

Audience Development is Dead (Long Live Audience Development): An Examination of the UK Policy Context

Lizzie Ridley

Postgraduate Researcher, University of Leeds, School of Performance and Cultural industries

Lizzie is a PhD candidate at University of Leeds. Her research explores audiences' attitudes to risk when choosing to attend theatre, and how this impacts audience development focussing on commercial musicals audiences. A communications specialist with 25 years experience in arts marketing, research, audience development, public relations and project co-ordination.

Abstract

This paper explores the concept of audience development as introduced as cultural policy in the late 1990s, specifically in the UK's performing arts sector. Despite its ambiguous beginnings, audience development has supported diversifying and deepening audience engagement, and broadening experiences, and yet it is considered by some to have failed in its purpose. This research examines this perceived failure through the industry context of audience development via examination of academic literature, grey literature, and interviews with arts marketing professionals. This research finds that professionals highlight 'finding' more than 'developing' audiences, suggests that audience development has supported a development in arts marketing itself, by providing the means to deepen understanding of audiences. In turn leading arts marketing in a transition from serving an organisation to becoming a 'custodian of the audience'.

Keywords

Audience Development, Arts Marketing, Cultural Policy, Audience.

Introduction

Audience development as cultural policy was introduced into the performing arts context in the late 1990s, and in the intervening time it has been used variously as a tool, a process and an ideology (Hadley, 2021). A seeming umbrella term (Lindelhof, 2015), it encompasses different interpretations

of how to develop the audience as well as deepening their engagement through co-creation, meaning making and arts talk (Scollen, 2009; Connor, 2013; Carnwarth and Brown 2014, Walmsley, 2019) as well as diversifying and increasing the representativeness of the audience (Lindelhof, 2015). It also includes the broadening of experiences for audiences, extending the core arts base, increasing attendance, meeting financial targets, and meeting the needs of existing as well as potential audiences (McCarthy and Jinnat, 2001; Hayes and Slater, 2002; Wiggins, 2004; Kemp and Poole, 2016).

However, in 2000 Kawashima cautioned that it was growing too fast with no clear idea of what it was and in 2021 Hadley claimed it had a functional ambiguity. This lack of definitional clarity has not, however, prevented claims that it is not working (Kemp and Poole, 2016; Jancovich, 2017; Torreggiani, 2020; Hadley, 2021).

This paper examines audience development as it connects with arts marketing in the performing industries in the UK industry and policy context. Through examination of the academic literature, grey literature and interviews with arts marketing professionals in subsidised and alternatively funded performing arts organisations, it examines the industry context into which audience development was placed and through interviews with industry professionals attempts to determine the context in which it currently sits. It then argues that, separate from audience development as a policy tool used to fund short term goals set by the government, arts marketing has in fact benefitted and grown from the introduction of this policy. It has helped move arts marketing from its initial place of serving the organisation to a ‘custodian of the audience’ (Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010). My research argues that audience development provided the understanding and skills to create a new way of navigating the liberal humanist product-led focus, building on Lee’s (2005) five approaches to marketing in the product led environment, and focuses on the importance of ‘finding’ in addition to ‘developing’ audiences. It also finds that as the economic and funding environment is changing there may be greater crossover than assumed between commercial and subsidised marketing and audience philosophy (Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010). It finally argues that in order to understand subsidised organisations audiences, there needs to be an academic place to build knowledge and understanding about *all* audiences, both commercial and subsidised. It concludes that while some may be claiming audience development as it relates to ‘missionary’ audiences, while not dead, is stalled, audience development as it relates to arts marketing’s ‘finding’ audiences, is consistently developing.

Arts marketing a background

Marketing as a practice was introduced in the cultural realm in the 1970s and 1980s. It was generally seen by the arts as an imposition of business practices in an industry which was previously mainly primarily concerned with artistic outputs. Politically, marketing in the UK’s arts sector was perceived

as a Thatcherite policy designed to reduce reliance on governmental funding, and the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB) subsequently ‘adopted a more interventionist approach’ (Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010, p.43), allowing for the introduction of market forces. Yet, in practice and through interviews with individuals employed in the arts during that period conducted by Hadley (2021), it appears that this change was, in fact, resisted by some Arts Council employees. In his important documentation of industry and practice at this key time of policy change within the arts, Hadley identifies that the introduction of marketing was perceived as a threat, not just by a section of Arts Council employees but by the arts organisations themselves, ‘how culture within the institution of the Arts Council regarded marketing management as the imposition of an alien business practice which was considered toxic and highly undesirable’ (Hadley 2021, p.80)

Hadley continues that the introduction of marketing was seen as an ideological compromise and outlines how it was ‘marketisation’ that formed a core dilemma between the art and the managerial function of ‘clear pragmatic economic necessity’ (2021, p.95). He maintains that this distrust continued until Diggle (1994) added the word ‘arts’ in front of ‘marketing’, continuing this was ‘seemingly a simplistic linguistic exercise but in reality deeply ideological’ (2021, p.94) yet, according to his research, the willingness of the Arts Council to accept the imposition of marketing was only ‘fully reconciled’ with the introduction of the term ‘audience development’. This is a significant point as it would appear from this that, in Hadley’s interpretation of the perspective of those people involved in the industry at the time, audience development, in the early days at least, was perceived as a rebranding of arts marketing and not a separate entity.

At the time marketing was introduced (some might argue imposed on) to the arts, the mainstream view of marketing was that it was instrumental, a universally appealing, ideologically neutral ‘source of tools and techniques to serve humanity’ (Kotler, 1972 in Eckhardt et al, p.312). Hirschman (1983) argued that this neutral positioning of marketing as a toolkit was a deliberate effort to expand marketing applicability away from a purely economic exchange between producer and consumer. However, she continued, even this new broadened perspective could not be applied to aesthetic or ideological producers due to the fundamental disconnect with the central ‘marketing concept [that] holds that products should be created in response to the latent or expressed desires / interests of their consuming public(s)’ Hirschman, 1983 p.46). This was supported by Diggle’s definition of arts marketing which placed the artist and product at the forefront of marketing strategies (Colbert, 2000, p.13). Therefore, what was, at the time, perceived essentially as a toolkit, was introduced within the arts realm, as a seemingly positive solution to the emerging pressures on public financing of the arts.

Rentschler (1998) has carefully mapped the development of arts marketing, and classified the era when marketing was introduced to the arts as the Foundation Period. Here, marketing was seen as a

set of techniques, and the marketer the ‘middle-man’ in their role of bringing art to the audience (Lee, 2005). The free-market approach in the 1980s early 1990s, which was affecting arts council funding by requiring less reliance on the public purse, reflected more broadly a time of intense marketisation and consumerisation and a greater reification of the ‘consumer as hero’ (Eckhardt, 2018, p.313). This in turn filtered into arts marketing which became increasingly professionalised (Rentschler, 1998). Arts marketing within many organisations adopted systematic processes which were outlined in a burgeoning number of practical guides. This included use of more general marketing techniques, the introduction of segmentation tools and a challenge to arts organisations to focus on the customer’s needs (Lee, 2005). In addition, 1993 saw the setting up of the first membership organisation of arts marketers in the UK, the Arts Marketing Association (AMA), which centralised knowledge and training and introduced an annual conference to discuss key issues within the industry.

Prior to this, arts marketers occupied a lower place within organisations, their work limited to core areas of the marketing mix. They were ‘often of low status in the organisation and poorly paid, reflecting the low value attributed to marketing activity’ (Hayes and Roodman, 2010, p.44). However, with the professionalisation and knowledge of audiences growing due to better market research, marketers started to claim their place within organisations. Gerri Morris of Morris Hargreaves MacIntyre, a key consultant, during a presentation in the 2004 AMA conference described this period as a time when marketers fell in love with data (2004). It was this deeper knowledge of audience behaviours, coupled with the financial constraints in funding leading to a greater need for organisations to increase their ticket income that put marketers in a position where they were able to suggest works audiences would buy tickets for. However, this placed a significant wedge between arts marketers and artistic directors, the latter of whom felt their position as arbiter of art was being eroded:

It was as if the artistic directors in our organisations, rather than seeing marketing as a means of more effectively communicating their vision, looked at it the other way round: it was as if the very existence of marketing confirmed their fears, that people didn’t actually want what they were producing and that what people did want was bad art or commercial fodder.
(Morris, 2004, p.12)

This subsequently led to arts marketers being characterised by some as ‘agents of the devil’ (Morris, 2004). This tension is reflected in academic literature, where it has been argued that ‘marketing practice within the arts has been viewed as inferior in value in comparison to the creation, staging, or critiquing of artistic work’ (Larsen and Kerrigan, 2018, p.136). This confirms Hadley’s (2021) findings about the discomfort with not only marketing but even arts marketing.

At the point arts organisations and arts marketers were being asked to find alternative funding streams, a government change in 1997 to Labour brought fresh injections of money into the cultural industries more generally and the performing arts specifically. This, however, brought with it a specific focus on audience development and a focus on art as a social good.

Audience Development

Audience development is a tool of cultural policy that was formally introduced by the UK Arts Council in the late 1990s as part of the New Audiences fund (1998-2003). New Audiences funded various initiatives such as Test Drive the Arts and Ambassador programmes (Johnson et al., 2004) to address, amongst other things, price initiatives, threshold issues, relevance, and effective communication with audiences, also tools for segmentation to identify and target relevant audiences. All these initiatives were bound in the concept of audience development, which, by definition of the fund's title, focussed on new audiences. There was funding defined for general audiences which covered 'new marketing approaches' (2004, p.9), but examination of the report clearly shows that the majority of new audiences targeted represented 'hard to reach' demographics. This therefore very clearly set the direction for audience development as 'Royseng, (2008) refers to this as cultural policy's 'ritual logic' – the assumption that culture can make things (and people) 'better' or make 'better' people (and things)' (Bell and Oakley, 2015, p.58). Hayes and Slater (2002) termed this, 'missionary' marketing.

The New Audiences fund represented the longest sustained period of public investment in UK audiences to date and represented a point of major change for funding and policy within the cultural sector in the UK. ACGB had been replaced with the four national arts councils and the National Lottery had been introduced as an 'alternative' or 'additional' form of funding. Up until this point, it has been argued, cultural policy existed in a 'policy vacuum' (Selwood, 2006, p.15), and it was at the beginning of the Blair era that politicians sought to bring cultural policy more in line with public policy (Gray, 2000, Selwood, 2006). This led to the introduction of financial and social 'targets' inextricably linked with funding which, even with three-year core funding, were arguably short term.

Tensions in marketing

Audience development therefore entered arts organisations as a flagship policy within the overall shifting objectives and funding sands of cultural policy being drawn into social policy. At that time, Gray argues, cultural policy was itself becoming increasingly commodified, moving from use-values towards economic exchange-values (2000, p.15), leading to an increased market orientation of arts

organisations. This new goal-driven, short-term funded policy initiative was initially placed within organisations arts marketing departments, subsequently deeper connections with what were education and then became engagement departments emerged. This created a tension within an increasingly professionalising industry which was simultaneously being expected to balance working with audiences to meet increasing financial goals to address reductions in public funding and short-term funded audience development targets. Audience developments focus on ‘developing audiences’ supporting the liberal humanist product-led perspective of the arts potentially assuaging the discomfort of marketing’s perceived commercial focus on market rather than product. Hadley (2021) found that the organisational discomfort with the role of arts marketing, its increasing professionalisation and its place as a ‘custodian of audiences’ (Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010) was mainly eased when the term ‘audience development’ was introduced. Yet for arts marketing it added an additional challenge in balancing missionary with mainstream marketing (Hayes and Slater, 2002), to combat increasing financial pressures.

Audience development in practice

An examination of the grey literature of the late 1990s and early 2000s clearly demonstrates this tension, and the proceedings from the 2004 AMA conference *How Does your Garden Grow?* was devoted to unpicking the differences between arts marketing and audience development. Geri Morris in her presentation stated, many of the New Audiences initiatives were, in actuality, simply effective sales tools, which were already ‘used in other industries that are dependent on the direct marketing of discretionary products’ (2004, p.15). Ivan Wadson, then chair of the AMA clearly outlined that the nature of the funding that came with audience development led to short-term, unsustainable projects where ‘the conditions for receiving that money [were] often accountability, access, inclusion, social benefits and cultural benefits. This created a new set of tensions: potentially the only way to justify putting money into the arts was by putting ticks in boxes’ (Wadson, 2004, p.13). Wadson went on to quote Heather Maitland and Anne Richards, both equally influential figures within the arts marketing industry, from the 2002 AMA conference who had said, somewhat controversially, that audience development ‘is specifically designed to include the excluded, is so expensive and time-consuming that it is in danger of bankrupting the arts’ (p.81). Expanding their statement he continues ‘some funders, especially Local Authorities, have simply added tackling social inclusion to the list of economic and artistic things they want us to achieve, like creating jobs and making ourselves less reliant on subsidy, and contributing to economic development’ (2004, p.81).

The conclusion of many of the presentations, and particularly those highlighted of Wadson and Morris, were that arts marketing and audience development were virtually overlapping but not synonymous due to ‘the baggage’ that comes with the term ‘arts marketing’.

So this was my diagram illustrating the relationship between the two:



(Wadeson, 2004, p.79)

So, while the perceived capitalism of arts marketing and socially focussed direction of audience development seem diametrically opposed, in reality there remains an ongoing connection between them that to date has not been fully explored. Academically this is supported by Hadley's (2021) interviews with arts professionals of the time. However, it would appear that Kawashima's caution that audience development was advancing too fast without a clear idea of what it is (2000) still remains, as a 2017 study by the European Commission also found, when trying to identify case studies, many of whom were in the UK, there was a 'difficulty in fully understanding the term "Audience Development", which was very often associated only with marketing and communication.' (Bollo et al. 2017, p.16). Therefore the question is raised as to whether marketing is a tool of audience development or vice versa?.

The product

An ongoing tension at the heart of the audience development / arts marketing dilemma is between the context of the liberal humanist perspective that art is universal (Kawashima, 2000, Hadley, 2021), and a determined product orientation (Colbert, 2000. Wadeson, 2004, Lee, 2005) that attempts to defy market logic (Larsen and Kerrigan, 2018). This product focus is also bound in the belief that adhering to market logic can result in negative changes to the art itself (Larsen and Kerrigan; Wadeson, 2004; Boorsma, 2006). Andreasen (1985) called this the 'organisational dilemma', and it can also be interpreted as a marketing dilemma: as the middleman between the art and the audience this has led to the marketing concept itself being 'adjusted in order to adapt to the context of the arts sector (Lee, 2005a, p.301). Lee identified five ways in which arts marketers have adapted to this product orientation: the relationship approach, adopting the generic marketing approach, extending the definition of the product, extending the definition of the customer and the (re-)reduction of marketing to function (see Lee, 2005 for more detail). Given the focus of audience development on education

and access, it could be argued that audience development forms a sixth approach to addressing the orientational dilemma. That, following the liberal humanist perspective, a solution to being unable to change the product is to develop the audience instead.

Methodology

This research combines the fields of cultural policy, arts marketing and the emerging field of audience studies. It takes a social constructionist approach, allowing for participants to articulate their lived experience on their own terms (Sedgman, 2019). It therefore takes a qualitative approach to answering the research questions set out and backed up by the literature review, specifically exploring how audience development is viewed by industry practitioners.

Exploratory interviews with five arts marketing professionals used five semi-structured questions, including ‘tell me about your audiences’, ‘what does audience development mean to you?’, ‘what does arts marketing mean to you’. There were additional questions about audiences and musicals which was relevant to my broader research on audiences attitudes to risk, particularly with reference to musicals. The sample was drawn from a mix of performing arts organisations, mostly from the North of England, there were two interviewees from two National Portfolio Organisations (NPO), two alternatively funded organisations, where funding came from a balanced of tickets and council with other grant funding, and a national commercial producing and touring organisation, they were purposively selected as a representative sample of the type of organisation to present musicals (commercial or otherwise). All interviewees were marketers or had a background in marketing, and most had lived experience in both publicly funded and alternatively funded organisations. Interviews lasted between one and two hours and were conducted over a period of two years. With a limited number of interviews this exploratory research was designed to examine initial perspectives rather than create an extrapolable sample.

Interviews were transcribed and then reflexively, thematically coded (Braun and Clarke (2021). Taking the interpretive turn within phenomenology I utilised abductive research to move between the literature and the interviews, particularly when looking for the ‘surprise’ within the responses (Timmerman, 2014), while resisting the temptation to test the accuracy of those findings (Schwartz, Shea and Yarrow, 2012).

Findings

The Audience

When asked to describe their audiences there was a general understanding that audiences and their tastes form a 'spectrum' across different types of product. Within all organisations represented there was an appreciation for the breadth of sub type of product even within product categories. For one NPO this was different forms of 'plays' and for the musicals a listing of at least six sub genres of musical. There was also a respect for the decision-making autonomy of audiences, supporting Hayes and Roodhouse (2010) definition of marketers as 'custodians of the audience'. This was demonstrated in an understanding that often their strategy is to 'get people to see a broader range of shows... but we do that from peoples natural place of comfort and then think what is the next ring from that rather than expecting them to jump from one very different type of show to another' (NPO1).

There was agreement, although from different perspectives, as to the impact the right product can have on audiences. An NPO respondent recounted when they had a product that had a hook that resonated with audiences, the resulting connection with that (new) audience was significant. However, in order to develop audiences, they were often tasked with bringing in new audiences to existing product. Within the commercial and alternatively funded organisations the perspective was that the audience was placed equal to or above the product, as the commercial organisation stated in a less than veiled statement on the liberal humanist perspective of many subsidised arts and how that might affect an audience:

[if AD is] engaging with people who wouldn't normally engage with the arts... my way of doing that is providing them with something that they want to see... rather than trying to get them to see *something that I want to make them see* and I think that's the big difference, isn't it? (CO, emphasis my own)

Similarly in the response of an alternatively funded organisation interviewee who, when asked what they would do if a manager asked them to bring in a different audience, stated they would ask the programmer to bring in different product for that audience.

This led to another finding in that instead of talking about *developing* audiences, respondents frequently referenced *finding* audiences, in other words having enough understanding of both the product and the audience to effectively match them together. This often occurred either through sophisticated audience development tools or through box office systems' own CRM, and was used either for 'audience development' for contemporary dance or for 'arts marketing' for new musicals. Or as one interviewee from an alternatively funded organisation stated 'that group who don't go to the art' (AFO1) or as 'part of your comprehensive plan of activities' (AFO1).

I think audience development is what we're doing in marketing, communications, you're finding the audience, and bringing them into that show or that product (AFO1)

Arts Marketing or Audience Development?

In Hadley's tracing of the origins of the term 'audience development' and with reference to grey literature of the time, it was felt that it was adopted in part to assuage discomfort with the term 'arts marketing'. In 2017 the lack of distinction between arts marketing and audience development was also highlighted in the European Commission report. My interviews confirmed that not only does this 'confusion' remain three decades on from its introduction, but there was in fact a deep discomfort in defining a difference between the two. One respondent stated: 'I don't really like this. [pause] I don't want to do this [describe the difference]. Because that's not how we think' (NPO2).

While there was a sense that audience development came 'from a really good place' (AFO2), that organisations are given a lot of public money and therefore *should* be concerned with broadening audiences beyond the core, virtually all interviewees communicated that the two are not mutually exclusive 'if you reject marketing as in some way irrelevant to developing theatre audiences, you are setting yourself up for failure' (NPO1).

There was a definite consensus within the interviews of how their 'official' understanding of the term 'audience development' was tied up with funding and specific, mostly under-represented, groups. The sense of discomfort in carefully choosing their words seemed most apparent when specifically describing audience development, using key funding phrases such as 'priority areas' and 'target audiences' and when listing 'target' groups such as under 35s, ethnically diverse audiences, deaf and disabled audiences, and geographical areas of higher deprivation. There was still a definite appreciation that while it represented a significant workload with sometimes limited response there was a place for this form of audience development.

Who or what is being measured?

As outlined earlier, one factor of audience development that presented issues within arts marketing was the short termism of the funding. This was apparent with one of the alternatively funded organisations who had been asked to undertake audience development on behalf of an arts council funded company that was touring into the venue. The short term very specific demand did not allow for a place in longer term strategic arts marketing plans and rather than the point of bringing in more diverse audiences was how to measure the specific success of that plan.

I suppose you could look at your postcodes and go, 'Have we had an increase?', but compared with what? an average? or a similar product?... sometimes you feel like you're chucking three grand [thousand pounds] at something, and you don't actually really know what returns you're getting' (AFO1)

This quote also illustrates the issue of what is being measured? It would appear to be capturing the metric of the 'right' type of audience for a particular product. It does not allow for the incremental development of audiences as outlined by NPO1 earlier. Which measurement places the product, once again, above the audience decision.

In addition, measurement linked to subsidy raises the question as to the potential limitations of what is understood by performing arts audience understanding if only the audiences that have to be measured in a certain way are being measured, as one alternatively funded organisation who took commercial tours of plays and musicals passionately states:

I've got 55,000 people coming to Phantom of the Opera over the next four weeks, do you want my data in there? Or do you not want my data in there?... you've got 45 genres of music you've got loads of plays, but even in plays it's a bit ropey because most of ours fits into other play dramas... and musicals you have mainstream musical, amateur musical, or other, that's it, that's all they will categorize it as. (AFO2)

Discussion

As explored earlier, there has been tension around the use of arts marketing in arts organisations since its introduction, however, arts marketing as a field has subsequently developed, to become 'custodians of the audience' (Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010). Increasing innovation within the industry (Rentschler, 2008; Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010) has led to greater knowledge and use of data and understanding of audiences and a sharing and growth of professionalisation. While Hadley would argue that this period can be classified as the 'failure' dilemma (2021), whereby this exact increase in data driven knowledge does little more than illustrate the failure of the diversification of audiences, in fact what it does is return audience development to the arts marketers.

At a point where, within publicly funded performing arts, organisations are still mainly driven by the liberal humanist, product-led, artistically driven notion of the arts, the need to develop audiences for artists and some sections of society is still very much alive, as demonstrated by my interviews. However, when taken apart from the instrumental aims of social policy, it appears that commercial, publicly and alternatively funded organisations aren't as distant in terms of audience perspective as

assumed. Each appears to understand the need to diversify audiences but recognise the unshakeable connection and business reality of matching the right product for the right audience.

It would appear that in practice, the approaches defined by Lee (2005) are still being adopted in terms of attempting to address the orientational dilemma and still meet the needs of audiences and organisations. While in the literature there is the indication that subsidised organisations concentrate on audience development and commercial on arts marketing (Hayes and Roodhouse, 2010), this research would indicate there are greater crossovers than previously outlined.

However, with measurement and financially supported research often restricted to funded work coupled with a perspective that musicals and commercial theatre are somehow less legitimate, I would argue that there is a gap in the understanding of performing arts audience in their totality. Given the ongoing demands for publicly funded organisations to find alternative forms of funding, which increasingly means growing ticket income, a broader understanding of audiences could help understand both audience development and financial imperatives, whether by diversifying product or by enabling arts marketers better information to better find the right audiences for the art that exists.

Analysis of the grey literature and these interviews to an extent support Hadley's (2021) finding that audience development was simply a re-branding of arts marketing, yet the depth of responses to the question 'tell me about your audiences' would indicate that an outcome of the 'imposition' of audience development and its focus on diversification has been a deeper understanding of audiences. Even if initiatives themselves were short-term, the learning has become ingrained, allowing for a greater breadth of knowledge when finding new and different audiences for the product. So, is audience development failing? Or if we adopt Jancovich and Stevenson's perspective that 'cultural projects and policies can and do succeed and fail simultaneously, in different elements of the work, to differing degrees, at different stages, and for different people in different ways' (2022, p.131), could it be argued that we consider audience development in two strands. While the two are interlinked, the first, participation, engagement and education, this is concerned with the literal 'development' of audiences and their knowledge and understanding of the art, and this can be held within engagement departments and programming. The second, increasing paid attendance to the performing arts through arts marketing / audience development to build a greater understanding of the audiences they serve. By understanding the interconnection between the two but also appreciating the different functions each strand has we could better start to examine which parts of audience development are 'failing' or 'succeeding'. With reference to the second strand, attempting to assess its success can possibly be summed up in a quote from a survey Wadeson conducted into practitioners' perspectives of developments within the industry since the introduction of audience development; 'hot air and tantrums... probably some better marketing along the way' (2004, p.82).

Conclusion

While there is still argument that audience development is theoretically stuck within an ‘ontological stasis’ (Hadley, 2021), in reality it could be argued that the need for arts marketing to balance the diversity focused but short termism of policy directed audience development with long term engagement with audiences has created an increasingly professionalised industry who are true custodians of the audience. In practice arts marketing is not just a commercial tool but is about finding ways of engaging and communicating with audiences that often will, but sometimes didn’t consider engaging. This greater understanding and focus on using a greater depth of knowledge to ‘find’ the right audience rather than ‘develop’ one represents a key direction for the future of audience development.

The first future direction for research is to develop a holistic understanding of *all* performing arts audiences, not just those who engage with funded or ‘legitimate’ art. Further research into marketing practices as they align and converge between the subsidised and commercial sectors is also needed. Both would lead not only to greater academic understanding of audience motivations, but also have practical implications in building and sustaining performing arts audiences for the future.

Acknowledgments

PhD research is funded by a scholarship from the School of Performance and Cultural Industries, University of Leeds. I would like to thank Professor Ben Walmsley for his helpful feedback on a draft of this paper.

References

- Bell, D. Oakley, K. 2015. Cultural Policy. Oxon. Routledge.
- Bollo, A. Da Milano, C. Garibaldi, A. Torch, C. 2017. Study On Audience Development – How To Place Audiences at The Centre Of Cultural Organisations. European Commission.
- Braun, V. Clarke, V. 2021. Thematic Analysis A Practical Guide. London. Sage.
- Carnwarth, J. and Brown, A. 2014. Understanding The Value And Impacts Of Cultural Experiences. Arts Council England.
- Colbert, F. (2000), Marketing Culture and the Arts, (2nd ed) HEC Montreal, Montreal.

Conner, L. 2013. 1st ed. Audience Engagement and the Role of Arts Talk in the Digital Era. New York. Palgrave Macmillan.

Eckhardt, G. Varman, R. Dholakia, N. 2018. Ideology and critical marketing studies. In The Routledge Companion to Critical Marketing. Eds Tadjewski, M. Higgins, M. Denigri-Knott, J. Varman, R. pp306-318. Oxon. Routledge.

Gray, C. 2000. The Politics of the Arts in Britain. Hampshire. Macmillan.

Hadley, S. 2020. Are we witnessing the end of the audience? Arts Professional. Available from: <https://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/magazine/332/feature/are-we-witnessing-end-audience> [Accessed 21/07/20]

Hadley, S. 2021. Audience Development and Cultural Policy. Cham. Palgrave MacMillan.

Hayes, D. Roodhouse, S. 2010. From missionary to market maker: reconceptualising arts marketing in practice. In Marketing the Arts a fresh approach. Eds O'Reilly, D. Kerrigan, F. pp.40-53 Oxon. Routledge.

Hayes, D. and Slater, A. 2002. 'Rethinking The Missionary Position' – The Quest For Sustainable Audience Development Strategies. Managing Leisure. Vol.7, No.1, pp.1-17.

Hirschman, E. 1983. Aesthetics, Ideologies And The Limits Of The Marketing Concept. Journal of Marketing. Vol.47, No.3, pp.45-55.

Jancovich, L. 2017. The Participation Myth. International Journal of Cultural Policy. Vol.23, No.1, pp.107-121.

Jancovich, L. Stevenson, D. 2022. Failures in Cultural Participation. Cham. Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, G., Pfrommer, P., Stewart, S., Glinkowski, P., Fenn, C., Skelton, A., and Joy, A. (2004). New Audiences final report. London: Arts Council England. [Accessed 10 May 2020] from <http://www.newaudiences.org.uk/resource.php?id%420>

Kawashima, N. 2000. Beyond the division of attenders vs. non-attenders: a study into audience development in policy and practice. Coventry: Centre for Cultural Studies, University of Warwick.

Kemp, E. and Poole, S. 2016. Arts Audiences: Establishing a Gateway to Audience Development and Engagement, The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society. Vol.46, No.2, pp.53-62.

Lindelhof, A.M. 2015. Audience Development And Its Blindspot: A Quest For Pleasure And Play In The Discussion Of Performing Arts Institutions. International Journal of Cultural Policy. Vol. 21, No.2, pp.200-218.

McCarthy K. and Jinnett, K. 2001. A New Framework For Building Participation In The Arts. RAND. Santa Monica.

- Larsen, G. Kerrigan, F. 2018. Critical Arts Marketing. In *The Routledge Companion to Critical Marketing*. (Eds) Tadjewski, M. Higgins, M. Denigri-Knott, J. Varman, R. pp. 135-151. Oxon. Routledge.
- Lee, HK, 2005. When Arts Met Marketing. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. Vol.11, No.3, pp289 - 305.
- Morris, G. It's a Vision Thing. In *Proceedings of 2004 AMA Conference. How Does Your Garden Grow?* – (Ed) Richards, d. Arts Marketing Association Conference Report. pp.10-17
- Neelands, J., Belfiore, E. Firth, C. Hart, N Perrin L. Brock, S. Holdaway D, and Woddis, J. 2015. *Enriching Britain: Culture, Creativity and Growth*. Report by The Warwick Commission on the Future of Cultural Value. Coventry: University of Warwick.
- Rentschler, R. 1998. *Museum And Performing Arts Marketing: A Climate Of Change*. *The Journal Of Arts Management, Law And Society*. Vol.28, No.1, pp.83-96.
- Rushton, M. 2023. *The Moral Foundations Of Public Funding For The Arts*. Cham. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scollen, R. 2009. Talking Theatre Is More Than A Test Drive. Two Audience Development Methodologies Under Review. *International Journal of Arts Management*. Vol.12, no.1, pp.4-13
- Sedgman, K. 2019. On Rigour in Theatre Audience Research. *Contemporary Theatre review*. Vol.29, No.4, pp.462-479.
- Selwood, S. 2006. A Part to Play? The Academic Contribution To The Development Of Cultural Policy in England. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. Vo.12, No.1, pp.35-53.
- Torregiani, A. 2020. Is it time to ditch old school approaches to audience development?. *Arts Professional*. Available from: <https://www.artsprofessional.co.uk/magazine/332/feature/time-ditch-old-school-approaches-audience-development> [accessed 21.06.20]
- Wadson, I. 2004. Audience Development, the Same But Different? In *Proceedings of 2004 AMA Conference. How Does Your Garden Grow?* – (Ed) Richards, d. Arts Marketing Association Conference Report. pp.75-88.
- Walmsley, B. 2019. *Audience Engagement In The Performing Arts. A Critical Analysis*. Cham. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wiggins, J. 2004. Motivation, Ability and Opportunity to Participate: A Reconceptualization Of The RAND Model Of Audience Development. *International Journal of Arts Management*. Vol.7, No.1, pp.22-33.