



Jazz Audiences Initiative*

Report #1: Music Listening Study

Joe E. Heimlich, Ph.D.
Ohio State University Extension
OSUExtension@COSI

Introduction

The Jazz Audiences Initiative asks fundamental questions about how and why people engage with jazz in order to uncover ideas for building audiences and infuse the art form with new energy. Relatively little research has been done on jazz audiences and what they value. We know that jazz audiences are aging, jazz media outlets and festivals are fading, jazz organizations are struggling, and jazz musicians are overly burdened. In addition, the jazz field lacks meaningful opportunities to network and learn as a professional community.

Simultaneously, we know that audiences crave participative, interactive and intimate experiences that they help create. They make last minute decisions to attend events, and subscription buyers have declined drastically. As more people look to create a “work-life” balance, they are interested in modest ‘perfect moments’ as a result of experiences that are authentic, community-based and unforgettable. It is the philosophy of the Jazz Audiences Initiative that the long-term sustainability of jazz depends on new knowledge and insight about the needs, attitudes and motivations of existing and potential audiences.

* With support from:



The purpose of the larger study is to qualitatively explore the potential for expanding the jazz market. The first phase of the project is to investigate and create deeper understanding of listeners' musical tastes and perceptions of jazz, with particular attention paid to the language they use to describe the music. Research will begin by exploring how people construct preferences for different forms of music and especially jazz, and what language they use to describe it. This will involve comparing what styles of music people *say* they like, with how they respond to various types of music played when they actually hear it. In other words, we'll see how their perceptions align with their actual tastes. This research will create a new vocabulary for describing jazz and will reveal how jazz artists and presenters can communicate about jazz more effectively. This phase of the project is called the Music Listening Study. This report outlines the findings related to the relationships among preferences, music background of study participants, and engagement with music.

Method, Music Listening Study

The Music Listening Study was conducted under an exempted human subjects review by the Ohio State University, protocol #2010E0016.

Population. The population for this study was self-identified music fans over the age of 18 who reside in or near Columbus, Ohio. Recruitment was conducted through electronic mailing lists of the Jazz Arts Group, electronic mailing lists and personal invitations from musicians, at a variety of venues, and through groups of other jazz styles and blogs. Although the goal was to conduct more than 100 interviews, due to weather and time constraints (the study was conducted in one week), the final number of individuals engaged was 47. However, more than 477 individual incidents of responding to music were collected. Participant ages ranged from 23 to 72 for males, and 25-67 for females. There were almost an equal number of males and females involved in the study (23 M, 24 F).

When individuals responded to the invitation (via paper, web, or e-mail), they were directed to visit a website where they were informed that they were electing to participate in a research study and their time commitment for the study would be 45 minutes, that the interview would involve them listening to different types of music and telling the researcher what they thought about the music they were hearing, and that the interview was confidential. If they agreed, they clicked on the next page which asked them to provide their contact information, select three preferred interview times, and enter a code included in the invitation or e-mail which allowed us the tracking of the source by which they entered the study. The individual confirmed their age as over 18, and was then informed that a confirmation would be sent electronically.

Methodology. This is an exploratory study with the intention of learning how people label different forms of music, the language they use to describe different music, and how they discuss what they are hearing.

Participants were interviewed individually. The interview began with a few questions regarding the individual's interest in music and any prior experience and training in music. The individual then listened to several 1.5 minute cuts of different types of music. The 63 possible cuts were shuffled using i-Tunes so the sequence could be randomly generated for each interview. The individual was asked to listen to the music and when they felt comfortable, to talk about their listening experience. The prompts for this line of questioning included *what would you call this music?*, *what do you like or dislike*

about it?, do you listen to this type of music at home?, and would you attend concerts, clubs, or other venues to listen to this type of music?. All of these questions build on the way the individual described the music as they listened or immediately after listening, to the cut.

The music cuts were coded so that the interviewer was able to key the responses to the cut being described. Each individual listened to between eight and eighteen cuts of music depending on how in-depth their responses were. The music cuts were selected by staff of the Jazz Arts Group to represent music across spectrums. Several intentional decisions were made in the selection and presentation of music:

1. The selections would be made to reflect a genre, not an individual or a group
2. As much as possible, the 90 second cuts would be selected from within a piece to try to showcase the essence of the music rather than a beginning or ending
3. Vocal music would NOT be included as it becomes difficult to separate the vocalist from the music and that would violate the first decision
4. Selections would intentionally mix instrumentation and expectations in listeners to determine if instruments or form determine genre.

Instrumentation. The instrument for the study was a partially open-ended response form. A code number was assigned to each person based on the sequence of interviews. The first section of the interview captured minimal demographic information and the individual's knowledge, interest, and experience with music. The music description sections included a field for the researcher to identify the code for the cut, a line for the "label" the individual puts on the cut, and space for capturing comments made while listening, then post-listening. A scale of 1 "hate it" to 10 "love it" with 5 being "so/so" was used for each cut.

Conditions of Study. Interviews were conducted at the Jazz Academy (Lincoln Theatre) in downtown Columbus. Individuals were asked to arrive within the 15 minutes prior to their interview. No appreciation gifts or incentives were provided for participation.

Findings

Engagement with music

Prior training. Analyses were conducted related to the individual's prior experiences with music. Two metrics were constructed from responses to open-ended questions based on 1) formal training in music and 2) the ways in which the individual engages with music. For training, seven categories emerged with one anticipated category having no individuals identify: that of formal training in music theory in high school. Thus, the categories for training are very close to a linear progression of exposure (excluding the final category). Table 1 shows the distribution of formal training by participant.

Level of Training	N by cut	Percent	N by individual	Percent
None	131	28.3	11	22.3
Instrument through High School	497	30.8	15	31.2
Instrument through College	58	12.0	6	12.5
Theory in College	12	2.5	4	8.3
Instrument-Lifelong	29	6.0	3	6.3
Theory and Instrument-Lifelong	87	18.0	8	16.7
Instrument as an Adult	10	2.1	1	2.1

Table 1: Level of training

When interview responses are categorized by music cut, over half the individuals had no training at all, or played an instrument in middle or high school. Only 20% of all participants had training in music theory. This finding could suggest one explanation for the difficulty in describing music and also in labeling music. That nearly a third of respondents had no music exposure bodes both well for presenters and performers of jazz in that music appreciation is not required by all aficionados of music, and also cautionary in that nearly a third of the individuals do not have the technical background for understanding music.

Ways of engaging. For engagement, eight categories emerged from the responses with two predicted categories having no respondents: reading about music only and creating music only. Coding was determined by the dominance of ways of engaging named by the individual as primary or dominant mode (e.g. “I mostly listen on my computer”). Table 2 following shows the percents of individuals and the ways they engage.

Almost 80% of the participants were super engagers or super listeners, categories that were defined by those who engage with music in several diverse ways, and those who routinely listen to music via three or more media. This supports the intention of the study to use individuals who are highly engaged in music and avid fans of a variety of forms of music.

Engage	N by individual	Percent
Listen at home on traditional media (vinyl, tapes, CDs)	2	4.5
Listen at home on digital media (ipod, computer)	3	6.8
Live music	2	4.5
Super engager (play and listen)	13	29.5
Super listener	17	38.6
Listen to radio/tv/internet radio	2	4.5
Read and listen but don't create	4	9.1
Think, study or write about music	1	2.3

Table 2: Engagement in music

Engagement, attendance, and personal practice

In order to determine the participants' willingness to engage with the various genres of music, as individuals listened to the cuts, they were asked if they currently did or would listen to that type of music, and if they would attend a concert or a club where that type of music was being performed. As expected, a fairly predictable response pattern emerged: the higher the ranking, the more likely the individual would be to listen or attend, to a certain degree. Regarding listening, the response was linear to a ranking of 8, after which the numbers began dropping, suggesting a curvilinear relationship. For attending, there was again a peak at 8, but the highest percentage response was for ranking of 10. Table 3 compares ranked cuts by type of engagement.

Ranked Cut	Number	Listen/would	Percent Listen/would	Attend/would	Percent Attend/would
1	17	1	5.9	2	11.8
2	32	4	12.5	3	9.4
3	23	4	17.4	3	13.0
4	38	4	10.5	10	26.3

Music Listening Study

Ranked Cut	Number	Listen/would	Percent Listen/would	Attend/would	Percent Attend/would
5	54	13	24.1	16	66.7
6	61	20	32.3	38	62.3
7	69	38	55.1	57	82.6
8	79	64	81.0	71	89.9
9	36	25	69.4	29	80.1
10	40	27	67.5	36	90.0
OVERALL	449	200	44.5	267	59.5

Table 3: Comparison of engagement by rank of cut

The general increase in willingness to attend over listening to music is notable in this comparison. In all but the cuts ranked 2 and 3, participants expressed a greater willingness to attend a concert or club more than to listen to the music on their own. Only 44.5% of all responses to cuts were positive for listening to the genre, but 59.5% of responses to cuts stated the person would attend.

As a basis for understanding attendance to concerts/clubs and personal behavior, questions were embedded in the listening study to suggest behavior and willingness to behave. When examining how individuals responded to interest in listening to the type of music via a recorded version and interest in attending a concert or show of this type of music, an interesting pattern emerged in preferences. Across all cuts and responses, 51.9% of the responses indicated that they would NOT listen to the genre on their own (n=250); 2.9% noted they might listen to the music on their own and the remaining 44.5% (200) would or already did listen to the music.

When asked about their willingness to listen to the music in a concert or club setting, the percentage of individuals flatly refusing to do so dropped to 38.4% (181). Nearly half (46.8%, n=221) said they currently listened to that particular genre of music in concert or clubs now, or that they would attend. There were 70, or 14.8%, who might attend—including 20 unqualified maybes, 20 who would attend if they came upon it or if the music were played in a club they had gone to, 17 who would if they were invited, 8 who would if the cost were low or free, and 5 who would if they knew the musicians.

As this was a broad question addressing willingness, it is not possible to accurately relate to actual behavior. It is easy in the context of the interview for individuals to say they would attend, but there is no commitment or effort required to state such an action. A more rigorous measure of willingness to engage or intention to act might reveal a different pattern. The finding does suggest that there is a greater expression of interest in engaging in a more diverse range of music externally than in personal media, however, which could provide opportunities for jazz producers and performers to encourage attendance.

Music Listening Study

In exploration across cuts of music, no discernable pattern emerged, suggesting the differences in preferences are uniquely related to the individual and the specific genre or genres of music (see Table 4).

Cut	Genre	Listen			Attend		
		Yes	No	Maybe	Yes	No	Maybe
1	World	2	1	0	1	1	1
2	Unclassifiable/other jazz	1	9	0	2	7	1
3	Rock/R&B	4	3	0	1	3	3
4	Country/Bluegrass/Americana	4	4	0	4	1	3
5	Unclassifiable/other jazz	3	3	0	2	2	2
6	Free jazz	2	3	0	3	1	1
7	Bossa Nova jazz	4	2	0	2	1	3
8	Unclassifiable/other jazz	9	5	0	5	5	4
9	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6	0	0	3	2	1
10	Classical	3	1	1	2	1	2
11	Swing-standards- 30s	1	4	0		4	1
12	50s swing	7	0	1	5	1	2
13	Unclassifiable/other jazz	3	3	0	4	1	1
14	BeBop	6	4	0	4	5	1
15	Gypsy jazz	5	9	0	5	5	4
16	Unclassifiable/other jazz	3	1	0	2	1	1
17	Impressionist/20 th century classical	4	4	0	3	1	3
18	Unclassifiable/other jazz	5	2	1	7	2	
19	Romantic	1	8	0	1	6	2
20	Classical Baroque	6	5	0	4	5	2
21	Rock/R&B	3	2	1	5	1	1
22	Funk fusion	3	6	1	2	5	3
23	Impressionist/20 th century classical	1	6	0	5	1	1
24	World	3	2	0	3	1	1
25	Early jazz	2	3	1	2	1	3
26	Rock/R&B	3	4	0	2	5	0
27	Rock/R&B	4	5	0	3	4	2
28	Free jazz	1	8	0	1	8	0
29	Unclassifiable/other jazz	2	1	0	1	2	0
30	Smooth jazz	2	8	0	6	2	2
31	Early jazz	0	5	0	0	5	0
32	Rock/R&B	2	2	0	0	2	2
33	Electric/rock fusion	5	2	1	3	3	2
		Listen			Attend		

Music Listening Study

Cut	Genre	Yes	No	Maybe	Yes	No	Maybe
34	Unclassifiable/other jazz	4	0	1	3	1	2
35	Cool jazz	5	6	0	4	7	0
36	Modal jazz	1	8	0	3	5	1
37	80s jazz	2	2	1	1	2	2
38	AACM/Free	2	4	0	5	1	0
39	Impressionist/20 th century classical	1	5	0	0	6	1
40	Rock/R&B	1	5	1	3	3	1
41	Electric/Rock Fusion	1	6	0	1	6	0
42	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	1	5	1	3	3	1
43	Ragtime	1	2	1	1	2	1
44	Blues	4	2	0	3	1	2
45	Country/bluegrass/Americana	1	1	0	1	1	0
46	Big Band	4	0	0	4	0	0
47	Early fusion	0	5	0	0	4	1
48	Country/bluegrass/Americana	3	3	0	2	1	3
49	Unclassifiable/other jazz	1	2	0	2	1	0
50	Blues rock	4	5	0	2	4	3
51	Rock/pop	1	2	0	1	1	1
52	Bluegrass	5	3	1	3	2	4
53	Jazz Rock	1	6	0	2	5	0
54	50s swing/straight ahead	3	2	0	2	1	2
55	20 th Century classical	1	3	0	4	2	1
56	50s swing/straight ahead (Control)	33	10	1	31	4	9
57	World	1	5	0	0	4	2
58	90s jazz	5	6	0	3	8	0
59	Rock/pop	0	5	1	0	5	1
60	"Latin" jazz	3	5	1	2	4	3
61	Electronic/jazz fusion	6	4	1	3	8	0
62	Rock/pop	4	5	0	5	3	1
63	Straight ahead	3	2	0	2	1	2

Table 4: Willingness to engage by cut

Overall, these data suggest that the acquisition of musical taste can be socially transmitted. In turn, this suggests a renewed focus on methods of social transmission, and that the social wrapper of a club/lounge experience lowers the perceived risk of trying out something new.

Language around music

A major focus of this study was on how people spoke about music and the ways they labeled music. A more in-depth analysis around relationships of likes, dislikes, types of music, and engagement will follow.

The dominant finding is that there is no common vocabulary people used to discuss music. In fact, participants consistently noted how difficult it was for them to verbally express what they were hearing. As one individual noted partway through the interview, *I'm not very good at describing music with words, with adjectives* and then added *this is fun*.

The words that appeared often in responses related to rhythm, though no patterns tied to any particular genre of music or likes/dislikes of individuals emerged. Indeed, a preponderance of the participants used the word rhythm in descriptions across genres. Often, rhythm was couched in *it had a good rhythm* and, as described below, by one listener as *it had a good rhythm section*. Others referred to being able to *tap my foot* or *nod my head* along with the music. The phrase *it had a good beat* was used by participants of all ages and across many genres, but interestingly, does not always mean the same thing for all people. The only piece that consistently received a positive response to its rhythm was the control cut: a Miles Davis jazz combo piece, "If I Were a Bell".

The other word category was *upbeat*. Often, it was related to songs with an upbeat tempo, but equally it was related to what people said, e.g., *makes me feel happy*. There were some consistencies in these cuts—they tended to have a stronger rhythm with a faster tempo, be in a major key, and follow a predictable structure or a familiar form. A few respondents commented on this predicatability: as one person noted, *I know what is coming, even if I haven't heard this piece before*.

Engaging with music

There was, however, a strong pattern that emerged across interviews in terms of three distinct ways of engaging with the music. Though only sometimes revealed in response to a single cut, the pattern was revealed within the full interview and how the individual responded to all the music to which they were listening. Once a pattern was identified, the earlier comments could be easily contextualized within the interview and support the findings (see discussion below). The patterns can be summarized as internalizing, externalizing, and intellectualizing.

Internalizing. The first group to fall into a clear pattern was those who internalized the music. In many cases, they exhibited physical signs as well as verbal descriptions of physical interaction with the music as they were listening: toe tapping, closing eyes and nodding, things that demonstrate that the *music moves me* or, the inverse as in response to a cut one listener did not care for, *the music didn't move me*. Some of these individuals discussed music in terms of their ability to dance to it. The key types of phrases used further divided this group into two: those who responded to music emotionally, and those who used the music to create images or stories in their minds.

Emotional Response: Although it might seem cliché to refer to music as inspiring an emotional response, it was surprising how few people described music using emotional language. Only a small proportion of those listening went beyond "I like it" or "it makes me happy" in describing the music they

were listening to. One noted, *I like dissonance. Uneasy. It creates high tension.* Often, the emotion was expressed through what the music was not providing:

I can't listen to music I feel is lying to me—expressing an emotion that isn't real, it's exaggerated.

Sometimes I want more than I feel I can get from [music]...you can get it and it'll make you smile. But it won't get a tear from you or make you want to get up and dance or be fully engaged with it.

For others, the emotion was about the power of the music. As one noted, regarding a 20th century orchestral piece that they only rated as a middle-of-the-road in terms of their preference for it, [it was] *dramatic—music has the power to change your own internal chemistry. I respect it for that.*

Few of these individuals were consistent in how they described all the cuts. But inevitably during their interview, they made a statement that clearly revealed an emotional attachment, and then the rest of their comments made sense when viewed through that lens. Some of the comments were tremendously intimate and the listener owned the emotion they felt/were feeling:

Spacious, quiet mood but not sad. Stirs my soul. I get lost in the music.

It made me feel orange—like on a street bathed in orange light at night.

Some also interpreted the music as possessing an emotional state. In these types of comments, the listener projected the emotion he or she felt onto the performance rather than themselves, e.g., *the interaction between instruments sounds angry.*

It appears that individuals who internalize music emotionally use music as a tool. More than one of these individuals identified certain music as *I would have to be in the right mood to listen to that style* and another echoed those sentiments saying *if I was in a really crabby mood I wouldn't listen to it, because it wouldn't go with the feeling I have at that time.* These participants also seemed open to listening to almost any type of music, if the music supported an emotional feeling, e.g. [if I were] *out with my friends having a good time and this came on, it would add to the feelings,* for a cut the individual said would not be music they would usually listen to. One individual who seemed to frame responses in terms of emotional response did struggle on a couple of cuts, saying *it makes me feel....I don't know.*

This is not to suggest that music does not spark, reinforce, or change emotions of other individuals, it is just that when describing what they hear, very few of the listeners used words reflecting emotion or an emotional response of depth.

Storytelling: Of those who engaged through internalizing, the larger proportion expressed the music as telling stories and creating visual images in their heads. They described many of the cuts using the word *story* or *picture* as in *I could picture this.* The concept of story was identified across genres of music, and there were many comments related to the story unfolding, i.e., *drama—the scene setting, the different stages of the music.* Another person discussed the *subtle changes that take you through a story while listening to music.*

An individual who rated a piece unfavorably pondered, *Even if you look at titles, and then take the title to the piece...what are they thinking? What does it mean to them? What was their inspiration? How to create a piece that way?* but also noted they did not like the cut as *It grates a raw nerve. Have to be in the mood to listen to it.*

The ways in which stories were expressed varied, but all surrounded a central concept of the music transporting the individual and changing his or her emotional state. Some of the transporting was via individual interpretation of the music:

Musicians expressing some trouble, mixed with hope. Make dissonances and then resolve...the struggle with hope.

Passionate, real, beautiful, sad. Storytelling.

Music expands people's horizons.

With other symphonic music, it's designed to take you through a progression or tell a story. The "storm" part of the story or the "peaceful meadow" part of the story. This seemed like it was a part of a story or the background to something. An intro to a scene of a play...

It's very personal, compositions like that. They almost tell a story. I would say you could feel almost a kind of melancholy or a heavy heart or a tenderness or a vulnerability.

For others who fell into the storytelling type of internalized engagement, the story was created by a specific image that came to their minds as they listened to the music:

Like watching the opening credits to a movie or television show. Every time it pauses I picture a close up with the name of a person underneath.

A little bit formal. Picturing people wearing nice clothing, more sort of a supper club atmosphere. It feels old to me. Something from a kind of another era. But warm and relaxing and relaxed. Comfortable and soothing. Getting an association with food. Nice table, nice cocktail in my hand, surrounded by company. An intimate sort of sound.

Sounds like the roaring 20s. From black & white cartoon or movie. Flappers. Party. Can picture Steamboat Mickey. Imagine lots of dancing. Ballroom. Active music.

Would make good background for a murder scene with a psychologically disturbed character.

Externalizing. A second pattern that emerged was verbalized by those who engage with music in an external manner. Often, these individuals felt connected with the musicians or used the music as an opportunity for social exchange with friends or other audience members — *Seeing music live allows me to interact with the artist. Live concerts keep me from "shuffling" and looking for something better on the i-pod. Enjoy shared audience experience – I feed off other's reactions.* While listening, they often made comments about *being there* or *watching the musicians interact*. For music with which they were unfamiliar, many who approached music from an external sense made statements like *if I were to stumble upon this in a bar, I'd stay and listen* or *if it came on while I was in a bar, I wouldn't walk out*. Externalizers appear to tie the music to the experience: *by the time 2 or 3 musicians get through their*

64 bars, you forget what the melody was, what the song was. You get so into what they're doing—it's not written down, it's inside them. Wonderful to see and hear.

Many of the comments the listeners offered, which indicated that they were engaging through external relationship with the music, the musicians, or others around the music, focused on the essence of watching the music being created.

When I listen live, there is always so much going on that I turn my attention to different musicians.

[This is] music I can enjoy anytime, but in a live setting, I would watch the musicians and be more engaged.

Lots of instruments/musicians to watch and engage me. Conversation between instruments.

The music described action.

I can imagine the pianist smiling.

Easy to picture that being done on stage.

It would be fun to watch the people play it, but it's not something I would go out of my way to hear again

Another common theme among those individuals who externalize, shared in a slightly different way by those who intellectualize (below), is acknowledgement of the musicianship of a piece even if he or she did not care for the cut. As one noted, *I can see the musicians working together and the audience getting excited*, and went on to state that they would only ever listen to music such as that cut in a live setting.

Intellectualizing. The third pattern includes those who appeared to struggle the most with putting words to what they were hearing. These respondents often began their description of the music with a flat statement of like or dislike, and then dissected the music in various ways, such as the instrumentation—*sounds like there is a cello in there. A very pleasant piano. I don't know, maybe there's some kind of guitar, I can't tell*; or in terms of form—*this is good. 5/4 time; five beats a bar*; or musicianship—*I'd say....poor tone and improvisational abilities.*

All of those who engaged through an intellectual approach provided a very clinical dissection of the music, whether they liked the music or not:

Strange beginning for what came later. Slide on fretless bass seemed to broadcast something that didn't come. Recording was very polished. Lots of space in piece when compared to traditional bluegrass. Similar style to artists I like.

The intellectualizers appeared to make quick decisions regarding the music they were listening to. Often, their comments were decisive and cutting:

Lack of melody and has an obscure rhythm.

Sounds heavily arranged.

Improvisation is good, but the guys that do it need to know how to start and end even if they do go wild in the middle.

This group was also able to recognize good musicianship and willing to appreciate a quality performance even when the music was not to the individual's liking:

Good technician: his attack and tone is perfect

Individually good musicians, didn't care for the song

There's musical talent there, but not something I'd buy

I can appreciate any type of music for the way it's played.

I appreciate that you can hear the effort, especially by sax player and drummer. They have to be talented and effort in learning the music. Can hear the desire to play it for other people.

It sounded like a complicated piece of music. I could appreciate the talent.

Another aspect of intellectualizers was their attention to both historical context for music and correctness.

Blues aren't always sad.

Historic style. Important.

Some of the individuals with this engagement profile had more formal training in music theory, history, and appreciation than did a similar proportion of listeners in the other areas of engagement, who had fairly similar experiences in performing and music lessons, but not the more technical musical training. This training did appear to provide a greater sense of context in the music—their comments were not all about the present and the individual's preferences:

Society quickly forgets what it used to like. Sad that that happens—there's been so much energy in different time periods in different music and it's washed away...So many radio stations play the same 100 or so songs from any era (or Christmas) and then people think that's all there was during that time period

Ultimately, one respondent made a statement definitive of the intellectualizers—*It's cool to deconstruct a song/deconstruct music.*

Interrelationships in types of engagement. As mentioned above, most individuals appeared to fall into one of the three engagement profiles. The approaches are not, however, suggested to be absolute, but rather as a preference or starting point. In analysis, there were many individuals who initially seemed to

fit into two or even all three approaches, but then a comment or series of comments across genres revealed a preferred pattern of engagement.

Here is one example of a listener who initially indicated concurrent engagement profiles which were later interpreted through the lens of subsequent comments: [I] *Don't own classical or jazz CDs because the media doesn't contain the true essence of the music. They need to be live.* In an isolated reading, this comment suggests externalized engagement. Yet, the individual later spoke primarily of listening to different instruments, of *dissecting the music*, which changes the interpretation of the experience from one of engaging externally to one of engaging intellectually—being able to experience the music in the “pure” way. Another interviewee had a similar perspective, noting *I like live music much better, much more energetic. Mistakes are made but that's close enough.*

An example of how an individual approaches through one mode, and then can use the other approaches came from an intellectualizer who, responding to “If I were a Bell” said: *Simply the best musicians on the planet playing together a music they are deeply engaged with. It hits me in that perfect spot where it's advanced music, but not too advanced that I can't appreciate it at a relaxed level. Engages me intellectually, physically and emotionally.*

Labels

How people refer to music is very important because they use these labels to make decisions about music. There were multiple instances where individuals claimed not to like certain types of music, yet when they listened to cuts of those types of music, they found them interesting and in many cases they said they would be interested in hearing more of that type. Others claimed to like a particular style of music but when a piece of that genre was played that did not fit their preconceptions of the music, they disliked it or dismissed it. One example was “Farmerette” which is a Rock/R&B xylophone piece. Most listeners of the cut described it in terms of cartoon or TV music.

Labels appear to both facilitate communication about music and appreciation of music *and* hinder individuals' ability to actually engage with music. It is generally assumed that people do not share a common understanding of the definition of the labels they use and this study found strong evidence to support this assumption. It was interesting that even as music is labeled by form by musicians, it is often defined by instrumentation by listeners: *that was a mandolin—that means country to me or Kind of an odd combination. A jazzy piano and a banjo in the background. Feels like bluegrass and jazz thrown together.*

Classical: When listening to many of the scored music cuts, only a few were able to specifically name an historical period of music. Instead, the term “classical” was used to refer to all symphonic music, including Baroque, Romantic, 20th Century Contemporary, and Impressionism. This prompted the researchers to probe for these individuals' operational definition of “classical”. For the most part, audience members used the term “classical” to refer to large orchestral pieces. Interestingly, the Baroque piano music cut was also identified as classical by most who heard it, even by those who said classical music referred to large orchestras playing music written for them. One 20th Century Contemporary symphonic piece (Stravinsky) was referred to as a movie soundtrack or orchestral jazz by five out of seven listeners. Not surprisingly, six out of six listeners correctly identified the symphonic piece of the classical period.

Distinctions tended to be made more technically by the intellectualizers. On the Baroque piano music, one intellectualizer did comment on this cut as: *Incredibly consonant music—not advanced harmonically, He wrote the book on 4 piece harmony in western music – owe debt to Bach. This is the most beautiful, most moving piece of music I can imagine.*

World music: Two of the thirteen individuals who heard cuts of world music identified the music as such. For others, labels included twisted waltz, dissonant classical, pop, experimental jazz, and ethnic rock.

Rock/R&B: In general, labels used for the rock/R&B genre had clearer paths of association. One cut was labeled as blues or Motown, while at the same time two of the seven listeners identified the cut as rock/R&B. On another cut, all five who heard the cut alternately called it psychedelic, recent jazz, or popular. For still another cut, all six individuals identified the music as “funk” with two adding “funky jazz” and two others saying “funky blues.” Nine out of ten called another cut alternative jazz, funk, acid jazz, jazz with a blues influence, or fusion.

Ragtime: One of the only cuts that had complete agreement among the listeners was a ragtime piece—six of six correctly named the music as such. However, two individuals also used ragtime to label early jazz.

Blues: An interesting element emerged from the blues cuts. One cut of blues was correctly identified by all six individuals who heard it. However, another cut which was more upbeat was given a variety of labels. Again, an intellectualizer did identify this as blues by commenting on this cut: *the 12 bar blues form is like a pair of comfortable shoes—you understand it implicitly, it doesn't take much effort to listen to it and know what's going on,.*

Jazz: The label of jazz was applied widely to a range of music and across many forms. For this study, cuts of several specific jazz forms were used: free jazz, smooth jazz, early jazz, ragtime, cool jazz, modal jazz, Bossa Nova jazz, swing (30s and 50s), BeBop, gypsy jazz, and a category identified as “unclassifiable/other jazz.” Most interviewees applied the generic label of “jazz” across many of the jazz forms as well as some of the above. Jazz, as a label, appears to be a large catch-all for any music that does not fit neatly into another category. Some of the different labels used to describe some of the defined forms:

BeBop	jazz, classical jazz, and big band
Gypsy jazz	country, bluegrass, jazzy
Swing (30s and 50s)	traditional jazz, sweet jazz, small band swing jazz, easy listening, swing-era derived, 50s cool jazz
Smooth jazz	pop, popular jazz, background, smooth jazz, soft rock
Unclassifiable and other forms of jazz:	tremendous range--piano jazz, contemporary, experimental, arty, pre-school-ish, fusion and modern, neo-Dixieland, jazz rock fusion, jazz rock, contemporary funk, free jazz, experimental jazz, honky-tonk

One respondent identified one unclassifiable piece as “chamber music” but defined chamber music as a small, instrumental ensemble where you can hear all the lines played by the individual instruments and

musicians. Another noted one piece as a *“Type of chamber music – woodwind/quintet that performs in small group. I love chamber music, it’s wonderful to play, that’s why I love jazz combos and I like this—it’s more intimate music, it’s a different sound/style of that type of music.*

Training and engagement measures were correlated with individual ratings across cuts, and there were negligible but significant correlations. Training and rating of cuts had a correlation of .122; engagement had a correlation against rating of cuts of almost no strength of .074. The significance measure is skewed as an individual’s training and engagement scores must be tied to all cuts to which they respond, which ensures significance, therefore they are not being reported here. The negligible strength of the correlations suggests that training has a slightly positive relationship to rating of preferences, while engagement does not relate to preference across genres.

ANOVAs were conducted holding constant for sex to determine if sex were related to training or engagement. Both training and engagement were significant (training, $F = 7.920, p = .005$; engagement, $F = 16.809, p = .000$). Mean differences were negligible suggesting there is no meaningful difference in sex of the individual, their training and engagement, and how they rated their preferences.

The following table (Table 5) shows the 63 cuts of music, the name of the piece, the genre, the artist and representative labels applied by the participants. The diversity of labels for most of the genres is reflective of the difficulty in describing music experienced across cuts.

Cut #	Name	Artist	Genre	Representative labels
1	Tanguedia III	Astor Piazzolla	World	Twisted waltz; dissonant classical; modern urban waltz
2	1972 Bronze Medalist	The Bad Plus	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Dirge; jazz, jazz piano/piano jazz
3	Honky Tonk, Pt. 1	Bill Doggett	Rock/R&B	Motown; DooWop; blues; R&B
4	Jerusalem Ridge	Mark O'Connor	Country/Bluegrass/Americana	Bluegrass/folk; folk with jazz swing; folk country; Celtic; Bluegrass; gypsy; modern Irish folk
5	Dropjes	Brad Mehldau	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Preschoolish; contemporary; experimental; jazz; fusion; modern; light

Music Listening Study

				jazz
6	Rick Kick Shaw	Cecil Taylor	Free jazz	Extreme progressive; jazz; some type of jazz; avant garde
7	Desafinado (Off Key)	Charlie Byrd	Bossa Nova jazz	Lounge music; light jazz; Latin jazz; jazz; lounge jazz; Samba/Bossa Nova
8	Spectacle	Bela Fleck/Chick Corea	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Classic; bluegrass; jazz; neo-Dixieland; fusion bluegrass and jazz; Southern 40s jazz
9	Next Best Western	Chris Potter	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Smooth jazz; fusion R&B; jazz rock
10	Symphony 3, Mvt. 1 -Allegro con brio	Ludwig van Beethoven	Classical	Classical; traditional classical; classical orchestra
11	Body and Soul	Coleman Hawkins	Swing-standards, 30s	Traditional jazz; sweet jazz; easy listening; swing era; small band swing jazz
12	Blue Rondo A La Turk	Dave Brubeck	50s swing	Jazz; 50s cool jazz
13	Moonshine	Dave Douglas	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Contemporary funk; jazz rock big band
14	Hot House	Dizzy Gillespie	BeBop	Big band; classical jazz; hot jazz; bop or bebop
15	Limehouse Blues	Django Reinhardt	Gypsy jazz	Texas swing; Dixieland; American Western; Old country style; Vaudevillish; Swing bluegrass; bluegrass

Music Listening Study

16	The Queen's Suite – IV. Northern Lights	Duke Ellington	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Big band; orchestral
17	An American in Paris	George Gershwin	Impressionist/20 th century classical	Theatrical; symphonic; movie; show; contemporary orchestra; orchestral jazz
18	Demonic Velocities/ 20,000,000 Volts	The Flying Luttenbachers	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Ska; experimental rock; free jazz; improve bebop
19	Symphony 2, Mvt. 4 – Allegro con spirit	Johannes Brahms	Romantic	Classical; classical orchestral; late classical; symphonic; Baroque
20	Goldberg Variations, BWV 988, Aria	J.S.Bach	Classical Baroque	Free jazz; classical; Baroque
21	Farmerette	Harry Breuer and his Quintet	Rock/R&B	Cartoony; gimmicky; silly; novelty; TV music/ TV jingle
22	Actual Proof	Herbie Hancock	Funk fusion	New age; funky; jazz; acid jazz; jazz funk fusion; crime show spoof; mix; jazz fusion; funky
23	Infernal Dance of King Katschei-Firebird	Igor Stravinsky	Impressionist/20 th century classical	Semi-classical; classical; movie soundtrack; modern classical; symphonic
24	Kurdzhaliyska Rachenitza	Ivo Papazov	World	Pop; world; weird Eastern jazz; nomadic gypsy; experimental jazz; Arabic jazz; Eastern European; ethnic rock

Music Listening Study

25	Black Bottom Stomp	Jelly Roll Morton	Early jazz	Jazz 20s; 20s; ragtime; traditional New Orleans; 20 th century New Orleans ragtime; swing
26	Third Stone from the Sun	Jimi Hendrix	Rock/R&B	Popular; kind of 60s; recent jazz; psychedelic; rock
27	Chris Cross	Thelonious Monk	Rock/R&B	Funk; funky blues; funk blues jazz fusion; 70s funk
28	Jupiter	John Coltrane	Free jazz	Jazz; pseudo-jazz; experimental jazz
29	Misterioso	Kenny Barron/Regina Carter	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Honky-tonk; chamber music; progressive; jazz with bluegrass; classical jazz; modern jazz funk; experimental jazz
30	Songbird	Kenny G.	Smooth jazz	Smooth jazz, popular jazz; soft rock; background
31	Chimes Blues	King Oliver	Early jazz	Early jazz; pop standard in the early 20 th century; jazz or old blues
32	Shake Everythin' You've Got	Maceo Parker	Rock/R&B	Funky jazz; funk rock; jazz with blues influence; improv jazz; Bossa Nova; free form acid jazz; jazz; modern jazz
33	Birds of Fire	Mahavishnu Orchestra	Electric/rock fusion	Rock; messy; rock jazz fusion; techno; fusion
34	Villa Palmeras	Miguel Zenon	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Caribbean; current jazz

Music Listening Study

35	Jeru	Miles Davis	Cool jazz	Swing; jazz; middle of the road jazz; Big Band; jazz swing; up tempo jazz
36	Flamenco Sketches	Miles Davis	Modal jazz	Bop-classic bluenote; jazzy; cool jazz
37	Tutu	Miles Davis	80s	Smooth jazz; new age; Soundtrack; jazz fusion; elevator; contemporary jazz; classical piano
38	Introspection	Mahal Richard Abrams	AACM/Free	Classical; neo-classic, jazz fusion; avant garde classical; modern quartet; heavy classic; classical orchestra; cartoony; modern contemporary
39	Children's Corner: Golliwogs Cakewalk	Claude Debussy	Impressionist/20 th century classical	Jazz/slow ragtime; modern classical; background; 20 th century jazz inspired; classical jazz piano
40	The National Anthem	Radiohead	Rock/R&B	Acid jazz; 70s jam band hair rock; rock jazz fusion; experimental rock; noise/space rock
41	Captain Senor Mouse	Chick Corea	Electric/Rock fusion	Jazz rock fusion; new wave jazz rock; acid jazz; Latin jazz
42	Pastor "T"	Roy Hargrove	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Jazz funk fusion; funk; contemporary jazz; modern jazz; straight ahead jazz
43	Something Doing	Scott Joplin	Ragtime	Ragtime

Music Listening Study

44	Lenny	Stevie Ray Vaughan	Blues	Blues; variant of blues
45	Pink Flamingos	Strength in Numbers	Country/bluegrass/Americana	Jazz; folk
46	Opus One	Tommy Dorsey	Big Band	Swing; Big Band; jazz swing
47	Tears	Weather Report	Early fusion	New agey; experimental; smooth jazz; experimental jazz; live smooth jazz
48	Indecision	Yo-Yo Ma, Edgar Meyer, Mark O'Connor	Country/bluegrass/Americana	Off-beat jazz; string jazz; improvisational; folk; not quite bluegrass
49	Club G.R.O.S.S.	Chris Thile	Unclassifiable/other jazz	Jazz; jazz bluegrass
50	Crossroads	Cream	Blues rock	Rock; hard rock; blues rock; southern rock; classic rock; classic rock with blues; soul rock
51	#41	Dave Matthews Band	Rock/pop	Combo jazz; Celtic type; contemporary jazz
52	Foggy Mountain Special	Lester Flatt & Earl Scruggs	Bluegrass	Bluegrass; bluesy; country; country or bluegrass
53	Lumpy Gravy II	Frank Zappa	Jazz Rock	Jazz; experimental/noise; 60s hippy classical; funky; modern jazz; modern experimental jazz; R&B devolved
54	Mr. P.C.	John Coltrane	50s swing/straight ahead	Jazz; jazz swing; bebop; jazz combo
55	West Side Story:	Leonard Bernstein	20 th Century classical	Orchestra;

Music Listening Study

	Prologue (Allegro Moderator)			soundtrack; orchestrated classical; jazz/classical; 20 th century symphonic; symphonic jazz
56	If I Were a Bell	Miles Davis	50s swing/straight ahead (Control)	Club jazz; jazz; standard jazz; traditional; popular jazz; swingy jazz; smooth jazz; lounge jazz; supper club jazz; classic jazz trumpet; upbeat jazz quartet; small ensemble jazz; jazz improve; jazz combo; easy listening; hard bop; swing
57	Soldadi	Orchestra Baobab	World	Small jazz combo; world beat; Caribbean smooth jazz; tropical
58	Follow Me	Pat Metheny Group	90s jazz	Jam band; soft rock; rock type; adult contemporary; pop light rock; easy listening; melodic instrumental rock; motivational
59	Punch You in the Eye	Phish	Rock/pop	Latin jazz; smooth jazz; Latin jazz fusion; Latin dance; Latin; salsa
60	Spain	Return to Forever	"Latin" jazz	World thing jazz; light jazz; intellectual/freestyle jazz; free jazz
61	Iambic 9 Poetry	Squarepusher	Electronic/jazz fusion	New age; experimental jazz; jazz rock; fusion/hip hop groove; light

Music Listening Study

				fusion; R&B jazzy; soft jazz
62	Moondance	Van Morrison	Rock/pop	Soul pop; jazz; blues; light jazz; light jazzy rock; jazz tune with folk and blues influences
63	Unit 7	Wes Montgomery	Straight ahead	Instrumental jazz; modern jazz; small ensemble jazz; late 20 th century swing jazz; swing jazz

Table 5: Cuts with Genre, artist, and Labels Applied

Diversity of Tastes in Music. Those participating in the study did represent a wide range of musical preferences, both in what they *said* they preferred, and what they then ranked highly as preferred music. In terms of overall preference for genres of music heard, the following table (Table X) provides a mean ranking by cut.

Cut #	Name	Genre	Mean Ranking	Range
1	Tanguedia III	World	8	5-10
2	1972 Bronze Medalist	Unclassifiable/other jazz	4.4	1-7
3	Honky Tonk, Pt. 1	Rock/R&B	6.9	5-9
4	Jerusalem Ridge	Country/Bluegrass/American a	7.3	6-10
5	Dropjes	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6.4	5-7
6	Rick Kick Shaw	Free jazz	5.4	2-9
7	Desafinado (Off Key)	Bossa Nova jazz	6.7	5-9
8	Spectacle	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6.2	2-9
9	Next Best Western	Unclassifiable/other jazz	7.0	4-9

Music Listening Study

10	Symphony 3- Mvt. 1 - Allegro con brio	Classical	9.0	8-10
11	Body and Soul	Swing-standards- 30s	9.0	7-10
12	Blue Rondo A La Turk	50s swing	8.6	5-10
13	Moonshine	Unclassifiable/other jazz	4.6	3-7
14	Hot House	BeBop	7.8	6-10
15	Limehouse Blues	Gypsy jazz	5.7	2-7
16	The Queen's Suite - IV. Northern Lights	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6.3	1-8
17	Gershwin: An American in Paris	Impressionist/20 th century classical	6.7	3-9
18	Demonic Velocities/ 20- 000-000 Volts	Unclassifiable/other jazz	7.0	5-10
19	Symphony 2- Mvt. 4 - Allegro con spirit	Romantic	7.4	4-10
20	Goldberg Variations- BWV 988- Aria	Classical Baroque	7.4	2-10
21	Farmerette	Rock/R&B	4.3	2-9
22	Actual Proof	Funk fusion	5.7	2-10
23	Infernal Dance of King Kaschei- Firebird	Impressionist/20 th century classical	5.8	2-9
24	Kurdzhaliyska Rachenitza	World	6.3	4-9
25	Black Bottom Stomp	Early jazz	7.2	5-9
26	Third Stone from the Sun	Rock/R&B	7.5	4.5-10
27	Chris Cross	Rock/R&B	7.3	6-8
28	Jupiter	Free jazz	4.3	1-8
29	Misterioso	Unclassifiable/other jazz	5.6	3-9

Music Listening Study

30	Songbird	Smooth jazz	3.1	1-6
31	Chimes Blues	Early jazz	6.3	5-8
32	Shake Everythin' You've Got	Rock/R&B	6.0	3-8
33	Birds of Fire	Electric/rock fusion	2.8	1-5
34	Villa Palmeras	Unclassifiable/other jazz	7.0	4-10
35	Jeru	Cool jazz	6.1	1-8.5
36	Flamenco Sketches	Modal jazz	8.0	4-10
37	Tutu	80s	5.2	2-10
38	Introspection	AACM/Free	3.0	1-8
39	Children's Corner: Golliwogs Cakewalk	Impressionist/20 th century classical	8.4	8-9
40	The National Anthem	Rock/R&B	6.2	2-9
41	Captain Senor Mouse	Electric/Rock Fusion	4.9	2-9
42	Pastor "T"	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	6.3	4-9
43	Something Doing	Ragtime	6.1	4-8.5
44	Lenny	Blues	6.8	4-9.5
45	Pink Flamingos	Country/bluegrass/American a	4.0	1-7
46	Opus One	Big Band	9.0	7-10
47	Tears	Early fusion	3.0	2-4
48	Indecision	Country/bluegrass/American a	5.8	2-8

Music Listening Study

49	Club G.R.O.S.S.	Unclassifiable/other jazz	8.3	8-9
50	Crossroads	Blues rock	5.5	1-10
51	#41	Rock/pop	6.8	5-8
52	Foggy Mountain Special	Bluegrass	5.8	1-10
53	Lumpy Gravy II	Jazz Rock	3.9	1-7
54	Mr. P.C.	50s swing/straight ahead	7.5	4-10
55	Prologue (Allegro Moderator)	20 th Century classical	7.2	5-10
56	If I Were a Bell	50s swing/straight ahead (Control)	8.0	5-10
57	Soldadi	World	5.0	4-6
58	Follow Me	90s jazz	5.1	1-9
59	Punch You in the Eye	Rock/pop	6.5	5-8
60	Spain	"Latin" jazz	7.5	2-9
61	Iambic 9 Poetry	Electronic/jazz fusion	5.5	2-9
62	Moondance	Rock/pop	7.2	5-10
63	Unit 7	Straight ahead	6.8	4-9

Table 6: Preference Rankings

Shifting the table to order cuts from lowest to highest mean preference scores indicates that preferences are not genre-specific. Responses for particular genres that had representation in multiple cuts shows a spread which would suggest that individual pieces have more or less appeal, and that individuals have preferences that are less genre-specific than they are related to other components related to how the individual engages with the music as described in the narrative above.

Cut #	Genre	Mean	Range	Spread
-------	-------	------	-------	--------

Music Listening Study

33	Electric/Rock Fusion	2.8	1-5	4
38	AACM/Free	3	1-8	7
47	Early Fusion	3	2-4	2
30	Smooth Jazz	3.1	1-6	5
53	Jazz Rock	3.9	1-7	6
45	Country/Bluegrass/Americana	4	1-7	6
21	Rock/R&B	4.3	2-9	7
28	Free Jazz	4.3	1-8	7
2	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	4.4	1-7	6
13	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	4.6	3-7	4
41	Electric/Rock Fusion	4.9	2-9	7
57	World	5	4-6	2
58	90s jazz	5.1	1-9	8
37	80s jazz	5.2	2-10	8
6	Free Jazz	5.4	2-9	7
50	Blues Rock	5.5	1-10	9
61	Electronic/jazz fusion	5.5	2-9	7
29	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	5.6	3-9	6
15	Gypsy Jazz	5.7	2-7	5
22	Funk Fusion	5.7	2-10	8
23	Impressionist/20 th Century Classical	5.8	2-9	7
48	Country/Bluegrass/Americana	5.8	2-8	6
52	Bluegrass	5.8	1-10	9
32	Rock/R&B	6	3-8	5
35	Cool Jazz	6.1	1-8.5	7.5
43	Ragtime	6.1	4-8.5	4.5
8	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	6.2	2-9	7
40	Electric/Rock Fusion	6.2	2-9	7
16	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	6.3	1-8	7
24	World	6.3	4-9	5
31	Early jazz	6.3	5-8	3
42	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	6.3	4-9	5
5	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	6.4	5-7	2
59	Rock/pop	6.5	5-8	3
7	Bossa Nova Jazz	6.7	5-9	4
17	Impressionist/20 th Century Classical	6.7	3-9	6
44	Blues	6.8	4-9.5	5.5
51	Rock/pop	6.8	5-8	3
63	Straight ahead	6.8	4-9	5
3	Rock/R&B	6.9	5-9	4
9	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	7	4-9	5

Music Listening Study

18	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	7	5-10	5
34	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	7	4-10	6
25	Early Jazz	7.2	5-9	4
55	20th Century Classical	7.2	5-10	5
62	Rock/pop	7.2	5-10	5
4	Country/Bluegrass/Americana	7.3	6-10	4
27	Rock/R&B	7.3	6-8	2
19	Romantic	7.4	4-10	6
20	Classical Baroque	7.4	2-10	8
26	Rock/R&B	7.5	4.5-10	5.5
54	50s Swing/Straight Ahead	7.5	4-10	6
60	"Latin" Jazz	7.5	2-9	7
14	BeBop	7.8	6-10	4
1	World	8	5-10	5
36	Modal Jazz	8	4-10	6
56	Control: 50s Swing/Straight Ahead	8	5-10	5
49	Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	8.3	8-9	1
39	Impressionist/20 th Century Classical	8.4	8-9	1
12	50's Swing	8.6	5-10	5
10	Classical	9	8-10	2
11	Swing-Standards- 30s	9	7-10	3
46	Big Band	9	7-10	3

Table 7: Range and spread on Genre

To clarify the mean/range issues, low, medium, and high range were assigned. Low ranges were those equal to or less than 3 point spread. High were those of 7 or higher. The following chart ranks the scores for which there were the most agreement, or the lowest ranges, and the genre of music of each cut. These are listed in order from the lowest preferred rank to the most preferred and denotes if the score were negative (3.0 or below), somewhat negative (3.1 – 5.0), neutral (5.1-5.9) somewhat positive (6.0-8.0), positive (8.1 – 10.0).

Title	Genre	Mean	Range	Score
Tears	Early fusion	3.0	2	Negative
Soldadi	World	5.0	2	Neutral
Chimes Blues	Early jazz	6.3	3	Somewhat Positive
Dropjes	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6.4	3	Somewhat Positive
Punch You in the Eye	Rock/pop	6.5	3	Somewhat Positive
Captain Senor Mouse	Electronic rock/fusion	6.8	3	Somewhat Positive
Chris Cross	Rock/R&B	7.3	2	Somewhat Positive
Club G.R.O.S.S.	Unclassifiable/other jazz	8.3	1	Positive
Children's Corner: Golliwogs Cakewalk	Impressionist/20 th century classical	8.4	2	Positive
Opus One	Big Band	9.0	3	Positive
Body and Soul	Swing-standards- 30s	9.0	3	Positive
Symphony 3- Mvt. 1 -Allegro con brio	Classical	9.0	2	Positive

Table 8: Low distribution on preference

The highest ranking of all cuts had, not surprisingly the lowest range. The four highest ranked preferences are cuts that have a familiarity in the music – classical (contemporary classical), standards, and big band. Only one piece, an early fusion, had a clearly negative mean with a small deviation.

Music Listening Study

Title	Genre	Mean	Range	Level
Introspection	AACM/Free	3.0	7	Negative
Farmerette	Rock/R&B	4.3	7	Somewhat Negative
Jupiter	Free jazz	4.3	7	Somewhat Negative
Captain Senor Mouse	Electric/Rock Fusion	4.9	7	Somewhat Negative
Follow Me	90s jazz	5.1	8	Nuetral
Tutu	80s jazz	5.2	8	Nuetral
Rick Kick Shaw	Free jazz	5.4	7	Nuetral
Iambic 9 Poetry	Electronic/jazz fusion	5.5	7	Nuetral
Crossroads	Blues rock	5.5	9	Nuetral
Actual Proof	Funk fusion	5.7	8	Nuetral
Infernal Dance of King Kaschei- Firebird	Impressionist/20 th century classical	5.8	7	Nuetral
Foggy Mountain Special	Bluegrass	5.8	9	Nuetral
Jeru	Cool jazz	6.1	7.5	Somewhat Positive
Spectacle	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6.2	7	Somewhat Positive
The National Anthem	Rock/R&B	6.2	7	Somewhat Positive
The Queen’s Suite – IV. Northern Lights	Unclassifiable/other jazz	6.3	7	Somewhat Positive
Spain	“Latin” jazz	7.4	8	Somewhat Positive
Goldberg Variations- BWV 988- Aria	Classical Baroque	7.5	7	Somewhat Positive

Table 9: High distribution on preference

It is not surprising that those pieces with higher ranges in preference scores tended to have far more “neutral” means. Those whose means were in the negative, slightly negative, or somewhat positive categories had more skewed preferences than those which fell in the neutral category.

Music Listening Study

In looking at similar genre, there were both “classical” and “impressionist” pieces which covered much of the scored and symphonic music. Classical cuts ranged with means from 9 and a spread of 2 to Impressionist with a mean of 5.8; of these cuts, a Classical Baroque piece had the widest distribution with a mean of 7.4 with a wide spread of 8. Impressionist/20th Century Classical pieces had a range of means with the lowest being 5.8 and the highest being 8.4; ranges were from 1 (high score) to 7 (middle score). The pieces less preferred both were described by multiple listeners as being from a movie soundtrack, a “show” or a theatrical piece.

Cut	Title	Genre	Labels applied	Preference ranking
10	Symphony 3, Mvt. 1 - Allegro con brio	Classical	Classical; traditional classical; classical orchestra	9.0
17	Gershwin: An American in Paris	Impressionist/20 th century classical	Theatrical; symphonic; movie; show; contemporary orchestra; orchestral jazz	6.7
19	Symphony 2- Mvt. 4 - Allegro con spirit	Romantic	Classical; classical orchestral; late classical; symphonic; Baroque	7.4
20	Goldberg Variations, BWV 988, Aria	Classical Baroque	Free jazz; classical; Baroque	7.4
23	Infernal Dance of King Kaschei- Firebird	Impressionist/20 th century classical	Semi-classical; classical; movie soundtrack; modern classical; symphonic	5.8
39	Children’s Corner: Golliwogs Cakewalk	Impressionist/20 th century classical	Jazz/slow ragtime; modern classical; background; 20 th century jazz inspired; classical jazz piano	8.4
55	Prologue (Allegro Moderator)	20 th Century classical	Orchestra; soundtrack; orchestrated classical; jazz/classical; 20 th century symphonic; symphonic jazz	7.2

Table 10: Labels and preference rankings for “classical” cuts

Jazz Preferences

For all cuts identified as jazz genres, swing, standard, and modal jazz were clearly the preferred genres across respondents. Smooth jazz and free jazz were the least preferred jazz. The spreads in range reveal that 90s jazz and cool jazz evoke the greatest extreme responses in listeners (see Table 11) with both having slight directional preferences, cool jazz toward the positive and free jazz toward the negative.

Jazz Genre	Mean	Range
Swing/Standards 30's	9	3
50's Swing	8.6	5
	7.5	6
50's Swing/Straight ahead (control)	8	5
Modal Jazz	8	6
Latin Jazz	7.5	7
Early Jazz	6.8	3.5
Straight ahead	6.8	5
Bossa Nova Jazz	6.7	4
Unclassifiable/Other Jazz	6.3	5
	8.3	1
	6.1	5
Cool Jazz	6.1	7.5
Gypsy Jazz	5.7	5
90's Jazz	5.1	8
Free Jazz	4.9	7
Jazz Rock	3.9	6
Smooth Jazz	3.1	5

Table 11: Jazz Genre

Overall, these data suggest there is a slightly positive skew to engaging jazz listeners across jazz genres. Expressed preferences and rankings across genres show that clear preferences across all listeners are toward Swing/Standards of the 1930s, 1950's Swing and Straight ahead, and Modal Jazz. These four categories had strong means, even with some range deviation for the modal jazz. Bossa Nova Jazz was slightly positive. Two of the three Unclassifiable/other jazz pieces along with Cool Jazz were just over the positive side while one Unclassifiable/Other jazz piece (Club G.R.O.S.S.) had a very positive mean with a minimal range.

Critical Themes

From these findings, several critical themes and questions emerge. One significant finding is that individuals are often willing to listen to music outside their comfort zones or stated preferences, but usually with conditions. Many respondents noted that they would attend a concert or a club with music they do not know or with which they are unfamiliar, but only under certain conditions. Usually, the condition was a specific invitation, a word of mouth comment plus an invitation, or attending with someone more knowledgeable about that form of music.

This theme raises several concerns. One emerges from the issue of labeling—those within the music industry use “form” to label most music. Those who are the consumers of music, i.e., the audience, appear to label music based on sound. And more specifically, they categorize music by sound contextualized in the approach the individual uses with which to engage in music.

The cross-directional use of labels could be “removed” by simply refusing to label any genre or piece of music. However, there are significant audience issues in considering removing labels. The first is how the music would be communicated in press and promotion, let alone in discussion or appreciation. It was clear from the findings that many individuals would be willing to engage in music with which they are unfamiliar, but only after they heard a sampling of the music. The second is that there is a desire in those who listen to feel they have access to the music—they understand or can appreciate it. How can music producers and presenters better communicate the requisite knowledge necessary to allow individuals to have greater access or more comfortable engagement with music that may be different than their usual preferences?

A second theme is the perception of music, both recorded and live, as either background for other activities or where active listening is the primary focus. Many comments referred to various cuts being good “background music.” One commented that they would listen *if I were out with friends and we were having a good time*, implying the music is supporting the good time, rather than being the focus of the good time. But for other individuals, certain genres or types of music demand attention. For many of the respondents, classical cuts and more challenging ‘unclassifiable jazz’ cuts, were among the types that required full attention.

Prefer to hear this in a performance—I can’t listen to this type of music casually because it’s more than background music. I like to listen to the piece and I respect the piece and it means more than just kind of having it on while I’m doing something else.

Some people use it as background or to relax—that doesn’t work for me.

When my brain is caught by music I really listen to it/pay attention to it.

I don’t have sound in the background when I’m doing things. I don’t turn on music. [referring to the cut] I might play this, like cleaning house, or ironing something where I don’t have to think about anything [so they can give their attention to the music].

Some individuals clearly distinguished between active and passive listening. As one individual noted: *Most listening is on stereo in my house using CDs or LPs. I find that LPs are the more active listening—when listening is the focus of what I’m doing. A little more hands on, actively. Half hour and switch sides. CDs, hours and hours [are played]without making a decision. I-Pod I use in the car [or I] use when exercising or away from the computer (doing work in the shop or whatever).*

A third theme relates to what is considered musical training. Most of the participants in the study claimed to have had formal music training, but in all but a few cases this training was instruction on an instrument (or instruments) and often participation in school band. Only one person (who did not major in music) voluntarily mentioned music appreciation and music theory courses as part of his or her formal study. This theme is critical because music education courses for all students are no longer part of most school curricula and therefore the exposure to music forms and differences is likely not part of many youths' experiences. As a result, exposure to form and variations which are used to categorize music are not currently part of the universal vocabulary.

A fourth theme that emerged in the data was the willingness to engage in music not usually within an individual's preferences, if someone else selected the music, e.g., *if I were somewhere where someone else was choosing the music, I'd be pleased to hear some of this stuff. But would I go out of my way to grab it, probably not.* A variation on this theme was the willingness to engage if someone more knowledgeable or someone they trusted invited them to attend a concert/club and was able to guide them through the music.

An extension of this theme emerged as a willingness across interests, ages, and genres to attend concerts or clubs playing music that the person was not familiar with. However, few would *search out* venues and several noted they would not know what the music was called so would likely not be aware of the music. The fifth theme was the desire for a *guide or someone who knows about the music* to invite the individual. Several noted in different words the sentiment *I want someone who can tell me what makes this music good; why I should like something.* Only a couple suggested that the information could or should come from the performers or the stage, but there was a clear expression that the need to understand music with which one is not familiar would facilitate exposure and engagement with that type of music.

A fifth them that emerged is the interpretation that the acquisition of taste in music can be socially transmitted and that the social wrapper of a club/lounge experience lowers the perceived risk of trying out something new. This has potentially significant meaning for the jazz field, because it suggests that socially-oriented venues play a key role in the evolution of public tastes in music. Cities without socially-oriented music spaces are missing a key link in the audience development system. This suggests a renewed focus on methods of social transmission.

Implications

These findings have several important implications for jazz performing and presenting organizations.

Language . There is no consistent language used to describe music. This includes the labels used to categorize music. It is evident that using labels in marketing, promotion, or discussion will rarely communicate clearly across individuals and audiences. Further, the lack of a consistent way to describe music suggests the adjectives an individual uses to describe music will not necessarily mean the same thing to others. For presenters and performers, this would strongly indicate a need to carefully consider how they model the use of language and to be aware of the need for clarity over jargon—the invaluable language used within a profession where words have specific meanings.

Invitation. People need to be invited to engage. A consistent finding was that individuals were willing to attend something different from their usual repertoire of listening/attending. However, most stated that they would attend if invited to attend with someone or if they understood what they would be hearing. Often, there was an explicit statement reflecting desire for someone to coach them through by explaining why what they are listening to is considered “good.” There are opportunities for presenters and performers to both invite and to satisfy the need of novices attending to the music.

Education. There was a consistent desire across participants to understand the music they were hearing. This suggests there is both a need and an opportunity to participate actively in educating audiences about the music they are hearing. Some of the specific areas of interest revealed in the interviews include influences (history) of the music, the type of music or labels used to describe the music being played, and why the music fits in that genre. Ultimately, people wanted their music to be put into a context. Such efforts would help audiences better engage with the music and expand their musical literacy.

Social. As with other free-choice activities, it appears music has a powerful social element. This suggests that an inviting setting could reduce the perceived risk of exploring music that may be less familiar to an individual. Socially-oriented venues could focus on this role and support evolution of public tastes in music by widening experiences. Cities without socially-oriented music spaces may be missing a key link in the audience development system.