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Abstract:
Focusing on a single concert at the Wigmore Hall in February 2016, this paper explores audience responses to historically-informed concert programming from a dual perspective of historical musicology and social science. The concert programme involved the interspersing of a single cyclical work – Robert Schumann’s 1840 song-cycle Dichterliebe Op. 48 with individual numbers from other works, thus breaking up the anticipated sequence in a way typical of 19th-century concert programmes. The small-scale study established the general audience demographic for the concert, and then explored the role of several key factors on their appreciation of the concert, including their age, whether they played a musical instrument/sang, the importance of the venue, artists, repertoire, and finally the effect of the programme order and the historical authority which underpinned it. The writing-up process caused both authors to reflect on the challenges of exploring such phenomena from different epistemological perspectives.

Keywords: audience response, concert programming, Wigmore Hall, German Lied, Schumann, Dichterliebe, cycle, 19th-century

1. Introduction and Aims
This paper arose from a small-scale research project in 2016 on audience responses to historically-informed concert programming. However, as the study was undertaken jointly by a social scientist (Terry Clark, TC) and a historical musicologist (Natasha Loges, NL), it developed into an attempt to reflect on how scholarly collaboration, not just across disciplines but across epistemologies, can be mutually beneficial. The questions which arose from the project – touching on central issues of repertoire, coherence, canon, audiences and value – are often asked from very different perspectives, with little dialogue between
them. Our paper therefore seeks to combine the approaches of historical musicology with those of social science, and to offer an account which reflects both sets of priorities.

Philip Bohlman, among others, has identified a divide between different scholarly communities. Broadly speaking, social scientists may explore music as social practices, but specific repertoire is often irrelevant and a rich context is often lacking because of the emphasis on concision and results. Historical musicologists are open to reading works as cultural practice, but tend not to explain methodologies, often resulting in nuanced, discursive and individual readings of works or other music-historical phenomena, rather than aggregated perceptions of populations. The language of research also differs greatly, although this may, naturally, reflect the researchers’ idiosyncrasies; NL was struck by the use of passive language in social science, while TC noted that musicologists tend to reflect upon ideas more expansively than is typically afforded within social science’s focused and concise preferred styles. Although both approaches and styles offer reassurance that the research question can be answered, each relinquishes the perspectives of scholars outside their discipline.

The public performance of Western art music can be understood as a contract between performers, their audiences and the promoters. It involves numerous implicit, often unexamined rituals. These enduring behaviours reinforce the sense of a community; as Finnegan has argued, ‘Musical performances have been seen as occasions for exploiting the encompassing capacity of sound to marshal a sense of communitas, of trance, or of transformation’. Equally, the ossification of these rituals provoke the constant fear that audiences for ‘classical music’ are aging and/or declining. Both the rituals and the repertoire attract charges of conservatism, complacency, class and elitism (although this is not the concern of this paper).

Programming, a crucial aspect of the concert phenomenon, usually adheres to a set of norms set by artists, promoters and audiences. This project explores an audience’s reactions to a concert programme inspired by 19th-century programming practices. It evaluates separate elements to which we argue a seasoned concert-going audience responds. The concert, which took place in February 2016 at London’s Wigmore Hall, was associated with a conference focussing on the performance of the German lied during the 19th century at the Royal College of Music, German Song Onstage 1770–1914. Given by the baritone Stephan Loges and the pianist Imogen Cooper, the concert opened with three songs by Franz Schubert and Hugo Wolf, followed by the sixteen songs of Robert Schumann’s cycle Dichterliebe Op. 48 interspersed with solo piano numbers also by Schumann (see the full programme below). This was a common presentation of the cycle during the 19th century, especially by Clara Schumann, however, this interspersing of genres is rarely encountered today. But in every other respect, the concert conformed to a typical Wigmore Hall recital, from the performers (who appear there regularly) to the composer (Schumann’s chamber, solo piano and vocal music is often heard there), and the constitution of the audience (see below). The study established the general audience demographic for the concert, and then explored the role of several key factors on their
appreciation of the concert, including their age, whether they played a musical instrument/sang, the importance of the venue, artists, repertoire, and finally the effect of the programme order and the historical authority which underpinned it.

2. Literature review

The differences in approach began with the literature review. For NL, as a musicologist, this would typically be topic- rather than methods-focused, while TC felt the need to justify the methods in addition to the concept or phenomenon under investigation. Thus, the review needed to embrace both theoretical and methodological perspectives.

Scholars like Christopher Small have long called for an understanding of the classical music concert audience. Yet Small perhaps also idealises history when he argues that ‘the 19th-century aristocratic and middle-class audience was full of confidence and fertile with ideas and invention, while today’s audience feels itself beleaguered, its values and position under attack.’ Historians of 19th-century concert life have shown that successful musical careers entailed many compromises between audiences and performers, and that while the musical landscape was varied, it was also conservative in various situations. Ferris has argued (perhaps somewhat idealistically) that knowledgeable attendees of Clara Schumann’s private performances ‘refrained from conversation and listened to the performance with rapt attention, not because they wanted to determine how the performer stacked up against other virtuosos, but because they were genuinely stimulated by the music’. However, others have questioned assumptions around a golden age of aesthetic appreciation of music; James Young, for example, has argued for a reappraisal not only of the assumption that there was a historical point at which audiences did not contemplate music as an aesthetic object, but also the assumption that the concert hall necessarily presents a space of which the sole function is to contemplate music as an aesthetic object. For him, ‘the hypothesis that concentrating on music as an exclusive aesthetic object became more common is unproven.’ Stephanie Pitts has responded to Small’s call by exploring empirically the nature of concert attendance (a preferable term to ‘listening’, which captures only one aspect of experiencing live music). Pitts has demonstrated that, contrary to the assumption that concert attendees are passive, audiences demonstrated ‘a high level of loyalty, awareness, and involvement that allowed them to feel fully participant in the musical event.’ Another study has investigated whether listening to music in a group setting influenced the emotion felt by the listeners. However, the question of how audiences respond to having their expectations challenged deserves more exploration.

There is a growing body of scholarship around concert programming. Nevertheless, as Gotham has argued, ‘rationales for contemporary programming are rarely discussed in either public or academic circles.’ In general, concert programmes aim for thematic coherence; when common-practice era works are offered, the tendency is for just a small number of complete works to be performed. In Marín’s large-scale study of programming, the average number of works performed in a concert was 3.94, far lower than in the 19th or 18th centuries. Song recitals, comprised of many short pieces, naturally do not fall into this
pattern, although a cycle of songs offers an obvious way to aspire to the condition of
instrumental concerts by filling a chunk of a programme with a single work.

For this study, the concert programme at Wigmore Hall was not a typical 19th-century patterned miscellaneous programme. This programme invoked a two-fold authority. The first is the specific authority of Clara Schumann, a figure venerated in German and English concert life throughout her career. Schumann performed the songs of *Dichterliebe* interspersed with other works numerous times; she often accompanied the baritone Julius Stockhausen (1826–1906), the lied’s ‘founding father’. Both artists were associated with a clutch of ideals which coalesced during their lifetimes: principally, the idea of servitude and fidelity to the composer’s intentions as enshrined in the score, ‘servants’ or ‘priests’ of the music. As such, their programming practices invite serious scrutiny today. The second is the general historical authority – what used to be called ‘authenticity’ – which is frequently invoked to lend support to numerous decisions in classical music performance, albeit selectively; practices which challenge modern audience expectations, for example, the inclusion of comic intermezzi between the acts of serious 18th-century operas, are not recreated today. Clara Schumann’s performances of broken-up song cycles took place repeatedly over several decades and were well-received, so are a good example of historical authority, however are often overlooked by performers, and dismissed by musicologists as ‘peculiar’ and ‘outdated’. Recent scholarship evinces a growing interest in 19th- and early 20th-century performance practices, if not programming. Separate from that, there is ever-growing interest in the soundscape of the 19th century. The exponential growth in searchable datasets has also made it far easier than previously to trace larger trends in concert life. The programming device of breaking up cycles with other works was the norm for much of during the second half of the 19th century. Such performances of large-scale song cycles such as Schubert’s *Die schöne Müllerin* or *Winterreise*, or Brahms’s *Magelone-Romanzen* Op. 33 offered the textural variety beloved of audiences who had been raised on patterned miscellany concerts. Cycles and sets of all kinds were presented as sub-groups of songs or piano numbers usually interspersed with movements from other genres. The performing of complete uninterrupted cycles only became normal during in the 20th century. Although there is no scholarship exploring the links between how pieces of music are presented in recordings, and how they are experienced in concert, it is almost certain that the existence of at least 175 recordings of *Winterreise*, 128 of *Die schöne Müllerin*, 120 of *Dichterliebe*, 83 of Schumann’s *Eichendorff-Liederkreis* Op. 39, 76 of *Frauenliebe- und leben*, and the more modest 28 of Brahms’s *Magelone-Romanzen* Op. 33 have firmly reinforced in listeners’ minds that this is the correct, indeed the only way in which this repertoire should be heard. Therefore, in both performance and scholarship, the wholeness of a song cycle remains largely unchallenged. For John Daverio,

... the Lieder in question will amount to more than a mere collection, [that] they will exhibit elements of musicopoetic cohesiveness extending beyond the individual Lied to encompass the entire set.
It is not possible here to discuss the numerous analytical and hermeneutic approaches to song cycles; it is sufficient to point out that wholeness of the cycle is never questioned – indeed, most musicological studies compete to explain that wholeness in different ways. It is the same in performance, even if other elements are added, such as dance (Simon Keenlyside with Trisha Brown, for example) or visual art (Matthias Goerne and Markus Hinterhäuser’s performance of Winterreise with graphic projections by William Kentridge).

At under half an hour, Dichterliebe cannot fill an entire evening, although it is still virtually always performed as an uninterrupted whole. The exception is the work of Julian Prégardien (son of the acclaimed Lieder singer Christoph Prégardien), who both on the concert stage and in recordings, experiments with 19th-century programming strategies such as interleaving cyclical works with other numbers, improvisations, spoken word, and so forth. As with Clara Schumann, Imogen Cooper and Stephan Loges, Prégardien’s pedigree and track record are important guarantors of quality, reassurance that despite the quirky presentation, the performance will be serious. Truly historically informed programming, with its associations of miscellany and arbitrariness, entertainment and superficiality, remains a great rarity.

3. The Elements of the Study

The Musicians

Both concert artists in this study have international careers, and both perform regularly at Wigmore Hall. Stephan Loges’s career leans more towards concert and recital work than opera; as the first winner of the Wigmore Hall International Song Competition in 1999, he is strongly associated with canonical art song. Imogen Cooper is a highly regarded pianist, also associated with canonical Classical and Romantic repertoire. Although primarily a soloist, Cooper has also performed and recorded German song with the baritone Wolfgang Holzmair, including all three Schubert song cycles (Winterreise, Die schöne Müllerin and the posthumously constructed cycle Schwanengesang). This was the first time Loges and Cooper had worked together; the significance of their status within the profession was affirmed by the findings of the study.

The Venue

The Wigmore Hall is widely regarded as one of the world’s leading chamber music venues. Originally called the Bechstein Hall, it opened in 1901, in what was effectively the golden age of the recital. Like many other venues, the Hall’s management has grown increasingly conscious of its historic status; its concert programmes are currently being catalogued. Also like most art music venues, the Hall has recently embraced a wider repertoire (including contemporary music and jazz) and new formats like Sunday morning coffee concerts, weekday late night concerts, live streaming, and a substantial learning and
participation programme. Nevertheless, the core business of the Hall remains the presentation of the canonical solo, chamber and song repertoire to a loyal audience. In one newspaper, the Hall is described as the ‘the London headquarters of classical song’.\textsuperscript{40} Within the autumn 2017 season, 23 song recitals were programmed as part of its Song Recital Series. Of these, roughly 21 include German song from the long 19\textsuperscript{th} century (bearing in mind that at the time of writing, the Hall was surveying all of Schubert’s songs over three years). Most of these recitals conform to this format: a 7.30pm event in two halves involving one genre, singer and pianist. The flipside of this is the implicit charge of conservatism; reflecting on low audience numbers for one less conventional vocal recital, a critic observed that ‘those empty seats [suggest] that the Wigmore Hall has a core audience immovably suspicious of any programme that doesn’t involve something by Schubert’.\textsuperscript{41} This observation surely reaffirms the centrality of ritual within the concert experience, and this centrality holds force even in less formal settings. For example, although Pitts’ study of Music in the Round in Sheffield implies that the conventional separation of audience and performers might feel ‘regimented and stuffy’, her findings also suggest that people will inevitably construct their own private rituals, even in informal spaces (‘audience members [at Music in the Round] often had fixed ideas about where they wanted to sit’).\textsuperscript{42}

We approached the Wigmore Hall for this study because of its reputation for quality, and its loyal audience who are mostly respecters of the established rituals around live classical performance. Personal experience suggests that the Hall engenders a strong sense of community; NL sees familiar faces there over many years. Pitts has identified the importance of this aspect of concert attendance: ‘the collective experience of being part of an audience’ is a ‘strong component in the social experience of attending a concert’.\textsuperscript{43} Furthermore, despite a capacity of 545 seats, the atmosphere is intimate, thanks to the much-admired acoustic properties of the space. This quality surely plays a part in evoking the world of musical experts, \textit{Kenner} rather than \textit{Liebhaber}, such as those who attended Clara Schumann’s private performances of her husband’s piano works.

The physical details of the Hall conform to all the elements Small has identified as central to the concert ritual: the space (soundproofed, and as ‘formal as that of a traditional school classroom’; lacking a proscenium; reserving an allocated place for the non-participating audience); an ante-room or foyer for socialising; a space for the commercial transaction (signifying the professionalism of the event through the purchase of the ticket); the ‘built-in proletariat’ who ensure the smooth running of the event; and the still largely sacrosanct conventions of behaviour, for both performers and audiences.\textsuperscript{44} Attire is inevitably formal, although the tradition of male singers wearing tails has gradually relaxed in favour of black shirts and trousers.

\textbf{The Audience}

Within studies of novel performance practices and audiences’ responses, participants are usually described in terms of mean (average) and standard deviation (SD: this gives an indication of how tightly clustered the data are distributed around the mean). Such
information gives the reader a clearer understanding of the demographic make-up of the participants so that the study’s findings might be considered and contextualised accordingly. For this study, 114 adults attending the Wigmore Hall performance volunteered to take part (this was the majority of the attendees, although ticket sales on the day were not reported and it is no longer possible to establish exact numbers). They included 56 self-identified men and 57 self-identified women with a mean age of 54.9 years (SD = 17.55, range = 20–82). 78 (68%) of the participants reported playing an instrument or singing (piano: n = 48 (42%); female voice: n = 19 (17%); male voice: n = 20 (18%); other instruments: n = 18 (16%)). The average number of reported years of playing an instrument or singing was 32.04 (SD = 20.04, range = 1–67). On average, the participants reported attending 40.99 concerts per year (SD = 44.37, range = 2–300) and 18.52 concerts at Wigmore Hall per year (SD = 30.41, range = 1–200).

When asked how the participants would describe themselves, 13 participants (11%) self-identified as professional musicians, 25 (22%) as academics, and 14 (12%) as students. Regarding their concert attendance, 81 participants (71%) considered themselves ‘regular’ concert attendees, 17 (15%) as ‘casual’, and two (2%) reported that they had been ‘dragged’ to this concert by a friend. In that sense, although they could not be regarded as representative of an overall population, they did compare well with the audience identified in Pitts’ study of Music in the Round, which ‘emphasized the ageing profile of the audience, their likely occupations in education, professional work, or retirement, and their tendency to be musically knowledgeable, if a little conservative.’ From a statistical perspective, it was soon evident that this was an unevenly distributed cohort; the implications of this and ensuing subsequent actions are discussed further below. In the writing process, it was evident that TC was more interested in where the data clustered, i.e. in establishing a picture of the trends within the overall population, whereas NL was drawn to the outliers (see ‘Data Treatment and Analysis’ below) and expressed concerns about cleaning the data. This points to an epistemological difference in the value of norms and exceptions.

**The Programme**

The recital programme was decided during a single evening at Cooper’s home, in which NL introduced Loges and Cooper to Clara Schumann’s programming practices. The invocation of this pianist resonated strongly with Cooper, herself an internationally famous female solo pianist who also accompanies song. Both artists found the concept of breaking up the song cycle interesting, and saw nothing ‘wrong’ with it, maybe because it had been legitimised by Clara Schumann herself. They would possibly have been willing to perform *Dichterliebe* in this way without this legitimisation, but it probably would not have occurred to them without this precedent. They would most likely have responded differently to the suggestion that they perform, say, only part of the cycle. In deciding the programme, the artists and the author experimented at the piano with various solo piano works, examining sequences of mood and keys, and balancing this with practical considerations of what was already in Cooper’s and Loges’ substantial repertoires, and what they would enjoy performing. Cooper
transposed all the songs down for Loges; interspersed with the numbers from *Kreisleriana*, the resultant tonal sequence was novel in itself.47 (The consideration of the related practice of transposition is rarely seen in scholarship, despite it being universal and necessary.) A fuller explanation of how musicians assemble programmes could form the basis of a substantial further study; experience suggests that the conversations which professionals have around concert programming range widely across topics, including literature, tonality, thematic links, venue expectations, familiar vs. new repertoire and much more.

The final programme was decided entirely by the artists. Small has lamented that ‘musicians on the platform … have no creative role to play, only a re-creative one, to carry out … the instructions of long-dead humans.’48 However, Leech-Wilkinson has argued that:

120 years of recordings provide the definitive evidence: as performance styles change over time, our understandings of compositions and of their composers change too. Performers, in other words, have been doing a very large part of the meaning making all along.49

Loges’ and Cooper’s creative approach to the programme suggests that performers share in the making of meaning well before they are on the concert platform. The programme is given below in Table 1. No programme notes were supplied at the concert, although a brief spoken introduction was given by one of the conference organisers. The printed programme utilised the visual branding of both the Royal College of Music and the Wigmore Hall, as well as the usual wordings about mobile phones and coughing so familiar to the Hall’s regular attendees. The translations were supplied by Richard Stokes, whose internationally regarded song translations are familiar to Wigmore audiences. In other words, the sequence of events on the programme was the only unusual element.

Nevertheless, this programme represented an artistic risk. There is little evidence that professional critics are positively disposed towards unconventional programming, especially when they violate the seemingly sacred value of coherence. In June 2017, a solo piano recital by Inon Barnatan presented in the first half: a Handel Chaconne, a Bach Allemande, a Rameau courante, Couperin’s Ordre 12 No. 8 ‘L’Atalante’ from the *Second livre de pieces de clavecin*, Ravel’s Rigaudon from *Le tombeau de Couperin*, Thomas Adès’s *Blanca Variations* (a UK premiere), two of Ligeti’s *Musica Ricercata* and the fugue from Barber’s Piano Sonata Op. 26. While this looks like a miscellany, it was underpinned by the intention to explore the idea of variation. Yet, for one reviewer, it fell flat; he wrote:

The problem was that Barnatan is a devotee of those cunningly curated sequences of short pieces, which are starting to become fashionable. Instead of having a complete Baroque suite, you take just the Minuet, and place it cheek by jowl with a Romantic miniature and a modernist firecracker. It’s not surprising that this idea has taken off – concentration spans are supposedly shorter these
days, and having a succession of contrasts delivers a regular jolt of electricity, which stops the listener from daydreaming.  

**Table 1:** Programme for Stephan Loges & Imogen Cooper, Wigmore Hall, February 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schubert (1797–1828)</td>
<td>‘Frühlingsglaube’ op. 20 no 2 D 686 (3’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf (1860–1903)</td>
<td>‘Er ist’s’ (2’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R. Schumann (1810-1856)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dichterliebe</strong> op. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. ‘Im wunderschönen Monat Mai’ (C sharp minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. ‘Aus meinen Tränen sprießen’ (E major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. ‘Die Rose, die Lilie, die Taube, die Sonne’ (A major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. ‘Wenn ich in deine Augen seh’ (D major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. ‘Ich will meine Seele tauchen’ (G minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. ‘Im Rhein, im heiligen Strome’ (C minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. ‘Ich grolle nicht’ (B flat major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. ‘Und wüßten’s die Blumen’ (F sharp minor) (13’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kreisleriana</strong> op. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. ‘Äußerst bewegt’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. ‘Sehr langsam’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dichterliebe</strong> op. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. ‘Das ist ein Flöten und Geigen’ (B minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. ‘Hör’ ich das Liedchen klingen’ (E minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. ‘Ein Jüngling liebt ein Mädchen’ (C major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kreisleriana</strong> op. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. ‘Sehr rasch’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dichterliebe</strong> op. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. ‘Am leuchtenden Sommermorgen’ (A flat major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. ‘Ich hab’ im Traum geweinet’ (C sharp minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. ‘Allnächtlich im Traume’ (A major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. ‘Aus alten Märchen’ (C major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. ‘Die alten, bösen Lieder’ (A minor) (15’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The implication is that this fashion (like all fashions) will eventually pass, and that such programmes pander to the audience’s shortcomings rather than realise an artistic intention. The reviewer continues:

> It was a relief to know that, after the interval, Barnatan would allow us to savour one composer’s world uninterrupted. He played Brahms’s Variations on a Theme of Handel, one of those pieces which – typically for Brahms – is fiendishly difficult to play, without being gratifyingly flashy to the listener.\(^{51}\)

Mixed programmes like Barnatan’s are rare, so it is difficult to collect consistent data about how critics evaluate them. Nevertheless, some hallmarks are present here: we are to savour a composer’s (rather than a performer’s) world; a work should be conceptually and intellectually demanding, eschewing empty virtuosity; coherence and stylistic continuity in a programme are essential; and the audience should not be expected to work too hard to construct or perceive this.

A comparable reviewer response can be seen to Simon Rattle’s decision in the second half of a concert in July 2017 to programme movements from eleven different orchestral works by Joseph Haydn under the billing ‘An Imaginary Orchestral Journey’, performed by the London Symphony Orchestra. Described as a ‘novel concept’, the programme extracted the movements from the full works, but as one critic declared ‘reforged [them] in such a way as to win over many more admirers of this endlessly resourceful composer’. Other concert parameters remained untouched – and above all, there was no concession to superficial pleasure. Rattle is quoted in the press material thus:

> I thought how wonderful it would be if all the most outlandish and particularly the most forward-looking pieces of [Haydn’s] were all put together like a kind of ‘greatest hits’, he says. ‘The idea is to make a musical journey through all that is quirky and extraordinary, humorous and profound in Haydn. Hopefully this pasticcio will give a picture of the composer who most summed up all the ideals of the Enlightenment, of intelligence, respect, humour, wit and profound thought.’

The reviewer stated with relief, ‘thankfully it was not, as Sir Simon mischievously threatened, ‘a kind of greatest hits’ of Haydn.’\(^{52}\) Rattle’s playful use of the term *pasticcio* in relation to this concert is distant from the original usage of that term, which described a collation of numbers by various composers to make up an opera, mainly to showcase the favoured numbers of the principal singers. In Rattle’s half-programme, Haydn was served undiluted, and the catalogue of the composer’s qualities (intelligence, respect, etc) has little to do with *pasticcio*, which often attracted pejorative descriptions even in its day.\(^{53}\) The repetition of the word ‘profound’ within two sentences on the website presumably
reassures the audience that although the concept may be quirky or ‘mischievous’, it will not be silly or superficial.

With responses like this, it is unsurprising that concert practices seem set in stone, although there is continual rumbling at the periphery. In London, for instance, the Multi-Story Orchestra, established in 2011, performs in unusual venues such as disused car parks, even if the actual repertoire would not be out of place in a conventional venue. Furthermore, in September 2017, the orchestra performed Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony in Birmingham Town Hall’s Symphony Hall, but offered novelty through ‘Living Programme Notes’ led by Fraser Trainer, ‘where the whole Orchestra celebrates and explores the symphony with the audience before coming together for a full performance of the symphony’.54 The Aurora Orchestra offers a ‘pioneering creative community’ with a ‘playful approach to presentation’, offering ‘intimate, hand-crafted works of ‘Orchestral Theatre’’.55 One aspect of this is their memorised, semi-choreographed performances of canonical works such as Brahms’s First Symphony and Beethoven’s Pastoral Symphony. Again, most of the parameters of traditional concert ritual are left untouched, like a dissenting congregation which still shelters under the umbrella of Christianity; thus, the stage and the audience were separated, the full work was performed without interruption, and spoken interaction between the performers and the audience was minimal. On one level, such initiatives merely offer a ‘reassessment and reworking of familiar masterpieces’ in the ‘search for novelty’.56 This construction of what Marín has called ‘novel listening itineraries’ is allied with, and arguably compromised by, a legitimate desire to attract audiences.57 More importantly, each of these is an attempt on performers’ parts to reclaim a degree of agency.

4. Methods

Data collection measures
For this study, a self-report survey was developed that sought to gather information on the participants’ demographics, concert attendance behaviours, familiarity with the music to be performed, emotional response to the performance, and a subjective assessment of factors that may have influenced the participants’ enjoyment of the performance. To determine the content and areas of focus within our survey, we reviewed previous research that has explored variables found to influence audience members’ responses to and evaluations of music performances.58 Specific elements that have been examined within these previous studies include: the venue and the conventions associated with it; the layout of the venue; physical and psychological closeness to the performers and to other audience members; social situation within which the performance occurred; audience members’ familiarity with repertoire performed; inclusion, or lack, of a spoken introduction to the repertoire performed; presentation of the repertoire (such as order and/or manner of presentation); artists’ reputation; and audience expectations preceding the performance.
While not all of these variables were relevant to the present investigation, the final version of the survey can found in the Appendix. Questions were answered either via short open responses (i.e. age, instrument played or voice type), yes/no (i.e. ‘Do you play an instrument or sing’), or 10-point Likert-style scales (i.e. ‘How familiar are you with music on the programme?’ in which 1=Not at all, and 10=Very). The decision to employ primarily closed questions as opposed to open-ended questions was taken largely due to the overriding desire for a straightforward survey design that presented as few barriers to participant completion as possible. We were also interested in respondents’ gut or immediate reactions to the questions, as opposed to responses which were thought out more carefully and may have been influenced by social desirability or some other form of bias. Although we recognise that including more open-ended questions could have provided a greater amount of new insight, we feel that our survey design still had the potential to elicit some qualitative responses which could form the basis for future studies.

The survey was piloted prior to use with researchers who regularly attended concerts. They considered the clarity and ease of understanding of the questions within the survey as well as the length of time required to complete to survey. Any concerns or ambiguously worded questions were discussed, and appropriate alternatives were selected. The final version of the survey used within this study can be found within the Appendix.

While it is not necessarily common to lay this all out within a statistical study, for NL, it was important to reflect closely upon the processes which underpin statistical enquiry, and which are rarely explained in scholarly publications. In NL’s experience, this lack of explication has led to mistrust on the part of general readers, or equally problematically, may lead to an unfounded trust in results and associated claims, simply because of the assurance that statistical results seem to offer.

The questions we asked fell roughly into two categories: two brief questions on general demographic characteristics (age and gender), followed by specific questions regarding musical background and concert behaviours. In the interests of feasibility, participants needed to be able to complete the questionnaire on the spot within five minutes, which prevented us from asking more nuanced questions. For the same reasons, only closed questions were used, i.e. tick-box, yes-no, or numerical scales/responses.

The opening questions about participants’ age, gender, musical background, and concert behaviours enabled us to undertake a quick demographic survey. Additional variable that a future study could consider are: race, occupation, socioeconomic status (via postcode collection, although this is recognised as a crude measure), income bracket, marital and family status, and level of education. An important limitation is that all responses were self-reported, meaning that it was not possible to verify neither their accuracy, nor the respondents’ understanding of the questions (see the consideration of the descriptive words below). Although we can assume that respondents accurately reported their age and gender, their estimates of the number of concerts they attend annually might be less accurate because of the risk of social desirability bias; we sought to mitigate this by use of anonymous surveys. However, obtaining an exact number of annual concert
attendances was unnecessary for the present study; a rough estimate of concert attendance sufficed to generate a general sense of the participants’ concert attending behaviour. Meanwhile, when asked to rate how ‘meaningful’ or ‘stimulating’ they found the performance, it is entirely possible that some participants interpreted ‘stimulating’ differently from other participants. Consequently, their ratings may refer to different constructs. Due to such issues (e.g. possible recall errors or differences in question interpretation), findings generated via self-report means are generally treated with a degree of caution. Nonetheless, self-report responses still represent an efficient means of gathering a general understanding of participant demographics and their initial responses to a novel scenario.

**Procedure**

Prior to any data collection, ethical approval was obtained from the Conservatoires UK Research Ethics committee. The survey contained a statement informing the participants that returning a completed survey would be considered an indication of their informed consent to participate in the research. No names or any other identifying information were collected from the participants and they were assured that all responses would remain anonymous.

Upon entering the Hall, audience members were invited to participate in a study on their experiences of attending the concert. Those expressing a willingness to take part were given a paper copy of the survey and a pencil, provided with a brief description of the study and how and when to complete the survey, and asked to return the survey following the concert. The survey itself contained additional information on the nature of the study and the instructions for completing the survey. Before the concert began, participants were requested to complete the first part of the survey which collected background and demographic information. After the concert ended, participants were requested to complete the second part of the survey which collected information on their response to the performance and a subjective assessment of factors that may have influenced enjoyment of the performance. After the concert, participants returned their completed surveys to the concert stewards and the researchers.

**Data treatment and analysis**

For the purposes of this essay, reflecting NL’s unfamiliarity with this approach, the process of analysis is fully explained. All data were coded and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. All data were first tested for normality of distribution using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, and all variables came up significant (p > 0.05). This indicated that the data were not normally distributed. Datasets that are not normally distributed require the use of non-parametric tests for all analyses.

To allow for the use of parametric tests, datasets are sometimes ‘cleaned’ which can involve defining and then removing what are called outliers. Outliers are defined in different
ways; for example, participants whose responses sit considerably higher or lower and apart from the other participants (see Figure 1 below which shows three respondents who could be regarded as outliers on account of their concert attending behaviours)\textsuperscript{61}. Typical statistical analyses focus on group trends or averages, which can omit outliers. However, in this case, NL felt that examination of such outliers can add richness to our understanding of the audience, so in this study, we did not exclude any outliers. Although our quantitative statistical analysis sought to get a sense of the average respondent or average type of behaviour, we were also interested in understanding the breadth of experience the audience presented and to reflect upon the range of responses we received, i.e. to reflect both TC’s and NL’s priorities.

For example, the histogram within Figure 1 presents the frequency distribution of concerts attended by the participants per year where it can be seen that the bell-curve is asymmetrical and is skewed to the left of the distribution. As noted above, the participants reported attending a mean of 40.99 concerts per year (SD = 44.37). A ‘normally distributed’ histogram would show the highest frequency bars placed around the mean of 40.99 (so 20–40 and 40–60 in our case), with the subsequent frequency bars above and below these decreasing symmetrically.

**Figure 1**: Frequency distribution of concerts attended per year.
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However, within this histogram we can see a surge in the number of participants who reported attending 100–120 concerts per year, with a further three participants reporting that they attend 156 (an intriguingly specific number!), 250, and 300 concerts per year respectively. Looking at these 13 participants who attended 100 or more concerts per year in greater detail, they included an even split of six men and seven women who, together, had a mean age of 68.9 years. This is compared to the mean age of the full sample which was 54.9 years. Whereas 68% of the full sample reported having played an instrument or sung previously, only 38% of those who report attending 100 or more
concerts per year also reported having played an instrument or sung previously. This suggests that playing an instrument is not a defining factor in high concert attendance, although age (and therefore leisure time) is. This finding relates to a study by Pitt which suggests that ‘experiential knowledge of performance heightens a listener’s awareness of the process of performing’ – but which also argues that amateur chamber musicians may privilege their own music-making over listening (and associated concert attendance).  

5. Results and Discussion

Participants’ familiarity with music
In the presentation of results, TC interpreted the findings numerically and had no difficulty in conceptualising their significance, whereas NL appended interpretative statements after each statistical one, effectively ‘translating’ them for herself. When asked about their familiarity with the specific music on the programme, the participants reported an average score of 7.67 (SD = 2.64) on a scale of 1–10 with 10 being ‘Very familiar’ for Schumann’s Dichterliebe Op. 48, and 5.51 (SD = 3.23) for Schumann’s Kreisleriana Op. 16. A Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test demonstrated that this difference between the two sets of scores was significant (z = -6.67, p < 0.001). In other words, the audience was generally more familiar with the song cycle than the piano cycle. This may reflect several things, principally how the event was publicised. As part of a conference on German song history, it was drawing on a pre-defined audience. It was marketed in two ways: through the RCM website as part of the conference, and through Wigmore Hall’s website as part of their main Song Recital series. It would be interesting to consider the different effects of these types of marketing on audiences’ expectations of an event. Even allowing for a number of attendees specifically associated with the conference, 98 respondents described themselves as regular or casual concert attendees.

Nine participants reported that they had heard the song cycle performed in this way before (i.e. interspersed with piano works), 97 participants reported that they had never heard it performed this way before, and eight left this question blank. For the vast majority, then, this presentation of the repertoire was new.

Participants’ emotional response to the pieces
On a scale of 1–10 with 10 = ‘Very’, when the participants were asked how they found the concert, they reported the highest mean score for ‘Enjoyable’ (m = 9.38, SD = 0.98), then ‘Stimulating’ (m = 9.17, SD =9.17), and then ‘Meaningful’ (m = 8.80, SD = 1.77). We wanted to see whether there was a statistically significant difference between these three scores and so employed Friedman’s ANOVA (ANalysis Of VAriance) which determined these scores to be significantly different ($\chi^2(2) = 28.940$, $p < 0.001$). Such high praise was not anticipated by the organisers of the event; however, there is no way of knowing how significant this is and what it really relates to. It is possible that Wigmore Hall audiences are
predisposed to respond positively, i.e. there is no data for comparison. Nevertheless, the concert was clearly a success from the audience’s perspective despite the unfamiliarity of the sequence of works in the programme.65

**Perceived influence of factors on enjoyment**

This set of data forms the core of the study. When the participants were asked about factors that may have influenced their enjoyment of the song cycle, on a scale of 1–10 with 10 = ‘Very’, the artists were rated as most influential (m = 9.23, SD = 1.24; see Figure 2). This was followed by the repertoire (m = 8.81, SD = 1.33), the venue (m = 8.77, SD = 1.53), and the programme order (m = 7.63, SD = 2.45). The historical authority attached to the programme was rated as least influential (m = 6.91, SD = 3.01). Friedman’s ANOVA was again used, which determined these scores to be significantly different ($\chi^2(4) = 85.688, p < 0.001$).

**Figure 2:** Ratings of factors perceived to influence enjoyment of the song cycle. Ratings were made on a scale of 1–10 with 10 = ‘Very’.
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This data affirms the importance of the performers to an audience’s appreciation of core canonical art music in a way that is still only gradually being acknowledged within art music scholarship.66 But given the small distance between the ratings given for the artists and venue (9.23 and 8.77 respectively), it further suggests that an audience’s response to an event is shaped by a nexus of factors, of which the repertoire, in this case at least, is not necessarily the most significant one (this affirms Pitts’ findings). It is also interesting to see that historical authority was the least significant factor in the success of the programme, i.e. the audience enjoyed the unusual sequence of items on the programme, but not because of its historical justification. Equally, however, because the term ‘historical authority’ requires specialised musical knowledge, this result may well reflect a lack of understanding of or interest in its implications; this, in turn, might prompt reflections on the success, or otherwise, of the marketing of historically informed performance.
**Relationships between variables**

Constructing and interpreting a correlation matrix acts like a ‘fishing expedition’, which correlates all the different elements of the study; the authors have selected correlations which are of interest and might stimulate further enquiry, in keeping with the exploratory nature of this study.

Looking at participants’ ratings for ‘Enjoyable’ response to the concert in particular, significant positive correlations emerged between enjoyment and the perceived influence of the artists \((r = 0.623, p < 0.001)\), the repertoire \((r = 0.430, p < 0.001)\), programme order \((r = 0.388, p < 0.001)\), and the historical authority attached to the performance \((r = 0.207, p = 0.003)\). Interestingly, a small yet significant negative correlation emerged between the number of concerts per year that the participants reported attending at Wigmore Hall and an ‘Enjoyable’ response to the concert \((r = -0.204, p = 0.034)\). This suggests that the more concerts they attend at Wigmore Hall, the less they felt that they could apply the term ‘enjoyable’ to this concert. Perhaps this is because they regard themselves as a more critical or informed audience, so the word ‘enjoyable’ is too simplistic; or they are more used to a particular style of programme, and as regular attendees, their expectations have become more rigid. No correlation emerged between the perceived influence of the venue upon enjoyment and ‘Enjoyable’ responses to the concert \((r = 0.009, p = 0.929)\).

Strong positive correlations emerged between the age of the attendees and how long they themselves had played an instrument \((r = 0.574, p < 0.001)\), how many concerts they attended altogether annually \((r = 0.373, p < 0.001)\), and how many at the Hall specifically \((r = 0.454, p < 0.001)\). A significant negative correlation suggested that older attendees actually found the concert less meaningful \((r = -0.217, p = 0.028)\). A significant negative correlation was also found between the influence of the programme order on enjoyment of the song cycle and age \((r = -0.240, p = 0.014)\). Meanwhile, a significant positive correlation was found between the influence of the venue on enjoyment and age \((r = 0.332, p < 0.001)\). This suggests that for older audience members, the venue had a significant impact upon their enjoyment of the song cycle, whereas the programme order had little impact.

To explore further the potential effect of age on factors that influenced the participants’ reported enjoyment of the song cycle, Figure 3 was made.

This Figure tells us that the venue and repertoire performed are considerably influential upon enjoyment among older audience groups, powerful enough to overcome possible misgivings about the programme order. Although qualitative feedback was not explicitly sought on the self-report survey, a few participants still added comments. Highlighting these possible misgivings about the programme order are the following quotes:
Figure 3: Reported influence of different factors on enjoyment of the song cycle across the different age groups of the participants. Ratings were made on a scale of 1–10 with 10 = ‘Very’.

I found the order of the song cycle most unsatisfactory - breaking the thread of one work with a different ‘texture’ - not for me! (71-year-old male)

The Kreisleriana destroyed the mood. I am not a great fan of solo piano and I do not like mixed programmes. I wanted to focus on the singing, voice, language etc... The piano solos were an unwelcome distraction, broke the mood. Couldn't wait for the piano pieces to finish. Repertoire good without the Kreisleriana. (60-year-old female)

I did not understand why the Dichterliebe had to be interspersed with the Kreisleriana - However beautiful, it interrupts the continuity of the cycle and breaks the spell. (75-year-old female)

Not all of the participants were unhappy about the programme order, however, as demonstrated by the following quotes:

Loved the interspersed piano bits – fabulous idea! (68-year-old female)

In later years probably more than ever I'm open to new experiences in music and listening. Thank you for this one! (66-year-old female)

No such comments, either positive or negative, were left by younger audience members. This may suggest an attitudinal gap between older and younger audiences, i.e. that older audiences feel more comfortable and confident about expressing a more detailed opinion. Equally, it may indicate a different approach to time, in that older audiences felt they had the additional minutes free to write their thoughts out. Finally, as explored further below, it
may suggest that younger audience members were simply less struck by the programming as opposed to some of the older audience members who found the programming distracting and to have a negative impact on their enjoyment of the song cycle.

To examine further the potential influence of age on audience members’ responses to the concert and programming, the participants were assigned to one of two age groups: those aged 54 years and younger, and those aged 55 years and older. Potential differences between the two groups were then analysed using a one-way ANOVA, these findings are presented in Figure 4. The differences between the scores for ‘Enjoyable’, ‘Impact of Order’, and ‘Impact of Venue’ all attained significance ($F(1,106) = 4.216, p = .043$; $F(1,102) = 9.999, p = .002$; $F(1,106) = 13.055, p < .001$ respectively). None of the differences between the other sets of scores attained significance. These results suggest that younger audience members found the concert to be significantly more enjoyable than older audience members. Younger audience members also felt that the order of the song cycle influenced their enjoyment of it significantly more than it did older audience members, whereas the venue influenced their enjoyment of the song cycle significantly less than it did for older audience members.

Figure 4: Reported ratings of responses to the concert and impact of different factors on enjoyment of the song cycle comparing younger (Blue) versus older (Red) attendees. Ratings for all questions were made on a scale of 1-10 with 10 = ‘Very’.

Note: * indicates a significant difference between the two scores.

If this ageing population forms the core audience, then these results suggest that the Wigmore Hall would need to maintain its current conservative programming model to retain them. If, however, the Hall wishes to attract younger audiences, it perhaps risks alienating their established, older patrons. There is a fascinating non-significant relationship between ratings for overall enjoyment of the concert and the perceived influence of the venue on enjoyment. In other words, according to this correlation result the audience members felt that they did not care about the venue. This contrasts with the high ratings given for the
influence of the venue on enjoyment as reported on Figure 3. This raises questions about how we describe success as associated with notable venues like Wigmore Hall. There is also a relationship to be explored between the age of the audience and the enjoyment of the concert, given that the data suggests that the programme appealed more to younger audience attendees. There is a strong correlation between enjoyment, meaning, and stimulus. However, we need to unpick the relationship between this enjoyment and the fact that it does not necessarily arise from having programmed familiar music.

Taking one step back, there are observations to be made about the study overall. Although we did consider pre-existing studies, and conduct a pilot, the potential ambiguities and overlaps in the offered descriptors (‘Enjoyable’, ‘Meaningful’, and ‘Stimulating’) were problematic. Some participants effectively submitted the same response three times. In future studies, such terms need to be more discrete in order to address specific areas of the concert experience. Nevertheless, it is a common limitation in such studies that ultimately, we have to offer generally understood descriptors.57

There are many more factors which could be explored, such as the social aspect of concert attendance (identified as crucial in Pitts’ work), and the ways in which the shared experience of listening in a public space affect the results, as opposed to private listening at home.68 Furthermore, each of these factors could potentially be broken down; for example, what was it about these specific artists’ performance that appealed? Was it their reputations, authority onstage, their public endorsement by the venue, or their evident ease and familiarity with the repertoire? Is it because quality is associated with this particular space? At a recent visit to the Hall, NL overheard a member of the public say to the Box Office manager while buying his ticket, ‘I am never disappointed with anything here’; given the huge impact of the venue on this experience, what might this say about other artistic ventures taking place in less conventional places? Did we even ask the right questions? We hope to repeat, nuance and expand the experiment in the future, to stimulate further thinking in this area.

6. Conclusion
This initial foray has offered some insights into how the Wigmore Hall audience responded to a historically-informed concert programme. It provided a snapshot of a typical audience for a song recital, revealing age (rather than gender) as an important factor in the appreciation of the concert. It gave a sense of the importance of concert attendance and being able to play an instrument/sing themselves; it affirmed the canonicity of the chosen repertoire; and it suggested a relationship between age and a willingness to accept unconventional programmes. It revealed the need to find better descriptors to capture how audiences respond to concerts. With regard to the historically-inspired concert programming, it evaluated key factors like repertoire, artists, and the venue; of these, the role of the latter is the most complex and would merit further exploration. Equally interesting, the role of the authority of historically informed performance in getting
audiences to engage with less familiar programmes was revealed as unproven, even when all other factors remain constant.

Furthermore, the process of writing the article has caused both authors to question some assumptions which underpin the epistemological stances of our respective disciplines. For the statistician, what is required in order to justify a methodological choice or process to other readers (for example, the basis of commonly used statistical tools (Likert) and tests (Friedman’s ANOVA))? Equally, the discursive style of historical musicology enables the scholar to unpack complex concepts and phenomena; the freedom to be expansive allows the consideration of a wide array of potentially influencing factors. However, such writing presents procedural challenges; both authors of this paper were challenged to write – and think – in unfamiliar ways. Writing style, so often taken for granted, emerged as centrally important; NL had to force herself to write more dryly and objectively, while TL commented on the sheer length the article was attaining. NL also found herself instinctively mistrusting the analytical process unless it aligned with her own experiences based on observations over the years. In the revision stage, each author played to their strengths, tackling areas which reflected their expert knowledge. The risk of that is in trying to write an article that satisfies two different readerships, we end up alienating, rather than satisfying, both – however, the results are hopefully enriched by the dual epistemological perspectives, the willingness to privilege different kinds of information, to share language and methodological richness, and ultimately, to produce studies which are of interest to a wider range of readers.
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Appendix:
RESEARCH PROJECT

Thank you for considering taking part in our research, hosted by the Royal College of Music. We’re looking at your experience of attending this concert.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time if you wish. By submitting your completed survey you are giving your informed consent to participate in this study. The answers you provide will be kept anonymous and confidential. We may publish reports based on our findings, but you will not be identifiable from the data included.

If you have any questions, please speak to one of the concert stewards or contact Terry Clark (terry.clark@rcm.ac.uk) or Natasha Loges (natasha.loges@rcm.ac.uk).

Please fill out the RED SIDE (this side) now before the concert starts. Then fill out the BLUE SIDE (opposite side) after the concert finishes.

We will collect the questionnaires from you after the concert at the door.

BEFORE THE CONCERT STARTS

A BIT ABOUT YOU

Age ____ Gender M / F Do you play an instrument/sing? Yes / No
If yes, for how many years? _______ What instrument(s)/vocal type? ________________
How would you describe yourself? ___ Regular concert attendee
___ Casual concert attendee
___ Professional musician (Genre? _____________)
___ Academic (Area? _________________________)
___ Student (Course?) _________________________
___ I was dragged here by a friend

Roughly how many concerts do you attend per year? ______

Roughly how many concerts at Wigmore Hall do you attend per year? ______

How familiar are you with the following music on the programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schumann: Dichterliebe Op. 48</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann: Kreisleriana Op. 16</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFTER THE CONCERT

THE CONCERT

How have you found the concert? Please circle the number that best applies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schumann’s Dichterliebe Op. 48

Have you ever heard song cycles performed this way before (i.e. interspersed with piano works)? Yes / No

Think now of Schumann’s Dichterliebe Op. 48 in the programme. To what extent did the following factors influence your enjoyment of the song cycle? Please circle the number that best applies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme order</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical authority attached to performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 See, for example, Roger Chaffin, Gabriela Imreh & Mary Crawford, Practicing Perfection: Memory and Piano Performance (New York: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, 2002), which is about the memorisation of Bach’s Italian Concerto, but concentrates far more on the former than the latter.
An associated issue here is the language of research, which alienates not only those outside the academy, but sub-groups within it. Sarah Price has considered this in her thesis ‘Risk and Reward in Classical Music Concert Attendance: Investigating the Engagement of ‘Art’ and ‘Entertainment’ Audiences with a Regional Symphony Orchestra in the UK’ (University of Sheffield, 2017), 53ff.


Sarah Price has demonstrated that, within the UK at least, the decline is not worrying. See Sarah Price, ‘Risk and Reward in Classical Music Concert Attendance: Investigating the Engagement of ‘Art’ and ‘Entertainment’ Audiences with a Regional Symphony Orchestra in the UK’ (University of Sheffield, 2017), 18.

There are various exceptions which are defined in relation to that norm, discussed later in this paper. The authors are grateful to Miguel Angel Marín, University of La Rioja, for sharing his unpublished research ‘Challenging the listener: how to change trends in classical music programming’.

See http://www.rcm.ac.uk/events/seasonhighlights/germansongonstage/ and http://www.rcm.ac.uk/included/gsosschedule.pdf. The conference was organised by Natasha Loges and Laura Tunbridge.


Marín identifies Schumann as a high-ranking member of the ‘golden’ list of composers. Miguel Angel Marín, University of La Rioja, ‘Challenging the listener: how to change trends in classical music programming’, unpublished.
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20 Thanks to Miguel Angel Marín as above.


23 The constructed nature of this legacy is discussed by Karen Leistra-Jones in ‘Staging Authenticity Joachim, Brahms, and the Politics of Werktreue Performance’, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 66/2: 397–436.

24 Historically informed performance ideals were deconstructed coruscatingly by Taruskin in his essay ‘Last Thoughts First: Wherein the Author Gently Replies to a Few of his Critics and Takes Tender Leave of the Topic’, in *Text and Act* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 3-47, in which he argues that such decisions simply reflect modern tastes, but draw on history (selectively) to legitimise them. See also Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, ‘What we are doing with early music is genuinely authentic to such a small degree that the word loses most of its intended meaning’, *Early Music* 12/1 (February 1984), 13–16. See also the AHRC-funded project *Transforming C19 HIP*, [https://c19hip.web.ox.ac.uk/home](https://c19hip.web.ox.ac.uk/home)


26 See, for example, Clive Brown’s recent editions of works by Brahms for Bärenreiter; Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, ‘Recordings and Histories of Performance Style,’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Recorded Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 246-62; and Neal Peres da


34 Keenyside collaborated with the choreographer Trisha Brown to create a Winterreise in which he sang and danced alongside three professional dancers. The performance was given, among other places, at London’s Barbican Centre and the Theatre Royal in Newcastle in September 2003. It was reviewed in various places, including the *Telegraph*. This review quotes Keenlyside who points out that nine performances sold out in New York, where ‘a conventionally sung Winterreise would struggle to sell two’. Ismene Brown, ‘The singer’s dance of death’, *The Telegraph*, 13 September 2003.

35 Various other performers have sought to combine Winterreise with other art forms, e.g. Samir Calixto, who created a Winterreise tetralogy for the Holland Dance Festival, incorporating other music, dance, song and poetry, performed by tenor Eyjólfur Eyjólfsson, pianist Rudolf Jansen and others.

Stephan Loges is married to Natasha Loges, one of the authors of this study. We acknowledge the potential for positive bias this raises. For this reason, the study did not include interviews with the performers themselves, and the initial analysis of the data was conducted by Dr Terry Clark.
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45 Pitts, ‘What Makes an Audience?’, 263.

46 The authors are grateful to Dr Thomas Synofzik of the Robert-Schumann-Haus Zwickau for sharing the unpublished data of Clara Schumann’s performances of German song cycles.

47 Irene Girton, ‘Dichterliebe and the transposition dilemma’, *The NATS Journal* 48/1 (1991), 10-15, argues that transposition irretrievably damages the connections between individual songs when practised indiscriminately. Exceptionally, Roy Howat’s and Emily Kilpatrick’s work has explored the question of transposition in Fauré’s songs, linking it to particular performers and considering its implications from an editorial (rather than analytical) perspective. See Roy Howat & Emily Kilpatrick, ‘Gabriel Fauré’s middle-period songs editorial quandries and the chimera of the “original key”’, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 139/2 (2014): 303–337.


49 Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, ‘Classical music as Enforced Utopia,’ *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 15, no. 3-4 (2016), 326.


51 Ibid.


Small, ‘Performance as Ritual,’ 15.


See, for example, A. Field, *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 4th ed. (London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2013), who defines the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test as ‘as test of whether a distribution of scores is significantly different from a normal distribution. A significant value indicates a deviation from normality...’ (p. 877). Normal distribution refers to the mathematically-defined spread of data points within a given dataset. In other words, data that is evenly distributed around the midpoint of all scores can be considered to be normally distributed. Data that are determined to be normally distributed (i.e. non-significant) can subsequently be analysed using parametric statistical tests which are considered to be more powerful (i.e. assume less error) than non-parametric statistical tests.

See, for example, A. Field, *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications Ltd, 2005), who defines an outlier as ‘an observation very different from most others. Outliers can bias statistics such as the mean’ (p. 740).


The relationships between audience pleasure, talking and self-expression, and the ability to perceive a meaning or value in an artistic event or object has been explored by Lynne Conner, *Audience Engagement and the Role of Arts Talk in the Digital Era* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

Friedman’s ANOVA is a non-parametric test which is used to determine whether more than two related sets of scores differ significantly from one another. Being a statistically significant difference simply means that the difference between the ratings was not due to chance.
Studies have argued that audiences are predisposed to evaluate arts events positively for a range of reasons and have therefore criticised quantitative methods of exploring audience evaluations. See K. Johanson & H. Glow (2015), ‘A virtuous circle: the positive evaluation phenomenon in arts audience research’, Participations, 12(1): 254-270.

This prioritisation of the performer is evident in the design of many historical playbills.

For an evaluation of validated scales which do not rely on verbal descriptors, e.g. pictorial response scales, see Natalie Bradford, ‘What is the effect of active music participation on well-being among adults with Down’s syndrome?’, PhD thesis, Royal College of Music, forthcoming.

Terry O’Sullivan has explored the tension between individual and group consumption of the arts, which we recognise within the Wigmore Hall audience, including the notion of a brand community, the idea of intersubjective consumption and collective facilitation of each other’s experience. See ‘All Together Now: A Symphony Orchestra Audience as a Consuming Community’, Consumption, Markets and Culture 12/3 (2009): 209–223.