic.

Moreover, this research offers relevant contributions to practitioners of the live music field, who are willing to target the segment of Millennials as potential attendees at the present moment, but – first and foremost – as the hard core of tomorrow’s audiences. Indeed, the findings of the study will provide a clearer picture of Millennials’ music consumption patterns, whose uncovering will facilitate the development of strategies and tactics aimed to attract this extremely relevant segment. Research results can actually bring benefits to arts’ institutions in general, since the trend of declining participation and the difficulty to attract and retain younger segments are phenomena that interest the arts’ field in its entirety.

In addition to the aforementioned, the study provides impactful implications for academics and researchers, who can implement this research by carrying out longitudinal studies around the topic.

Lastly, the present fieldwork opens up to a currently paramount subject matter in Italy, where, despite the diversified and high-quality artistic offer, cultural institutions rely on fewer and fewer financial resources, face decreasing audience participation and struggle to sustain their activity over time. More specifically, as classical music is enrooted in western tradition, it is interesting to assess whether classical music institutions are able to reinvent themselves according to the contemporaneity, attracting young adults and strengthening their audience.
1.4 Problem Statement and Research Question

Today’s data on performing arts’ participation are discouraging, with unstable – mostly declining - trends both in Europe and in the US over the last 30 years. Conversely, the average educational level has increased throughout the past 30 years (European Commission, 2013; NEA, 2015). These two trends should not be of opposite sign, assuming that a higher educational background should foster frequent arts’ participation.

Of course the level of education does constitute one important element to be taken into consideration when analysing consumers’ behaviour, but it is necessary to take a step further in the analysis in order to investigate which other factors influence consumers’ choices within the arts’ sector.

The focus of the study, as already mentioned, is directed towards the antecedents behind the consumption of live classical music and live popular music among the under 30-year-old segment of audience. As a matter of fact, despite the worrisome situation addressed above, it is interesting to notice that popular music genres still manage to appeal to a wide audience – Generation Y and Z in particular – when compared to classical music genres.

In today’s world, Millennials find satisfaction and fulfilment to their needs and desires in renewed ways with respect to the previous generations. As consumers, consequently, they manifest a thoroughly different behaviour, which requires attentive investigation. Which choices does this behaviour bring about, when it comes to live music consumption?

To assess the issue, this study is built around the following research question:

*Which are the drivers behind Millennials’ live music consumption choices within the Italian context?*

And sub-questions:

1. *Which drivers mostly impact on classical music concerts’ participation?*
2. *Which drivers mostly impact on popular music concerts’ participation?*

1.5 Delimitation and Scope of the Research

This work intends to exclusively investigate the segment of audience comprised between 18 and 30 years of age, hence addressing only Millennials born between 1987 and 1999. Coherently, preliminary conditions to the validity of both the focus group and the survey are that participants (1)
belong to the considered age cohort and (2) have attended at least one live music concert in Italy. Respondents are mainly Italian, while the few foreigners who took part to the research have spent a reasonable amount of time in Italy, enough to come in contact with its cultural offerings.

The targeted recipients of the interviews and focus group have been contacted via email invitation, following both purposive and convenience sampling techniques. The survey’s respondents, instead, have been partly personally invited to fill in the questionnaire via social media, according to the researcher’s personal network, and partly have been indirectly involved through word of mouth.

Furthermore, the analysis and the findings of the present study rely exclusively on primary data collected through qualitative and quantitative research.

As far as the scope is concerned, despite a necessary premise around the arts’ field in its entirety and the general trends across Western countries, the study is narrowed down to only address live music consumption patterns among Millennials in Italy. Moreover, music genres have been grouped into two main macro-categories – popular and classical music – for research purposes, in order to facilitate the development of the fieldwork.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

Due to the importance of adopting a critical approach while reading the thesis, the researcher has purposefully decided to include the limitations of the study beforehand, in order to maximise transparency and avoid ambiguity.

First of all, a potential limit to the research is represented by the grouping of variegated music genres into two main umbrella-genres: classical music and popular music. The researcher acknowledges the fact that each genre holds specific and unique characteristics in terms of style, form, composition canons, tradition, addressed themes and so forth. However, the selected division, despite the breadth of the two categories, is widely adopted among academics. Additionally, this way of classifying music genres has also been introjected and commonly used by people in general.

Another limitation is brought by the quantitative and qualitative tools and techniques adopted to carry out the research, each of which is characterised by inner pros and cons. The specificities of the advantages and disadvantages of each research tool are addressed further in the discussion. However, it is worth pointing out that, according to the mixed-method approach here adopted, the triangulation
of different research techniques permits to partially overcome this limitation, as the strengths and weaknesses of the different techniques balance each other out.

The last limitation – perhaps the most significant – is constituted by the relatively small number of survey’s respondents, which rises the issues of low generalisability of the results of the quantitative research. In other words, the behaviour registered within the sample may not thoroughly match the behaviour at the level of the entire population of Millennials in Italy. Moreover, it may interfere to some extent with the accuracy of the statistics. Unfortunately, these issues cannot be entirely fixed by the researcher, whose purpose is, anyhow, to shed light on a concerning situation through the collection and elaboration of empirical data, in order to set the goal for future deeper endeavours.

1.7 Thesis Structure

This study is structured into 7 chapters, briefly addressed hereafter to facilitate the reading of the thesis. After the introductory overview of the overall thesis provided in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 addresses the relevant body of knowledge around the topic, starting from academic contributions on arts’ participation and audience development, moving towards literature dedicated to Millennials’ consumer behaviour and finishing off with an in-depth discussion about popular and classical music consumption.

Chapter 3 briefly presents the main characteristics of the Italian cultural offerings, along with the assessment of the managerial side of the artistic panorama.

Chapter 4 introduces the theoretical framework and the hypotheses of the study, which constitute the backbone of the overall research.

Chapter 5 concerns the methodology and the analysis of the research. Hence, it firstly addresses the research paradigm and design. Afterwards, it presents the qualitative and quantitative strands of the research in terms of data collection methods, analysis strategy, sampling technique and outcomes. Ethical concerns are addressed as well.

Lastly, chapter 6 is dedicated to the discussion of the implications of the study, while chapter 7 concludes the dissertation with the statement of the answers to the research questions, as well as considerations about future research.

Finally, references and appendices complete the thesis.
2. Literature Review

This section is dedicated to the presentation of the main theories and studies which constitute the academic backbone of this study.

2.1 Experience Economy and Hedonic Consumption

Over the past 30 years, the traditional way to intend economy turned out to be anachronistic for its inability to grasp the new patterns of Western economy, following the joint occurrence of disruptive technological, socio-demographic and cultural changes (Pegg & Patterson, 2010). In such a context, consumption patterns are needful for a deeper investigation that goes beyond the outdated constructs of the traditional economy approach. As a matter of fact, assessing today’s economic system under a merely utilitarian perspective would only result into a partial and incomplete analysis.

Pine and Gilmore (1998) are among the researchers that first spotted the shift from the economy of goods and services to the experience economy, claiming that “customers unquestionably desire experiences” (p. 98). Today’s consumers consider far more criteria in their decision-making process than simply balancing costs against benefits to measure satisfaction, as claimed by the rationalistic stream of thought.

If this happens when deciding whether or not purchasing goods and services, it is even more evident when it comes to hedonic consumption, namely experiencing ‘products’ that belong to the realm of arts and culture. The way in which Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) define hedonic consumption is harmonically entangled with the abovementioned experiential view of economy: indeed, postmodern consumer’s buying behaviour – besides the cognitive and information-processing component – is the result of seemingly irrational motives, such as playfulness, sensory pleasure, aesthetic delight and emotional responses.

However, the experiential theory of consumption is not aimed at completely dismantling the previous traditional theory, rather at broadening and completing it, in terms of:

- **Mental construct**: consumers attribute subjective meanings and symbols to products beyond the objective features, shaping their buying decisions on more emotive and sensory patterns. Moreover, when it comes to creative products, “the process of evaluation is always contingent on who is evaluating what, for whom, when, where, how, why and in what context” (Moeran & Strandgaard Pedersen, 2011, p. 11), as value is socially-constructed and not an inherent property of goods;
- **Product classes**: the experiential view of consumption extends its spectrum of products to include the never-before considered cultural-creative goods, defined as "nonmaterial goods directed at a public of consumers, for whom they generally serve an aesthetic or expressive, rather than a clearly utilitarian function" (Hirsch, 1972, p. 641). For their own nature, they call for consumption patterns which are highly determined by emotional responses;

- **Product usage**: depending on the decision-making patterns applied, products break out of their pre-fixed original function and take on new meanings, or even new uses (Belk, 2013);

- **Individual differences**: once overcome the assumption of consumers as rational decision-makers and reckoning the preponderant role of the emotive-sensory component, the same products can assume different meanings depending on the specific individual and his or her own consumption behaviour. Actually, literature unveils the tendency to make similar buying decisions among individuals within the same sub-culture (Bourdieu, 1984).

In a nutshell, the experiential economy theory identifies consumption as holistic experience, for its multi-faceted nature prompted by the multiple variegated antecedents to the consumers’ buying decisions. It goes without saying that marketers aiming to seize these antecedents are adopting more and more eclectic marketing tools, in order to investigate the consumption motives that – through mere quantitative and analytical methods – are hard to grasp (Clouse, 2016). Moreover, “experience staggers must constantly refresh their experience, change or add elements that keep the offering new and exciting, and worth paying money to experience all over again. To fail to effectively do so, only serves to denigrate the offering” (Pine & Gilmore, 2000, p. 21). How does the experience economy impact on the arts’ world?

The following sections of the chapter will dig into the determinants of arts’ participation as necessary premise to the core theme of the present dissertation, namely the antecedents of Millennials’ participation to live music concerts.

### 2.2 Arts’ Participation Research: Criticalities and Challenges

Marketing research shows a growing interest in the study of audience development within the realm of arts. As a matter of fact, the recent social, economic and technological trends have significantly impacted on the arts’ environment, which maybe for the first time has started to be more strategically-focused in building audience participation, through the adoption of tactics directly imported from the commercial world (McCarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras, 2004). Thus, if before arts’ institutions were
prioritizing aspects such as supply and quality of the performance, the focus has now shifted towards a demand-driven approach, more attentive to the aspects of accessibility and experience of the art form itself (Oakes & North, 2008).

Literature offers numerous valuable approaches to the study of audience development, however, the contributions brought by McCarthy and Jinnet (2001), both by displaying the new patterns in arts’ participation and by elaborating the guidelines for arts’ institutions to investigate the decision-making process of their current and potential audience and to broaden their offerings to new segments of their community of reference, are essential as they pioneered and gave a boost to the contemporary academic approach towards the discipline.

How has arts’ participation changed overtime? McCarthy and Jinnet (2001) shed light on four factors as antecedents of the current attendance patterns:

1. *Change in practical considerations about art* (e.g. cost, accessibility, amount of leisure time available);
2. *Change in people’s degree of knowledge about arts*, following their education and exposure to various forms of art;
3. *Change in people’s taste*, following novel arts’ combinations and experimentations;
4. *Socio-demographic changes* (e.g. size, ethnic origins, age composition).

Although the present study focuses on the consumers’ side, as the following chapters will highlight, it is necessary to address the institutions’ side as well, in their approach to audience participation building, in order to provide a thorough picture of the topic. Thus, the following paragraphs will present two different ways in which arts’ practitioners build up their audience, as formulated by McCarthy and Jinnet (2001): the traditional approach and the integrative approach.

### 2.2.1 Traditional Approach

The *traditional approach* to audience participation is directly related to the traditional view of consumers’ buying behaviour, previously explained. As a matter of fact, individuals are identified as rational consumers who choose whether or not participating to a certain form of art consistently with their quest for the highest degree of satisfaction, given some contextual constraints (e.g. income, time, costs, such as transport and childcare). According to this view, income and participation are directly proportional, as individuals who benefit from higher income are assumed to participate more. At the same time, ticket price and participation are inversely proportional, following the assumption that the
higher is the price, the fewer are the people able to participate. Another key element to pinpoint is that consumers’ preferences are presumed to be constant overtime, as the result of a fixed combination of socio-demographic and psychological elements. For example, Stigler and Becker (1977) identify the main determinants of participation in factors like previous experience with art, level of education, degree of knowledge of the form of art and family exposure to art.

Overall, the traditional view, which, despite being dated, is still widely adopted among arts’ institutions, results to be quite anachronistic as it fails in providing a complete picture of people’s decision-making process, which, in fact, is a “complex mix of attitudes, intentions, constraints, and behaviour, as well as feedback between that mix and past experience” (McCarthy and Jinnet, 2001, p. 23).

### 2.2.2 Integrative Approach

The integrative approach takes a step forward with respect to the traditional approach. This model, indeed, is aimed both at investigating the individuals’ decision-making path that leads to participation and at suggesting consistent tactics and strategies to arts’ institutions according to the target of interest. As the name suggests, the present approach adopts a holistic perspective, integrating the artistic mission of the organization with (a) its internal and external resources and with (b) the specific community environment within which the institution operates.

As represented below (Figure 1), arts’ participation unfolds into multiple stages, which should all be taken into consideration by arts’ institutions. It is clear how the socio-cultural and socio-demographic components, which are considered as fully explanatory of the dynamics behind arts’ participation by the traditional approach, represent only the first stage (Background Stage) of the participation model under the integrative perspective.

![Figure 1. Participation Model (McCarthy & Jinnet, 2001, p. 24)](image-url)
(deepening strategies), individuals inclined to participate (broadening strategies) and individuals disinclined to participate (diversifying strategies).

Below are the conceptualisations of the four stages that constitute the Participation Model:

1. **Background Stage.** It comprises socio-demographic, personal and socio-cultural factors, as well as previous experience. This starting point to decision-making cannot be influenced or acted upon by arts’ institutions, as it exclusively depends on the context-specific background of each individual. Thus, it can only be enriched or modified through future experiences.

2. **Perceptual Stage.** It addresses the advantages and disadvantages of participation, according to the individual’s own beliefs about the art form and the perceived social norms existing in his or her groups of reference (e.g. family, friends). As this second stage leads to the development of potential inclination towards arts participation, it is crucial for arts’ institutions which are willing to diversify their audience and convert disinclined segments into patrons, to tailor their programmes to the new targets of interests, by – for example – bringing their offerings to more familiar venues to the community and reaching out to the reference groups that may affect each individual’s attitude towards participation.

3. **Practical Stage.** This stage regards the practical issues that concern individuals who are already inclined to participate. Hence, arts’ organisations, besides spreading out precise information about the institution and the form of art, should take care of functional aspects to broaden their audience, such as convenient transportation costs, fair ticket price and accessible venues, which may represent objective obstacles to participation.

4. **Experience Stage.** It refers to the actual art experience and its follow-up. It is fundamental for the organisation to ensure a fulfilling experience and identity-creation in order to retain the new segments of audience and, at the same time, to exceed the expectations of the current audience, incrementing even more their involvement and deepening the already established relationship.

Summing up, arts’ institutions which follow the integrative participation model should:

a. Align participation-building strategies to core values and value proposition;

b. Determine segments of interest and set up tailored tactics;

c. Understand the organisational resources, both internally and externally;

d. Follow up by constituting systems of feedback and evaluation.
The great contribution that the integrative approach to participation brings to the present study lies in the fact that for the first time multiple factors are addressed and considered as relevant and impactful for arts’ participation. McCarthy and Jinnet (2001), indeed, trace strategic guidelines for arts’ institutions to investigate current and potential targets of audience, by not only examining socio-demographic components, but also emotive and experiential patterns, as well as environmental components. Hence, the Participation Model – on the institutions’ side – consistently mirrors the theoretical framework of the present study (see Ch. 4) – on the consumers’ side –, which is built upon different categories of factors (socio-demographic, experiential, personal, environmental and marketing mix) hypothesised to impact on Millennials’ decision to participate to concerts.

Subsequently, the dissertation will delve into the specificities of the research topic, reviewing literature around Millennials as well as studies dedicated to live music concerts’ participation.

### 2.3 Who are Millennials?

The present study aims at investigating the target of Millennials, namely those who are born between 1987 and 1999. In other words, young adults between 18 and 30 years of age. It is hard to identify the precise starting and ending points that define this segment, as researchers generally adjust them according to their own research purposes (Strauss & Howe, 2006; Glover, 2010; Pendergast, 2010; Christian, 2011; Kruger & Saayman, 2015; Graham, 2015).

The word *Millennials* sounds pretty self-explanatory: it defines the individuals that grew up and came of age in the new millennium, in a world that has been deeply transformed by socio-cultural changes and – above all – by outstanding technological improvements. With regards to the latter aspect, Millennials’ generation is, in fact, “the first always-connected generation” (Taylor & Keeter, 2010, p. 1), being their daily life ultimately built around high-tech devices.

This age cohort is also known under the name of *Generation Y*, or *Yers*, conventional denominations to indicate the segment of population that follows *Generation X*, or *Xers* (born between 1965 and 1979).

Broad is the literature around generational theory (Strauss & Howe, 2006), however, there is widespread agreement around the main traits of Millennials, as well as their environment, values and aptitudes, which are all potentially meaningful factors in shaping their arts’ participation decisions.

Below are listed the key aspects that characterise Millennials’ generation, classified into two macro-sections: *personal sphere* and *external sphere*. 


1. **Personal Sphere:**

1a. *Attachment to Family and Friends.* Millennials are significantly more socially-oriented than the previous generation of Xers, dominated by individualism and scepticism. In particular, family and friends represent the closest reference groups to Yers, who are primarily affected by opinions and decisions of those they care about and trust the most.

1b. *Structured Life.* Since the earliest age, Millennials’ lifestyle has generally encompassed a multitude of activities, both educational and amusing, being “*the busiest generation of children*” (Raines, 2003, p. 2). Therefore, as the amount of unstructured time left is minimal, the decision on how to spend leisure time has become more and more selective (Wiggins, 2004).

1c. *Higher Education.* Compared to the previous generations, Millennials’ average educational level is significantly higher, as education has become more and more accessible over the years. This aspect is strictly related to the Generation Y’s traits of being achievement-oriented and having higher expectations with respect to their future self-actualization.

1d. *Self-Expression.* Contrarily to Xers, Millennials are more concerned with expressing themselves through their experiences and achievements, instead of their job positions or study titles (Graham, 2015). Thus, experiences play a crucial role in shaping Millennials’ preferences, taste and decision-making patterns.

1e. *Tech-savvy.* As previously mentioned, Generation Y is grown within today’s interconnected world and, therefore, technology plays a preponderant role in their lifestyle. Their ability to master technology and make use of it on a daily basis, confers to digital media and devices the nature of means of self-expression (Turrini et al. 2012).

2. **External Sphere:**

2a. *Interconnectivity.* The presence of Internet in everyone’s daily life teared down the barriers of space and time. Friendships and love relations are nurtured despite the distance and Millennials’ tastes are more and more similar across the globe.

2b. *Multiculturalism.* Yers are more ethnically-tolerant and open-minded to other cultures, being immersed in a multicultural context since their childhood. This aspect indirectly
leads to a general openness towards changes and dynamic contexts, as well as a more positive attitude with respect to novel and unfamiliar situations.

2c. **Globalism.** Another direct consequence of being connected 24/7 around the world, is the blurring of boundaries, which makes Millennials seek opportunities way out of their comfort zone (Raines, 2003).

Besides the abovementioned aspects which picture the Millennials’ generation as a very charming and interesting subject of research, there are several concrete reasons why the researcher has decided to focus the investigation around this demographic cohort, which, for its unique characteristics, deserves exclusive attention.

First and foremost, Millennials are crossing a delicate stage of their life, as they have just left childhood and adolescence behind and start to approach the adult world, which entails major decisions and responsibilities. The second reason is strictly linked to the first one: Yers’s life choices combine novel maturity and accountability, proper of the adulthood, with enthusiasm, optimism and fresh eyes, as youth’s prerogatives. Thirdly, as young adults, they incur into significant life changes which relevantly influence their consumption behaviour, namely moving out of their parents’ home, traveling abroad, engaging into a serious relationship, finding a job and becoming economically independent, even having children. Finally, as a direct consequence of all the previous reasons, Millennials develop a personality of their own, with specific tastes, inclinations and preferences which make them, for the first time in their life, independent in their buying decisions.

Additionally, it goes without saying that, besides representing an extremely conspicuous segment of today’s arts audience, most importantly they will constitute the very core of tomorrow’s audience.

Thus, being profoundly different from previous age cohorts, it is reasonable to assume their consumption patterns to differ as well, even more when it comes to seek pleasurable experiences. Therefore, fruitful is to investigate the drivers behind their decision to approach arts’ offerings, in order to enable arts’ institutions to elaborate tailored strategies to attract and retain Millennials.

### 2.4 The Ubiquity of Music

Diving into the specificity of the present study, it is interesting to acknowledge the way in which music has evolved overtime, in its role, functions, meanings, and modes of consumption.

As already mentioned, technological endeavours have had a disruptive impact on the totality of the arts’ field (Hyun & Byun, 2016). With respect to music consumption, “technologies have contributed
to configuring the ways in which music is written, recorded, produced, marketed and listened to” (Nowac, 2016, p. 14), and shifted the role of music from mirroring a certain level of education and social status to mediating everyday life experiences, becoming “a resource for daily activities and cognitive processes” (Nowac, 2016, p. 42).

The most significant way in which technology bolstered and shaped music is by making it omnipresent, broadening its accessibility to the maximum extent, namely anytime and anyplace (Hyun & Byun, 2016). Access is the new name of the game: today, digital streaming services enable individuals to consume a potentially infinite amount of music, everywhere.

Moreover, Madden (2009) sheds light on the ease and convenience of accessing digital music, in terms of infinitesimal costs, device portability, mobility, breadth of choice and remixability. These five aspects induce a widespread endorsement of digital music over live music.

Another major effect of today’s music broad accessibility is the growing criticality of the already intricate concept of music taste, thought to be the primary determinant of individuals’ consumption choices. What causes the development of a certain music taste? This tricky question is the object of a heated and ongoing debate. Multiple are the schools of thoughts as the answer is, assumptionly, multi-faceted.

Accredited by numerous researchers is, for example, the Bourdieuan concept of habitus, namely a “system of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively ‘regulated’ and ‘regular’ without in any way being the product of obedience to rules” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 72). In other words, Bourdieu’s framework seeks to re-conduct people’s particular choices and practices – hence their taste – to their habitus, namely their immersion within a certain social context.

A different stream of research explains taste as the result of the joint occurrence of factors of diverse nature. One exponent is Lewis (1992), who identifies three dimensions that concur to the development of music taste: demographics, which includes factors such as gender, age, race and place of living; aesthetics, which entails the individual’s own connection with a certain music genre; politics, meaning the environmental factors of one’s societal context.

Furthermore, numerous studies about the determinants of music consumption are constructed around the notions of identity and personality (Frith, 1996; Schwartz & Fouts, 2003; Papinczak, Dingle,
Stoyanov, Hides & Zelenko, 2015). This perspective connects music preferences to personality aptitudes, as well as to the individuals’ desire of identity affirmation and self-expression.

Despite being among the most accredited, the abovementioned theories portray only a partial representation of the broad research conducted around the notion of taste and its antecedents. However, for the sake of the present study, the topic will not be covered in its entirety, as privilege is given to the unfolding of the drivers behind popular and classical live music consumption among Millennials: whilst the theory provides the necessary support to the dissertation, the actual field research, as illustrated later on, attempts to provide answers to the research questions.

Hence, the following sub-sections are dedicated to the macro-genres of classical and popular music, in terms of historical background and participation characteristics.

### 2.4.1 Classical Music

The Oxford Dictionary offers the following definition to the locution *classical music*:

> “Serious music following long-established principles rather than a folk, jazz, or popular tradition. More specifically, music written in the European tradition during a period lasting approximately from 1750 to 1830, when forms such as the symphony, concerto, and sonata were standardized”. (Oxford Dictionary)

Whilst in its proper meaning the term *classical* identifies the period of time of Western Music that spans between the XVIII and XIX centuries, as the definition underlines, it is also commonly used in a ‘synecdochical’ way as umbrella term to indicate the spectre of music genres that differ from folk, jazz, pop or rock, or more generally to popular music, defined later on.

Other terms that could appropriately define this kind of music are “serious music”, “cultivated music”, “art music” or “highbrow music”. However, for research purposes, the word *classical* is the one adopted throughout the present dissertation as it results to be the most widely known and understood among individuals.

To effectively grasp the antecedents of classical music attendance today, it is necessary to trace the profile of the past audiences, since, as already mentioned, classical music has been enrooted in Western culture for centuries.

Relevant suggestions around the topic are brought by Kolb (2001) in her UK and US-based study of the effect of generational change on classical music attendance. Back in the XVIII century, classical music was a social and cultural means of expression, aimed at conveying the dominant values of the British upper classes, namely noble origins, higher moral, intellectual superiority, tradition and order.
If, on the one hand, orchestra music was exclusive patronage of the nobility, on the other hand, opera was widely accessed by common people, given its ultimately entertaining value.

During the XIX century, characterized by the ascendance of the bourgeois class, classical music was still considered a means for self-improvement and self-actualization, but also took on a more educative role directed towards the new dominant class. Kolb (2000, p. 21) rightfully identifies this music genre as “affirmation of the values of the middle class life, which includes self-control and hard work”.

Classical music keeps its cultural elevation aura throughout the last century as well, as soon as the radio became a widely diffused mass media at the very beginning of 1900. If the first radio channel dedicated to classical music was soon divested because of low listening ratings, after the II World War the UK Government officially guaranteed classical music broadcasting both on TV and radio, with the ultimate purpose of improving the taste of the general public.

The previous sections show how Kolb’s studies (2000; 2001) shed light on the pattern of recurring motives and associations that have defined the role of classical music in the Western society as means to reaffirm class values, being the fil rouge across the past three centuries. In fact, themes like tradition, intellectuality, education and nobility have not only permeated the past modes of consumption of the genre examined, but have also impactful consequences on today’s fruition of classical music, as well as on the configuration of the current audiences, as the following paragraph further substantiates.

**Audience Configuration**

The current demographics of classical music audience are overall the same across all the Western countries: the average patrons happen to be white, middle-aged, highly educated, professional, affluent, living in large cities and mostly female (Baumol & Bowen, 1966; Small, 1998; Kolb, 2001; Turrini et al., 2012; Curtis & Koo, 2016).

However, the fact that a more mature age and a high educational level are commonly identified as major determinants of classical concerts participation, is not fully supported by the following concerning trends: on the one side, publics are ageing, which means that newer segments have not yet started to attend, and, on the other side, despite a wider access to education and prosperity, classical music attendance is inexorably declining (Turrini et al., 2012; Clouse, 2016).

Which are the barriers that hinder young adults’ participation to classical music concerts?

Research shows that ageing audience, first of all, is a major deterrent to younger people (Schlemmer
& James, 2011). As a matter of fact, current youth feels uncomfortable in sharing concert experiences being exclusively surrounded by older people. Other aspects that act as barriers are the excessive formality and the perception to lack the rightful cognitive resources to fully enjoy the performance. Additionally, studies by Kolb (2000) and Dobson and Pitts (2011) on first-time classical concert attenders, between the age of 21 and 35, underline similar patterns: namely, taken-for-grantedness in the assumption that frequent classical concert-goers do not need further information about the show, due to the absence of leaflets or introduction to the performance; the absence of visual stimuli and appealing staging techniques to improve the physical environment and provide an all-rounded mise-en-scene; the limited social interaction among concert-goers and between audience and performers, which prevents personal involvement and engagement in the performance.

Aside from the elitist aura that surrounds classical music and the negative preconceptions that may discourage youngsters, there is an actual misalignment between classical music organizations’ offerings and Millennials’ needs and priorities. Although practitioners are actually aware of the current situation and are starting to implement audience development policies, still ongoing and intense is the debate on whether or not classical music institutions should be held as ‘guardians of the tradition’ or reach compromises to open up to new audiences (Oakes, 2010; Graham, 2015).

However, Schlemmer and James (2011) open up to a critical consideration: will classical music concerts ever be able to attract a solid base of young audience, in spite of the efforts made in that direction?

### 2.4.2 Popular Music

The term *popular music* holds relatively recent origins: it first appeared in 1855 within the title of William Chappell’s work “Popular Music of the Olden Times”, but it only became of broad use between 1930s and 1940s (Shuker, 2016). Nowadays, it is commonly employed as comprehensive category of music genres like pop, rock, soul, reggae, dance music and rap (Oxford Dictionary). It can also be identified as “light music”, but, for study convenience, the term *popular* will be henceforth utilized.

The same intricacy encountered in defining classical music emerges when it comes to provide a univocal definition of popular music. In this instance, the study will be mostly drawn upon Shuker’s contribution (2016) to the thematic. He defines *popular music* as follows:
“It consists of a hybrid of musical traditions, styles and genres, and influences, with the only common element being that the music is characterized by a strong rhythmical component and generally, but not exclusively, relies on electronic amplification.” (Shuker, 2016, p. 5)

In addition to the previous formulation, which strictly refers to the musical specificities of the term, Shuker remarks the relevance of other aspects, just as important, to frame the concept more broadly. As a matter of fact, the word popular suggests the wide appeal and diffusion of the music genres underneath the umbrella category of popular music. Additionally, he sheds light on more socio-economic components, in terms of:

- *mass production*, favoured by the new digital devices that allow access anytime and anywhere;
- *commercialization*, which reflects the profit-driven activity of music labels, in tension with the artistic vocation of cultural goods; and
- *commodification*, with reference to standardized production and dissemination processes,

all aspects that unveil a phenomenon of complex nature, which cannot be grasped by a single precise definition.

Another aspect that is recurrently associated to popular music, especially when compared to classical music, is its ease of approach and fruition, which does not require previous formal training, therefore attracting a vast public. As a consequence, popular music does pervade individuals’ daily life, especially Millennials’.

The next paragraph provides a more in-depth investigation of the literature around the relationship between Generation Y and popular music.

**Audience Configuration**

Differently from classic music audience, popular concerts are attended by rather heterogeneous participants, coming from different age cohorts, social and professional status and cultural background. However, today’s music industry is strongly youth-oriented (Shuker, 2016) and strives to reach the target of Millennials through tailored marketing strategies aimed at appealing to their desires and needs. Indeed, Millennials differ from any previous youth generation, being animated by completely dissimilar values, which are mirrored by today’s popular music.

Whilst for young Baby Boomers and Xers music gave voice to their feeling of being detached from the dominating values and principles of their society, as well as to their desire of emancipation from their parents, Millennials embrace popular music in a completely renovated way. They re-discover a
new complicity with their family, together with a hopeful and positive attitude towards the society, factors which nurture their striving to fit in (Strauss & Howe, 2006).

As a matter of fact, concerts are occasions for collective music fruition, social interaction and identity re-affirmation, where participants find themselves surrounded by people with whom they share an emotionally moving experience, bonding with each other and feeling part of a community (Graham, 2015). Undoubtedly, the concert’s environment, in terms of venue and rituals – before, during and after the concert – is a key component to enable the social activity.

Linked to the social aspect of live popular music concerts is the active role of the attendees with respect to the performance. Indeed, there is a continuous interaction between artists and participants, which conveys a strong sense of belonging and closeness to the performer. This latter is acclaimed and worshiped as spokesperson of Millennials’ daily life. Young people, indeed, embrace music that speaks about their ordinary issues and situations and that re-affirms shared values and beliefs, narrated by someone like them, someone they feel represented by (Earl, 2001; Strauss & Howe, 2006; Kruger & Saayman, 2015). Moreover, Papinczak et al. (2015) underline the role of music as enhancer of youth well-being. Indeed, together with fostering social interaction, music boosts cognitive stimulation and intensifies emotions.

Given the aforementioned, popular music is highly value-imbued, as it is classical music, but in a completely different way, which results to be more appealing and attractive to Millennials, as it “fulfils their social, emotional and developmental needs” (Schwartz & Fouts, 2003).

In conclusion, the academic debate around live music consumption patterns among Millennials, although open, has offered solid pillars upon which building the present study. After few more notable remarks from scholars, the dissertation will dive into the more concrete part of the research, which includes a summary description of the Italian context and the illustration of the conducted field work.

### 2.5 Related Work

This last section briefly reviews the contributions brought by previous empirical research which addresses the subject under alternative perspectives, which have been useful to gain deeper insights for the present study and build up a more complete overview of the topic.

The first relevant contribution comes from the work of Heydari, Mohammadi and Rostami (2013), who investigate the relationship between sensation-seeking and music preference among college students. The concept of sensation-seeking was first introduced by Zuckerman (1979) to indicate a
type of human behaviour animated by the desire for new, challenging, sensorial and even risky experiences. Heydari et al. (2013), in applying this concept to students’ preferred type of music, found out that, not only sensation-seeking and favourite music genre are correlated among college students, but, above all, that there is a positive and significant relationship between low sensation-seeking and classical music, as well as between high sensation-seeking and pop music. The second research, conducted by Roose and Vander Stichele (2010), sheds light on the difference between public and private music consumption patterns. While the former is highly influenced by cultural capital, as well as by factors as familiarity with the concert rituals and with the other participants, the latter is subjected to less pressure and can encompass the consumption of a wider array of music genres compared to the types of concerts actually attended, revealing that “omnivoroussness in music consumption is especially situated in the private sphere” (Roose & Vander Stichele, 2010, p. 185).

2.6 Literature Summary

Given the multitude of the aforementioned academic contributions, the table below (Table 1) reiterates the main studies and theories encountered throughout this chapter, organized by author, topic and relevance for the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-topics</th>
<th>Main Authors</th>
<th>Relevance for the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Economy; Hedonic Consumption; Cultural-Creative Goods</td>
<td>Hirsch, 1972; Hirschman &amp; Holbrook, 1982; Pine &amp; Gilmore, 1998, 2000</td>
<td>To provide a background to the topic under investigation, by delineating the current socio-cultural and economic panorama in Western societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of Arts Participation: Traditional vs. Integrative Approach</td>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Jinet, 2001</td>
<td>To frame the different approaches to Arts’ Participation in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials: Values and Characteristics</td>
<td>Strauss &amp; Howe, 2006</td>
<td>To present the target segment investigated in the present study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubiquity of Music: Determinants of Music Taste</td>
<td>Bourdieu, 1984; Hyun &amp; Byun, 2016; Nowae, 2016</td>
<td>To introduce the main topic under investigation, by identifying the role of music in the contemporary world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Music: Background &amp; Audience</td>
<td>Hamann, 2005, 2011; Dobson &amp; Pitts, 2011; Graham, 2015; Clouse, 2016</td>
<td>To present the main theories and empirical studies behind live classical music consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Music: Background &amp; Audience</td>
<td>Chaney, 2012; Graham, 2015; Papineau, 2015; Shuker, 2016</td>
<td>To present the main theories and empirical studies behind live popular music consumption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Literature Review Summary, Personal Elaboration
3. Discussion of the Field

This chapter aims at contextualizing the present study through the delineation of the current trends in terms of concerts’ offerings and the assessment of the managerial prescriptions within the Italian context. The data hereafter presented rely primarily on two acknowledged sources, namely Istat – the Italian National Institute of Statistics (in Italian: *Istituto Nazionale di Statistica*) – and SIAE – the Italian Society of Authors and Publishers (in Italian: Società Italiana degli Autori ed Editori), two public research institutions that operate across the national territory.

3.1 The Italian Panorama and its Live Music Offerings

According to Istat’s last statistical annual report, in 2016 participation to cultural events has registered one of the highest picks within the period 1993-2016, considering that almost 67% of the population aged 6 and above have attended at least one not-in-house cultural activity (Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Population aged 6 and above that attended at least once a year one not-in-house cultural activity (2005-2016, percentage). Source: ISTAT, Multipurpose Survey on “Daily Life Aspects”](image)

More specifically, this positive trend can also be spotted in the growing participation in 2016, compared to the previous year, to cultural activities such as:
- museums and art galleries (from 29.9% to 31.1%),
- archaeological sites and monuments (from 23.6% to 24.9%),
- cinema (from 49.7% to 52.2%), and
- popular music concerts (from 19.3% to 20.8%).

The only type of cultural activity that registered a decline between 2015 and 2016, and thus remains the least attended form of entertainment, is classical music concerts’ participation (from 9.7% to 8.3%).

There is, however, another discouraging element to consider: while the 43% of the patrons of popular
music concerts are aged between 18 and 24, only the 9.8% of people aged between 18 and 34 are attending classical music concerts, being the majority of the patrons between 55 and 64 years of age. Nonetheless, it is interesting to notice that classical music concert-goers seem to be attending more often than popular music concert-goers: if 11% of the former participants attend more than 6 concerts a year, only 7% of the latter do so.

Moreover, another peculiar factor that comes out from SIAE’s 2015 annual report is that the average price for a popular music concert ticket is double the average price for a classical music concert ticket, €30.17 the former against €14.67 the latter. Therefore, witnessing that, despite the higher price, popular music concert-goers are almost three times more numerous than classical music concert-goers, it is reasonable to assume that the element of price plays a marginal role among the factors that primarily affect individuals’ decision to attend a concert.

SIAE’s report also provides useful data on the number of concerts performed throughout 2015, together with the total amount of participants, the audience expenditure and the turnover, as it is summarized in the table below (Table 2):

![Table 2. SIAE’s data on 2015 concerts. Source: SIAE’s 2015 Annual Report](image)

Data show that, whilst the number of shows does not vary significantly between the two music genres, the other indicators report considerably higher audience expenditure and asset turnover for Pop Music.

To complete the delineation of the Italian context for concert offerings, it is worth mentioning that cultural institutions dedicated to artistic creation and live entertainment (Istat, 2016), category which comprehends also concerts’ providers, account for the 20% of the total amount of cultural institutions operating on the Italian territory (namely more than 25.000 entities out of a total of around 131.000 institutions).

The next paragraph dives into the specificities of public intervention in terms of managerial and legislative principles that regulate the Italian music panorama, and its criticalities.
3.2 Modalities of Public Intervention within the Italian Cultural Field

The vast Italian cultural and artistic heritage is managed by a tailored ministry, called MiBACT (Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo – in English: Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism), set up in 1974 with the law 657 and in accordance with the already established principles for public intervention within the artistic fields, regulated by the “Corona Law” (law 800/67), formulated in 1967.

With specific regards to the live entertainment compartment, in 1985 MiBACT introduced the Fondo Unico per lo Spettacolo (literally the “Total Fund for Live Entertainment”, hereafter called FUS) to fund different categories of performing arts’ entities, such as opera houses, music institutions, dance activities, theatrical activities, circuses, art residencies and multidisciplinary projects.

Despite the initial decision to annually allocate € 406,229,000.00 for the triennium 2015-2017, the law 220 of 2016 prescribed the suppression of the section of cinematographic activities from the annual repartition of the fund starting from the following year, namely 2017. Therefore, at the present moment, FUS accounts for € 333,716,856.00 and is distributed as follows:

- 14 Opera Houses (in Italian: Fondazioni Lirico-Sinfoniche): 54.62% (€ 182,272,058.30);
- 297 Theatrical Activities: 20.28% (€ 67,664,568.57);
- 259 Music Institutions: 17.39% (€ 58,022,184.96);
- 137 Dance Activities: 3.48% (€ 11,604,436.99);
- 33 Multidisciplinary Projects: 1.75% (€ 5,845,868.14);
- 79 Circuses: 1.45% (€ 4,846,374.30);
- Art Residencies: 0.88% (€ 2,936,364.14).

Additionally:

- Observatory of Entertainment (in Italian: Osservatorio dello Spettacolo, institution dedicated to the monitoring of the sector through data collection, analysis and elaboration): 0.15% (€ 500,000.00);
- Committees and Commissions (ministry authorities designated for the elaboration of policies and the evaluation of quantity and quality standards): 0.01% (€ 25,000.00).

Since its allocation in 1985, FUS has been constantly cut in its amount, decreasing its initial value of more than 50% over the years, as shown in the Figure below (Figure 3).
What is interesting to notice is that more than 50% of the fund is allocated to a very small number of institutions, namely the 14 major opera houses, as recognition to their outstanding cultural and historic value, as well as support to the quality of their artistic programmes. According to the law 367 (1996), they are non-profit private foundations subjected to an innovative mixed financing system which aims to stimulate contributions from private sectors, on top of the public support. Moreover, as private entities, they are endowed with managerial tools which, if correctly employed, can ensure long-term sustainability.

However, these institutions are still struggling with the issues that concerned them before 1996: scarce ability to raise private funds, employment saturation – with more than 6000 people employed in the 14 entities –, high fixed costs (e.g. wages), regulations’ rigidity and strong presence of politics in the governance of each opera house, starting from the major of the city, who is in charge as president of the respective foundation, and the inclusion of one member from the government and one member from the Region in the Board of each foundation. On top of the situation is the €328 million debt accumulated over the past 10 years (Baratta & Banfi, 2013) by these institutions, which
is rather disconcerting and clearly calls for the need of a widespread willingness to change directed towards the actuation of sustainable policies of fundraising, together with the investment in the promotion and dissemination of their programmes in order to attract new targets of audience and achieve more financial autonomy.

After examining the main aspects of the Italian cultural system in its functioning and key aspects, the following part of the present study is dedicated to the specificities of the fieldwork. This latter is carried out, firstly, through the presentation of the theoretical framework, together with the formulation of the hypotheses that emerged from the insights offered by the literature. Afterwards, the dissertation is dedicated to the explanation of the methodology and the analysis, with consequent extrapolation of findings and results. Lastly, the discussion and the conclusion will wrap up the key points touched throughout the study, offer cues for future endeavours and practical implications, and – not least – formulate answers to the research questions.

4. Theoretical Framework

This chapter provides the presentation of the conceptual framework upon which the analysis is built, as well as the formulation of the hypotheses which will be tested later on through the quantitative research.

4.1 Research Approach: Deductive Reasoning

The present study draws upon a deductive research approach (Saunders et al., 2007), which entails several steps (Robson, 2002), detailed below:

a. Deduce hypotheses from relevant theory;

b. Indicate how to operatively measure such hypotheses;

c. Test the hypotheses;

d. Analyse the outcome;

e. If needed, modify the existing literature according to the findings and results obtained.

As the five phases suggest, the deductive approach – also known as hypothetical approach – consists into investigating existing theory and verifying whether it is applicable to a certain context or not and, hence, it is strictly linked to the scientific research, which moves from the general to the particular.

This approach is mostly endorsed in studies which can strongly rely on current literature, as this latter
constitutes the starting point to elaborate the hypotheses. Deduction also brings benefits in terms of both time consumption, as it does not require an excessive amount of time to accomplish the research, and risk avoidance, as it is configured as a very logic and rationalistic research approach (Sneider & Larner, 2009). Other favourable characteristics of the deductive approach are: reliability and objectivity, mainly brought by the deployment of quantitative tools to analyse data; clarity and straightforwardness, due to the reduction of complex data into simple elements, according to the reductionism principle; generalisability, as the results obtained from the examined sample can be considered as broadly valid (Saunders et al., 2007). Potential pitfalls of deductive reasoning, in turn, could be the high extent of abstraction in conducting the research, which may not be faithful in representing the reality, as well as the scarce amount of collected data, which can hinder the generalisability of the results (Dudovskiy, 2016).

The aforementioned 5 steps are henceforth addressed as follows:

(a) in Chapter 4 – Theoretical Framework
(b) (c) (d) in Chapter 5 – Methodology & Analysis
(e) in Chapter 6 & 7 – Discussion & Conclusion

4.2 Elaboration of the Theoretical Framework: the MAO Model

The theoretical framework represents an extremely relevant component for a critically-conducted study, as it constitutes the backbone and the guidance upon which any research is carried out. The conceptual model selected by the researcher for the present study is the Motivation - Ability - Opportunity Model, otherwise called MAO Model. This model has been widely employed by scholars for over 20 years in various fields within the discipline of consumer behaviour (McInnis & Jaworski, 1989, 1991; Ölander & Thøgersen, 1995; Rothschild, 1999; Wiggins, 2004; Stockmans, 2005; Wohlfeil & Whelan, 2006; Kemp & White, 2013). Despite the numerous ways in which MAO Model has been applied over the years, there is a common ground upon which all the studies are built up regardless of the context, namely the identification of motivation, ability and opportunity as the three major explanatory determinants of consumers’ behaviour.

Before the presentation of the actual model developed for the present research, it is worth mentioning the studies that – among the others – provided the basis to build up the final framework, explaining in which way they actually served as fundamental guidance and inspiration.
First conceptualization of MAO Model by McInnis and Jaworski (1989) to explain consumers’ information processing in reaction to advertisements.

McInnis and Jaworski (1989; 1991) found out that the effectiveness of the message communicated through ads fundamentally depends on consumers’ motivation, ability and opportunity to disclose and process the information contained in the ads. According to their conceptualization, motivation measures consumers’ willingness to process ads’ information, ability stands for individuals’ skilfulness in interpreting such information and opportunity indicates the extent to which environmental variables influence consumers’ information processing. The authors, hence, built up a framework to provide evidence of the relevant links between the three components and the communication outcomes. Consequently, their model is highly relevant to marketers, who can modify the executional cues contained in ads in order to intervene on and adjust consumers’ motivation, ability and opportunity to process brand information according to their specific market dictates.

The main contribution that McInnis and Jaworski bring to this study, besides being the first scholars to theorise the MAO Model, is the identification of three different categories as determinants of consumer’s behaviour, which should all be considered and, when possible, acted upon by practitioners for the elaboration of coherent and effective marketing strategies to attract and retain consumers. Consistently, the theoretical framework for the present study is built up on the three macro-categories of motivation, ability and opportunity as antecedents to Millennials’ decision to attend music concerts.


Recent literature shows evidence of the adoption of MAO Model within cultural and artistic fields with the aim of probing audience participation in its determinants and characteristics. This model actually makes a step forward when compared to other models previously adopted with the same purpose, first among the others, the RAND Model (McCarthy & Jinnet, 2001). This latter, despite well-conceptualized, fails in practice to fulfil its goal (Wiggins, 2004), as it claims that arts’ institutions should solely leverage on people’s perceptions of the art form when willing to convert them from disinclined to inclined to participate, while no attention is paid to practical factors (e.g. time, location, price of the performance), which are thought to only be relevant for the individuals who are already inclined to participate.

Wiggins (2004) claims that not only both categories of factors (perceptual and practical) play an
active role in determining people’s inclination to participate, but also underlines the importance of discriminating for different target segments. The author, therefore, drawing from consumer’s behaviour discipline, identifies the MAO Model as more appropriate than RAND to allow “practitioners not only to segment their audience based on their inclination to participate, but also to understand which barriers to participation are impacting on which segments, and what the impact of their marketing decisions will be on their entire audience” (Wiggins, 2004, p. 2).

The relevance of Wiggins’s contribution to the present study certainly lies in the application of MAO Model to the discipline of building arts’ participation. More specifically, it sheds light on the positive effects that such model can bring to arts’ practitioners whose main challenge is understanding actual and potential patrons’ needs, desires and barriers, in order to make their offerings appealing.

- Identification of the factors which shape motivation, ability and opportunity to participate by Stockmans (2005).

Stockmans (2005) also recognizes the applicability of MAO Model as useful framework to investigate arts’ participation and offers a clear definition of the three components. Additionally, he provides some examples of factors that determine individuals’ motivation, ability and opportunity to participate:

- **Motivation’s antecedents**: personal beliefs about the art form, *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984), past behaviour;
- **Ability’s antecedents**: financial resources, leisure time available, physical condition, mental resources in terms of education and intellectual competences;
- **Opportunity’s antecedents**: environmental barriers to participation, marketing mix of the cultural product.

The detailed exemplification offered by Stockmans is paramount in the definition of the final framework for the present study. As a matter of fact, it provides a guidance for the researcher to re-conduct all the different variables affecting Millennials’ decision to attend concerts extrapolated from the available literature to the three categories of motivation, ability and opportunity.

- Application of MAO Model by Kemp and White (2013) to conduct a US-based fieldwork aimed at disclosing the drivers behind audience participation to Jazz concerts.

The last source which significantly concurred to the implementation of the theoretical framework is given by the study of Kemp and White (2013), who applied MAO Model to investigate the
determinants and deterrents of audience (non-)participation to jazz concerts in New Orleans, the birthplace of jazz music, given some discouraging premises, such as declining attendance, ageing audience and lack of interest from locals. Through qualitative analysis, the authors unveiled the main barriers to audience engagement towards jazz music and, according to MAO Model, identified the key themes that mostly affected individuals’ willingness to participation, as emerged from the interviews conducted. The themes are summarized in the table below (Table 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement’s Components:</th>
<th>Component’s Determinants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Lack of interest, disconnection between jazz and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Perceived lack of education, perceived unaffordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Hard accessibility to jazz venues, lack of promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Main Themes (Kemp & White, 2013). Personal Elaboration

The research also sheds lights on the great impact that the concert experience has on individuals’ emotions, senses, intellect and behaviour, which the authors identify as the four components of the experience and, hence, the four elements that every music institution has to take into consideration when implementing policies of audience development.

Due to the fact that this last study and the present research share common ground not only in terms of framework, but also in terms of addressed themes (e.g. music, concerts’ attendance, declining audience), Kemp and White’s contribution provides the researcher with useful and inspiring insights concerning research design, methodology and data analysis.

Now it is time to introduce the conceptual framework elaborated for the present study, which resulted from the abovementioned literature (Figure 4).
The model pictures the three components of participation, motivation, ability and opportunity, each of which is determined by a set of variables. Each component is singularly elucidated in its meaning and academic ground in the following paragraphs, together with the formulation of the respective hypotheses.

4.3 Formulation of the Hypotheses

4.3.1 Motivation to Participate

*Motivation* can be defined as the desire to participate to a concert. Scholars show evidence of multiple factors of different nature which could be more or less influential on individuals’ motivation. Acknowledging and summing up different positions, the researcher identifies two macro-categories of variables as motivation’s antecedents: *socio-demographic* and *experiential variables*. According to the academic studies examined, the recurring themes which pertain to the socio-demographic sphere of factors presented as antecedents to Millennials’ motivation to attend a concert are:

- **City of Residence**. Concerts’ offerings are not uniformly distributed across the territory, as arts’ institutions are mainly concentrated in the bigger cities (Lewis, 1992; Kolb, 2001). As a consequence, Millennials who reside in central areas are more subjected to cultural proposals and, therefore, are more prone to attend concerts. Residing in peripheral areas or minor cities, indeed, implies less exposure and accessibility to culture and, hence, decreases individuals’ motivation to participate;

- **Age**. Numerous studies suggest how people’s willingness to attend a concert depends on their age. Young people, for instance, are predisposed to approach music genres which can meaningfully relate to their youth (Kruger & Saayman, 2015). Age also acts as a deterrent for young people who are discouraged to participate to concerts where the audience is much older than they are (Schlemmer & James, 2011). This factor, however, also contributes to change people’s music preferences: as a matter of fact, the process of growing old enacts a series of conditions, such as “the needs after order, peace, harmony and tradition” (Hamann, 2011, p. 122-123), that naturally lead to a raising predisposition towards the classical music genre and a stronger willingness to participate to this type of concerts;

- **Gender**. Studies provide evidence of a stronger female component among cultural activities’ patrons, both across different demographic cohorts (Turrini et al., 2012) and among Millennials. Indeed, Martin, Anderson and Adams (2012) found out that, while young girls are more prone to
dedicate their leisure time to arts, males mostly engage in sports’ activities during their spare time;

- **Relationship Status.** Research shows that being in a stable relationship is a positive incentive for individuals to attend more performances, as occasions to spend time with each other (Boorsma, 2006). However, the partner’s (dis)inclination to attend can significantly affect the other person. Indeed, Montoro-Pons and Cuadrado-García (2016) claim that in situations where the partner is not passionate about an activity, it directly impacts on the other person’s behaviour, reducing his or her motivation to participate;

- **Parental Status.** Having children is another factor which significantly influences individual’s motivation to be concert-goers. As a matter of fact, as parents, people tend to exclusively dedicate their own financial and time resources to take care of their children, resulting in a decreasing interest towards leisure activities, such as concerts (Kraaykamp & Van Eijck, 2005; Roose & Vander Stichele, 2010);

- **Habitus.** Recalling the definition offered by Bourdieu (1984), this factor refers to the specific patterns of values, norms, behaviours and customs that permeate a certain social context and, consequently, are perceived as socially-acceptable and personally adopted by the people living in such context. Hence, music fruition is also affected by the specificities of the socio-cultural context wherein people belong.

Therefore:

**H1. Socio-demographic variables affect Millennials’ motivation to participate to music concerts.**

Recent literature, however, sheds light on the importance of more psychological antecedents behind live music attendance belonging to the experiential sphere (Sloboda, Lamont & Greasley, 2009), which seems to preponderantly intervene in determining Millennials’ motivation to attend concerts:

- **Identity Re-Affirmation.** Music taste is an intangible manifestation of individuals’ identity (Belk, 2013) and is strictly linked to personality and self-expression (Saldana, 2016). Nowadays, Millennials strive to achieve personal growth, as well as self-actualization and affirmation within the society and, by taking part to a specific concert, youths state their affiliation and sense of belonging to a certain group, with its values and beliefs. Accordingly, attending live music performances is configured as a means of "development and reinforcement of individual and/or community identity" (Ballantyne, Ballantyne & Packer, 2014, p. 66);

- **Social Interaction.** The social component is a major aspect of concerts, which provide occasions to closely bond with family and friends, as well as meeting new people to share the experience
with (Ballantyne et al., 2014). The presence of close people is a key antecedent to Millennials’ participation to a certain performance and it becomes paramount in case of unfamiliar representations (Graham, 2015). Moreover, Dobson and Pitts (2011) claim that the social sphere of concerts is actually predominant in defining the degree of Millennials’ satisfaction following concerts. Consistently with this perspective, music acquires socially-constructed meanings and is considered as highly impactful for the creation of interpersonal relationships (Saldana, 2016);

- **Co-Creation.** Today’s consumers ask for transparency and involvement in organizations’ activities (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004), especially in the performing arts, where production and consumption happen simultaneously and the presence of the audience is an essential condition for live performances to actually take place (Chaney, 2012). With regards to the music industry, consumers play an increasingly active role, in both the processes of creation and dissemination of the cultural product (Anberrée, Aubouin, Coblence & Kletz, 2015). Studies also demonstrate how meaningful co-creation and user-generated content can be as boosts for cultural institutions (Boorsma, 2006; Hoyt & Sutton, 2016), which can benefit of people’s contributions and suggestions to build up an attractive and well-defined artistic proposition;

- **Emotion-Seeking.** Another major determinant to popular music concerts’ attendance is their enduring affective and emotive element (Graham, 2015). When it comes to creative industries, intrinsic rewards such as emotive arousal, hedonic pleasure and sensory stimulation, are those primarily sought by patrons (Ballantyne et al., 2014). In fact, “all segments [of audience] wish to be emotionally moved and affected by music” (Roose, 2008, p. 237), Millennials above all. Thus, the more emotion-evoking is the concert experience, the more motivated will Millennials be in willing to repeat such experience.

Therefore:

**H2. Experiential variables affect Millennials’ motivation to participate to music concerts.**

**4.3.2 Ability to Participate**

*Ability* stands for each person’s resources, tangible and intangible, which encourage or hinder concert participation. The main criticality of these factors is the fact that arts’ institutions are unable to directly intervene on them, as they strictly pertain to the personal sphere of each individual. Institutions can, however, create favourable conditions which may partially or totally overcome potential limitations. Below are the *personal resources* which mainly impact on people’s ability to participate, as emerged
from the literature:

- **Financial Resources.** Despite the unprecedented appeal of classical music genre (Mac Donald, 2010), concert halls, theatres and auditoriums struggle to sell tickets. As a matter of fact, today’s music consumption mainly happens through media, as it “costs more to attend a concert than to listen to music at home” (Chan & Goldthorpe, 2005). Financial means is a key factor in determining peoples’ (in)ability to attend live music concerts, especially considering the wide variety of cheaper forms of entertainment accessible today “that makes concert hall seats - expensive by comparison - difficult to fill” (Doublet, 2016, p. 2);

- **Time Resources.** Time is a scarce resource, especially when it comes to leisure time, namely the limited amount of time that people autonomously choose to dedicate to pleasurable activities, including to attend concerts. Given that “time constraints are assumed to be more pressing with regard to attending concerts than listening at home” (Roose & Vander Stichele, 2010, p. 188) and that concerts are rather time-consuming leisure activities, it may be hard to conciliate such events with individuals’ limited spare-time. Besides being scarce, leisure time is also very fragmented (McCarthy & Jinnet, 2001), making the choice on how to spend it highly selective;

- **Mental Resources.** This category refers to the intellectual resources gained through learning experiences and, above all, academic education. Data show an objective preponderance of highly educated patrons among cultural activities’ attendees (Van Eijck, 2001; NEA, 2015), suggesting that educational background primarily impacts on individuals’ inclination to participate. Studies also provide evidence of the fact that education can actually be determinant in understanding – and fully enjoying – cultivated art forms, such as classical music (Dobson et al., 2011; Clouse, 2016), which are by nature “associated with a higher degree of intellectual aptitude or achievement” (Polzella & Forbis, 2014, p. 109). The perception itself of not possessing enough knowledge about the art form is enough to discourage attendance (Kolb, 2000);

- **Past Experience and Behaviour.** Strictly linked to the previous factor is the personal background, in terms of past and present experiences linked to arts’ participation. Hamann (2005) claims that activities such as learning how to play an instrument, attending concerts during childhood and go to music classes, can relevantly influence later participation. In turn, if Millennials are not concert-goers at the present moment, it is extremely unlikely that they will be converted into ticketholders in the future, as present and future attendance is strongly dependent on past attendance habits (Graham, 2015). As a matter of fact, “as people advance in their years of life, there is a tendency of disconnecting from popular culture, stop following new trends and
Instead maintain old habits developed at an earlier stage of life” (Saldana, 2016, p. 8).

Therefore:

**H3. Personal resources affect Millennials’ ability to participate to music concerts.**

### 4.3.3 Opportunity to Participate

*Opportunity* is determined by all the external factors that impact on individuals’ decision to attend concerts. This category of factors includes, on the one side, the *environmental variables*, which are all the exogenous factors that may favour or hinder participation, independently from the institutions’ and individuals’ willingness:

- **Accessibility.** Concerts may lose their appeal due to factors such as dated ticket purchasing methods, unclear information or inconvenient transportation, which prevent people from participating (Rizkallah, 2009; Kemp & White, 2013). Despite being potentially interested in attending a concert, people often decide to dedicate their leisure time to activities which are more easily approachable, as they perceive a more favourable balance between the expected degree of satisfaction and the extent of sacrifice requested to dedicate to such activity (Pine & Gilmore, 2000);

- **Familiarity.** “Consumers [...] draw meaning from the service environments they visit” (Oakes & North, 2008, p. 63). When the joint combination of concert venue, atmosphere and audience conveys a sense of familiarity to the attendees, these latter, especially if first-time concert-goers, will be more prone and inclined to repeat the experience overtime (Dobson & Pitts, 2011). The aspect of familiarity is particularly determinant for Millennials, who, as previously mentioned, are especially moved and affected by environmental aspects of the musicscape, such as the location, but also smells or details, which transmit familiar vibes and significantly enhance their experience (Legeros, 2016);

- **Alternative Sources of Entertainment.** Today’s world offers a huge variety of forms of live entertainment, which not only differ for the nature of the activity but also for the method of fruition, that does not necessarily require the physical presence of the attendee (Montoro-Pons & Cuadrado-Garcia, 2016). Consequently, people are hit on a daily basis by countless alternatives, which negatively affect the opportunity to attend concerts. Therefore, it is up to music institutions to develop effective ways to catch the attention of Millennials among other entertainment providers (Kruger & Saayman, 2015).
Therefore:

**H4. Environmental variables affect Millennials’ opportunity to participate to music concerts.**

On the other side, concerts’ providers intervene on another set of factors, namely the *marketing mix* components (McCarthy, 1964), in order to favourably orient the decision of potential concert-goers:

- **Product.** This variable refers to the core activity of concerts, namely the live performance, but also to the collateral activities which complete and enrich the main offerings. Music institutions, especially if very traditional in their programming and service, tend to exclusively direct their efforts towards the very core of their activity, failing to grasp all the aspects surrounding the performance, ignoring the fact that “*concert-goers’ experiences are clearly influenced by more than just the music itself*” (Dobson & Pitts, 2011, p. 356). For example, as far as the main product is concerned, Millennials are especially deterred by the ‘church-like’ atmosphere of certain concerts, where they are not allowed to talk, applaud, leave the seat or drink during the performance (Legeros, 2016). Additionally, if paired up with the cross-selling of alternative activities (e.g. happy hour, dinner, talks, merchandising), concerts are more likely to attract disinclined individuals (Oakes, 2010);

- **Price.** Affordable ticket prices are definitely an appealing condition for Millennials, who are rather price-sensitive especially towards unfamiliar music experiences (Montoro-Pons & Cuadrado-Garcia, 2016). However, strategies of participation building do not prove their effectiveness through the mere lowering of ticket prices. Indeed, excessively inexpensive tickets may jeopardise people’s perception of the quality of the performance. Therefore, the subtle role of concerts’ providers should be to highlight the value for money behind the ticket price (Sciarelli & Tortorella, 2004): when perceiving an event as unmissable, people are less price-conscious and more willing to participate, regardless the price;

- **Place.** As already seen, the musicscape plays a major part in maximising attendee’s concert experience and takes on a preponderant role in the positive outcome of such experience (Graham, 2015), not only in terms of physical cues but also for the emotive reactions which a certain location stimulates in the participant (Oakes & North, 2008). Studies show that an effective way to attract young segments towards less popular music genres, is to break out of the physical constraints of the traditional concert venues, bringing music to unconventional places, which better match Millennials’ preferences (Schlemmer & James, 2011; Clouse, 2016);

- **Promotion.** This factor ties all the components of the marketing mix together, as all the aspects
of the concert experience (e.g. performance, collateral activities, venue, price, offers) have to be promoted. Nowadays, individuals are constantly subject to countless stimuli from the external environment. As a consequence, the elaboration of an effective targeted promotion of the artistic proposal is vital – yet challenging – for all the arts’ institutions in order to make their offerings pop up among the others. Research shows that dated, unappealing and/or unclear promotion is a major cause for Millennials’ scarce interest towards certain music genres, as they perceive not to be “part of the target market […] and that no concerted effort was being made to share information about […] events with them” (Kemp & White, 2013). Therefore, active, creative and engaging promotion strategies can make a significant difference in building audience participation, especially by making young people feel personally involved as co-creators (Legeros, 2016). Moreover, as Millennials are tech-savvies, the development of catchy, attractive and user-friendly web channels is paramount for concerts’ providers (Rizkallah, 2009; Turrini et al., 2012).

Therefore:

**H5. Marketing Mix variables affect Millennials’ opportunity to participate to music concerts.**

Numerous are the factors proven to be significant predecessors of arts’ participation, despite their different nature. In order to holistically investigate the antecedents of Millennials’ live music consumption in Italy, none of the factors have been ignored a priori in the formulation of the hypotheses. Hence, it pertains to the qualitative findings and quantitative results to confirm or confute the significance of the abovementioned variables, according to the specificities of the present study. For further comprehensibility, Figure 5 graphically shows the links between the conceptual framework and the aforementioned hypotheses:

---

![Figure 5. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses. Personal Elaboration](image-url)
5. Methodology and Analysis

This section constitutes a broad part of the dissertation, as methodology and analysis are jointly addressed. Careful attention is reserved to the presentation of the qualitative findings and quantitative results towards the end of the chapter.

5.1 Philosophy of Science

5.1.1 Research Paradigm

Up to now, the majority of the studies conducted around the topic of arts’ participation have been investigated under a positivistic paradigm, which entails “working with an observable social reality and that the end product of such research can be law-like generalisations similar to those produced by the physical and natural scientists” (Remenyi, Williams, Money & Swartz, 1998, p. 32). Such research paradigm draws upon a series of assumptions which provide foundation to the concept itself of positivism: objectivity of the approach, based on observable facts which lead to unconfutable outcomes; generalisability of the results – mainly quantitative – from the single case to the totality of the occurrences; structured methodology in undertaking the research, starting from the current theory, to elaborate and test hypotheses, in order to constitute newly improved theory; value-free perspective adopted by the researcher, who does not allow personal values and opinions to interfere and alter results (Saunders et al., 2007).

However, given the complexity of the subject matter, this study is undertaken under a post-positivistic type of research paradigm, which, on the one hand, embraces similar standpoints as the aforementioned, and, on the other hand, is epistemologically and ontologically more adaptable to the specificities of the present research: the critical realism (Dobson, 2002; Muijs, 2004; Saunders et al., 2007). Despite adopting scientific reasoning in approaching knowledge, critical realism admits error and fallibility of academic theory and research, following the claim that “our knowledge of reality is a result of social conditioning [...] and, thus, cannot be understood independently of the social actors involved in the knowledge derivation process” (Dobson, 2002). Despite acknowledging the unavoidably value-laden nature of research conduction, this position still aims at reaching objectivity, but here intended as the scholars’ critical questioning of each other’s work with the purpose of approaching the truth. Critical realists also endorse triangulation of different research methods as reliable way to holistically grasp an inherently complex subject matter in all of its aspects.

Given the aforementioned, critical realism is the research paradigm that best fits the specificities of the present study for two main reasons:
- The research does not only investigate objective factors, like age or educational level, but it also dives into a more perceptual and experiential dimension, made of subjective factors as identity re-affirmation and social interaction. Hence, both qualitative and quantitative research tools are relevant to be adopted.

- The researcher shares the same age cohort, nationality and, potentially, socio-cultural background with most of the research prospects. The component of social conditioning may, therefore, interfere and bias the study.

### 5.1.2 Research Design

The present research is articulated as explanatory study, as “the emphasis is on studying a situation or a problem in order to explain the relationships between variables” (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 140), which exactly mirrors the purpose of this study: given a certain configuration of today’s concert audiences in Italy, the research aims at identifying causal relationships between the explanatory variables presented in Chapter 4 and concert participation.

In order to carry out the study and answer properly to the research questions, a mixed-method research, which combines qualitative and quantitative analyses, results to be the most appropriate choice. As a matter of fact, the necessity to deploy both qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques arises from the specificities of the investigation. The advantages of method triangulation are essentially the complementarity of outcomes originated from different techniques and a broader and more complete study approach, as mixed methods allow for the consideration of multiple and diverse aspects of the topic (Saunders et al., 2007).

Qualitative and quantitative methods have been conducted in sequence: semi-structured interviews and focus group in the first place, and subsequently the survey. The rationale behind the deployment of the qualitative research before the quantitative lies in the fact that, despite literature around arts’ participation building and audience development is rather broad, there is shortage of academic literature regarding the Italian context. The qualitative phase, indeed, provides the researcher with significant insights from relevant prospects around themes not fully covered beforehand. In particular, the contributions originated from interviews and focus group are here fundamental to enrich the theory and aid the researcher in validating the formulated hypotheses. Qualitative data, above all, have been the basis upon which the quantitative research is built up. Hence, the second – quantitative – stream of data has been collected through an online questionnaire, which has the purpose of
broadening the insights gained by means of the qualitative research and test their generalisability on a larger sample of people, in order to get relevant outcomes applicable at a general level and to significantly add up to the existent theory.

One last remark concerns the timeframe within which the research has been carried out. Given the time constraints that characterise the present study, the approach adopted to conduct the investigation is *cross-sectional*, as it provides a snapshot of the phenomenon at a specific time (Saunders et al., 2007). In order to capture potential changes under a longitudinal perspective, further research will be needed. Below (Figure 6), the research design is visually explained.

5.2 Ethical Concerns

Before moving forward with the analysis, for the sake of transparency and clarity of the study, it is worth addressing the ethical matters in which this fieldwork may incur.

The first ethical issue may arise when considering the fact that the researcher shares the same age cohort and cultural background as the majority of the recipients of both the survey and the focus group. Hence, it could lead to a biased conduction of the study, which – although involuntarily – may be influenced by the researcher’s own experience and assumptions. This issue is acknowledged and addressed through the adoption of the critical realism paradigm.

Another sensible point refers to the compliance with confidentiality and privacy principles related to the usage of respondents’ personal data. All the participants to focus group, interviews and survey have been assured with discretion and purposeful usage of data for the sake of the research only. Specifically, survey respondents are granted full anonymity when filling out the questionnaire, while
focus groups and interviews’ informants have previously agreed on and signed an informed consent document (Appendix 3) about confidentiality terms and audio-recording process.

Lastly, the fact that focus group and interviews have been conducted in Italian and subsequently translated into English for research purposes may, to some extent, alter the original data. The research guarantees for the highest possible faithfulness during the translation process.

5.3 Qualitative Research

5.3.1 Data Collection

The qualitative strand of the research has been carried out through 3 semi-structured interviews and a focus group, the two most utilized qualitative research tools by scholars. These two techniques serve specific purposes within a study, especially when it comes to gaining understandings around themes and motives at a deeper level.

As defined by Kvale (1983), a qualitative research interview is “an interview, whose purpose is to gather descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee with respect to interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena” (p. 174). In other words, its aim is to unfold the ‘hows’ and the ‘whys’ underneath the interviewee’s point of view (King, 2004). Hence, it asks for (1) a skilled interviewer able to make the respondent feel at ease in speaking up his or her mind, (2) a loose structure in order to allow the conversation to freely flow and – consequently – (3) a prevalence of open questions, which enable the researcher to catch the interviewee’s point of view in a thorough and accurate way. Therefore, the main advantages of qualitative interviews are: flexibility, which allows for a multilayered interaction going beyond superficial meanings (Fylan, 2005); thematic enrichment, shading light on potentially relevant suggestions not previously considered by the researcher (Gill, Stewart, Treasure & Chadwick, 2008); credibility, given by face-to-face interaction, direct proximity and non-verbal language observation (Sewell, 1998). However, the qualitative interview technique presents the following drawbacks: time-consuming process; information overload or dearth, due to misconducted interviews; difficulty in reaching out to potential participants (King, 2004).

For the sake of this study, the format of semi-structured interviews has been adopted as qualitative tool. Together with allowing for a smooth and flowing conversation, it is built upon thematic categories which are mandatorily covered during the interview, as paramount topics for the research (Saunders et al., 2007). Semi-structured interviews are here deployed with the following aims:

- Overcome the scarcity of literature around the Italian music panorama, in its offerings and
regulations, through the contributions of practitioners;
- Investigate the way in which concert suppliers currently deal with Millennials;
- Gain insights around the potential barriers that may prevent Millennials from participating to concerts, according to the practitioners’ point of view.

The other qualitative tool used to add further significance to the primary data research is the focus group, defined as “a research technique that collects data through group interaction on a topic determined by the researcher” (Morgan, 1996, p. 130). The main strength of this method lies in the high degree of interactivity among the participants who, thanks to the fundamental guidance of a skilled moderator, are engaged in an active discussion around a topic and willing to share their opinions and points of view. In order to favour a fluent and free interaction, the group of participants can include from 4 to 12 individuals, according to the specificities of the subject matter under investigation (Saunders, 2007). It also has to be homogeneous in its composition, in order to allow everyone to feel at ease and encouraged to intervene and to collect meaningful insights around a topic of interest that all the participants know to some extent. Another element that concurs to the success of a focus group is the setting, which should be relaxed and informal, appropriate to create an inclusive atmosphere (Malhotra, Baalbaki & Bechwati, 2013). The aim of focus groups is, therefore, to raise interest in a topic and stimulate a discussion among participants, in order to broadly cover the subject and unveil multiple – at times, novel – perspectives around it.

However, as for the interviews, it can be time-consuming and its success largely depends on the moderator’s ability to conduct the discussion, to avoid off-topic interventions and to equally include all the participants. Another weak point of this technique is the potential rise of phenomena like group-thinking or conformism, given by the social pressure forces that – voluntarily or not – can emerge. Below are the purposes of the focus group conducted for the sake of this research:

- Discuss the music consumption habits of the participants;
- Unveil similarities and dissimilarities among the consumption patterns of the participants;
- Extrapolate the main themes to be investigated in the quantitative strand of the research through the online questionnaire;
- Confirm or review the theoretical framework.
5.3.2 Data Analysis Strategy

As already mentioned, the qualitative strand of the research is mainly aimed at providing for broader information about the Italian context due to the lack of current literature, as well as constituting the basis upon which the quantitative strand of the research is built up.

As far as the interviews’ are concerned, the drafts of the questions have been tailored to each interviewee (Appendix 1), but they all cover three main thematic categories, defined in advance:

| Accessibility of the Offerings | Divulgation of the Offerings | Millennials’ Response |

Another common feature is the distribution of the questions, starting from ice-breaking questions aimed to make the interviewee feel at ease, following by questions about more challenging or sensitive matters, to end up with questions with positive and hopeful undertones (King, 2004).

Regarding the focus group (Appendix 2), the guidelines used by the moderator follow a similar pattern to the interviews: an initial ice-breaking phase, with food and drinks, short presentations of the participants to get to know each other and broad questions about their relationship with music; a middle phase, in which participants feel comfortable to express their own opinions and point of view around trickier topics, facilitated by participative inputs, such as visual and written material, aimed to further stimulate interaction; a final phase, characterized by personal considerations about the current situation and hopeful thoughts towards the future.

Both the interviewees and the participants to the focus group have been contacted upon invitation sent via email. According to the document of agreement signed by the recipients (Appendix 3), the interviews and the focus group have been audio-recorded via mobile phone.

Qualitative data have been analysed following the paradigm of thematic analysis, one of the most frequently used analytic methods for qualitative research (Boyatzis, 1998). Specifically, the six-step-thematic analysis method elaborated by Braun and Clarke (2006) – first adopted within psychology, then broadly embraced across social and behavioural disciplines – provides the main guidelines to the qualitative analysis for the present study:

1. *Get familiar with the data.* Transcribe the audio material and read through it multiple times to underline common thematic patterns within and across the interviews.
2. *Generate codes.* Highlight interesting points and key passages throughout the transcription.
3. *Find themes.* Link the codes to macro-themes that can thoroughly include all the relevant excerpts of the interviews.
4. **Review themes.** Check the completeness of the extrapolated themes and produce a thematic map.

5. **Finalize themes.** Name the final themes.

6. **Report findings.** Through a careful selection, transcribe the main findings of the analysis.

Despite the flexibility and straightforwardness of this method, biases may arise given the potentially broad range of information that can be extrapolated by the data. However, it is not a drawback attributable to the method itself, but more to an improperly-conducted analysis (Braun & Clark, 2006).

5.3.3 **Data Sampling**

5.3.3.1 **Semi-structured Interviews**

The sampling method chosen to select the interviewees finds its rationale behind two assumptions, namely the high difficulty to involve expert practitioners in taking part to the research, and the vastness of the Italian music panorama in terms of concerts’ offerings. As a consequence, the contributions offered by the interviewees, despite disclosing precious insights that undoubtedly enrich the theory available, are unable to represent the totality of cases present in Italy.

Given the abovementioned, the selection of the interviewees has followed a *purposive sampling method*, a non-random sampling type which is applicable to fieldworks, exploratory research or, in general, “in cases of highly specific and difficult-to-reach population” (Lawrence Neuman, 2014, p. 273).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Location of the Interview</th>
<th>Duration of the Interview</th>
<th>Date of the Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruben Jais</td>
<td>Composition, Choir and Orchestra Conduction Diploma</td>
<td>Artistic and Executive Director of LaVerdi Orchestra in Milan</td>
<td>LaVerdi Orchestra, Milan</td>
<td>33:51 min</td>
<td>April 19th, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Cigni</td>
<td>Theatre, Dance, Acting</td>
<td>Opera Director, Artistic Director of Orizzonti Festival, Academic, Director of Monteverdi Conservatoire in Cremona</td>
<td>Claudio Monteverdi Conservatoire, Cremona</td>
<td>43:27 min</td>
<td>April 21st, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federico Perotti</td>
<td>Composition and Organum Diploma</td>
<td>Student, Composer, Choir Director, Organist</td>
<td>Saint Raimondo Church, Piacenza</td>
<td>40:29 min</td>
<td>April 23rd, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Interviewees*

Ruben Jais and Andrea Cigni are two affirmed practitioners, the former as the Artistic and Executive
Director of one of the 14 main Italian orchestras, LaVerdi, and the latter as an award-winning Opera Director. Whilst these two experts can provide significant perspectives on the supply side, Federico Perotti, as a 23-year-old aspirant musician and composer, can unveil an alternative point of view on the subject matter, being a Millennial himself.

5.3.3.2 Focus Group

The chosen participants to the focus group have been selected through a both *purposive* and *convenience sampling method*. As for the in-depth interviews, the sampling process is here non-random, guided by the purpose of gaining insights from Millennials’ about their music consumption habits. Therefore, it was essential for all the participants to be between 18 and 30 years of age and be more or less frequent concert-goers. It is, however, also a convenience sampling process, which entails the selection of “*cases that are easy to reach, convenient, or readily available*” (Lawrence Neuman, 2014, p. 248). This method, despite facilitating the research in terms of time and costs, presents the risk to incur in various biases, such as the low representability of the chosen sample. To partially overcome this limitation, participants cover different age categories, come from rather different background and hold different occupations. However, as already mentioned, a certain extent of homogeneity and uniformity among the participant is necessary to stimulate an open discussion, where everyone feels in the condition to freely express his or her own opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Passions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Inverardi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Management and Economics</td>
<td>Digital Marketing Manager</td>
<td>Music, Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federica Peroncini</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Management and Economics</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Music, Theatre, Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina Colombo</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Arts’ Management</td>
<td>Publisher Manager, Student</td>
<td>Music, Football, Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federica Cavalletti</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Arts’ Management</td>
<td>Digital Marketing Assistant, Student</td>
<td>Music, Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Spinello</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Environmental Psychology</td>
<td>Theatre Usher, Student, Musician</td>
<td>Music, Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arianna Riboni</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Arts’ Management</td>
<td>Milan’s Triennale Intern, Student</td>
<td>Music, Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia Dallavalle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nursing, Anthropology</td>
<td>Nurse, Student</td>
<td>Music, Yoga, Horse Riding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Focus Group Participants*
5.3.4 Findings

5.3.4.1 Semi-structured Interviews

The findings are hereafter narrated according to the pre-fixed macro-themes that underlie each interview.

Divulgation of the Offerings

- The first form of music divulgation that stems from all the interviews is achieved through **scholastic education**: despite some limited curricular and extracurricular activities, such as weekly music classes and occasional theatre attendance, music is scarcely studied in regular schools, as it holds a marginal role among the other subjects during primary and middle school and disappears during high school. “I think that music should be a high school subject, at least for gymnasiums, because it’s a huge part of the Italian cultural heritage. It’s during high school that young people really become passionate about things, thanks to the teachers that are able to transmit their own passion for a subject”, says Federico Perotti. However, the interviewees share positive and hopeful considerations about the changes that are being actuated within the scholastic system. As claimed by Ruben Jais, “thanks to the introduction of performing arts’ high schools, music has been taught and studied more compared to the years when I attended high school” and he is grateful to the Ministry of Culture for disseminating “the concept that culture holds a precious value also in economic terms”.

- The **cultural context** also represents a paramount vehicle of music divulgation: despite not all the Italian municipalities destine the same amount of investments on cultural dissemination, Andrea Cigni pictures the favourable and facilitating situation of the country, since “every city has got a theatre with a lyric season within the compass of 20 km”. The practitioners also highlight the breadth of the extra-seasonal programmes that the majority of the institutions are currently offering: summer festivals, events, educational activities in partnership with schools and universities, and social activities in hospital or prisons. However, Ruben Jais recognises the difficulty of converting the event-goers in actual concert-goers, claiming that “it is hard to be able to vehicle the public from the event to the regular season”.

- Music divulgation is also carried out by the **media**, such as radio, television, digital media and press. However, the informants agree on the evident disparity with which popular and classical music are disseminated and promoted: “today we have so many activities that we could engage
in, but for some reason classical music events are never considered as an option, even though maybe some people would be interested in attending a concert. The problem is that they are not even aware of the existence of classical music concerts, because promotion is inexistent, at least through the channels that young people access the most to find out what to do in their free time” (Federico Perotti). Despite the radio and television channels tailored to classical music’s broadcasting, the respondents acknowledge the necessity to promote classical music through more attractive and updated channels.

- The last element that arises across the three interviews is the worship of the image. In today’s world, the message of music is primarily conveyed by personas, namely famous artists, as Andrea Cigni claims: “[popular] artists are more visible and easily talked about by media, in a society where the cult of the image is paramount”. It is not by chance that the artists belonging to the classical music world who have been able to build up their persona through Millennials-friendly media, are now commercially successful and well-known also within the popular music world: some examples provided by the interviewees are Andrea Bocelli, David Garreth and Jean Rondeau. However, as Federico Perotti’s words suggest, “there’s always a prejudice within our field [classical music], that often talent doesn’t correspond to notoriety and fame. In my opinion, it’s not negative to build up a persona, especially if associated to talent. It would be a win-win game: some artists are worth to be known deeper than for the limited time they are onstage”.

**Accessibility of the Offerings**

- “Music is a language, and consequently it asks for some extent of acknowledgement of its grammar, semantic and vocabulary”, is Ruben Jais’s premise when asked about the degree of effort that Millennials are required to make in order to approach classical music. Whilst popular music hits people on a daily basis and for its simple structure and catchy themes is immediately and widely accessed and understood, classical music “as all the deeper cultural experiences, […] requires an effort” (Ruben Jais). However, this effort is not unilateral: on the one side, listeners have to dedicate extra attention and preparation to this music genre, on the other side, “it’s up to the public sphere and the cultural institutions […] to sustain their programmes, by supporting music as a school subject or promoting it on proper channels and media” (Andrea Cigni).

- Elitism is also a recurring theme across the interviews and is thought to hinder Millennials’ accessibility to classical music concerts. As a matter of fact, the perception of the elitist character of this art form is widespread among people, especially youth. Andrea Cigni, who brought several
of his operas abroad, claims that going to the opera in foreign countries is a “more playful and relaxing activity”, which finds deep appreciation among young people. He adds that “in Italy, going to the opera is more like a showcase and a social statement, rather than a cultural and entertaining activity”, still strictly associated to formality, sobriety and status.

- As previously mentioned, Andrea Cigni acknowledges the advantage of the presence of innumerable music institutions across the Italian territory, which undoubtedly increases the chances of accessibility. He also remarks the low monetary expenditure for those who decide to participate to a performance in a theatre or in a concert hall: “opera tickets for students cost between €8 and €15, […] there’s a big economic incentive for young people to participate”. However, all the interviewed practitioners identify the low affluence of young people, once again, as a problem of communication and dissemination of the events: youngsters “are unaware of the offers that classical institutions have for them, who could attend a concert for an extremely low price” (Federico Perotti).

- Another significant aspect extrapolated from the collected data regards the difference between popular and classical music accessibility in terms of time and space: “Classical music”, says Federico Perotti, “is not background music […]. It was created when the radio and the television didn’t exist. Today’s music, instead, is created to be listened through digital media and we hear it as background to everything we do, every day”. Ruben Jais and Andrea Cigni support the same claim, both suggesting that the two music genres are hardly comparable. They also add that, while light songs’ features (structure, themes, duration, rhythm) allow people to easily listen to such music from any device, anywhere, art forms such as opera or symphonic concerts, due to their inner characteristics, necessarily ask for dedicated time and space, as well as listeners’ full attention: “popular music follows the trends, classical music doesn’t: it remains faithful to the heritage and the memory of the past” (Andrea Cigni).

**Millennials’ Response**

- Ruben Jais and Andrea Cigni both underline the breadth of the classical music genre, whose art forms can be more or less appreciated by Millennials, according to their personal inclination. For instance, Andrea Cigni is satisfied in terms of age and gender diversity of the audience attending his operas, claiming that it is a rather appreciated art form also among youth, who is “not necessarily graduated”, he adds. He identifies the reasons behind youngsters’ positive attitude towards opera partly in the fact that schools are more and more taking children to the theatre,
partly in the multi-layered experience that opera is: “opera as a genre is also belonging to the theatrical sphere, so it can also satisfy the taste of those people that attend dance and prose performances” (Andrea Cigni). Conversely, Ruben Jais, whose institution is exclusively dedicated to symphonic music, is struggling more than his colleague in attracting and retaining young people. Aside from the performances that feature famous guests or well-known repertoire, the regular programme does not significantly appeal to youngsters. Even if “youth audience is more inclined to attend experimental concerts than the adults [i.e. XX and XXI centuries’ music]”, says Ruben Jais, being more familiar to their taste, contemporary music is deeply penalised within the symphonic season, which has to be oriented towards the loyal adult audience, who prefers the already popular late-romantic repertoire.

- Directly linked to the personal inclination towards certain music genres is the individuals’ own sensibility and taste, as emerged from the data. Andrea Cigni claims that choosing which cultural activities to attend “is a matter of personality, sensitivity, passion and taste: we’re all different and we like different things”. This perspective highlights the innate nature of people’s preferences, which are not necessarily an outcome of education or social homologation. Consequently, he believes that some people are simply more naturally inclined towards a genre that others: “[opera-goers] probably love to read, go to the cinema and listen to music, even light music, and then attend operas” (Andrea Cigni). Ruben Jais shares this assumption, claiming that “we all are inclined towards certain languages”, meaning that each individual prefers certain forms of entertainment over others.

- Another primary aspect that practitioners identify as determinant of Millennials’ response to concert offerings is familiarity. Ruben Jais claims that people in general feel reassured by what they already know and are hard to persuade to approach something that they do not know about or are not familiar with. Therefore, they generally tend to participate to events where they know what to expect from the experience. For instance, LaVerdi’s Film Programme, which entails the screening of cult films accompanied by live soundtracks played by the Orchestra, is extremely popular among young people, because they are very familiar and enthusiast about the films, but “only very few of them feel curious towards other genres and come for different types of events”, says Ruben Jais. Familiarity, therefore, partly explains the closeness between Millennials and popular music: its unlimited accessibility, straightforward structure and relatable themes offer them a reassuring experience.
The interviewees also agree on the pervasive presence of different external stimuli that affect Millennials’ decisions. Today’s technological endeavours have radically changed people’s way to access culture and, in the specific, music both in terms of fruition and promotion. As a consequence, “our ability to concentrate today, in the world of social networks, is very low and lasts few seconds. After 5 seconds we feel the need to find a different stimulus. Therefore, it is hard to follow a discourse that lasts one or two hours” (Ruben Jais). As previously mentioned, if light music is created to be digitally available, classical music is not: for instance, “opera is made of music, lyrics and above all, as the name ‘opera’ suggests [in Latin: work, activity], it’s made of action”, says Andrea Cigni, hence it has to be seen live. Another deterrent brought by the pervasiveness of stimuli is that classical music institutions’ offerings, which are hardly able to take advantage of Millennials-friendly channels of communication, are barely considered among the multitude of other stimuli, as testified by Federico Perotti’s emblematic words: “just consider that I’m passionate about classical music, it’s my job, and I constantly keep myself informed about the events. However, it often happens that I find out too late – or I don’t ever find out – about concerts that I would have loved to see, but there was absolutely no promotion about them”.

The table below summarises the main themes emerged from the qualitative data collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divulgation of the Offerings</th>
<th>Accessibility of the Offerings</th>
<th>Millennials’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Inclination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Context</td>
<td>Elitism</td>
<td>Sensibility and Taste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Affordable Price</td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship of the Image</td>
<td>Time and Space</td>
<td>External Stimuli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Summary of Qualitative Findings, Personal Elaboration

### 5.3.4.2 Focus Group

The findings on the focus group have been grouped into five main thematic areas, presented below.

**Music: Meaning and Genres, Private Listening and Live Music**

To start off the focus group, participants are asked some preliminary and introductory opinions about music, in terms of habitual fruition, genres and general first impressions about the topic. All the respondents, despite age and background differences, share the passion for music and show great interest towards the discussion from the start. When asked about the first three words they can think about when hearing the word “music”, the answers reveal recurring patterns:
- **Entertainment**: “I think that listening to music, whether at home or at a concert, is a fun activity. I enjoy it, no matter if the music is sad or happy”, says Arianna. Most participants bring up the same argument, namely the highly entertaining nature of music. This word is also connected to the term “joy”, mentioned by Sofia (“Joy for when I listen to the song I love, when I’m on the bus or the train and I’m wandering with my mind”). What comes out is the shared opinion that listening to music or attending a concert are positive and fun activities to be engaged in, which bring the listeners to a lighter – almost dreamy – dimension. Federica P. and Laura, however, underline also the relaxing nature of music: listening to music means for them dedicating time to themselves and turn off their minds from the matters related to work and daily life (“When I listen to music is one of those rare moments when I’m far from my daily issues”, Federica P.).

- **Emotion**: “Music is something fundamental in my life and is strongly connected to emotions”, says Valentina. Respondents highlight music’s ability to stimulate in them emotional reactions, making them think about a person, recall a memory (“Music reminds me of experiences: a song makes me think back to a person or a moment”, Laura), or daydreaming.

- **Concerts**: “When I think about music, first of all, I think about concerts”, adds Federica C. Most interviewees primarily connect music fruition to live music events, which represent a fundamental part of their music consumption habits. Concerts are seen as essential way to support their favourite artists, as well as unique experience to share with friends. As far as the music genres are concerned, all the participants claim to be passionate about different genres, mostly pop and rock. They adjust their music choices to a specific situation (“I hate cooking and to create the mood while I have to cook I play the “Napoli playlist” on YouTube”, Laura) or to their current mood (“If I’m depressed and I feel like crying, I listen to sad songs”, Laura). Lorenzo, Sofia and Valentina show great openness towards discovering new artists or music genres, according to their friends’ suggestions or the radio. However, barely anyone shows interest towards classical music, apart from limited occasions (“I’ve never been to a music hall but I would like to try. I’m a big fan of the New Year’s Eve Concert broadcasted on television every year”, Federica P.).

**Concert Venues: Familiarity and Social Interaction**

Concert venues is another key theme that arises from the focus group. The totality of the interviewees expresses major appreciation for the locations that allow for social interaction, both with the artist and with the people around them. The preferred size and type of venue are strictly related to the kind
of concert: be it a small and familiar bar for intimate concerts by indie musicians and young talents, or huge and overwhelming stadiums and arenas for international superstars. Sofia’s argument is particularly interesting, as it shows to which extent the venue can make a difference in the overall enjoyment of a concert: “I have an example of two concerts by the same artists, Mumford & Sons, in two different venues: at the Roman Arena in Verona and Alcatraz in Milan. The concert at the Arena was amazing, peaceful and relaxed with few hundreds of people, within a great open-air location. I was in first row, the place was small and familiar and they were singing without microphone, making advantage of the natural sound of the arena. Two years later I saw the same band at Alcatraz [a club in Milan]. They were still amazing, but the place was anonymous and the magic was gone”.

When asked to pick out some representative photos among the ones shown by the moderator, the festival photo and the arena photo (Appendix 2) resulted to be the most popular among the participants, who were attracted by crowded venues characterized by involving atmosphere, active audience participation and strong interaction between the crowd and the artist. Only Federica P. chose the photos of the auditorium and the opera house as the most representative for her: “I choose the photos of the theatre and the auditorium because it’s where I see myself more. I love to go to the theatre, not really for the opera though, I’ve seen it only once. I love to see other genres, like ballet or prose. The experience of a theatre is something incredible to me. Unfortunately, I’ve never been to an auditorium but I would love to attend a classical music concert someday”. Classical music venues are generally perceived as formal and exclusive, hence rather intimidating. However, when discussing about softening these characteristics, for example with a casual dress code or concerts in more popular locations (e.g. Piazza del Duomo, in Milan), Federica P., Arianna and Laura reckon that it would not be faithful or respectful to the tradition of the institutions and of the music genre itself (“I think it’s right to respect the venue. I don’t think we should be allowed to eat chips in the theatre or wear sweatpants”, Arianna; “It’s nice that this kind of events [orchestra playing in Piazza del Duomo] enables everyone to access a niche music genre. At the same time, however, they lose the aura of exclusivity that somehow attracts me”, Laura). This perspective mirrors the dilemma of classical music institutions (see Ch. 2) when compromising between the respect for the tradition and the looseness of existing canons (Oakes, 2010; Graham, 2015).

**Artist: Inspiration and Persona**

As far as the artist is concerned, two opposite trends emerge from the focus group, revealing different perspectives between the younger and the older participants.
Federica P., 27: “I’m passionate about music and I like to listen to every genre, but I’m not focalised on the artist”.

Laura, 28: “I agree. [...] sometimes I don’t even know who sings the song I’m listening to”. Conversely, the other participants, aged 23 and 24, show great interest in the artists, not only for their profession but also as personae (“To me, music means following the artists I like”, Sofia; “I’m obsessed with the artists I like: I know life and times of my favourite artists”, Lorenzo). Therefore, the personal component plays a fundamental part in supporting an artist: fans feel inspired by the artist’s endeavours and are willing to dive into the private sphere of his or her life. Some respondents are excited to share the story about their face-to-face encounters with their favourite singers and musicians, praising their behaviour and admiring their manners. Sofia, for instance, feels represented by the fan action photo (Appendix 2): “I took part of various fan actions: I feel part of something and it’s like making a gift to the artist I love and welcome him to our country”.

This deep attachment to the artist-persona, however, is proper of the popular music world. While resonating about few similar phenomena within the classical music panorama, everyone agrees on the fact that, despite the prejudice, building up a persona able to attract today’s generations could represent a good way to reduce the gap between classical music and Millennials, who would feel closer to the artists and more willing to engage in a different music genre (“When you start being known in that world [classical music], even if you deserve it, you are criticised for being too ‘pop’, which shouldn’t be a depreciative adjective”, Valentina).

**Company: Concerts as Bonding and Sharing Experiences**

“A concert is something that creates a bond between two people in a special way”, says Valentina. The totality of the informants primarily thinks about concerts as occasions for sharing unique moments not only with friends, but also with the entirety of concert-goers who share the same passion. Federica C. shares her experience at her idol’s concert: “During his concert, he was flying on the crowd and I burst into tears. I turned on the side and I saw the girl next to me who was crying exactly like me and I felt very close to her and part of the same family, even though we didn’t know each other. So I think that the bond that you create with other people is the best thing of a concert”. Popular music concerts are characterised by active involvement and familiar atmosphere and – according to the points of view presented by the respondents – the components of sharing, interaction and co-participation are fundamental to fully enjoy the concert. To some extent, they can represent the most important component (“I went to [...] a reggae concert: everyone was passionate about the genre,
except for me, but I loved the concert because I felt very involved by the people around me and the artist”, Laura).

As already mentioned, company does not only refer to friends, but also to the entirety of the concert attendees. As a matter of fact, Sofia and Valentina would not mind to attend a concert on their own, as they are sure to feel equally involved and close to the people around them, who share the same passion for the artist (“Even though I don’t know anyone, the environment is familiar, everyone likes the same artist and I still enjoy it”, Valentina).

Federica P., however, enjoys the experience of the theatre as well: “when I’m at the theatre, I love the atmosphere: it’s all dark and all everyone can see is what the performer is doing onstage”. In the case of classical music venues, the focus of the attendees is on the performance only, while the sense of familiarity and interaction with the other concert-goers is partially – if not totally – lost.

Classical Music: Accessibility, Formality, Education

As the majority of the focus group was focalised on popular music, which captured everyone’s interest, the last part of the discussion was directed by the moderator towards classical music. All the participants have listened to classical music at least once, but barely none of them felt connected to this world. However, there is general willingness to discover more about it and, if the opportunity comes, to attend a concert.

When asked about the reasons for this distance, several arguments are brought up and agreed upon:

- **Absence of Promotion**: “My spare time is limited and I decide what to do on the basis on the proposals that I see around or hear about. I don’t spend more time looking for other activities, I see what comes to me. And I never consider these kinds of events because I never know about them”, says Laura. Participants complain for the lack of promotion about classical music concerts on the channels they typically access to find out how to spend their leisure time (e.g. social media, radio, television). As a consequence, they are also unaware of the discounts they would get being under 30 years old, which would make such events more appealing and affordable.

Federica P.: “Under-30 subscriptions for 3 performances at Teatro alla Scala in Milan cost €75, meaning €25 per show, which is very cheap for la Scala”.
All: “Really?”
Sofia: “No one knows about this!”

- **Intimidating Formality**: respondents generally perceive classical music concerts as niche and elitist events uniquely attended by wealthy and educated people and mostly characterised by
excessive formality. The aura of exclusivity, however, brings a double-sided effect: on the one hand, it discourages young people from regularly attending performances, on the other hand, it stimulates their curiosity, which nonetheless is not strong enough to make them want to attend. Federica P. claims that the stereotypical image of the middle-aged, well-off audience given by the media is further detaching Millennials from the genre (“It’s also discouraging for the image we see of opera houses on television, with old people, very formally dressed, and politicians”).

- **Lack of Music Education**: despite believing that a high-level education is not a necessary requirement to enjoy a classical music concert, respondents complain about the scarce music education they received at school, as they recognize the fundamental heritage that music is in Italy and feel disappointed to not learn enough about it (“It’s sad that I don’t know anything about music from the past, especially because it’s a huge part of the Italian heritage”, Sofia). Thus, well-taught music at school is thought to be a primary way to put in contact children and young people to the classical music world. Valentina also claims that a deeper music education at school should go parallel with more opportunity to enjoy and practice live music out-of-school (“I think it’s very important to study music at school. But there should also be places out of school to encourage young people to approach and play music, like bars or pubs, where people can play instruments and practice”, Valentina).

As seen by the presented findings, the qualitative data collected through interviews and focus group touch all the 5 categories of variables (socio-demographic, experiential, personal, environmental and marketing mix) considered in the theoretical framework (see Ch. 4), which, consequently, does not require any modification. Therefore, the 5 hypotheses remain as well unmodified and are tested through the quantitative analysis presented below.

### 5.4 Quantitative Research

#### 5.4.1 Data Collection

The quantitative strand of the research has been carried out through the administration of an online questionnaire and the subsequent analysis of the so-obtained data through the IBM SPSS Statistics software (version 24, 2016).

The most straightforward definition of quantitative research is provided by Aliaga and Gunderson (2002), who describe it as “explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)”. According to the specificities of the
present study, the survey is constructed upon the basis of the hypotheses formulated in Chapter 5 and its results are aimed at answering the research questions which kick-started this work in the first place. Amongst the different survey research designs, questionnaire is the most widely adopted tool for its flexibility and as a time-and-cost efficient form of data collection (Muijs, 2004; Saunders et al., 2007). In particular, online-based questionnaires allow for direct data storage and, as a consequence, speed up the whole analysis process, being data immediately ready for statistics’ elaboration.

The 26-question questionnaire for the present study was set up through Qualtrics Survey software, a professional tool for survey design (Appendix 4). The link was administered via Social Media throughout the period between the 1st and the 16th of July, 2017, available both in English and Italian, according to the respondents’ preference. The average completion time was estimated as 6 minutes per questionnaire.

Part of the sample (around 60% of the respondents) was reached out following the convenience sampling method, which – as already mentioned – has the advantage of exploiting the researcher’s own resources and network, although suffering from several biases which might compromise the representability of the targeted population. However, the remaining 40% of the respondents have been indirectly reached out through word of mouth, which partially balances out the risk of low representability.

The questionnaire’s structure complies with standard survey design rules (Muijs, 2004): relatively brief, accomplishable in short time (displayed on Qualtrics through the progress bar); clear and simple structure and vocabulary, to avoid confusion; provided with neutral answers for more controversial topics; ice-breaking and engaging questions are placed at the beginning, while personal and sensible matters at the end, once the respondents are more involved; variegated choice of question format (dichotomous, multiple-choice, with image, bipolar-status, likert, rating scale…) to make the questionnaire less monotonous; placement of page breaks to thematically separate the questions.

Before spreading out the finalized version of the survey, three pilot questionnaires were administered to three selected recipients in order to test out the functionality, check for questions’ clarity and detect eventual typos.

5.4.2 Data Analysis Strategy

The analysis of the collected data is carried out through the deployment of several statistics techniques, with the purpose of unveiling significant results to answer the research questions. The main part of the analysis is constituted by fitting 5 multiple linear regression models, each one
assessing the existing association between the response or dependent variable (*Number of Concerts Attended in the Last 12 Months*) and a set of covariates or explanatory variables, each representing the 5 categories of factors hypothesised to affect concert participation (see Ch. 4). The second part of the analysis consists into running a binary logistic regression aimed at highlighting the factors that mostly lead to popular concerts’ participation compared to classical concerts’. Hence, the aim of the regressions is to test the predictability and the explicable of the response by means of a set of covariates and the results will highlight the factors that mostly affect Millennials’ concert consumption.

The analysis’ process unfolds into multiple steps:

1. **Data Screening**: assessment of the obtained variables through univariate and bivariate inferential analysis tools (frequency analysis, measures of central tendencies, chi-squares, crosstabs, charts) in order to obtain descriptive measures of the dataset.
2. **Selection of the Covariates**: choice of the relevant covariates to be used in the regressions, once that the necessary recodifications have been done.
3. **Model Fitting**: regression of the response on the covariates.
4. **Validation of the Assumptions**: verification of the compliance with the assumptions (Normality of the Distribution, No Correlation of the Error terms, No Multicollinearity, Homoscedasticity).
5. **Detection of Outliers, Influential Cases and Interactions**: detection of the cases which could compromise the interpretation of the model.
6. **Final Evaluation of the Model**: interpretation of the model on the basis of the previous considerations.

The results of the statistics – addressed in the following paragraph – will provide empirical evidence to confirm or reject the hypotheses.

### 5.4.3 Dataset Construction

After the closure of the survey, the data have been directly downloaded from Qualtrics to IBM SPSS Statistics in order to construct the dataset and proceed with the actual data analysis. To start off, the initial amount of responses, 137, was reduced to a final number of 103, due to the filtering-out of the invalid responses (e.g. missing answers, respondents who have never attended a concert, respondents whose age is below or above 30). To facilitate the analysis, a new worksheet only including valid cases was created and used henceforth.
The next preparatory step consisted in the selection of the relevant variables to the statistics, as well as their eventual re-codification and re-nomination to further improve the usability of the dataset. The 112 initial variables were decluttered into 88, as the deleted 24 variables were not considered as relevant for the research (e.g. longitude, latitude, IP address, duration in seconds). Moreover, it was necessary to adjust the dataset in order to be able to fit the regressions. As a matter of fact, as far as the linear regression models are concerned, numerical variables can directly be entered in the model as covariates, while categorical explanatory variables have to go through some transformation before fitting the model: binary variables were turned into dummies and multinomial variables were turned into set of dummies. Ordered variables, despite categorical, were left untouched as they adopt values which can be ranked and can be treated as numerical.

To finalize the construction, the measure of each variable (scale, nominal, ordinal) was modified where necessary.

Before moving on to the illustration of the results, a worthwhile remark is that the statistics are conducted on the basis of the confirmatory approach in terms of the choice of which covariates to use to fit the model: such approach encompasses the addition of all the explanatory variables to the model in one single step, backed up by relevant supportive theory.

## 5.4.4 Results

### Profile of the Respondents

Before diving into the specific analysis, descriptive statistics (frequencies and charts) are run in order to delineate the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, area of residence and educational level. The pie charts below provide a visual representation of the informants’ demographics.

As the Gender chart shows, informants are mostly females (77.67%), accounting for the three quarters of the total amount of respondents. To ensure a more equal analysis, it would be ideal to have about the same amount of female and male respondents. However, this result confirms that on average females are more prone to attend concerts (see Ch. 4).
As far as the age is concerned, respondents are for the most part between 22 and 24 years of age (67.96%). However, it is interesting to notice that informants overall cover all the age sub-groups.

The Area of Residence chart shows that the vast majority of the respondents are currently residing in the North of Italy (81.55%). Despite being asked about their city of residence, the researcher opted for the grouping of the single cities into geographic areas, in order to produce more straightforward and less dispersive results.

The general educational level of the respondents is quite high, considering that three quarters of them are graduated, and 50% of the total have a Master’s Degree or higher title. These results confirm the general trend according to which people with a higher educational background are generally more interested in the arts (see Ch. 2).
In order to obtain significant results which could answer the research questions, 5 multiple linear regressions and 1 binary logistic regression are fitted. The first technique will provide evidence of the factors that mostly influence Millennials’ live concert participation (Main Research Question), while the second technique will provide insights on the variables that lead to the attendance of popular music concerts compared to classical music concerts (Sub-questions 1 & 2).

**Multiple Linear Regression Models**

To conduct the first part of the quantitative analysis, 5 multiple linear regression models have been fitted, each one aiming at testing and verifying the 5 hypotheses formulated in Chapter 4. Thus, each model is regressed upon a different set of covariates, according to the different categories of factors which are hypothesised to be the antecedents of Millennials’ motivation, ability and opportunity to attend a concert. The response variable, in turn, is the same for each model (*Number of concerts attended in the last 12 months*). In other words, the models will highlight which variables mostly encourage or discourage concerts’ participation.

Each set of covariates is displayed in the Appendix (5).

**1st Regression: Socio-demographic Variables**

The initial model was fitted with 12 covariates. After acknowledging that the three dummies regarding the area of residency caused a serious problem of multicollinearity having VIF higher than 10, they were removed. After regressing the response on the remaining variables, 3 more variables (age, importance of being in an audience of the same age, importance of liking the music genre) have been removed due to their high insignificance. Hence, the final model contains 6 covariates.

The first considerations are made upon the model as whole, in terms of its validity and goodness-of-fit. Therefore, the Model Summary Table and the ANOVA Table are examined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summaryb</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.412²</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>1.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7, Model Summary*

Table 7 provides measures of goodness-of-fit. In particular, $R^2$ explains the portion of total variability explained by the model (17%), while the Adjusted $R^2$ (.118) is an index of comparison between models: the higher the index, the better the model. Therefore, it is useful to establish which of the 5 regression models better explains the response. Moreover, the Durbin-Watson value detects the
eventual correlation of the error terms, which, if present, would cause misjudgements about the model. Here it is not significantly below 2, so the assumption of no correlation of the error terms is met.

The ANOVA Table displays the composition of the total variability of the response variable, namely the sum of the variability explained by the model (Regression Sum of Squares) and the variability not explained by the model (Residual Sum of Squares). The other relevant feature is the F-statistics, which tests the significance of the covariates all together in explaining the response. Since the p-value (Sig.) is lower than 1% significance level ($\alpha=1\%$), it is possible to conclude that the model is valid and the totality of the covariates provides a significant explanation of the response.

Once established the validity of the model as a whole, it is time to verify the contribution provided by each single variable in explaining the response. To do that, the Coefficient Table is examined.

Taking a look at the T statistics, which tests the significance of the contribution of each variable, and at the p-value (Sig.), two variables out of 6 are proved to be significant in explaining alone the response variable, controlling for all the other covariates:

- $rel_{\text{background}}$, a recoded dummy which indicates the informants’ main relationship with music as passive listening while doing other activities (e.g. cleaning, driving, cooking, studying), significant at $\alpha=1\%$. The coefficient (Unstandardized B) tells the analyst that Millennials who mostly listen to music as a background to other activities are twice less likely to attend concerts.
than those who do not mainly listen to music as a background to other activities. This dummy also registers the highest Standardized Coefficient Beta in absolute value, which makes it the most impactful covariate among the others.

- *in_a_relationship*, a recoded dummy which indicates the relationship status of the respondents, significant at $\alpha=5\%$. According to the coefficient, the respondents who are in a stable relationship with a partner are over 100% more likely to attend more concerts than those who are not in a stable relationship.

As far as the compliance with the assumptions is concerned, having previously fixed multicollinearity issues and verified the non-correlation of the error terms, normality and homoscedasticity are yet to be addressed. The former is visually explained by a histogram chart and the Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual: the histogram displays a rather bell-shaped distribution, while the P-P Plot shows that the data points partly deviate from the straight line. Therefore, there is not enough evidence to confirm the hypothesis of Normal Distribution of the Standard Errors. The assumption of homoscedasticity, in turn, is validated as the scatter plots do not show any specific pattern, meaning that standardized residuals and predicted values are not correlated.

Lastly, according to the Casewise Diagnostics Table and Cook’s Distance, there is no evidence of outliers or influential cases.

### 2\textsuperscript{nd} Regression: Experiential Variables

The second model is fitted on 9 variables belonging to the experiential sphere. Despite a mild problem of multicollinearity regarding three variables (*rel_passion, Extent of agreement: I would spend more money to see the artist I prefer, Extent of agreement: I would travel to another city/country to see the artist I prefer*), whose Zero-order Correlations were slightly higher than the Partial and Part Correlations, the model was not modified, as the presence or the absence of those variables were not significantly affecting the result and compromising the validity of the statistics.

The Model Summary Table provides the Adjusted $R^2$ (.237) which, being higher than the one of the first model (.118), indicates Model 2 as more interpretative of the response variable. Overall the model explains 30.4% ($R^2$) of the variability of the response.

<p>| Model Summary\textsuperscript{b} |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.552\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>2.982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10. Model Summary*
Furthermore, as the Durbin-Watson value is around 2, it is possible to conclude that, according to the assumption of No Correlation of the Error terms, the model does not present any positive serial correlation.

As far as the F-statistics is concerned, the ANOVA Table confirms the validity of the model: the p-value (Sig.) is, indeed, lower than any conventional significance level and there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, which states that all the coefficients of the covariates are equal to 0. Consequently, the covariates taken together provide a significant explanation of the response variable.

As far as the single covariates are concerned, the Coefficients Table reports the contribution of each explanatory variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.913</td>
<td>3.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel_passion</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel_feelings</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel_dance</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Active engagement in the concert</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Be with friends/family</td>
<td>-.608</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Involving atmosphere</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of agreement: I would spend more money to see the artist I prefer</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of agreement: I would travel to another city/country to see the artist I prefer</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of agreement: I would never go to a concert alone, not even if I like the artist</td>
<td>-.901</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: How many concerts have you attended in the last 12 months?

As for Model 1, there are 2 covariates taken singularly which significantly impact on the response:
- **Degree of importance: Active engagement in the concert**, a scale variable which indicates the degree of importance of being actively engaged in a concert (being 1 = Not Important and 5 = Very Important), significant at a 5% significance level. According to the coefficient, the people who most strongly attribute importance to being actively engaged during the concert are 61.4% more likely to be frequent concert-goers.

- **Extent of agreement: I would never go to a concert alone, not even if I like the artist**, a scale variable which indicated the extent of agreement with a specific statement, namely the unwillingness to attend a concert alone (being 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree), where the p-value is lower than any significance level. The coefficient suggests that people who strongly disagree with the statement (therefore, considering the possibility to attend concerts alone) are 90% more likely to be frequent concert-goers. Additionally, it is the covariate that mostly impact on the response, according to Beta taken in absolute value.

Furthermore, the model presents one outlier case (Std. Residual = 3.065), which can be kept as long as it is not an influential case. In fact, no influential cases are found.

As for Model 1, there is not enough evidence in favour of the Normality assumption, as the data points partially deviate from the main line of the P-P Plot. As far as the homoscedasticity is concerned, the scatter plots show no evidence of particular patterns and, subsequently, meet the assumption.

### 3rd Regression: Personal Resources

The third model is constructed upon 18 covariates relating to the category of personal resources. Despite the variable *school_badlytaught* had a slightly higher VIF than the other covariates (4.764), it did not provide any significant consequence to the overall model in terms of multicollinearity, therefore it was not removed.

This model as a whole provides the highest explainability of the response compared to the other 4 models, with and Adjusted $R^2$ of 0.388. Consistently, more than 50% of the total variability of the response ($R^2$) is explained by the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.721$^a$</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13. Model Summary*

Again, there is enough evidence to confirm the assumption of No Correlation of the Error terms, as the Durbin-Watson value is around 2.
Taking a look at the ANOVA Table, it is possible to verify the validity of the overall model in providing a significant explanation of the response variable. As a matter of fact, being the p-value lower than any significance level, the null hypothesis of the F-test is rejected.

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>577.114</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.062</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>.009b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>534.581</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1111.694</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14. ANOVA Table*

When examining the contribution of each covariate taken singularly, the Coefficients Table highlights 3 covariates as significant to explain the response variable. Their p-values, indeed, provide enough empirical evidence to reject the null hypothesis of the T-test:

- **rel_job**, a dummy that indicates the relationship with music as a job, whose p-value is lower than any significance level. The extremely high coefficient shows that the people whose job deals with music are 8 times more likely to be frequent concert-goers than people whose job does not deal with music. Beta also suggests that this covariate exerts the highest impact on the response.
- *rel_instrument*, a dummy that identifies people relationship with music in terms of singing or playing an instrument, significant at $\alpha=5\%$. According to the coefficient, Millennials who sing or play an instrument are 3 times more likely to be frequent concert-goers than people who do not sing or play an instrument.

- *school_notaugt_interest*, a recorded dummy belonging to a group of dummies and measured against the reference category *school_notaugt_nointer*, significant at $\alpha=5\%$. It identifies the people who were interested in learning music at school, but did not receive any education, compared to the people who were not interested in learning music at school and, again, did not receive any education. Logically, among people who did not receive music education at school, those who would have been interested in studying music as a scholastic subject are 7 times more likely to attend concerts.

As for Model 1, neither influential cases nor outliers are found. Moreover, the Normality assumption is here respected, as both the P-P Plot and the Histogram of Standardized Residuals show evidence of a generally normal distribution. The Homoscedasticity assumption is here supported as well, with no evidence of any significant patterns of the scatter plots.

**4th Regression: Environmental Variables**

The fourth regression model is fitted on 11 covariates concerning the environmental category of variables. Unfortunately, the model results invalid, as the p-value is higher than any significance level and, hence, it is not possible to reject the null hypothesis of the F-statistics, as the ANOVA Table displays. Therefore, the covariates taken together do not provide a significant explanation of the response variable.

### ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>117.215</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.656</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.539b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1071.834</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1189.049</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16. ANOVA Table*

Despite several attempts to adjust the set of covariates by removing the most insignificant ones, none of the revisited models could provide better result. Consequently, as far as the collected data are concerned, there is no evidence that environmental variables actually impact on Millennials’ decision to attend live music concerts.
5th Regression: Marketing Mix Variables

The last model includes the 15 covariates which belong to the Marketing Mix realm. After removing the dummy info_personal, which caused multicollinearity issues and compromised the model’s goodness-of-fit, the final model was fitted on a set of 14 covariates.

The Model Summary shows the second best Adjusted R² when compared to the other 4 regressions (.312). The portion of the response’s variability explained by the model is significant as well (R² = 40.7%). Furthermore, the assumption of No Correlation of the Error terms is here met, being the Durbin-Watson index around 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>2.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 17. Model Summary*

As far as the ANOVA Table is concerned, the results show that the p-value is lower than any conventional significance level and, consequently, allows the analyst to reject the null hypothesis of the F-statistics. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that there is enough evidence to consider the overall model as valid and significant in explaining the response variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>483.672</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.548</td>
<td>4.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>705.377</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1189.049</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 18. ANOVA Table*

After analysing the significance of the set of covariates taken all together, it is necessary to dig into the contribution provided by each covariate in explaining the response. In this regard, the Coefficient Table of Model 5 shows that, following the T-statistics, 6 explanatory variables are able to significantly explain the response on their own, controlling for the other covariates:

- influence_media, a dummy variable which indicates media as the primary source for people to develop their taste for a certain genre of music, significant at α=5%. According to the coefficient, people whose love for a music genre finds its roots in media is 157% less likely to be frequent concert-goers than those not influenced by media.

- Degree of importance: eat and/or drink during the concert, which represents the extent to which being able to eat or drink during a concert is important for Millennials (being 1 = Not Important and 5 = Very Important), significant at a 5% significance level. The coefficient suggests that
people who do not consider eating or drinking during a concert as primarily important increase their attendance by 63% than people who do care about eating or drinking during concerts.

- **unfamiliarconcert_low_price**, being a dummy variable which indicates the willingness to attend a concert of an unfamiliar music genre if the ticket price is low, significant at $\alpha=5\%$. People who are willing to attend concerts, when affordable, despite not knowing the music genre, are twice more likely to be frequent concert-goers than those who are not willing to do the same.

- **info_websites**, dummy indicating websites as primary source of information about concerts, significant at a 5% significance level. People who primarily rely on websites as source of concerts information are 120% less likely to be frequent concert-goers.

- **info_press**, a dummy referring to press (magazines, newspapers) as main source of information about concerts, significant at $\alpha=1\%$. In this case, the very high coefficient shows that Millennials who get informed primarily through press materials are 8 times more likely to attend concerts than those who do not primarily rely on press. According to the absolute value of the Standardized Coefficient, it is also the covariate that mostly impact on the response.

- **info_tv_radio**, a dummy variable according to which television and radio are the primary source of concerts information, significant at a 5% significance level. Respondents who declared to rely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.766</td>
<td>2.424</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence_media</td>
<td>-1.571</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>-2.231</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Fair price</td>
<td>-0.702</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Time and duration of the concert</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Eat and/or drink during the concert</td>
<td>-0.631</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Lie in a specific venue</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfamiliarconcert_low_price</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfamiliarconcert_collateral_activities</td>
<td>-0.967</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfamiliarconcert_by_friends</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_billboards</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_websites</td>
<td>-1.270</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-2.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_friends</td>
<td>-1.158</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>-1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_press</td>
<td>8.676</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>2.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_tv_radio</td>
<td>-2.050</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>-2.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_SoMe</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: How many concerts have you attended in the last 12 months? Table 19. Coefficients Table*
primarily on radio and television are twice less likely to attend concerts than those who do not primarily rely on television and radio.

Furthermore, while the Homoscedasticity assumption is met by the model as the scatter plots do not show any case of heteroscedasticity, there is not enough evidence to support the Normality assumption. As a matter of fact, part of the data points deviates from the straight line of the P-P Plot and, additionally, the Histogram does not provide clear evidence of a bell-shaped distribution.

Lastly, according to Casewise Diagnostics and Cook’s Distant, Model 5 does not include any outlier or influential case.

**Binary Logistic Regression Model**

The second part of the analysis is aimed at identifying the relevant antecedents to live classical music consumption compared to live popular music consumption. Due to the fact that here the selected response variable is a binary categorical variable (most_attended_concert, where 0 is Classical Music and 1 is Popular Music), a binary logistic regression is required, as it assesses the relationship between a binary categorical variable taken as dependent variable and a set of covariates of any kind. In this case the valid answers are 85, as the remaining 18 (=103-85) indicate an equal amount of popular and classical music concerts attendance. Therefore, only the univocal answers have been considered as valid.

Starting from the same dataset used for the linear regressions, a preliminary bivariate inferential analysis, with crosstabs and chi-square, has been conducted in order to identify the relevant covariates to be used as explanatory variables.

Crosstabs between the binary response and each variable have been run and, according to the chi-squares, which test the null hypothesis of non-association between the two variables against the alternative hypothesis of association, 7 variables have been identified as relevantly associated to the response and, consequently, used as covariates for the binary logistic regression, as illustrated below.

Looking at the Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients it is possible to evaluate the model as a whole: being the p-value (Sig.) lower than any conventional significance level, the null hypothesis which
states that the model without any covariate is better than the model with all the covariates is rejected. In conclusion, all the covariates taken together provide a significant explanation to the response.

**Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>24.029</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>24.029</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 21. Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients*

The Model Summary, instead, provides descriptive measures of goodness-of-fit. In particular, Cox & Snell R Square and Nagelkerke R Square indicate the proportion of variation explained by the model, which is between 24.6% and 53.1%.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>-2 Log likelihood</th>
<th>Cox &amp; Snell R Square</th>
<th>Nagelkerke R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.005²</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 22. Model Summary*

The last step to assess the model as a whole is the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, which evaluates whether the model is good (null hypothesis) or bad (alternative hypothesis) at making predictions. The p-value is higher than any significance level, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected and there is enough empirical evidence to conclude that the model makes good predictions.

**Hosmer and Lemeshow Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 23. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test*

When it comes to evaluate the contribution of each single covariate, the Variables in the Equation Table has to be examined.

**Variables in the Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1α</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rel_job</td>
<td>-4.537</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>4.383</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel_instrument</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>2.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel_background</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>2.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence_media</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>2.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence_instrument</td>
<td>-2.487</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school_wellaught</td>
<td>-2.278</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>info_personal</td>
<td>-2.530</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.227</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>4.184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>68.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 24. Variables in the Equation*

Taking a look at the p-values, significant at α=5%, and at the highest Wald values, which denote the highest association between each covariate and the response, there is enough empirical evidence to
identify three covariates as significant in singularly explaining the response, controlling for the other covariates:

- **rel_job**, where $B (-4.537)$ is the change in the logarithm of the odds ratio of attending popular music concerts compared to classical concerts associated to primarily approaching music as a job. According to $\text{Exp}(B)$, the odds ratio for respondents whose job deals with music to attend more popular than classical music concerts decreases of $98.9\% \,(= \{(0.011-1)\}*100\%)$.

- **school_welltought**, where $B (-2.278)$ is the change in the logarithm of the odds ratio of attending popular music concerts compared to classical concerts associated with having received a good music education in school. Moreover, the odds ratio for respondents who are satisfied with their music education received at school to attend more popular than classical music concerts decreases of $89.8\% \,(= \{(0.102-1)\}*100\%)$.

- **info_personal**, where $B (-2.250)$ is the change in the logarithm of the odds ratio of attending popular music concerts compared to classical concerts associated with proactively searching for information about concerts. Here the odds ratio for respondents who personally search for music events to attend more popular than classical music concerts decreases of $89.5\% \,(= \{(0.105-1)\}*100\%)$.

Lastly, the Casewise List identifies 2 outliers which, being non-influential cases, do not have to be removed from the model.

6. **Discussion**

This part of the dissertation assesses the contributions that the study provides to both existing theory and field practitioners. Afterwards, the conclusive chapter will present the answers to the research questions, as well as final remarks and suggestions for future research.

6.1 **Implications for Theory**

This thesis has provided new insights which, to some extent, enrich the currently available body of knowledge around Millennials’ consumption of live music performances.

First and foremost, acknowledging the dearth of studies dedicated to the Italian context, the present research aims at raising themes and issues that, despite heated, have not been extensively covered yet. As a matter of fact, although international studies on music consumption among young people offer extremely interesting and useful arguments and constitute a solid basis upon which building up new research, they are hardly grasping the specificities of the Italian cultural panorama, which is undoubtedly complex, even controversial. For instance, factors like the deeply enrooted musical
tradition, the highly politicised cultural scene, the overwhelming number of musical institutions and the strongly conservative paying audience, are only few factors that testify the uniqueness of the Italian reality and that make elsewhere-applicable principles and solutions hardly fitting for the situation of the peninsula. Therefore, keeping such criticalities into consideration, the present research unveils interesting causes for reflection on the factors explaining Millennials’ live music consumption. Additionally, it holistically investigates the subject matter, as none of the variables emerged from the literature – despite their different nature – have been aprioristically excluded from the examination, while most existing studies mainly focus their attention on a single category of factors as explanatory antecedents of Millennials’ behaviour.

The second contribution of the thesis to current research refers to the segment under investigation, namely Millennials. Like every age cohort, Generation Y is well-identified and distinguishable in its peculiarities in terms of values, principles and aptitudes (Strauss & Howe, 2006). Consequently, the body of theory around Millennials generally portrays such generation as rather homogeneous. Such consideration is surely valid in absolute terms, however, this study shows inner streams that somehow differ from each other within the same cohort. As a matter of fact, the focus group’s findings provide clear evidence of dissimilar thoughts and approaches towards music consumption between the 23 and 24-year-old participants and the 28-year-old participants. Despite not causing major intra-generational distance, this observation may be valuable in strategic terms, as younger and older Millennials – at least, in Italy – may not be appealed by the same type of value proposition concerning concerts.

Lastly, the application of the MAO Model as conceptual framework of the research generates novel insights within the discipline of audience development. This model, originally elaborated to interpret consumers’ responses to advertisements (McInnis & Jaworski, 1989) and only in recent times applied to the arts’ field (Wiggins, 2004; Stockmans, 2005; Kemp & White, 2013), has not been extensively implemented within practical studies, being mostly treated from a theoretical point of view. Such shortage of fieldwork implied, as a consequence, the absence of univocal interpretations towards the components of motivation, ability and opportunity, as well as the variables supposed to influence such components. Therefore, the framework elaborated by the researcher is specifically tailored to the present study, acknowledging nonetheless the fluidity of the boundaries of the three components and of the variables which impact on them. Hence, different combinations of factors are encouraged for future research.
6.2 Implications for Practitioners

From the present study, besides the academic contributions, it is possible to derive interesting and useful insights for concerts’ providers, which can gain novel understandings on Millennials’ music consumption patterns to re-orient their value proposition.

By taking a look at the findings and results presented in Chapter 5, promotion, engagement and education are amongst the factors that emerge as highly explanatory of Millennials’ behaviour. First of all, informants are very affected and stimulated by the promotional cues around them. However, as they are mostly passively hit by promotion, it is up to concerts’ institutions to make their offerings emerge among the others in a valuable and catchy way. In order to make Millennials feel directly addressed and primary recipients to their offerings, these latter should be marketed through sensory cues, languages, codes and channels that not only are understandable by such segment, but are above all pleasing and curiosity-arousing. For instance, designing updated and appealing websites and – more importantly – being daily active on social media platforms with interesting contents, are the first and necessary steps for practitioners to take in order to set up an effective, youth-friendly promotion of their music programmes.

Secondly, concert participation among Millennials is significantly enhanced by the extent of engagement of the activity, supporting the literature on youngsters’ desire for co-creation and all-rounded involvement in the creative experience (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Anberrée et al., 2015). Consequently, practitioners should highlight these aspects of the concert’s experience. It goes without saying that some music halls (e.g. offering classical music concerts) struggle more than others to make such aspects pop up in their concerts. However, it is superficial to merely consider elements like freedom to applause, singing along, drinking during the concert or recording the performance on mobile phones, as engagement enhancers. As a matter of fact, concerts should be considered in their entirety: hence, adding up new attractive visual elements to the venue, unexpectedly surprising the audience during the performance, customising pre- and post-show customer service or providing information which kindles people’s interest, are only few of the different ways to convey the same engagement-stimulating effect to the experience.

Education is another preponderant factors emerged from both qualitative and quantitative research. The majority of the informants shows interest and curiosity about music studies but complains about the scarce – or absent – music teaching during the school years. Since the binary logistic model suggests that Millennials who received a good scholastic education in music and learned how to play
an instrument during childhood are frequent attendees of classical music concerts, it is possible to deduce that music education received during childhood and adolescence plays a major part in explaining Millennials’ concert attendance. Despite most music institutions do offer educational programmes, the scholastic system should implement music studies as well, to enable the vast majority of children to approach such discipline. In this regard, the interviewed practitioners, Andrea Cigni and Ruben Jais, are positive towards the recent improvements in the scholastic system promoted at governmental level, improvements which hopefully will be beneficial for and appreciated by younger demographic cohorts (i.e. born in the 2000s).

Another interesting outcome of the research refers to the dilemma faced by traditional concert halls: either staying true to their music heritage or loosening up the canons of the traditions (Oakes, 2010; Graham, 2015). Focus group’s participants, although recognising the rigidity and conservativeness of most classical music institutions, find aspects as dress-code formality and behavioural sobriety somewhat intriguing and exclusive, as well as authentic and genuine part of the Italian heritage and, therefore, do not wish for them to disappear.

A strong musical tradition should not be seen as a limit, nor should cultural experimentation be seen as inauthentic and treacherous towards the heritage of the past. Therefore, instead of perceiving tradition and innovation as two mutually-exclusive pursuits, practitioners should promote their musical offerings as the harmonious integration of the two. After all, today’s tradition was yesterday’s innovation, which makes them two sides of the same coin.

One last meaningful consideration concerns the role of government in the artistic field. From the interviews with practitioners, shared concerns emerge towards the prescriptions that regulate the performing arts in Italy. As a matter of fact, the sector, besides being highly politicized (see Ch. 3), is regulated by a 50-year-old normative (law 800/67) which, despite numerous modifications over the years, does not fully mirror and relate to the contemporary artistic panorama and somehow inhibits its potential. This subject matter is surely delicate and not directly linked to the purpose of the present research, but it is worth acknowledging. It also constitutes an interesting input for future research.

7. Conclusions

7.1 Answers to the Research Questions

*RQ: Which are the drivers behind Millennials’ live music consumption choices within the Italian context?*

Following the conceptual framework adopted, five different categories of variables have been taken
into consideration as relevant antecedents of Millennials’ concert attendance decisions, consistently with the main academic contributions extrapolated from the existing body of knowledge around audience development and consumer behaviour towards performing arts. Accordingly, 5 hypotheses have been formulated (see Ch. 4) and tested through the quantitative analysis of the collected data: specifically, a regression model has been run for each hypothesis (see Ch. 5).

Results reveal that 4 out 5 sets of variables – namely socio-demographic, experiential, personal and marketing mix – provide a valid explanation of Millennials’ participation to live music performances. Consequently, it is possible to confirm the following hypotheses: H1, H2, H3, H5. In turn, the set of environmental variables is not proved to significantly impact on concerts’ participation. Therefore, H4 is rejected.

The table below graphically represents the answer to the main Research Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Set of Variables</th>
<th>Most Impactful Variable</th>
<th>Impact on…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Socio-Demographic</td>
<td>Habitus</td>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Co-Creation</td>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Past Experience &amp; Behaviour</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Marketing Mix</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>OPPORTUNITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Factors affecting Millennials’ Concert Attendance, Personal Elaboration

Sub-Q. 1: Which drivers mostly impact on classical music concerts’ participation?

Sub-Q. 2: Which drivers mostly impact on popular music concerts’ participation?

The two sub-questions have been simultaneously addressed and analysed through a binary logistic model, built upon the same set of covariates used for the linear regression, here jointly considered. However, it is necessary to interpret the results with caution, because preliminary inferential statistics revealed low association between the response and most of the independent variables, which, as a consequence, have been excluded from the binary logistic regression. As it may be a consequence of the small amount of collected responses, analyses run on larger samples may open up to different scenarios.

Taking a look at the results (Ch. 5), the drivers that mostly impact on classical music concerts’ participation (Sub-Q. 1) belong to the realm of the personal resources and, therefore, significantly affect the behavioural sphere of ability to participate. Specifically, respondents (1) whose job deals
with music, (2) who received a good music education in school and (3), instead of being passively hit by promotion, proactively search for information about concerts, attend considerably more classical music concerts rather than popular music concerts.

Conversely, the model, although valid when considering the joint explanatory contribution of the covariates, fails in identifying the specific drivers behind popular music concerts’ participation (Sub-Q. 2), thus preventing the researcher from providing a univocal answer to the second sub-question. This issue, still unanswered at the present moment, pushes and stimulates the researcher to engage in further investigation.

### 7.2 Final Remarks and Future Endeavours

The present study has taken the first steps towards an extremely complex and multifaceted issue which is nowadays concerning the Italian cultural panorama, yet far from being unfolded in its entirety. By addressing Millennials’ behaviour with respect to live music consumption, this research has risen awareness on several aspects which strongly impact on their consumption patterns and, consequently, have to be acknowledged by music institutions willing to attract and retain younger segments of audience. Consistently, an interesting follow-up research to the present study would be, for instance, to carry out a longitudinal analysis of Millennials’ consumer behaviour, in order to investigate whether or not its determinants would change over multiple years. Furthermore, reaching out to a larger sample of informants would be ideal to obtain more faithful and generalizable results.

However, the same topic can be addressed under alternative perspectives which might unveil novel outcomes. One example would be to discriminate among the different music genres underneath the macro-genres of classical and popular music, since some sub-genres may be more appealing than others, as this study has already mentioned. Alternatively, it could be interesting to apply a different conceptual framework other than MAO Model to the same issue, to discover new combinations of factors as behaviour’s antecedents. Lastly, a deeper analysis of the concert supply side – namely, private and public concert providers –, in its strengths and weaknesses, can be extremely useful to shed light on the potential barriers which act as deterrents to Millennials’ participation and, therefore, must be teared down.

To conclude, this thesis has constituted an enriching and stimulating work to carry out. Despite the limitations encountered and the yet-unanswered questions, the researcher is satisfied with the outcomes accomplished and, being deeply passionate about the topic, is willing to personally carry on with the investigation in the future.
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Appendix 1. Semi-structured Interviews

1. **RUBEN JAIS**
   
   Artistic and Executive Director of LaVerdi Orchestra in Milan

The purpose of my research is investigating the drivers of Millennials’ behaviour with respect to concerts’ participation. Therefore, I think it could be also useful to have the point of view of someone that works in the field and really has got a clear idea of the current audience situation. What is your perception about it?

It’s a very complex situation, very different from how it was 10 years ago. Indeed, until 10 years ago we had a solid number of attendees coming from subscriptions, which gave us the possibility to create a heterogeneous programme every year, which included both pieces from the tradition that most public like and some experimentation. Then the economic crisis that hit our country for sure pushed for a reduction of the investments on the subscriptions: families and individuals now prefer to choose the performance they like instead of making an investment in a subscription for the entire season of a certain institution. This means that objectively the programme must be more oriented towards the audience’s taste and less to the freedom of proposing something new or different. Also because normally the public is intellectually “lazy” and prefers to participate to something that is already known rather than experimenting novelty, therefore it gets harder to propose new things. The youth segment is undoubtedly the most complex to reach, mostly because in Italy it doesn’t exist a real musical education at school, therefore the language that young people can perceive musically speaking is in general elementary, it’s what can be easily approached. A bit more complex language like the one of the classical or cultivated music is scarier. We do a lot of educational projects and activities with all age segments: the concert-lessons for the schools, ad hoc concerts from kindergarten to university, themed activities for high schools. This is one of the ways we adopt to attract younger people and put them in contact with this kind of music. We also organize conferences that prepare to listen to concerts, or activities in hospitals for hospitalised youngsters. We then set up concerts in universities, like Iulm, Bicocca or Statale as a way to appeal to young adults. However, the cultural gap is important as there is no real preparation. Usually youth audience is stimulated by famous artists: for example, when we hosted the Turkish artist Fazil Sai, composer, jazz musician, Mozart executor, the auditorium was filled up with young people, which are attracted by the persona. But also Mozart concerts attract younger people, because they are very popular. What I can say is that youth audience is more inclined to attend experimental concerts than the adults, namely XX and XXI centuries’ music, especially easily approachable music, less avant-gardist. While adult concert-goers love what they already know, like the late-romantic repertoire. If we cultural institutions had a clear solution on how to attract young people, we would be a lot happier, but it’s a diffused problem, especially in Italy. We do a lot of divulgation activities towards people, like music history classes or music reading, or the Off-key Choir. This last activity is very popular and currently accounts for more than 500 subscribers, considering that we started with 50. Participants are between 40 and 70 years old and feel the need for a musical education and they want to be main actors by singing. This demonstrates that the problem is originated by a lack of a solid scholastic music education.

While it’s very easy to listen to popular music on the radio, you are saying that we need a bit more preparation to enjoy classical music. For example, I notice that my peers interested in classical music, often have some relatives being musicians, or can play an instrument or go to dance classes for example. Do you think that to enjoy classical music concerts people have to approach this music genre before?
Music is a language, and consequently it asks for some extent of acknowledgement of its grammar, semantic and vocabulary. Everyone can read “Mickey Mouse”, but if we want to read “The man without qualities” by Musil we need to put more effort. It’s also true that those people holding a solid cultural education don’t find enjoyment and satisfaction in always listening to light songs and ask for deeper or more challenging stimuli that cultivated music can offer. We, as institutions, can provide assistance in offering musical knowledge with our educational activities, but we cannot substitute what the school is doing. Lately thanks to the introduction of performing arts’ high schools, music has been taught and studied more compared to the years when I attended high school, where classical music — even though I attended gymnasium, which was considered as the major provider of culture — was inexistent. I had to study music privately and go to the music conservatory.

It was the same when I went to high school. I only studied music during primary and middle school, but it was only one hour a week. Why is music considered as a non-relevant subject?

These are choices that are made in a society primarily funded on economics and finance principles, where it’s hard to measure the impact of culture. I think, though, that there has been a positive turning point lately because thanks to our minister of culture it’s becoming widespread the concept that culture holds a precious value also in economic terms and it’s necessary to develop the right tools in order to allow this good to be implemented and accessible to the community. Therefore, I hope that there will be the chance to increment the educational approach to music as well.

I agree, and especially in Italy with the enormous musical heritage we have. It’s strange that culture wasn’t considered as a tool for our economic relaunch from the start.

Yes, unfortunately, but I think that now the government is starting to follow the right path with the MiBACT’s investments towards museums and cultural travels for tourists. Therefore, I hope that we will proceed on this path. The reason why we arrived to the current situation in music is that around 1930-1940, with the philosophical approaches of philosophers like Adorno claiming that an art piece to be a work of art had to be somehow hard to understand by the general public, and this perspective put a strong distance between music and people. Composers started writing incomprehensible music not only to their contemporaries but also to the future generations. This is undoubtedly a reason for the deep distance that was created between cultivated music and public. From the Seventies, a new stream was born, the neo-romantics, in extreme opposition to the previous approach, in order to try to make people feel close to music again, but with scarce results. Therefore, the subject matter about how to attract and retain people remains open. For example, I am dedicated to Baroque music and I see that lately this genre has been able to communicate a strong message to our public, thanks to its clear structures which are immediately perceived and understood also by the less musically educated spectators, therefore it’s a music that facilitates the relationship with the audience.

It’s commonly perceived that classical music is an elitist genre, holding an aura of exclusivity. Is this only a prejudice?

As all the deeper cultural experiences, it requires an effort. It’s not a matter of exclusivity, but it’s a vast world, going from the Italian opera to Mahler’s symphonies, from Stockhausen to Beethoven. If the communicative skills of an opera by Verdi is very direct, this doesn’t happen as easily with Mahler, or an opera by Puccini or a structuralism opera. It goes without saying that every kind of audience has to find its way of direct communication. I also prefer certain music genres and authors because they are closer to my personal musical and literary taste: I hardly read Proust, while I enjoyed reading Musil. We all are inclined towards certain languages. For what concerns elitism, I think that mass culture is of course very positive, because it enhanced the average cultural level with respect to the post-war period. However, it means that we need to stimulate the progress over the years. I think that such an approach would bring more satisfaction, but it’s not easy. Our ability to
concentrate today, in the world of social networks, is very low and lasts few seconds. After 5 seconds we feel the need to find a different stimulus. Therefore, it is hard to follow a discourse that lasts one or two hours.

While popular music is accessible everywhere at any time, does classical music need a specific time and place to be accessed?

There are television and radio channels that broadcast classical music, even successfully, and follow musical acculturation. There are amazing channels in France and Germany that propose very different activities, such as opera, baroque, contemporary, symphonic, chamber music, and they give people the possibility to access and approach all these experiences and it’s very helpful. For example, the harpsicord has always been considered a boring instrument, now it became super popular in France thanks to Jean Rondeau, a young harpsichordist that is now a superstar. Everyone wants him and look for him also on popular television channels. He’s immersed in the contemporaneity and managed to reach out to people in a new way. Therefore, it is surely important to find out new ways to vehicle music and concert activities. We cannot offer the same product as in the Sixties!

So you’re saying that it’s also important to make a step towards the audience.

Yes, it’s important to allow people to access the tools to learn about this world and it’s necessary to find ways to vehicle the message that are tailored to today’s world. So be it the harpsichordist that plays bare-footed!

Related to the topic of the persona, I can also think about other phenomena of crossovers between classical and popular world, who in different ways, managed to be known by most people: Pavarotti, Bocelli and Il Volo. What do you think about these phenomena?

Pavarotti was the best tenor of the past century and had the ability to communicate easily his way of doing opera through his voice. Also, keep in mind that opera has a scenic-theatrical part that symphonic music doesn’t have and has an ability to communicate which is much more direct and intuitive for the public. Bocelli belongs to another era, and has been able to build his persona through his talent and his extraordinary personality. We had the pleasure and the honour to record twice with him and he is an amazing person, very brave and human. He could walk through the auditorium on his own after only the first time that his assistant helped him finding the way. He has gained a strong popular approval and was able to spread a certain repertoire. I don’t know much about Il Volo, so I prefer not to express my opinion. I can say that Bocelli and Pavarotti are two very different people and experiences. I don’t think they should be compared, neither in vocal terms nor as personas, but they are both very important and significant experiences. What we observe is that there’s almost no possibility to transfer the public from one genre to the other. The experiences of musical crossover could barely bring those people listening to light music to become classical music concert-goers. In the auditorium, we offer the broadcasting of famous films accompanied by live-played soundtrack. During these events, the theatre is packed with young people, but they only come to this kind of activity. Only very few of them feel curious towards other genres and come for different types of events but in general they are hardly persuaded to try something that they don’t know about. They mostly like what they already know: smallest effort, greatest result. We do this activity because it works, in terms of money and of music, because we’re talking about great soundtracks written by cinema music composers like Morricone, Rota or Williams. However, we are aware that it will not lead to an increasing audience for our main symphonic programme. It’s another type of activity where people who come, come for that event and know what to expect.
What do you think of other contaminative phenomena like the Orchestra playing at Sanremo Festival or in Piazza del Duomo in Milan? Can they create curiosity towards classical music?

We actually did a concert in Piazza del Duomo with Bocelli. For sure it’s a divulgation activity which can have some positive aspects. It is hard to be able to vehicle the public from the event to the regular season. I think that recently culture has been based mostly on events and less on the constitution of a stable activity. The event is always attractive to many people, especially when there are special guests like Bocelli, or David Garreth with the Filarmonica della Scala. For sure a good amount is made by concert-goers, but then we should see how many of the event-goers would effectively participate to a similar performance in a theatre. We also need to consider that numbers are not comparable. Today it seems that a performance to be successful has to have millions of views. During Verdi’s period, a successful opera was seen by 1500 people! We need to consider these proportions. Classical music has always been a genre directed to the limited number of people that went to the theatre. We cannot compare it to popular songs that collect millions of views with their YouTube videos to be successful. They are very inhomogeneous entities. But it’s very important to bring people back to theatre and concerts because it’s a cultural form that can positively stimulate people. I recall a social research conducted in two small German villages in order to test the possibility to abolish the study of music in German schools: it was found that among adolescents not exposed to music learning the degree of violence was 30/40% higher compared to the schools were music was studied. Music is a social activity per se, which teaches coordination and living in a structured society, therefore it holds a significant social value. For this reason, we bring our activity to hospitals and prison. We also provide music therapy for San Raffaele Hospital’s patients, as they discovered that those under music therapy have better chances of healing with success. Therefore, everyone should be aware of the fundamental social and cultural value of music, which has to be protected.

What are your wishes for the future?

In Italy we arrived last to study English in school, but we made it eventually. Therefore, I’m confident that we can also open up to culture and education sooner or later. At least, we are working in this direction.

2. ANDREA CIGNI

Opera Director, Artistic Director of Orizzonti Festival, Academic, Director of Claudio Monteverdi Conservatoire, in Cremona

The purpose of my research is investigating the drivers of Millennials’ behaviour with respect to concerts’ participation. Therefore, I think it could be also useful to have the point of view of someone that works in the field and really has a clear idea of the current audience situation.

How is the audience of your operas composed?

The average audience of the opera is variegated. In Italy, opera is part of our cultural heritage and therefore the recipients are variegated in terms of age and cultural education. Today more and more schools are bringing children to the theatre to approach opera and melodrama. We also have it in our DNA: who didn’t hear at least once an aria from Aida, Traviata, Rigoletto or Monteverdi’s toccata. It’s like something innate. The opera-goers reflect this situation: it’s diverse. High likely, loyal opera-goers are more culturally educated, but not necessarily graduated. I think it depends on a more refined cultural sensibility. For example, they probably love to read, go to the cinema and listen to music, even popular, and then attend operas. opera as a genre is also belonging to the theatrical sphere, so it can also satisfy the taste of those people that attend dance and prose performances, being a complete and multi-layered spectacle. I see that a lot of young people are coming to see operas. Needless to say, in Italy we’re also very lucky under this point of view: it’s an
unlucky country when it comes to finding an occupation, but there are a lot of facilitations towards culture accessibility. For example, opera tickets for students cost between €8 and €15 and most times in other nations it can be a lot more expensive. Therefore, there’s a big economic incentive for young people to participate. There are also good discounts for adults and older people. For example, a ticket for the premiere of Monteverdi’s Orfeo at Teatro Ponchielli costs around €30, so quite accessible. The programme is variegated, because there are people that are very fond of the melodramatic panorama and follow a certain artist, for example, the soprano Anna Netrebko, and before her Maria Callas or Luciano Pavarotti. There are also people that don’t know the singers but are curious to see an opera. In Italy there are also many possibilities to attend a performance in a theatre: every city has got a theatre with a lyric season within the compass of 20 km. More theatres don’t close during the summer anymore, they organize summer festivals and events. Due to this offerings’ overload, the real problem is choosing, among such a huge amount of alternatives. But as for the accessibility, I would say that we’re lucky because the offer is broad – at least in terms of quantity, I will not say anything about the quality – and all the age cohorts have the chance to approach it. The problem is at the basis: how do youngers come into contact with the classical repertory? Therefore, it’s interesting to see the modalities through which opera is promoted and divulgated to young people. It also depends a lot on the cultural context within people grow and live. Some cities don’t dedicate much attention to cultural promotion and to reach out to youngsters, especially in more depressed cities in Italy. It depends on the repertoire as well: if it’s famous, it attracts more people, like Aida or Traviata; if it’s less known or rare, like a rare Donizetti, a Pia de Tolomei, it asks for a deeper preparation. The 1500/1600 repertoire is the most appreciated by young people, even more than the late 1800 romantic one.

The sphere of classical music is very broad, as it includes many different genres. What kind of effort has to be done by people to approach this world, generally speaking?

Today there are a lot of stimuli, like sports and most of all telephones. So how can classical music reach out to young people? For example, via television. There is a tailored channel to classical music on the national television, channel 23. So of course it’s not amongst the first channels you can find when you turn on the television. Some time ago, the government was deliberating about the suppression of the subject of music for primary school, so it was pretty hard to expect people to be educated towards music. Of course, young people can make an effort to approach something different, but in a world where there are so many stimuli and the competitiveness is very aggressive, it’s also hard for them to find out about this kind of product. It’s up to the public sphere and the cultural institutions to make an effort to sustain their programmes, by supporting music as a school subject or promoting it on proper channels and media. Therefore, the effort must come from both parts, who promotes and who attends. Of course, it won’t guarantee that everyone can appreciate classical music. Also, it is a matter of personality, sensitivity, passion and taste: we’re all different and we like different things. Given these premises, it’s worth of attention to investigate which are the best ways to promote high-brow music genres. Where can we access classical music today? In concert halls, theatres, through a cd...but they have to be promoted. We don’t see commercials about it on television, it’s like we take music and its existence for granted. Would we notice if classical music didn’t exist? Personally, I cultivated my passion privately but it all started when my school teacher took my class to the theatre to see an opera. It would be interesting to see the role of theatres about this, how can they break out of the theatre’s walls and talk to young people, what kind of promotion policies they enact. Moreover, there are two ways to approach music, passion and profession. A lot of young people choose to make a living out of music.

As far as popular music is concerned, we can access it everywhere and always. This can be a reason why Millennials feel closer to this music genre. What are the others?
The modern song comes from the ancient music and was born in Italy, around 1600. Then it was transformed throughout years and centuries and today we find it completely different than before, but one derives from the other. It’s called popular or light music, because listening to it is less demanding compared to other genres. The themes are also easier to understand: songs mostly tell stories with a beginning and an end, around motives like love, pain, friendship, affection, simple themes that can affect everyone. Talking about affection is easier. Probably if songs were about mathematic formulas, they wouldn’t be as appreciated! The form of the modern song has a different rhythm, arrangement and sampling possibilities compared to classical music, which didn’t change from the past. Light music uses tools and modalities that are catchier and appealing to young people, together with simple themes that everyone can understand and distribution channels like television and radio that are the most commonly accessed. Popular music also finds its power in the creation of superstars. Before there were myths like Vivaldi or Mozart, then Maria Callas and Pavarotti. Today there’s the myth of Lady Gaga. Today’s artists are more visible and easily talked about by media, in a society where the cult of the image is paramount. Popular music follows the trends, classical music doesn’t: it remains faithful to the heritage and the memory of the past, which is the source from where all the music comes from. For this reason, there’s no real conflict between the genres, one is originated by the other.

You mentioned Maria Callas and Pavarotti. There are also people coming from the classical music world that managed to become superstars. Another example, more recent, is Andrea Bocelli. What are the reasons for their broad notoriety?

Bocelli is more famous for popular music, also due to his vocal skills. There’s also another phenomenon today, il Volo, even though I don’t think they’re comparable to Bocelli and don’t belong to the lyric music world, despite they claim so. Their vocal capabilities and preparation are totally different compared to standard lyric singers. They wouldn’t be able to sustain an entire opera. Bocelli is vocally talented, but due to his physical limitations he could build up a more popular image rather than lyric. And his persona is commercially very successful. Pavarotti is another story: he became famous for his innate talent and his unique voice, with his extraordinary vocal and interpretative techniques. Besides his voice, he was able to create the phenomenon of the Italian tenor in the United States. He also participated to light music concerts and charity concerts, like Pavarotti & friends, together with great singers of the popular music panorama, like the U2. Young people started to know about him through the people he was around, like Lady Diana. We owe a lot to him, for having divulged the lyric music message around the world and across different age cohorts. Contamination between the two world would be a good vehicle but there are a lot of difficulties, starting from technical issues: for example, light music runs through digital media, while classical music is made to be listened and seen live. For example, opera is made of music, lyrics and above all, as the name ‘opera’ suggests, it’s made of action.

Compared to the ubiquity popular music, does classical music have a definite space and time to be listened to?

You can try and listen to one aria from an opera on your iPod, but opera has a duration, its story covers two to three hours. Popular songs have a definite beginning and ending and last 3 to 4 minutes, therefore it’s much easier to listen to.

As you said before we are stimulated by a huge amount of inputs from the external environment, and maybe it’s the reason why Millennials can’t keep their attention on the same thing for a prolonged time.

That’s right. And while you can listen to popular songs or television as background while you’re doing something else, opera cannot be a background. It’s complex and requires attention.
You are the Artistic Director of Orizzonti Festival. Which difference do you notice between the audience of the theatre and of the festival?

Orizzonti Festival is a multidisciplinary event, with dance, prose, opera, literature and symphonic concerts. The aim of the festival is to create an interchange of cultural genres and audiences, in order to enrich everyone’s cultural baggage. In this way, opera-goers can discover dance, while prose-goers can discover opera, and so forth. It’s also very nice that the artists themselves discover other artistic disciplines aside from their own. It’s a great experience to be able to access multiple forms of art with the same ticket.

You’re also presenting in foreign countries the operas you direct. What kind of differences can you notice between the Italian system and abroad?

First of all, the work practices are different. We have an important heritage: our theatres come from the Seventies, when they were poles of power and politics, and a lot of public money was involved. The problem is that we remained with the same mind-set. Today there’s not much meritocracy, but more of a vicious circle. Something should change under the political perspective, but we are working under the same law that was created 50 years ago, the Corona law. Abroad is different. In the US, for instance, the private intervenes more than the public, the artistic directors change often according to merit and theatrical productivity. They also highly value the capability of the theatre to attract the public and create cultural and economic value. Therefore, there’s immediate solvability and artists are always paid. It works quite good and they really appreciate Italian music. The accessibility is also high and going to the theatre is a more relaxed activity. In Italy, very often people like to criticise the singers, which doesn’t happen abroad. In the US, the dress code is also less formal and there’s often the possibility to drink and eat while attending the performance. Also in some cities of France it happens the same: for instance, at the Rouen Opera House, during the break of Don Pasquale, they were selling beers and hamburger. The theatre was packed and people were having fun and feeling actively involved in the play. In the US, in Minneapolis, they were laughing during some scenes from Tosca, but not in an impolite way, but because they were really participating. Abroad they also really appreciate our way of doing theatre, for our costumes, the scenography, the wigs and the lighting, all extremely accurated in the details. The production practices are also different: they find artists through auditions and have a great respect for them. It’s all built up on meritocracy. In Italy there’s the agency system, which doesn’t always reflect meritocracy. Theatres are also very different. You can enter Rouen and Saint Etienne Opera Houses with a beer, in Italy it wouldn’t be possible. Abroad there were a lot of youngsters and people were enjoying. It was a more playful and relaxing activity. In Italy, going to the opera is more like a showcase and a social statement, rather than a cultural and entertaining activity. Moreover, you don’t see the respect for the artwork from the smoking, but from the attitude towards the artwork itself.

You have a rather young team around you. Does it help you to better fulfil the needs of young people?

It is young for the Italian context, but it wouldn’t be seen as a young team abroad. In the US, when you’re 40 years old you are already an affirmed director, while here in Italy you’re almost a child. Just consider that there are 70-year-old theatre directors that are still there. I started when I was 30 and it was really hard, so I push my assistants to be proactive. Sometimes I give up on some projects myself to assign them to my assistants, otherwise there will never be a change and a growth. We don’t have to be jealous of one another. The beauty of the theatre is the possibility to pass on the tradition to other people to assure its perpetuation overtime. If we close in ourselves, we go against the principle of the theatre and against common sense. Through the language that I use, I try to both respect the tradition and to open up to contemporaneity. It’s also wrong to completely revolutionize
opera a priori, because it’s also fascinating to show people something different from modernity. I think that theatre should evoke things, but leave to the spectator the possibility to imagine something that I didn’t say, to participate to the narration and to the meanings. I do my part and the spectator adds the rest.

3. **FEDERICO PEROTTI**  
Conservatoire student, Composer, Choir Director, Organist

The purpose of my research is investigating the drivers of Millennials’ behaviour with respect to concerts’ participation. You’re both a Millennial and a musician, therefore I’m sure your point of view can be very interesting to my research. Tell me about the course of your music studies.

I started privately to play the organ when I was 7. I was also singing in the choir of the church, but my biggest passion was for the organ and it emerged when I heard it playing in the church. Afterwards, I started attending organ classes at the music conservatory of my town when I was 16. It’s a 10-year course, but I entered the fourth year and I skipped another one, so when I was 18 and I moved to Como to finish my studies and get the diploma, I missed only 5 years. I’ve just got my diploma in organ, which is also a diploma in orchestra direction and Gregorian reading. In 2013, I also started studying composition, it’s five years long and I’ve just finished the third. Composing has always been a great passion: I started to compose music when I was 16. For many years, my only passion was the organ, but thanks to it I opened up to everything else. Opera, for example, is the last genre that I started to appreciate.

Did you receive support with your family? Does any of your relatives deal with music, for work or passion?

My parents supported me from the start, but no one in my family works with music or is very passionate about it.

Are you working at the moment?

Currently I am a choir director and I work as main organist for some churches of my city, Piacenza. But in my life I would like to become a composer because I want to write music that other people can bring to life. I already have some of my pieces played by orchestras, in Prato and Schio, thanks to the help of an artistic director, who is also my teacher in Como. He once heard my composition and asked me to make it an orchestra version. When it was ready, he managed to insert it in a lyric programme of an orchestra. The conductor loved it and added it to another of its repertories. However, I was very lucky because it’s hard for someone my age to have their pieces performed by an orchestra. In my life I would also like to compose chamber music, because you are in direct contact with the musicians. I would like to compose operas as well. But it’s very hard to make a living out of it. Therefore, I think I also want to become a conservatory teacher, to be economically independent. It’s hard for musicians to have a remunerative job, it’s very competitive.

Do you find openness towards music within scholastic institution?

Not really, or at least not as much as I would expect. I didn’t study music well in primary school, I had to cultivate my passion privately. I think that music should be a high school subject, at least for gymnasiums, because it’s a huge part of the Italian cultural heritage. It’s during high school that young people really become passionate about things, thanks to the teachers that are able to transmit their own passion for a subject.
Why is classical music harder to access compared to popular music?

I think that the problem is that classical music is not background music, and cannot be rightfully enjoyed via radio. It was created when the radio and the television didn’t exist. Today’s music, instead, is created to be listened through digital media and we hear it as background to everything we do, every day.

But classical music is alive and some composers take care of the current means of communication. For example, Minimalists are contemporary musicians that make music which is specifically tailored to be listened via radio.

Do you think that classical music can be enjoyed also by people that don’t have any education in music?

Yes, I think so. Among the people that participate to my concerts, there are always people that are not educated in music, but no one ever completely dislikes what I do when they listen to it. I think the problem is not to make young people listen to the concert, but to persuade them to attend in the first place, to convince them to step out of their house and go to the theatre.

Today we have so many activities that we could engage in, but for some reason classical music events are never considered as an option, even though maybe some people would be interested in attending a concert. The problem is that they are not even aware of the existence of classical music concerts, because promotion is inexistent, at least through the channels that young people access the most to find out what to do in their free time. Also, they are unaware of the offers that classical institutions have for them, who could attend a concert for an extremely low price. Classical institutions are far away from today’s world and way to communicate, they need to try harder if they want to reach out to youngsters and use more attractive channels to promote themselves. It’s difficult to catch up with events. Just consider that I’m passionate about classical music, it’s my job, and I constantly keep myself informed about the events. However, it often happens that I find out too late – or I don’t ever find out – about concerts that I would have loved to see, but there was absolutely no promotion about them.

When do you see a positive reaction of youngsters towards classical music?

Very often when it’s about a music celebrity, like David Garreth. I went to the theatre to see him and the place was packed with young people.

However, there’s always a prejudice within our field, that often talent doesn’t correspond to notoriety and fame. In my opinion, it’s not negative to build up a persona, especially if associated to talent. It would be a win-win game: some artists are worth to be known deeper than for the limited time they are onstage. This prejudice exists because there are examples of so-called lyric artists that claim their talent for classical and lyric music, when they’re actually mere pop phenomena.

One example that I personally think is genial is the Berliner Filamorniker: they have been able to reinvent themselves through digital contents that are very appealing to young people, like the 360° technology to watch their performances online, or the interviews with artists, which are very funny and disclose another side of the musicians that makes people feel more close to them. They reveal some aspects of their private life, but also their humanity and “normality”.

Have you ever been to popular music concerts?

Yes, but just because they were occasions to be with my friends. I’m not interested in live popular music, but I really enjoy to listen to it on the radio.
Appendix 2. Focus Group

**PARTICIPANTS**

Laura Inverardi - LI  
Federica Peroncini - FP  
Valentina Colombo - VC  
Federica Cavalletti - FC  
Lorenzo Spiniello - LS  
Arianna Riboni - AR  
Sofia Dallavalle SD

Hello and thank you for being here. The reason why I invited you to take part to this focus group is because I would like to hear your opinions about music. Feel free to speak your mind, there is no right or wrong answer and your contribution will be very helpful. To start off, I would like us to briefly present ourselves, our name, what we do, our age, our passions... so that we can know a little bit more about one another. I am Alessandra, I’m 23 years old and I’m carrying out a Master in Arts’ Management at Bocconi University. I’m passionate about music, theatre and travels. What about you?

- **LI:** Hi everyone, I’m Laura, I graduated in management at Bocconi and I’m 28 years old. Currently I work as digital marketing manager within fashion and travel sectors. Specifically, I work for Costa.

- **FP:** Hi, I’m Federica and I’m 27. I also studied management at Bocconi and now I’m working as a consultant in the oil and gas sector.

- **VC:** I’m Valentina and I’m a student in arts’ management at Bocconi, I’m 23. At the moment I’m doing an internship in the sports’ field. I’m passionate about music, concerts and sport.

- **FC:** I’m Federica, I’m 24 years old and I’m also a student in arts’ management, but I’m specialized in the media sector, namely cinema, television and music. Currently, I’m doing an internship at Discovery for the graphic department.

- **LS:** Hello, I am Lorenzo and I’m 24 years old. I study environmental psychology at Statale. I love music, I play the drums and I work as usher at the theatre.

- **AR:** I am Arianna, I’m 24 years old and I’m also studying arts’ management. My passions are music, sports and cinema. At the moment, I’m doing an internship at Triennale, which is more related to visual art.

- **SD:** Hi, I’m Sofia and I’m 23. I’m a nurse but I’m studying anthropology in Turin. Music has always been my greatest passion.

You are here because I would like to investigate the segment of audience between 18 and 30 years of age for what concern their live music consumption. I find this target very interesting because once that you’re 18 or older you have formed your personality and your taste. Across this age span, people often move out of their’ parents’ house, start to work and earn money, therefore there’s more autonomy in deciding how to spend one’s spare time. Now I will give you a white paper and a pen and I ask you to write three words that you think about if I say the word “music”.

- **SD:** I wrote “concerts”. To me, music means following the artists I like. I tend to really dive into the world of the artist, which includes attending his or her concerts. I also wrote “wait” because I love to queue in front of the arena waiting for the concert, it gives me so much adrenaline, or waiting for the album to be released. Then I wrote “joy”, joy for when I listen...
to the song I love, when I’m on the bus or the train and I’m wandering with my mind. These things for me are the best things about music.

- **AR:** I wrote “entertainment” because I think that listening to music, whether at home or at a concert, is a fun activity, I enjoy it, no matter if the music is sad or happy. It’s something I really love. “Passion” is my second word, because it’s something that I couldn’t live without. And finally “friends”, because if I think about it, I’ve always shared music with people I love. It happens that I listen to it on my own, but I still associate it mostly to friends.

- **LS:** The first words that came up to my mind are “concert”, because for me the aspect of live music is fundamental in following an artist. Then “entertainment”, in following the concert. Finally, “study”, because I play the drums and music means both learning the instrument and listening to music over and over to learn.

- **FC:** I also put “entertainment” and “passion” like Arianna. The third thing is “freedom”, and all the three words are referred to my experience of concerts. Of course I listen to a lot of music through my headphones, but when I think about music, first of all, I think about concerts.

- **VC:** I have something in common with Arianna and Sofia. I wrote “company/sharing” because when I think about music, I think about live music and for me the memory of a concert is beautiful also because is linked to a certain company, the people you shared the experience with. A concert is something that creates a bond between two people in a special way. Then I wrote “emotion”, because whether positive or negative, music is something fundamental in my life and is strongly connected to emotions. Lastly, “memories”, because both with recorded and live music there’s always a certain memory of an experience coming up.

- **FP:** Actually my position is rather different from the others. The first thing I wrote was “relax”, because I’m never stopping and I never have much time, and when I listen to music is one of those rare moments when I’m far from my daily issues. The second word is linked to the first, “shower”, which is the moment at night when I come home from work and I’m tired and I take the time of the shower only for me. The last word is “dance”, because I love to dance and the first thing that comes up to my mind when I think about music is dance.

So far you Federica, music is more like something that accompanies you during some moments of your day.

- **FP:** Precisely.

- **LI:** I wrote “dream”, “memories” and “freedom”, so I’m not very much focalized on the artist or the concert. Memories to me means that music reminds me of experiences: a song makes me think back to a person or a moment. Dream concerns the future, I start dreaming about places and I wander. And freedom is linked to the other two words. As Federica was saying, listening to music represents also for me a moment when I don’t think about stress and problems, but I’m more calm and I dedicate time to myself.

And to do it, do you always listen to the same music genre or to different ones?

- **LI:** I like the songs, but 99% of the times I don’t even know who’s singing. I like a song, sometimes for the lyrics, if it’s in Italian. I understand English but I can’t be bother to pay attention to the lyrics if the song is in English. Otherwise I like a song when the melody is catchy.

Research claims that the more people are educated, the more they are inclined to listen to different genres of music. You all are attending or have attended university, so I would like to know if you have a variegated taste for music and appreciate different genres. For example, I like very different music, from pop to classical. Is it the same for you?
EVERYBODY: Yes, totally.

What are the criteria with which you listen to one thing or the other?

- SD: Maybe the mood. If I listen to the pop chart is because I want to get energized, in a happy situation, maybe with friends as a background to a dinner. Therefore, I think it’s according to the situation and the people you meet along your life, who maybe broaden your perspective when they make you hear their favourite artists that you didn’t know about.

So you are open to hear new things.

- SD: Yes, absolutely.
- LI: Yes, I agree. Also for what concerns the mood. If I’m depressed and I feel like crying, I listen to sad songs. But then there are different situations. For example, I hate cooking and to create the mood while I have to cook I play the “Napoli playlist” on YouTube. Or in the morning when I’m sleepy and I have to get up I play reggaeton songs. So it depends both on the situation and on my mood. And as Sofia was saying, you can also meet people that make you discover new things. My boyfriend is Latin-American and made me discovers Latin-American groups and now I love them and listen to this music often.
- VC: I also agree. I hate cooking as well and that’s when I listen to the pop chart as background. Then I have my favourite artists, whose songs I don’t hear all the time because they’re sacred and can’t be wasted. I think that when you like a genre and know other people liking the same genre, you can broaden the knowledge. For example, you go and check which other groups before inspired the group you like and it’s like going back in time.

What do you think Lorenzo, as a musician? Which genres do you listen to?

- LS: Rock, funky, pop... But not according to my mood, but to the artistic sector. I’m obsessed with the artists I like: I know life and times of my favourite artists. And I do it for all the music genres to get to know them.

And how do you find out about new things?

- LS: Through the radio, or YouTube suggestions related to what I usually listen to. But I’m not talking about classical music.

Regarding this, we distinguish light music, which is the one that the majority of us listens to, from cultivated music. I think that these two adjectives are very interested. Why “cultivated”? What do we need to listen to it?

- LS: Musical knowledge or at least open-mindedness. It’s objectively harder to listen than pop for example.
- FP and LI: What do you mean by “cultivated music”?

Cultivated music is the music macro-genre that includes genres such as classical music, chamber music, ballet music, opera and so forth. While light music comprehends pop, rock, funky, jazz music. And today, despite the average educational level is higher than before, which should mean that we are more prone to listen to diverse music genres, young people actually feel more distant than ever to classical music. Why do you is this happening?

- FC: Because pop, rock or funky music can be listened on the radio, in clubs, in restaurants, in shops, while classical music can only be appreciated in a concert.

So you don’t find many chances to access this genre on a daily basis?
FC: No, but above all you don’t have many people who can get you involved. It’s hard to find someone who plays the piano and says “listen to this pianist”. Then, you have less chances in social terms. Maybe if in my group of friends there would be more people listening to that genre I would be more willing to try and attend a concert. There may be interesting concerts but no one knows.

SD: To me it all depends on the formality. I’m sorry that I don’t know more, but maybe the problem is due to the fact that classical music is linked to a certain social classes. It could be that there are young people and it’s not so formal, but I have this idea of niche since I’m a child.

LI: I would see it as an exclusive thing that has to be done at some point.

AR: I don’t agree on the adjectives cultivated and light because I think that also light music has its own complexity and deepness. The adjectives penalise popular music. Obviously I’m not talking about all the popular artists, but about some of them.

So you’re saying that it’s not always true that we can fully appreciate popular music as passive listeners but that there’s more to know about it.

What about the venues of concerts? Which kind of venue is your ideal location for a concert?

AR: I would say pub when it comes to young talents, who I like to see, but unfortunately in Milan such places are disappearing. If I think about famous artists I would say theatres or arenas, depending on the artist. Also smaller venues, like the Blue Note for jazz music. I think that the location depends a lot also on the music genre. Last summer I went to Sting’s concert to the Summer Festival in Milan: the concert was amazing but the place was awful, a parking area in from of the road.

So the place is important to some extent to positively influence the enjoyment of a concert.

EVERYBODY: Yes, a lot.

VC: For example, I attended a concert in Rome, at the Ippodromo delle Capannelle in 2015 and it was amazing. It was July, with a great company of friends, and the place was organized like a small village, with the bar and so forth. We saw the concert with a beer, then there was a DJ Set after the concert. It was very well set up and created a great atmosphere. But I also agree with Arianna about the small bars for young talents, I saw a lot of cover bands. I love arenas as well: I think about Assago Forum, where I’ve seen many concerts, and I love to see the people around me and see the arena filled up with people that are there for the same reason as me. I also like Alcatraz in Milan, it’s smaller but very familiar.

LI: I also enjoy places that are not too huge. But of course it depends on the artists. I like when the venue is medium-large, so on the one side you’re together with fans like you, on the other side the artist is not too far from you: you’re both with him and with the fans. In the US I went to a rather big place to attend a reggae concert: everyone was passionate about the genre except for me, but I loved the concert because I felt very involved by the people around me and the artist.

FC: I also like to feel close to the people and the artists. It happened when I went to J-Ax and Fedez concert: the location was big, but we were not too tight on the pitch so I could dance, sing, jump. When I saw Alvaro Soler, instead, I didn’t enjoy it. We were too tight and it was full of teenagers.

I went to my first concert when I was 15 and I can clearly see that I changed as a spectator. When I was younger I was queuing and pushing for hours, now I need to be in a different situation and have my space to enjoy the concert.
- VC: One strange thing that happened to me and my best friend was when we went to Kasabian’s concert in Amsterdam at the Heineken Music Hall. We arrived half an hour before, afraid that we would have been very far from the stage, but there was no one. They opened the gate, everyone was very relaxed, we have a beer and see the concert in first row. Last year I saw the Muse in Milan, but I was in the upper tier because I didn’t want to be surrounded tightly by people.

- SD: I have an example of two concerts by the same artists, Mumford & Sons, in two different venues: at the Roman Arena in Verona and Alcatraz in Milan. The concert at the Arena was amazing, peaceful and relaxed with few hundreds of people, within a great open-air location. I was in first row, the place was small and familiar and they were singing without microphone, making advantage of the natural sound of the arena. Two years later I saw the same band at Alcatraz. They were still amazing, but the place was anonymous and the magic was gone. But I also love big venues, I’ve been to Turin stadium and to Wembley Stadium and the atmosphere was amazing: looking at how many people were there was overwhelming. So what you get from a concert in a small or in a big location is totally different.

- FP: I haven’t been to a lot of concerts, but I was mostly in arenas. Recently, in Gorizia I went to this little bar in the centre, all decorated with vynils and guitars. Every night there’s a different emerging group playing and it’s beautiful because people stop in front of the bar to listen to the music coming out. The atmosphere was involving and sharing the experience with the other people around was really great.

It seems like the location is very important. What about the artist? How important is to see your favourite artists live?

- FP: I’m passionate about music and I like to listen to every genre, but I’m not focalised on the artist.

- LI: I agree. As I said, sometimes I don’t even know who sings the song I’m listening to. Of course there are artists that I really like and maybe I follow them on social media, but I don’t feel the necessity to see them live no matter what.

- LS: I like to meet them, only if I have the possibility or happens by chance. I work at a theatre so I met a lot of artists, but I never asked for a picture. I would prefer to talk to them.

- FC: I think it’s risky to talk to an artist. The artist is loved for the image we perceive of him. I would be scared to find out that he’s a different person than I though.

- VC: To me it’s linked to the theme of taking photos. A lot of artists are treated like animals by fans only for a picture. I was waiting for my favourite artist outside of his hotel in Milan, but I waited for other people to leave, I didn’t want to oppress him further. My turn came and I’ve been very lucky but I was also respectful. Here in Italy fans are very inappropriate sometimes, especially invading artists’ private life.

- LS: It happens often at the theatre that there are queues of 80-100 people outside of the artist’s changing room just to take a photo with the artist. And artists are of course rather irritated. At the Blue Note, it happened that I stopped a musician to talk with him and I didn’t need to take a photo. The key is not to treat them as animals, but as people.

- VC: I went to Kasabian’s signing session and it was full. The rules said that it was forbidden to take photos, but people were grabbing them to take photos and running away. I looked at them in the eyes and asked for a hug, which they gave me. It was the best thing, a lot more than a photo.

- LS: It’s also more likely that the artists remember you that way.

- VC: Some artists are also acting different in different countries, because they know how fans can be. The same artists I met in London and Milan, in London they stop to talk to people and
ask them for a beer out. In England they go and play at Wembley Stadium and then take the metro as normal people. I think it’s a cultural factor.

I’ll show you some pictures. When you’re ready I would like you to tell me by which ones you feel more represented.

1. Fan Action (San Siro Stadium, Milan)

2. Mediolanum Forum Arena (Milan)

3. LaVerdi Auditorium (Milan)

4. Tents outside Justin Bieber’s concert (Unipol Arena, Bologna)
AR: I feel represented by this one [PHOTO 7]. I excluded this [PHOTO 4] because I’ve never been an extreme fan that slept outside of the venue just to be first row. I also never listen to opera or classical music, it’s not my genre [PHOTO 3 & 5]. This other photo [PHOTO 2] is amazing if you think that if the artist raises one hand, then everyone is doing the same. I chose this one [PHOTO 7] because is open air and the majority of the concerts I’ve been to where open air, so it really reflects my experience. Also I don’t share music on Facebook [PHOTO 6], since I barely post anything on Facebook.

Who shares music on Facebook? And why?

- FP: Not me, I’m anti-social network.
- SD, VC, LS: Yes, very often.
- LS: To share my mood or because I want everyone to know how much I love an artist.
- SD: I agree, to tell others “look at this artist, he’s amazing!”.
- VC: I have a weird thing for songs’ birthdays. Every song has a birthday or some dates are strictly linked to songs.
- SD: Maybe I post the song because it reminds me of a particular moment, so I choose this photo [PHOTO 6]. I also choose the photo of the tent [PHOTO 4], to remind me of all the experiences when I slept outside of the venues waiting for the concert. Also the fan action photo [PHOTO 1], because I took part of various fan actions: I feel part of something and it’s like making a gift to the artist I love and welcome him to our country. I also like this one
[PHOTO 8] in the square, because it reminds me of when I was singing in a gospel choir in the square of my city. I also went to see the same choir when I was not part of it anymore, in Piazza Duomo in Milan and it was full of people, who were clapping along.

- **FC:** I choose this one [PHOTO 2], I recognize that it’s Assago Forum, in Milan, where I’ve seen a lot of concerts. It really makes me feel part of something. I also love the stadium [PHOTO 1], because I’ve never been and soon I will attend Coldplay’s concert in a stadium and it’s something I’ve always wanted to try. I imagine it as a very involving atmosphere.

- **FP:** I choose the photos of the theatre [PHOTO 5] and the auditorium [PHOTO 3] because it’s where I see myself more. I love to go to the theatre, not really for the opera though, I’ve seen it only once. I love to see other genres, like ballet or prose. The experience of a theatre is something incredible to me. Unfortunately, I’ve never been to an auditorium but I would love to attend a classical music concert someday. I’ve never been to a music hall but I would like to try. I’m a big fan of the New Year’s Eve Concert broadcasted on television every year.

- **LI:** I was hit by this one [PHOTO 7], but maybe just because it’s very breath-taking, I mean, I would like to be there right now. I also really love this one [PHOTO 1] because if I think that fans organize such a huge surprise to the artists it’s overwhelming, they don’t show this huge love not even for their parents! It’s a strong thing, beautiful. And about this one [PHOTO 8] I only have one comment, it’s nice that this kind of events enables everyone to access a niche music genre. At the same time, however, they lose the aura of exclusivity that somehow attracts me. So I don’t know, if the only thing I like is exclusivity and then it’s not exclusive anymore...

- **FC:** That is LaVerdi auditorium [PHOTO 3], isn’t it? Because I think that they’re trying to break that barrier.

**How do you think they are doing that?**

- **FC:** They’re projecting very famous films and playing the soundtracks live with the orchestra. And it’s attracting a lot of young people.

- **EVERYBODY:** Really? Sounds cool!

**Yes, that’s true, I’ve been to one of those concerts last year, it was great! A very straightforward question now, would you ever go to a concert alone?**

- **SD:** Yes, if no one wants to come and I really want to see an artist.

- **AR:** I don’t know. I like to share these moments with someone else, especially if I don’t like the artist or the genre that much.

- **LI:** I don’t think. Also because as I said my relationship with music is more with the songs than the artist, I wouldn’t go alone to see a concert. But maybe it’s more of a cultural problem in Italy. When I was doing my internship in the US it was normal to have breakfast, lunch or dinner alone if there was no one with me, but here in Italy you wouldn’t go to the restaurant alone. But no, since I don’t feel strong passion for any artist, I wouldn’t go without a friend.

- **VC:** I think I would. Usually I buy two tickets, then if someone wants, they come with me, otherwise I sell the extra ticket and go on my own. And if I get to the venue, even though I don’t know anyone, the environment is familiar, everyone likes the same artist and I still enjoy it. But I agree that it’s partly a cultural factor not to go alone. Abroad they do it easily. One of my friends went to see a concert alone at Wembley Stadium and she felt part of the family and it was great.

**Another thing that I would like to talk about is, among all the components of a concert, which one/ones is the most important for you to enjoy the experience? Is it the artist, the company, the venue?**
- **FC**: My idol is Marco Mengoni. During his concert, he was flying on the crowd and I burst into tears. I turned on the side and I saw the girl next to me who was crying exactly like me and I felt very close to her and part of the same family, even though we didn’t know each other. So I think that the bond that you create with other people is the best thing of a concert. I’m not one of those who cry at concerts, but in that moment there were a lot of things that got me emotional and the fact that there were people around me who were feeling the exact same thing was incredible.

- **VC**: To me the most important part of a concert is to see the artist, to know that he exists and he’s in front of me. When Noel Gallagher, my favourite singer, came to Italy, I saw him in the morning and he signed my cd. At night, during the concert, I cried from the first note until the last, I couldn’t control and I’m not either one of those people who cry during concerts. It was because I waited for so long to see him, I know times and stories about him and it was overwhelming to have him really in front of me. But I also love sharing. I saw Cesare Cremonini in Milan, and from my seat I could see how happy everyone was in singing his songs, from children to adults. Actually the memory is even more vivid because on that same night the terroristic attack at Bataclan happened, so I felt emotionally very connected.

- **FP**: For me it depends on the type of concert. For example, for an artist like Cremonini, it’s nice to see everyone dancing and singing along. But when I’m at the theatre, I love the atmosphere: it’s all dark and all everyone can see is what the performer is doing onstage. In this case the aspect of sharing is of secondary importance.

- **AR**: For me the artist is very important. I love to see musicians having fun while they play onstage. I went to John Legend’s concert but there were very few people. If the warmth given by people was missing, the artists filled up the whole atmosphere with the enjoyment they were feeling onstage. I love to see how passionate is an artist.

I have three more images to show you, of three artists/personas: Andrea Bocelli, Ezio Bosso and Giovanni Allevi. I guess that you all know them, or at least heard about them. They are three peculiar phenomena, kind of halfway between two worlds more or less. Would you consider following a classical music artist if this artist would be able to build up a strong image?

1. Andrea Bocelli
2. Giovanni Allevi
3. Ezio Bosso
- **FC**: I don’t agree much with Bocelli’s approach. I also think about Il Volo. The singers that define themselves as lyric singers shouldn’t be using microphone for example. I saw Allevi live and I really liked him. However, I know that he’s really criticised by all the classical music practitioners because he’s too commercial. But I think that it’s not wrong to build up your persona and I still attended a classical music concert to my knowledge.

- **VC**: I agree with Federica. When you start being known in that world, even if you deserve it, you are criticised for being too ‘pop’, which shouldn’t be a depreciative adjective. One of my friends saw Ezio Bosso at the theatre and she loved it. However, she felt like he was playing a lot on his physical limitation and paying less attention to the music. People were feeling compassion towards him, and laughing too hard at his jokes, but she thought that it missed some authenticity.

- **LS**: I saw them all live and I noticed the same thing in all of them, especially with Bosso. You don’t understand if people follow him because of his talent or because of the phenomenon or for compassion. For Allevi I think his persona is what really matters. As an approach, his music helps more people to access that world, but when you do it, you get to know other artists and understand that Allevi is not the best, but he’s the easiest to listen to. I think it can help but then it’s up to you to go deeper. He speaks a lot during concerts, almost as if he wants to make people feel emotional no matter what.

So the persona approach is not always perceived as authentic in the classical music world. Talking about accessibility, there are good offers for young people to attend performances at the theatre or at music halls. Are you aware of this?

- **FP**: Under-30 subscriptions for 3 performances at Teatro alla Scala in Milan cost €75, meaning €25 per show, which is very cheap for la Scala.
- **EVERYBODY**: Really?
- **SD**: No one knows about this!

Exactly, ticket prices to go to the theatre for young people are very affordable, but everyone thinks that it’s an expensive activity. So maybe it’s more a matter of lack of promotion.

- **AR**: I think it’s right to respect the venue. I don’t think we should be allowed to eat chips in the theatre or wear sweatpants.
- **FP**: I agree. You would miss the experience of the theatre.
- **AR**: Exactly. But of course it’s also right to dismantle the belief that theatre is only a place for rich or educated people.
- **FP**: It’s also discouraging for the image we see of opera houses on television, with old people, very formally dressed, and politicians. When I was in Vienna, young people could attend operas with a €3 ticket. But it was also a lot more promoted. Here, even if there are often, you don’t know about.
- **VC**: Exactly. And we have the perception that it’s really expensive.
- **LI**: As far as I’m concerned, my spare time is limited and I decide what to do on the basis on the proposals that I see around or hear about. I don’t spend more time looking for other activities, I see what comes to me. And I never consider these kinds of events because I never know about them.
- **SD**: Maybe we’re also limited if we only think about La Scala as a theatre where to attend classical music concerts. It could be that there are a lot more places offering concerts of this genre, which are more relaxed and cheaper.

So there is an objective problem of lack of divulgation and promotion. The last question is about scholastic education and music studied at school. For me it was very limited. Did you study
music at school? Do you think that studying music at school could help people approaching less popular genres?

- **SD**: Yes, I think so. Music is not well-taught in Italy.
- **AR**: I had a great music teacher in primary school, who let us choose which instrument to play, and not only the flute, as it always happens. But then in middle school, it was all about the flute and I hated it.
- **SD**: Exactly. I also think that we should not only study flute, but also music history. It’s sad that I don’t know anything about music from the past, especially because it’s a huge part of the Italian heritage.
- **VC**: I think it’s very important to study music at school. But there should also be places out of school to encourage young people to approach and play music, like bars or pubs, where people can play instruments and practice. In high school I had a lot of friends playing an instrument, but they had never the chance to play their music.
- **AR**: I agree. Abroad is different. For example, in London, I was walking around not very popular areas but I found 3 or 4 bars where young bands were playing live music.
- **LS**: I have a friend who plays the guitar and went to London. He said that he played more times there in few months than in many years in Milan.
- **SD**: I saw the same thing in Morocco, in Essaouira. There were a lot of places with live music. For example, we went to a bar where the owner was inviting a different jazz band every night. And it was happening the same in other very close bars.

We are done, thank you very much for your help and precious contribution!
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Appendix 4. Questionnaire

Hi! I’m a university student, working on my Master’s Thesis. By filling out this survey you will significantly contribute to my research.
It will only take 5 minutes of your time and I assure you full confidentiality for your answers.
Thank you very much for your participation.

PRE-QUESTION 1: Have you ever attended a live music concert in Italy?
Yes → [Move forward in the survey]
No

PRE-QUESTION 2: How old are you?
Younger than 18
18-30 → [Move forward in the survey]
Older than 30

1. What is your relationship with music? You can choose a maximum of 3 answers:

- It’s a passion
- It’s part of my job
- It’s a background to social events
- It expresses my feelings
- I dance to it
- I play an instrument/I sing
- I listen to music while I’m doing something else (e.g. driving, studying, cleaning, cooking…)
- Other (Please specify____)

2. Order the following music genres from the one you like the most (at the top of the list) to the one you like the least (at the bottom of the list):

Classical → Rap
Folk → Reggae
Jazz → Rock
Metal → Techno
Pop → Other (Please specify____)

3. Consider these two categories:

Popular music:
- pop, rock, soul, dance
- music, rap, reggae,
- jazz

Classical music:
- orchestra music, symphonic
- music, opera, ballet music,
- chamber music
Which music macro-genre stimulates the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Popular music</th>
<th>Classical music</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like it live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend most concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m curious about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How did you cultivate the passion for your favourite music genre(s)? You can select a maximum of 2 answers:

- From my parents
- From my friends
- From the media (e.g. radio, television, press)
- From school
- By playing an instrument
- Other (Please specify____)

5. Have you studied music in school?

- Yes, it was taught very well.
- Yes, but I would have preferred a better education in it.
- Yes, but I wasn’t interested.
- No, but I wouldn’t have been interested.
- No, but I would have liked to study it.

6. How many concerts have you attended in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Concerts</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>&gt;12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In which type of venue do you mostly attend concerts?

- In bars and pubs
- In theatres
- In arenas
- In stadiums
- In parks
- In squares
- Other (Please specify____)
8. **Indicate the degree of importance of the following aspects of a concert, on a scale from 1 (Not Important) to 5 (Very Important):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active engagement in the concert (e.g. sing, scream, take photos/videos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be part of an audience of similar age as yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being in a specific venue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being with friends/family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy accessibility (e.g. transportation, familiarity and proximity of the venue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing the artist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking the music genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility to eat and/or drink during the concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and length of the concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Indicate whether you agree or not with the following statements, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would spend more money to see the artist I prefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would travel to another city/country to see the artist I prefer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would never go to a concert alone, not even if I like the artist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please take a look at the photo below.
For each couple of opposite adjectives listed below, please put a mark for each row according to the feelings that the previous photo has stimulated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Neither / nor</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertained</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Neither / nor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Neither / nor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Neither / nor</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Neither / nor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Neither / nor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please take a look at the photo below:

![Photo](image)

For each couple of opposite adjectives listed below, please put a mark for each row according to the feelings that the previous photo has stimulated.
12. Would you attend a concert of a music genre that you are not familiar with, if:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested by a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The price ticket is low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s paired up with collateral activities (e.g. happy hour, dinner, talk with the artist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Would you attend a concert of a music genre that you are not familiar with, instead of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A night out with friends (e.g. dinner, bar, club)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending other cultural activities (e.g. museum, art gallery, theatre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the cinema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How do you find out about concerts in your city? You can select a maximum of 3 answers:

- Billboards/Posters
- Radio and/or Television
- Event websites
- Social media
- Friends/Relatives
- I personally search for the events I’m interested in
- Newspaper and magazines
- Other (Please specify______)

15. Where are you born? (CITY) ___________

16. Where do you live? (CITY) ___________
17. How old are you?

- 18-21
- 22-24

18. Are you…

Male
Female
I prefer not to declare

19. Do you have a partner?

Yes
No

20. Do you have a child/children?

Yes
No

21. Do you live with your parents?

Yes
No

22. What is your educational level?

Primary school
High school
Bachelor’s Degree
Master’s Degree or higher

23. What is your occupation?

Clerk
Entrepreneur
Freelance/Professional
Other (Please specify________)

24. Are you financially autonomous?

Yes
Not yet

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.
Appendix 5. Final Dataset

Filter-out Variables
- Have you ever attended a live music concert?
- How old are you?

Multiple Linear Regression

Response Variable: How many concerts have you attended in the last 12 months?

Sets of Covariates for each Regression:

1. Socio-Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Variables</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hometown</td>
<td>City of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Residence</td>
<td>City of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Parental Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with parents</td>
<td>City of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music:</td>
<td>Habitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background to Daily Tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music:</td>
<td>Habitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background to Social Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Experiential Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Variables</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Passion</td>
<td>Emotion-Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Express my feelings</td>
<td>Identity Reaffirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: I dance to it</td>
<td>Emotion-Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Active engagement in the concert</td>
<td>Co-Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Be with friends/family</td>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Involving atmosphere</td>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of agreement: I would spend more money to see the artist I prefer</td>
<td>Emotion-Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of agreement: I would travel to another city/country to see the artist I prefer</td>
<td>Emotion-Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of agreement: I would never go to a concert alone, not even if I like the artist</td>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Personal Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Variables</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Job</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Play an instrument/Sing</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent live music consumption</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Parents</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Friends</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Media</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: School</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Playing an instrument</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you studied music in school?</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Time Resources for Leisure Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial autonomy</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Know the artist</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Environmental Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Variables</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most frequent concert venue</td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Be part of an audience of similar age</td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Easy accessibility</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Like the music genre</td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert INSTEAD OF: A night out with friends</td>
<td>Alternative Sources of Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert INSTEAD OF: Attending other cultural activities</td>
<td>Alternative Sources of Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert INSTEAD OF: Going to the cinema</td>
<td>Alternative Sources of Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert INSTEAD OF: Staying at home</td>
<td>Alternative Sources of Entertainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Marketing Mix Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Variables</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Media</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Be in a specific venue</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Fair price</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Eat and/or drink during the concert</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance: Time and duration of the concert</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert: If suggested by a friend</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert: If the price ticket is low</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend unfamiliar concert: If it’s paired up with collateral activities</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Billboards/Posters</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Event websites</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Friends/Relatives</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Newspapers/Magazines</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Social Media</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Personal Research</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Binary Logistic Regression**

**Response Variable:** Most frequently attended genre of concert

**Set of Covariates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Variables</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
<th>Set of Variables</th>
<th>Impact on...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Job</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Play an instrument/Sing</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with music: Background to Daily Tasks</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Media</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion cultivated from: Playing an instrument</td>
<td>Past Experience and Behaviour</td>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you studied music in school?</td>
<td>Mental Resources</td>
<td>Personal Resources</td>
<td>ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert info source: Personal Research</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Marketing Mix Variables</td>
<td>OPPORTUNITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variables to detect General Trends:

- Rank Classical music genre among the others
- Rank Folk music genre among the others
- Rank Jazz music genre among the others
- Rank Metal music genre among the others
- Rank Pop music genre among the others
- Rank Reggae music genre among the others
- Rank Rap music genre among the others
- Rank Rock music genre among the others
- Rank Techno music genre among the others
- Preferred music macro-genre
- Preferred live music
- Theatre Venue: Familiar - Distant
- Theatre Venue: Entertained - Bored
- Theatre Venue: Informal - Formal
- Theatre Venue: Active - Passive
- Theatre Venue: Interested - Indifferent
- Theatre Venue: Ease - Unease
- Theatre Venue: Pleased - Dissatisfied
- Theatre Venue: Simple - Difficult
- Arena Concert: Familiar - Distant
- Arena Concert: Entertained - Bored
- Arena Concert: Informal - Formal
- Arena Concert: Active - Passive
- Arena Concert: Interested - Indifferent
- Arena Concert: Ease - Unease
- Arena Concert: Pleased - Dissatisfied
- Arena Concert: Simple - Difficult
- Curiosity about a music genre
- No interest in the music genre