

# New Music:New Audiences evaluation report

---

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
1.1. Objectives.....	2
2. The evaluation process .....	3
Working communities .....	3
Understanding audiences .....	3
Primary research methodology .....	4
Concerts .....	5
Resistance to evaluation.....	6
Response .....	7
3. Outcomes .....	7
3.1. Building capacity .....	7
Has New:Aud raised awareness of the importance of audience development among participating ensembles? .....	7
Has the project professionalised participating ensembles' audience development practice?.....	8
Have the ensembles developed a better understanding of existing and potential audiences for new music? .....	9
Have ensembles exchanged ideas, experiences and good practice about audience development? .....	9
Have lasting relationships been created between participating ensembles?.....	11
What were the factors that enabled effective co-operation? .....	11
How could the project have provided a better environment for co-operation?.....	11
Has New:Aud created an audience development resource to support the wider sector? .....	12
3.2. Developing audiences .....	13
What has the action research revealed about developing audiences for new music? .....	13
3.3. Artistic development.....	15
Has participation in the working communities changed the way ensembles present concerts? ..	15
How did ensembles involve composers in their New:Aud concerts?.....	16
Do ensembles have a better awareness and understanding of the concert format as a tool to reach broader audiences? .....	16
Did ensembles expand their repertoire through New:Aud? .....	17
References .....	19

# 1. Introduction

Over two years, 32 contemporary classical music ensembles from 18 countries collaborated on New Music : New Audiences (New:Aud), a pan-European collaboration to explore ways of getting bigger and broader audiences for new music. The participating ensembles were:

Athelas Sinfonietta, Denmark	London Contemporary Orchestra, UK
Avanti! Chamber Orchestra, Finland	London Sinfonietta, UK
Cantus Ensemble, Croatia	Lunatree Ensemble, The Netherlands
Cikada Ensemble, Norway	Melos Ethos, Slovakia
Con Tempo Quartet, Ireland	Musiques Nouvelles, Belgium, Wallonia
Crash Ensemble, Ireland	Orkiestra Musiky Nowej, Poland
Defunensemble, Finland	Oslo Sinfonietta, Norway
Ensemble 21, Belgium, Wallonia	Psappha Ensemble, UK
Ensemble ON, Belgium, Wallonia	Scenatet, Denmark
Ensemble Recherche, Germany	Sinfonietta Riga, Latvia
Gageego, Sweden	Spectra Ensemble, Belgium, Flanders
HAM Ensemble, Hungary	Sturm und Klang, Belgium, Wallonia
Hebrides Ensemble, UK	The Christopher Chamber Orchestra, Lithuania
Hermes Ensemble, Belgium, Flanders	Ensemble TM+, France
KammerensembleN, Sweden	ZAK Ensemble, Hungary
Klangforum Wien, Austria	
Kwartludium, Poland	

## 1.1. Objectives

### Building capacity

- To build a lasting international network of organisations dedicated to developing audiences for new music
- To raise awareness of the importance of audience development among participating ensembles
- To professionalise participating ensembles' audience development practice
- To foster the exchange of good practice, knowledge and experience in audience development across the network
- To develop a better understanding of existing and potential audiences for new music among the participating ensembles
- To develop an audience development resource to support the wider sector

### Developing audiences

- To explore ways of expanding and broadening the European audience for new music through a series of concerts
- To undertake action research to test approaches to audience development new to the participating organisations

### **Artistic development**

- To explore ways of deepening audience engagement with new music by experimenting with the concert form
- To expand participating ensembles' repertoire in order to bring works to different audiences across Europe

## **2. The evaluation process**

### **Working communities**

The participating ensembles were organised into working communities around the audience development topics they expressed interest in at the beginning of the project:

- Mixing artforms
- Ditching the concert hall
- How music and audience meet
- Online with your audience
- Engaging young people and children.

The working communities met twice for an all-day workshop then again as part of the annual conference which brought together all 32 ensembles. After a year focusing on their chosen topic, the ensembles joined a new group to explore a different topic in the second year. There was a total of 19 workshops and three conferences.

Working community meetings consisted of input from expert speakers, the presentation by group members of ideas for concerts designed to develop audiences, feedback on those ideas from the whole group using the critical response technique, collaborative exercises and group discussion about audience development topics raised by participants.

The working communities were evaluated through focus groups with participating ensembles at the final workshop. An online questionnaire sent after the final conference asked ensembles about the impacts of the project on their audience development knowledge and practice.

### **Understanding audiences**

A workshop at the launch conference in Brussels helped participating partners and ensembles to compile a shopping list of what they wanted to know about audiences for new music.

The shopping list of research questions fell into five areas:

- Audience profile and attendance patterns at music and other cultural events
- The audience experience of concerts and motivations for attending including attitudes to the venue
- Barriers to attendance by potential audiences
- Marketing effectiveness and how this could be improved
- Information for partners about ensembles' audience development attitudes, approach and practice.

Many of the questions were answered through overviews of existing research into audiences for live music presented by the Audience Development Consultant at each of the workshops. These were framed in everyday language to give the ensembles solid evidence to support decisions about the audience development projects they were developing. The most useful sources of evidence were often unexpected, ranging from brain science to architecture. These presentations have been summarised into a series of briefings answering questions like how do audiences listen? How do they choose what to listen to? How do they develop their musical tastes? What are the concert formats that attract new audiences? Where do audiences feel most ready for new musical experiences?

### **Primary research methodology**

Twelve academics or audience research professionals were recruited to support ensembles in carrying out primary research to answer the ensembles' outstanding questions about their audience and evaluate the audience development approaches being tested as part of each concert.

Laila De Bruyne, Vida Razavi and Prof. dr Annick Schramme: Hermes Ensemble  
James Coutts: Hebrides Ensemble, Scotland  
Baiba Freimane: Sinfonietta Riga, Latvia  
Sine Tofte Hannibal: KammerensembleN, Sweden  
Anna Karina Nortung: Athelas Sinfonietta, Denmark  
Seamus Redmond: Crash Ensemble and Con Tempo Quartet, Ireland  
Anna Reshetniak and Maryana Golovchenko, Lunatree, The Netherlands  
Sayaka Sakashita: London Contemporary Orchestra, England  
Malgorzata Zamorska, Kwartludium, Poland

The Audience Research Consultant assembled a simple research toolkit that the ensembles could use themselves and the research partners could use as a starting point for their own research. This kit consisted of:

- "I'm still wondering" card with two questions about engagement (see below)
- a set of recommended survey questions for researchers and ensembles to choose from and add to
- a description of how focus groups work and instructions for recruitment for research partners to brief ensembles.

If research partners used questionnaires, they were asked to ensure results could be compared between ensembles by using the same response bands eg for age or frequency of attendance.

Research partners were free to use other methodologies and create new tools where appropriate. An example of this was the observation framework developed by research partner Malgorzata Zamorska when researching the engagement of young children at concerts by Polish quartet, Kwartludium.

Research partners were asked to write a brief report (2,000 to 4,000 words) that would be meaningful to participating ensembles.

These ensembles carried out their own research using the research kit:

Avanti! Ensemble, Finland  
Cantus Ensemble, Croatia  
Ensemble Recherche, Germany

Orkiestra Musyki Nowej, Poland  
Ensemble TM+, France

### **"I'm still wondering..." cards**

The "I'm still wondering..." cards were designed to be a simple tool that would take few resources to administer. Although they lacked sophistication, they were designed to demonstrate the value of research to the ensembles by revealing a little about how audiences feel about the concert, how they engage with the music, whether they understand what the ensemble is trying to do, what the audiences' expectations are and clues about what kind of listener they are. The findings from this tool were placed within the context of the more rigorous research carried out.

The text and images were chosen to make sure all the audience were likely to respond in a meaningful way whether they were experienced or inexperienced, emotional or analytical listeners. The research partners or ensembles made a cultural (not literal) translation of the cards, choosing a word for "concert" that reflected the atmosphere and intention of the event. The word "wondering" was chosen because it includes the possibility of doubt in a way that "thinking" does not.

The cards were tested by two ensembles. They reported that handing them out got a far better response rate than putting them on seats. Each time one was handed to an audience member, they said something like "[ensemble name] would like to know what you think about the concert so please jot down something - anything - at the end and then hand it back".

### **Concerts**

Ensembles were asked to complete a concert fact template that logged basic information about each concert they presented as part of the New:Audproject:

- Ensemble name
- Date of concert
- Time of day
- No. of attenders
- No. of free tickets to invited guests
- Box office income
- No. of seats put on sale (capacity of hall)
- Type of venue
- Home venue yes/no
- Festival yes/no
- Pre- or post- show talk yes/no and number of attenders
- Did the concert
  - happen in a traditional concert hall? yes/no
  - feature a well-known guest star? yes/no
  - have a theme or concept? yes/no

feature mixed media or cross-artform? yes/no

feature a mixed programme in a traditional format? yes/no

A case study template asked ensembles to report on the artistic content of the concert and what they learned from it.

Finally, the online questionnaire sent after the final conference asked ensembles about the impact of the project on their artistic policy.

### **Resistance to evaluation**

Some ensembles were comfortable with the principles of evaluation and two had already undertaken research to understand their audiences better. Others wanted to explore what their audiences were like and how they responded to the music but were small ensembles, run by musicians and so did not have the skills or resources to do it.

There were national differences in attitude that seemed to spring in part from the reporting they had to do for funders. The ensembles from France, Ireland, The Netherlands, Poland and the UK were keen to engage with evaluation.

Almost all the participants could identify what they wanted to know during the workshops at the Brussels launch conference. Most found it much more difficult to articulate their ensemble's goals, including those concerned with the development of music. Just twelve ensembles were able to give three bullet points about what they wanted to achieve.

This meant that many participating ensembles were highly suspicious of evaluation.

They did not want to be judged by numbers that they felt were unrelated to what they were trying to do so were reluctant to share information about the size of their audience and level of activity. Their difficulty in articulating their goals meant that they could not express what they did want to evaluate. The twelve ensembles that did identify goals were more likely to engage with the evaluation process.

Many ensembles believed that asking the audience questions before or after the concert, or even recruiting them to participate in subsequent research, would spoil the concert experience. This meant that the implementation of the evaluation plan was delayed.

The project management did not prioritise evaluation either, and delayed the implementation of the plan to recruit research partners by six months as their focus was on developing and delivering the working community workshops.

In an attempt to persuade the ensembles to participate, the "I'm still wondering..." cards were piloted by two ensembles. The project managers surveyed audiences at a concert by KammerensembleN and filmed interviews with two audience members who completed questionnaires about whether they felt this had been intrusive. These videos were shown at the Helsinki conference at the end of the first year. At this conference, one of the research partners, Anna Karina Nortung, talked about her approach to audience research. As a result, a consensus was finally reached about the evaluation process.

This delay caused problems for some ensembles:

*"My main concern with the process was a lack of specific data for Psappha. Due to the early adoption of a work from the composers' database the protocols regarding audience and concert research were not in place which meant we received no research support or data. I realise that mounting such an enormous project will always be difficult but I would certainly be keen to be involved in a future project particularly if the protocols for research were set up in advance of the start of the project."* Psappha Ensemble, UK

## Response

There were 62 New:Aud concerts. Eleven concert fact templates and 16 case study templates were returned. Thirteen research reports were submitted.

Sixteen ensembles responded to the online survey about impacts and outcomes sent out after the last conference.

## 3. Outcomes

### 3.1. Building capacity

#### Has New:Aud raised awareness of the importance of audience development among participating ensembles?

All the participants participating in the focus groups held as part of the final working community meetings believed they now had a much better understanding of audience development:

*"We're no longer like little kids, falling down, getting up, falling down again. We've had people holding our hands so we've been able to take a few steps."*

In the online survey distributed to ensembles after the final conference, they were asked to describe five things that had changed because their ensemble participated in the New:Aud project. Half of the impacts named were related to audience development, a third to organisational development and the remainder associated with artistic development.

Audience development outcomes were ranked 3.8 out of five in importance compared to 2.8 for artistic development outcomes and 2.6 for organisational development outcomes. Seven organisations out of the 16 responding to the online survey reported that their organisations were more focused on audiences. Six respondents said they and their colleagues thought about audiences a bit more than before the project and ten said they thought about them a lot more than before:

*"More weight is given to audience development."* defunensemble, Finland

*"My own understanding of audience development has not changed, I only improved my knowledge and found the answers what tools exactly could be used to reach the results. BUT...Being a part of New:Aud helped me A LOT finally to involve the Orchestra members into discussions about the audiences and to prove that they are playing FOR THE AUDIENCE and it's not only concern of marketing department. It should concern all of us. It's a very very important inner change and I'd say the biggest achievement. It's a merit of New:Aud: when practically the whole Europe speaks about changes and new, fresh view to the*

*audience, you cannot ignore this anymore. Being a part of New:Aud gave an understanding to our Orchestra members that without their involvement, we can lose the relevance and interest of the people very fast."* St. Christopher Chamber Orchestra of Vilnius

### **Has the project professionalised participating ensembles' audience development practice?**

The 16 respondents to the final online survey reported the following impacts on their audience development practice:

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>No. of ensembles</b>	<b>Average importance ranking</b>
Improved audience engagement	9	3.9
Improved marketing tools	8	3.6
Increased audience focus	7	4.1
Engagement with a new audience segment	4	4.0
Building relationships with audiences	3	4.3
Better understanding of audiences	3	2.7
New audience development strategy	2	3.5
More weight on marketing	1	4.0

Eight respondents said they understand a little more about audience development as a result of New:Aud and eight said they understand a lot more.

*"Sinfonietta Rīga made audience research already before. New Audience gave us a chance to experiment with different approaches of communication and creative content. With participation in New Audience we understood our weak points that we can develop (eg web page)."* Sinfonietta Rīga, Latvia

*"Avanti! has tried to rethink the role of the audience."* Avanti! Chamber Orchestra, Finland

*"It helped us to grasp the good questions that one must make to understand the audience. With the evaluation we have done at one of our concert, we are more focused on what we have to improve : digital communication, but also interaction with the audience before and after the concert. One person in our team will be focused full time on this aspect."*

Ensemble TM+, France

Fifteen out of sixteen respondents to the online survey issued to ensembles after the final conference said that they would continue to develop audiences in the future. One said it would "maybe" continue with audience development, commenting:

*"Audience development needs resources. Especially what concerns new creative content. New:Aud was a great input for experimenting and creating a new content. After closing the New:Aud program we will continue to use different communication tools, especially social and digital media to attract new audience."* Sinfonietta Rīga, Latvia



## Have the ensembles developed a better understanding of existing and potential audiences for new music?

All the ensembles responding to the online survey reported that their knowledge of audiences for new music had improved because they were part of New:Aud.

<b>Has your knowledge about audiences changed because you were part of New:Aud?</b>	<b>No. of ensembles</b>
No, we already understood our audiences well	0
No. we learned nothing useful about audiences from this project	0
Yes, we now realise how little we know about our audiences	2
Yes, we understand audiences a bit better now	6
Yes, we know a lot more about audiences now	8
Total responses	16

*"We have been given a lot of interesting and sometimes stunning facts. There is no audience that only attends new music events. There is a big "art-audience" that can be interested in new music if the event and the surroundings are appealing."*

Gageego!, Sweden

*"The audience questionnaires and focus groups have really provided us with knowledge and insight."* Lunatree, The Netherlands

*"The experience of taking part in New:Aud project was like an eye-opener. We had an opportunity to gather interesting and useful knowledge which is very specific and rarely discussed by ensembles and concert organizers, at least in Poland."*

Orkiestra Muzyki Nowej, Poland

However, a better understanding of audiences does not necessarily mean bigger audiences, as ensembles need resources to take action:

*"Problem is that now I know more, but because we have very limited resources in staff, we cannot do as much as we should."* Avanti! Chamber Orchestra, Finland

However, the project was at least partially successful in focusing on audience development approaches relevant to organisations with few resources:

*"We got information about marketing in a form that is really useful for chamber music ensembles with a small marketing budget."* ensemble recherche, Germany

## Have ensembles exchanged ideas, experiences and good practice about audience development?

In the online survey, six ensembles out of 16 cited their practical learning from their peers as one of their five most important outcomes from the project, ranking it 2.8 out of five. They commented:

*"New ideas, new composers and new perspectives, but facing the same questions."*

ZAK Ensemble, Hungary

*"It allowed us to have confidence in what we are doing, to see ourselves in the context of what ensembles across Europe are doing, to access repertoire we may not have otherwise considered, open up the potential for future collaboration and gain real advice from those who know the industry. No, this would not have been possible working with groups from our own country as there aren't enough groups."* Crash Ensemble, Ireland

*"We now know that there are many further possibilities to get new audiences. From others and from the lectures of the invited experts we also have learned that we have to have patience and think in long term to build up new audiences. Before the New:Aud project we have not spent time to find a clear definition which audience we want to get. This has now changed."* ensemble recherche, Germany

*"Learning from previous experience by other ensembles helped a lot in reaching out to new audiences, and in preparing our projects to reach more and different target audiences."*  
HERMES ensemble, Flanders

The participants in the focus groups reported that the most important outcome of the project was the exchange of ideas.

*"The direct exchange of ideas is very important, especially how to launch relationships with new audiences."*

They found most participants were eager to provide useful input:

*"The people in this group really wanted to help me"*

*"There was a good atmosphere and discussions at our workshops"*

*"The first workshop was shocking because there were so many ideas, so many ways of working."*

There were several types of exchange:

One ensemble used a working community meeting to try out a concert format with the group members as the audience. They asked them afterwards how the format had changed the listening experience and how they could further enhance this.

Some ensembles have adopted other participants' projects wholesale:

*"We have copied Ivo's scheme."*

Some were inspired by other ensembles' projects to develop their own versions, with big changes to suit their particular circumstances.

Others have made smaller changes to existing projects by adopting specific ideas:

*"The idea we got from the workshop was to put musicians throughout the gallery and have the children wander through as they want."*

*"We got practical ideas from each other – we asked "How did you...""*

But sharing negative experiences was just as important:

*"The meetings are so important. We find out what we should avoid when trying to conquer new audiences."*

*"What is most useful is discussing what works and what doesn't about the repertoire, project ideas and what engages audiences."*

*"I will miss this workshop because it kills ideas and that's a good thing. We can use other's experiences rather than trial and error. That means we don't waste our time on things that won't work."*

### **Have lasting relationships been created between participating ensembles?**

Many participants believed that they would continue to co-operate with other ensembles:

*"Ensemble leaders in Europe feel like colleagues now instead of being afraid or competing. We now realise we all have our own expertise and direction so we don't need to be afraid."*

It did take time to develop these relationships:

*"The situation changed completely during the two years from a loose, informal group to formal co-operation."*

The working community format was important in developing lasting relationships:

*"Things have become easier as a result of the workshops. Direct contact with the partners and ensembles is so much easier. And it's less formal contact so you get open answers."*

### **What were the factors that enabled effective co-operation?**

Participants felt that working in small groups was the best way to foster co-operation. They felt the groups were particularly effective because they were organised by theme:

*"It meant we met people who are interested in the same things as us"*

Many wanted them to meet more often – perhaps three or four times a year.

They felt the three conferences were useful too:

*"The big discussions were good with everyone open to sharing."*

Participants valued the continuity provided by the project manager, however some thought that different facilitators for each meeting would challenge participants to think in different ways.

They valued what one group called the 'show and tell' moments when ensembles presented completed projects:

*"Very inspiring."*

### **How could the project have provided a better environment for co-operation?**

Some participants expressed frustration that not all the issues raised in the Year 1 working communities had been fully discussed before the groups were changed round for Year 2.

Others felt that the changeover meant the groups remained open and productive, easily incorporating new members. However, they felt that forming the new groups was not easy.

It was suggested that a different structure for the working community meetings would have made them more immediately productive:

*"We have been learning as we go but it has been tricky sometimes because there were no clear learning outcomes for each meeting."*

If the meetings started with a dinner and opening session the night before, the group could set learning objectives and think about them overnight.

The environment made a big difference:

*"Don't use a small room – we need space if we meet all day."*

Some commented that meetings were more productive when they weren't rushed:

*"We need to have time to discuss things properly."*

Many of the ensembles valued input from their peers more than the presentations by most of the guest speakers. This was because most speakers were from the new music sector and had no more experience than the ensembles themselves:

*"Having visitors doesn't work – who the speaker is really matters."*

*"Sometimes it was a little bit like being on the school bench."*

Others wanted presentations from festivals and venues, people working in other contemporary artforms or from philosophers who could talk about "the big issues".

One group said that they would have liked more visibility about what New:Aud concerts were happening and what pieces from the database were being played.

### **Has New:Aud created an audience development resource to support the wider sector?**

The introduction of the Basecamp online project management facility was seen as important by most participants in the focus groups held as part of the final workshops as it allowed them to use resources and tools developed in other working communities. Basecamp now holds 264 concert reports, case studies, images and marketing tools; audience development checklists and briefings, plus all the research findings. Several commented that they would have benefited from its earlier introduction.

These comments indicate that the resource will be useful to the wider sector. It is now being transferred to a permanent website whereupon it will be promoted to the wider sector through composers' societies, music information centres, music publishers, rights organisations, conservatoires and audience development organisations.

## 3.2. Developing audiences

### What has the action research revealed about developing audiences for new music?

The New:Aud working communities developed hypotheses about audiences and approaches to audience development in response to reviews of the secondary research already available and discussions and exercises within the groups. They went on to test these through the series of concerts they delivered over the two years of the project. The following sets out our hypotheses and gives a brief summary of the findings of the concert evaluations. The full research reports, raw data and other analysis will be available to all on the New:Aud website.

### What we say about our concerts matters

True – for example, an interviewee at an Athelas Sinfonietta concert said “Normally I would never go to a concert like this as it is miles from what I normally listen to. The way they were marketing the concert – the words and phrases used to sell - it was spot-on.”

### Different people listen to music in different ways

True – but it’s more complex than we predicted. We knew from neuroscience that inexperienced listeners seem to experience musical form as a whole using the right side of their brain. Experienced listeners, though, have learned to experience melody through the intervals between notes using the left side of their brain.<sup>i</sup> We used Alan Brown’s framework<sup>ii</sup> to categorise our audiences’ responses and found listeners being captivated by the experience, mental stimulation, emotional resonance, spiritual value, aesthetic growth and the quality of the experience. This was true for audiences for concerts in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Poland, Latvia and the UK. Sayaka Sakashita’s careful observation of the audience for a concert by the London Contemporary Orchestra highlighted the contrasting external or internal focus of different people as they listened.

### We can get bigger audiences by ditching the concert hall

True – but only if the marketing messages focus on the venue and the experience. Around half the audiences at these concerts know little or nothing about contemporary classical music. Audiences are motivated by three things in combination: the concert as a special event, the uniqueness of the venue and the music.

### The venue matters

True – 90% of respondents at a concert by Sinfonietta Riga said that the venue changed the way they listened to the music. Research for two other ensembles highlighted that this only worked if the venue was not regularly used for classical concerts. Churches, in particular, could feel like formal concert venues. Different venues made concerts feel like a new experience, they heightened audience perceptions, inspired them and encouraged them to try the unfamiliar.

We also discovered that the best way to attract young audiences between 18 and 35 was to perform in places they already know and love.

### **Audiences prefer informal, social concerts**

True – most audiences want welcoming and cosy venues where they can sit near the musicians, not in rows. They want musicians to engage with them and to have opportunities afterwards to share experiences with other audience members. Formal talks by or interviews with composers can alienate audiences by highlighting how much they don't know. Lunatree, Cantus Ensemble and Athelas experimented with intertwining the music with videos and recordings of composers talking their work. Audiences loved them, as long as they were short and to the point.

We thought that audiences would talk about the elements that community architects say make third spaces. They seemed to take these things for granted, however, only mentioning food and drink or the comfort of the seats if they were missing.

### **Audiences don't think in terms of musical genres**

Not always true – some audiences did talk in terms of narrow genres like "classical piano" but most described themselves as musical omnivores with very wide tastes. Others talked about enjoying any music that triggered particular emotions. The balance of different types of listener depended on the concert programme, as this example shows (the larger the word, the greater the number of respondents falling into this category):



### **Young people do not want to be passive listeners**

True - under 35s preferred concerts where musicians connected and communicated with them. And Cantus Ensemble and Avanti! Ensemble found that if you involve young people in the concert they will bring friends and family.

### **Very young children like challenging music**

True - Kwartludium developed a concert format for children under 12 and as young as four. Even the youngest listened with interest and curiosity. They were so involved in the music that they preferred to listen than engage in activities such as drawing.

Dagna Sadkowska of Kwartludium has developed a handbook on how to engage young children in new music downloadable at <http://issuu.com/musiceducation/docs/music-education-handbook>

### **We can help people engage with the music**

True - audiences love the role that the audience can play in creating a great concert and they want musicians to engage with them. Oslo Sinfonietta took this further and experimented with ways of helping the audience prepare to listen. Overall, we found that our music has more impact if audiences feel at home in the venue, feel some sense of familiarity with the music and composers and feel a sense of occasion and anticipation.

## **3.3. Artistic development**

### **Has participation in the working communities changed the way ensembles present concerts?**

*"We tried out new concert venues such as clubs, an old factory or via a so called "block party" in the street where our ensemble is located."* Klangforum Wien, Austria

*"We worked with concert formats that brought us closer to our audiences."*

Lunatree, The Netherlands

Eleven out of the 16 respondents to the online survey sent out after the final conference said that their concerts have changed a little because they were part of New:Aud. Four said their concerts have changed a lot. Only one ensemble, well known for its innovative approach to engaging disadvantaged communities, said that they had not changed, commenting:

*"Artistic content and the concert form didn't change directly. But it helps to be aware of what level of innovation we must maintain to be part of the network."*

Ensemble TM+, France

Fourteen out of sixteen said they would continue to present concerts in the new formats they had piloted as part of New:Aud.

*"We have introduced a few additional features such as pre- concert talks, narration of the concert, special lighting. We have also considered other interesting or unusual venues and extra ideas which could be inspiring for the future."* Orkiestra Muzyki Nowej, Poland

*"All our New:Aud concerts were really special experiences not only for our audience, but also for musicians and the management team! We included some elements from New:Aud concerts to our traditional concerts."* Sinfonietta Rīga, Latvia

One ensemble that said it would not continue with the changes to its concerts was continuing to experiment with every aspect other than the actual programme:

*"But we are more actively experimenting with concert length, concert times and venues."*

Hebrides Ensemble, Scotland

## How did ensembles involve composers in their New:Aud concerts?

Only two of the 16 respondents to the online survey did not involve composers in their New:Aud concerts. One of those that did not, commented:

*"Unfortunately we included a work by a composer from the database early on in the project. This meant that not everything was in place for us to get useful data and an understanding of what was on offer."* Psappa Ensemble, England

	<b>No. of ensembles</b>
We talked to them about their piece before or during rehearsals	10
They came to a rehearsal	10
We invited them to the concert	10
They came to the concert	10
They were involved in the concert eg giving a talk or a workshop	5
We filmed them talking about their music eg for our website or social media	5
We sent them reviews or feedback after the concert	5
We did not involve composers in our concerts	2
Total responses	16

Several ensembles specifically experimented with ways of building relationships between composers and audiences:

*"Since all of them live far away, we interviewed them; those interviews were integrated in a sound environment that was part of the concert. This setup worked very well, and will surely be repeated in future concerts."* Lunatree, The Netherlands

## Do ensembles have a better awareness and understanding of the concert format as a tool to reach broader audiences?

Most participants in the focus groups held as part of the final working community meetings were able to identify specific inputs they got from the other members of their working communities that they had put into practice.

*"I got a very long list of tools and ideas. Many are now part of our business plan and are built into our forthcoming concerts."*

*"The group's ideas that became a reality were to take the audience on a tour of the archive before the concert, to talk to the audience during the concert in a meaningful way, to hire lighting and to perform each concert twice, once at 6pm for people coming straight from work and again at 8pm for the people wanting a night out"*

They valued the feedback from their peers:

*"The input was very precious to us"*

Several participants commented how difficult it was to discuss negative issues and failure in other forums:



*"I used the working communities to explore sector-wide issues I can't discuss elsewhere because most people want to ignore them"*

*"It was useful to see all aspects of our project and hear the problems other had. The most useful outcome was to decide not to do live streaming project but to make trailers instead. Our strategy now is to document concerts to promote the next one."*

Some participants completed their New:Aud concerts early in the project so did not have concerts in development during Year 2 of the project. Other participants planned concerts a long way in advance so found it difficult to identify cases for which they wanted feedback. These participants reported that they still benefited from the working communities because they could talk about more general issues and this would have an impact on future concerts:

*"We understand the importance of conceptualisation now, that we need to find the meaning behind the concert and how to communicate it".*

Some participants commented that the impact of the working communities has been even broader:

*"We have all changed our systems and thinking."*

Several participants reported that the impact of the working communities ripples through the whole orchestra:

*"I have got much more involved in arranging concerts and the project has given me the ability from the audience point of view... now we discuss a lot within the orchestra how to use what we have learned from New:Aud to fill the concert hall."*

*"We have a meeting when I get back to debrief the others and then brainstorm."*

One participant felt that the project would have even more impact on what they do in the future as it takes time to implement change.

The effectiveness of the working community meetings seemed to depend on the quality of the participants' note-taking:

*"I can't remember much about the last session."*

This makes the notes, tools and resources posted on Basecamp particularly important.

*"We can grasp and hold onto valuable insights".*

### **Did ensembles expand their repertoire through New:Aud?**

On average, participating ensembles performed 3.8 pieces from the repertoire. One ensemble focused on one major work, another played seven pieces in all.

Thirteen ensembles made positive comments about the impact of the pieces they chose:

*"It was wonderful to work closely with Stockhausen's long-time collaborator Kathinka Pasveer on the performance of 'BALANCE', and we hope to build on that relationship for future Stockhausen projects (perhaps by staging 'KLANG' in its entirety one day)! We also*

*have it in mind to commission a work from Øyvind Torvund whose work 'NEON FOREST SPACE' went down so well at our Aldwych Underground performance."* London Contemporary Orchestra, England

*"New:Aud gave us a chance to enlarge our repertoire of contemporary music. In future we will continue to find solution to perform contemporary music programs as the New:Aud program showed that it is very much in demand in Riga."* Sinfonietta Rīga, Latvia

*"We had good experiences with these pieces and feel encouraged to continue using this database."* Orkiestra Muzyki Nowej, Poland

*"Our co-operation with Michel van der Aa will continue and we'll invite him to work with us again."* Avanti! Chamber Orchestra, Finland

*"Contact with and experience of new composers is the most important thing when it comes to repertoire development. We now have two new contacts that hopefully will lead to more collaborative projects."* Gageego!, Sweden

*"The repertoire introduced us to composers we had not performed before. We will continue to use the database and hope to perform other works by composers we have already performed. We have also developed a personal relationship with one of the composers who attended a concert including his work."* Crash Ensemble, Ireland

*"We know composers whose work we wouldn't have performed regularly. The tour with these pieces allowed the ensemble to deepen the relationship with the composer. We are now aware of the rich European repertoire of other ensembles and it is stimulating to feel a part of this whole network."* Ensemble TM+, France

*"The piece of Jean Marie-Rens will be included into regular repertoire of the Orchestra."* St. Christopher Chamber Orchestra of Vilnius, Lithuania

Three ensembles had less positive experiences, partly because the database held few pieces that suited their instrumentation or artistic focus:

*"[The pieces we performed] were close to our ensemble's basic repertoire. We work in the area of electro acoustic music and the repertoire database didn't include this genre pieces very much."* defunensemble, Finland

and partly because of the quality of the work they chose:

*"It wasn't a terribly inspiring piece, and was poorly notated so we won't play it again. It fulfilled a purpose for our collaboration with young performers though, who could discuss the need for clarity in notation, and also how composers often don't know enough about the instruments they are writing for."* Hebrides Ensemble, Scotland

## References

---

<sup>i</sup> Bever, T.G. and Chiarello, R.J., 'Cerebral Dominance in Musicians and Nonmusicians', *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 2009; 21, pp. 94–97

<sup>ii</sup> Alan Brown, 'An Architecture of Value', *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader*, 17,1, p21