All You Need to Bring is Your Trust

: How free admission to live music venues' performances influences audience perception of musical performances?

Abstracts

Public institutions, mostly national collections and museums, have operated free admission in terms of realizing democracy and collective ownership of culture. This open-door policy has expanded to indicate a form of pricing strategy across the cultural industry, particularly in the music business. Live music venues have experimented free admission to performances as such. Considering those venues attributes as commercial platforms, their forsaking economic profits arouses curiosity about why they have operated free admission to their performances. This question motivates us to investigate free admission's impact on audience perception of musical performances. We choose BIRD, the live music venue located in Rotterdam, to collect the data of the audience who attended BIRD's free admission performances before. With the data collected via online survey, we test the 4 hypotheses using ordinal regression. More specifically, we use ordered logit regression to analyze our data as most of the variables are ordinal that use interval and Likert-scale.

List of Contents

List of References (pp. 144-147)

4

Chapter 1. Introduction

1. Background of Free Admission

Free admission has been importantly discussed in terms of realizing democracy and collective ownership of culture. This approach has focused on sociological perspectives suggesting that cultural goods promote tolerance and encourage social inclusion (Ferraro et al., 2018). Such ideological foundations have shaped the principles of policy making across public museums and monuments. Nowadays free admission, grounding on this, generally stands for an open-door policy. UK museums has been the representative cases in cultural sector (Gall-Ely et al., 2007). Quite an amount of commercial platforms in England also have applied free entry with financial assistance from either government or cooperation. Museums are nevertheless not the only cases that practice an open-door policy nowadays. The range of free admission has burgeoned to imply a form of pricing strategy across the whole cultural industry. A rising number of live music venues as such have used free admission to attract more audience.

2-1. Emergence of Live Music Venues

Referred as performance clubs or bars, live musical venues have been mentioned to enlarge audiences' musical experiences (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016). Deeply associated with a musician's career development, among such, their roles as gatekeepers have been especially discussed. Such an attribute has ascribed to their lower barriers to entry. Competent, yet less noticeable suppliers have been drawn to their informal, unofficial characteristics (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016) to exhibit their works. Performers often have traded with platform owners to provide their talents and earn experiences and reputations. This exchange often has led bundling their performances with other contingent services referred as food or drinks.

2-2. Dilemmas of Operating Free Admission at Live Music Venues

Live music venues often define themselves as commercial platforms. Financial benefits are integral to sustain their business. Considering this aspect, pricing musical performances entails several dilemmas for them. Owners of platforms, let's say, are cautious of a predicted relationship between performance quality and ticket price. Consumers, because, have frequently regarded price to indicate quality (Volckner and Hofmann, 2007). Some audience believe that expensive performances guarantee better quality. This implies potential negativity of free admission. Since it does not levy any charges, it could be a sign of low quality. Platform owners inevitably get doubtful whether free admission has enough attraction. They have nevertheless persisted on an open-door policy, which is surprising.

Commented [Office1]: In what sense idealizing? Maybe boosting? Facilitating? Ot idealization of?

Commented [Office2]: Private?

Commented [Office3]: Which one?

Commented [Office4]: What do you mean? Are food and drinks artifacts? In your previous version you referred to services and it was clearer

Commented [Office5]: Elaborate a bit n this as it is an important part

Commented [Office6]: Please rephrase and elaborate this is a fundamental part for you but it's not very clear. Who are the suppliers? Musicians or venues' owners? Build the sentence more carefully: 1. Price = indicator of quality; 2. Thus Free entrance = low quality; 3. Suppliers doubts & free entrance not attractive; 4. Still there is free entrance and this is surprising.

3. Extant Academic Contemplations over free admission

In fact, input of consumer research literatures on free admission has been rare. Among all, cultural sector has taken consumer perception of free admission for granted (Gall-Ely et al., 2007). Estimation of such non-market values has leaned more toward sociological perspectives. There has remained much to be explored, hence, regarding economic perspectives. Studies over free offers have been limited to short-term impacts (Walster and Walster, 1975). Restricted investigations have led insufficient insights for permanent free admission's impact. Under such circumstances, relevant research still suggests crucial hints over free admission.

Academic analysis on free entry have been comparatively abundant across museum studies (Cowell, 2007). Concerning positive influence of free admission, researchers have stated it might compensate for audiences' need to know '*what they are paying for'*. This attribute is particularly beneficial to cultural goods as they are experience goods (Nelson, 1970). Consumer interaction with experiences goods has been a critical process to prove their worthiness. Meanwhile, actual evaluation has been only available after purchasing the goods. This often has led consumers holding back from consumption with huge dislikes, because they cannot assure the goods' quality. Consumers end up displaying strongest skepticism against advertising claims that require experiences with goods to verify their efficacy (Nelson, 1970). When experiencing cultural goods asks for more than just paying for the good, it gets worse.

A total cost for attending a concert, let's say, stands for more than paid admission. Transaction costs, including transportation fare or time invested, are also included. Even when admission is free, visitors still have to pay for these. New visitors, concerning such, would be more hesitant of opening their wallet. They cannot be assured whether their decision would pay-off. Gall-Ely et al. (2007) argue, in this regard, free admission, abates monetary distance between audience and institutions by cutting back opportunity cost. It ultimately increases consumers' cultural participation, which strengthens adhesive relationships with institutions.

4. Characteristics of music audience

Studies over music audience's consumption dynamics, meanwhile, have emphasized past consumption's impact on cultural participation. As Castiglione and Infante (2016) argue, knowing 'what they are paying for' is significant to them as well. Changing circumstances across music industry have enabled music audience to access an extensive range of fine quality information. Nowadays music audience has higher chances to discover the ones that suits their tastes in advance. Their searching for information might not be sufficient, still, due to characteristics of cultural goods. As explained above, cultural goods including musical performances are experience goods. Especially musical performances' short-lived, temporary attributes (Phelan, 1993) matter. Pre-accessible information cannot reveal enough about actual experiences with them. Personal circumstances also significant variables that influences each individual's impression of the identical performance. Advertising claims can never accurately predict every audience's experiences with actual performances.

Commented [Office7]: In the previous version, here you started a sub-paragraph this made the whole part clearer. Also you introduced this part better

Commented [Office8]: These are interesting aspects. Add some references, please

5. Attributes of musical performances

Places in which musicians do live musical performances should be considered, because the context of live art has been discussed in its relations with places. Audience's impression of given performances could differ depending on the nature of venues (Hill and Paris, 2006). Live music venues often appeal informal, unofficial attributes (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016). A Shadow aspect of such is represented as live music venues' obscure status. Audience could think it is an indicator that discredits catered services' quality. This potentially leaves an impression that their products, musical performances, are not professional as well. overall situations complexify management of asymmetrical information[1] issue for both consumers and suppliers.

Overall, trustworthiness of service qualities seems significant to music audience's consumption dynamics. Consumers invest resources to match their expectations about cultural goods. They want to be sure that their efforts ultimately get rewarded. The uppermost task for suppliers, in this regard, is to fulfill perceived fairness on the demand side (Dolgin, 2009). This issue of persuasion empathizes free entrance as a notable attraction tool. By exempting consumers from ticket prices, this price-setting intends to maximize their utility concerning fairness. As mentioned above, free admission's impact on performing arts sector has yet to be verified. Related literatures on consumer decision models in performing arts, still, provide an insight for its potentials.

6. Academic contemplations over consumer's decision models in performing arts

Consumers' decision models in the performing arts often represented as two types (Castiglione and Infante, 2016). They either consider impacts of past consumption or do not. Concerning the former one, scholars regard cultural capitals as an accumulation of cultural participations. They follow the idea that consumer behavior shaped through cultural participations influences consumption. Education, as such, was reported to display slightly stronger impacts on cultural participation than economic capital (Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2015). Ateca-Amestoy (2008) meanwhile elaborates how some constraints, especially financial situations and prices, demotivate theatre goers' utility maximization. This impact of financial status appears to be stronger regarding the consumer decision model that disregards past consumption.

Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996), for instance, approach this aspect grounding on intertemporal separability of utility conditional on past consumption. Considering p*ast* work and *consumption* do not influence current and future consumption, their find consumers' demand of theatrical performances relies on their income elasticity of demand and prices. The introduced investigations leave some notable remarks. It is clarified, to begin with, a long-

---

[1] Information asymmetry indicates a situation in which one side to an economic transaction possesses greater material knowledge than the other side (Akerlof, 1970). This imbalance between the two parties incurs decrease in sales, since consumers' distrust in goods discourages their consumption.

learning process forms cultural consumption. Castiglione and Infante (2016)'s research on beneficial addiction of theatrical performances supports this. Their investigation finds past consumption and prices increase marginal utility of current consumption. Audience's accumulated experiences enhance their perception of performances. This phenomenon importantly shows significance of motivating consumer's initial engagement in cultural participation. Scholars such as Ateca-Amestoy (2008) and Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996) argue, meanwhile, how audience decide not to go to theatres regardless of their past consumptions; Overall, the audience's financial status determines their decision making.

Economic capitals' impact could be even conspicuous across low-end goods than high-end ones in cultural sector. Consumers' expression of price inelastic demands for high-end goods turns into high price elastic demands for low-end ones (Towse, 2012). Arts is not, in this regard, necessarily a luxury good with own-price elastic demands. This makes low-end goods' attracting consumers tricky. Live music venues are not exceptions. They are often considered to supply low-ended performances. For audience with less or without past consumption, in particular, those venues might sound too untrustworthy to spend their money on. Free admission, concerning this, could be a useful promotion tool to attract them.

Hasty convictions over free admission's impact is risky, which reminds several issues surrounding consumer experiences. As Seaman (2005) states, for instance, investigation of price elasticity in cultural consumption have reported mixed outcomes. Audience's future consumption of musical performances might differ as well, depending on numerous variables that include economic capitals. Demand of Finnish national opera, as such, has been reported to shows inelastic demand during the premieres, but elastic demand for the performances scheduled after (Laamanen, 2013). Consumer's evaluation of performances nevertheless appears to be significant. Accumulated positive experiences could catalyze their purchases after on. Performing arts' common attribute especially empathizes this point. High, positive cross elasticity of demands among the performances has been observed despite their heterogeneity (Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette, 1996). This ultimately indicates good impressions of performances possibly expand audience's cultural consumption in performing arts sector. This research accordingly investigates the influence of free admission to live music venues on consumer perception of musical performances.

7. Academic contributions of This Research

4 domains comprise this research's potential academic contributions. First, it broadens the economic contemplations over impacts of consumers' cultural consumption in the performing arts sector. Such an approach seeks for connections between their past, current and future consumption. Inference of future consumption importantly strengthens the train of related arguments mentioned above. This research, second, benefits both commercial and non-commercial organizations in cultural sector. This research, in particular, quantitatively measures audience's subjective evaluation of musical performance by applying

Commented [Office18]: The year should always go next to the author's name

Commented [Office19]: What do you refer to?

Commented [Office20]: Inelastic?

Commented [Office21]: Before it seems that performing arts are separated and correspond to more classical performances. Was that so? If yes here you need to change the term

WTP(Willingness to Pay)[2]. Quantifying such non-market values is expected to provide suppliers with more direct overviews of free admission's impacts. It could be a useful indicator to set the direction of consumer marketing strategies after on. Followed understanding of free admission's impacts could also be applied to donation model in pricing strategies. This could be particularly applied to a type of donation that audience can voluntarily price a concert.

This research, as the third contribution, benefits musicians as direct suppliers of musical performances. Verifying the efficiency of free admission is ineluctably associated with labor exploitation issues in the cultural sector. Free admission imposes both live music venues and artists a huge sunken cost to attract more audience. For the majority of artists meanwhile free admission is not at all exceptional. Free concerts have been rather customary in cultural sector to develop artists' careers and reputations. Exploring free admission's efficiency, concerning this, could help musicians to be respected and be reasonably compensated for their works. These series of consideration, as the fourth contribution, benefit consumers who are the main elements in the free admission mechanism. free admission possibly grows audience's accessibility to musical performances. This brings more diversity in audience's consumption dynamics, adding richness to their cultural participation.

8. A summary of Research Designs

To implement this research, quantitative data collected through online survey is used. 4 main hypotheses are tested with sub-hypotheses. The variables that comprises each hypothesis are largely represented as respondents' interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, trustworthiness of pre-accessible information, satisfaction with pre-accessible information, satisfaction and WTP for musical performances, consumption patterns, and personal information related variables such as gender, age, education levels, professions, etc. Those variables firstly intend to test socio-cultural dynamics' impact on audience's cultural participation. Associated with how the respondents encountered information about free admission performances, those variables are also used to see pre-accessible information's influence on audience's cultural consumption. Concerning the respondents' experiences with free admission performances, those variables ultimately intends to see whether audience' impression of free admission performances influences their consumptions after on.

---

[2] WTP (Willingness to Pay) is a maximum price that an individual is willing to pay for one unit of a product.

Commented [Office22]: What is it? You have never mentioned it so far. So before using the acronym you should have indicated the entire name and explained why it is relevant.

Commented [Office23]: what do you refer to? Which non market values?

Commented [Office24]: Not clear how this relates to the rest

Commented [Office25]: Exceptional?

Commented [Office26]: What do you mean by verifying?

Commented [Office27]: Please rephrase

Chapter 2. Literature Review

1. Emergence of Free Admission across Live Music Venues

1-1. Background of Free Admission

Debates surrounding free admission are not new. Bailey et al. (1997) find that political debates on museum charges, for instance, have been repeated over times throughout history. Such arguments consisted of cultural, educational, leisure and recreational issues, dynamics of political ideology, both institutional and political pragmatism and professional cultures and social policy perspectives. Regarding its operation, the idea of free entry has been guided principally by politics in general. Whether or not to actually charge has displayed an inseparable connection with charging policies of organizations at different times of history. Apart from political the perspective on free admission, there has been the view that an institution's governing body and/or trustees should decide whether to impose admission charges or not (Bailey et al., 1997). Free entrance accordingly did not always signify operation of an open-door policy. Free admission might also correspond to a policy where institutions' administrators use ticketing exceptionally. Even ostensibly 'free' institutions could impose charges for particular events and other services. Cowell (2007) finds, for instance, that an admission ticket was mandatory for British Museum's visitors to be personally guided throughout their visits. Such institutions have also operated multi-branches or galleries where charges could be levied for.

Exemption from payment, nevertheless, has been crucially tackled regarding idealization of democracy and collective ownership of culture among all. These ideological foundations have shaped the principles of policy making across public museums and monuments. Such principles weight on the sociological perspective that suggests that cultural goods promote tolerance and encourage social inclusion (Ferraro et al., 2018). Nowadays free admission accordingly stands for an open-door policy in general. British national collections are often freely accessible. Not only public institutions, several galleries and museums under sponsorships from corporations in England also have claimed to be free in terms of their operation. UK museums have been the representative case in the cultural sector (Gall-Ely et al., 2007).

1-2. Emergence of Live Music Venues

Free admission, as mentioned above, had been confined to either public or sponsored institutions, mostly museums. Museums are nevertheless not the only cases that apply an open-door policy. Free admission nowadays has expanded further to indicate a form of pricing strategy across the cultural industry, particularly in the music business. Rising number of live music performance venues have experimented free admission to performances. When

mentioned in academic works, music venues have entailed extensive descriptions related to specific performance conventions.

Referred as performance clubs or bars, live music venues often have represented a particular genre or era's zeitgeist in the music making history, like musicians themselves (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016). Venues such as the "Cotton Club" or "Manchester's Hacienda" represent indefinitely-growing live music venues over the past 100 years (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016) that have achieved iconic status due to their monumental status regarding music history.

Meanwhile, their actual physical appearances, regular audience, types of performed bands and blended attributes that gives them aesthetic appeal have been hardly mentioned (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016). For the past years, however, their emergence has taken on symbolic resonance regarding the expansion of musical experiences (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016). Their roles as gatekeepers have been frequently mentioned. Intertwined with a musician's career and reputation development, in particular, live music venues have attracted countless musicians. Their encounter with the venues has enabled them to access a broader range of audiences, which includes intermediaries in the cultural industry (Tai, 2014). One aspect that contributes to such development has been their lower barriers to market entry compared to professional platforms. Their informal, unofficial attributes (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016) have attracted promising, yet less competitive, suppliers in search of opportunities to display their talents.

In exchange for such potentials, performers usually have lent their musical talents to platform owners. This trading often has led grouping the borrowed talents with other contingent goods like food or drinks. The definition of sellers has encompassed both musicians and owners in this case. Based on Musicians' cooperative relationship with platforms, they together merchandise a package which comprises the performances and service goods. BIRD, a cultural venue in Rotterdam, is a representative case. Indicating its cultural omnivorous characteristics (2020, BIRD), it has served multi-functions that include its restaurant, a performance stage, and a club area.

1-3. Dilemmas of Operating Free Admission at Live Music Venues

As it is often the case with live music venues, many of them are profit-making platforms. Forsaking economic profits is not easy, which is not weird because they need to make both ends meet. At the same time, pricing a musical performance accompanies so-me dilemmas. Including musical performances, pricing in performing arts has been set according to the types of audiences and characteristics of performances (Frey and Steiner, 2010). This flexible attribute of pricing has been an integral element in marketing mix. Yahayaet al. (2015) find t hat it has significantly influenced designing economic mechanisms to attract and hold au diences. One common pricing strategy thus is setting initial ticket prices lower than consumers' WTP[3]. Suppliers rather want concert seats to be full than having financial loss due to a slump in selling (Courty and Pagliero, 2012). Suppliers cannot disregard, nevertheless, a

---

[3] WTP (Willingness to Pay) is a maximum price that an individual is willing to pay for one unit of a product.

predicted relationship between ticket price and performance quality. Price often has been told to be an indicator of quality shaped through a consumer's experiences (Volckner and Hofmann, 2007). Some audience do think that expensive concerts offer better quality, which implies possible negative impacts of free admission.

2. Academic Discussions over Free Admission

2-1. Limitations of Extant Academic Contemplations

Suppliers' juggling between those aspects does not make free admission look very attractive. This makes wonder why, despite these doubts, some venues have willingly operated an open-door policy. Efficacies of free entry on consumer perception of musical performances meanwhile have stayed rather unidentified. Consumer research literatures on free admission is scarce. There stand several reasons why. To begin with, the cultural sector has taken consumer perception of such promotional tools for granted, still leaving much to be explored (Gall-Ely et al., 2007). Estimated as recreational values not found in the marketplace, scholars have rather discussed them in terms of non-market values. Academic estimation of those non-market values has leaned more toward sociological perspectives that discuss symbolic meanings. Their focus on measuring personal judgments has neglected economic aspects of consumer behavior. A rather partial exploration has been done, thus, when it comes to the economic perspective. Extant contemplations over free offers mostly have not expanded beyond short-term impacts (Walster and Walster, 1975). Disregarding impacts of permanent free offer, as a consequence, has circumscribed the variety of research topics. With these limitations, relevant studies provide notable implications regarding free admission's impacts.

2-2. Mixed Reactions Surrounding Free Admission

Academic analysis on free entry's impacts has shown comparative abundance across museum studies (Cowell, 2016). Perspectives on its efficiency have been polarized into pros and cons to provide strong arguments for both. Those colliding standpoints ground on mixed consumers' reactions toward free admission.

Advocates of paid admission find paid admission's significance in terms of efficiency of pricing. In classic economics, efficiency is gained by setting prices equal to marginal costs. For museums, an additional visitor incurs marginal costs because new visitors make museums more crowded, which downgrades every visitor's museum experiences. If a museum decides to disregard this congestion issue, however, the marginal cost per visitor gets extremely close to zero (Rushton, 2017). Being a non-rival good, a museum does not economically benefit from having additional visitors. Not generating revenues from admission, museums should invest additional resources on sustaining the quality of service. This critically influences institutions'

12

financial stability and renovation.

Stepping further from this economic impact, advocates find that paid admission determines visitors' commitment. As Walster and Walster (1975) confirm, such 'fair contributions' boost a visitor's ego as the chosen, allowed to enter the institutions. This intangible 'entry visa' motivates visitors to behave responsibly as it exclusively empowers the visitors socially, culturally, and economically. On the institutions' side, thus, paid admission is an empowered mode of participation and approval, which encourages audiences' constant contributions.

Free admission, on the contrary, has been said to trigger the opposite because it is comparatively spontaneous and less constrained (Gall-Ely et al., 2007). Optimistic views on free admission, to be ironic, also find its significance as a catalyst of consumer commitment. The advocators of free admission find that visitors, after experiencing free admissions, become more favorable to permanent paid admission. They especially claim it could compensate for consumers' desire to know '*what they are paying for*'. As Nelson (1970) finds, consumers express the strongest skepticism against attributes of goods that require actual experiences to verify their values. Among the various types of goods, cultural artifacts are particularly susceptible to this issue. Individuals can only experience cultural goods to prove its promoted claims.

Visiting a museum, meanwhile, arouses one more issue due to the complex cost charged on consumers. A general cost for visiting a museum encompasses certain transaction costs and the admission fee. The entry fee is not the only cost that visitors have to face, then. The certain transaction costs, referred as transportation fare or time invested, are also unavoidable. Even when admission is free, visitors still have to pay for such costs. New visitors, considering this, would be even reluctant to spend their money as they cannot be sure that their decision would pay-off. Gall-Ely et al. (2007) claim that free admission, thus, mitigates monetary distance between museums and people instead by reducing opportunity cost. It ends up encouraging new visitors to be culturally engaged, which helps to accumulate adhesive relationships with institutions.

.

3. The Relations between Music Audience's Consumption and Information

3-1. Characteristics of music audiences

The arguments over free admission above are largely confined to cases of museums, as previously mentioned. Such might not sound perfect-fitting to cases of live music venues due to circumstantial differences. It might particularly do when considering different pursuits of genres. Consilience across different genres occurs, for sure, to blur the boundaries in between.

13

Commented [Office30]: this is not clear. Why does the museum not benefit from another visitor?

Commented [Office31]: What do you mean?

Commented [Office32]: Who?

Commented [Office33]: what do you mean? That they go back or that a ticket is introduced?

Commented [Office34R33]: This sentence is rather separated from the rest and not too clear

Arlander (2011) finds musical performances are basically classified as performing arts while every performing arts[4] is classified as visual art. What Arlander (2011) argues, stepping further, is that clearer distinctions between types of arts, let's say music and fine arts, may still exist . It is thus not logical to rashly justify the goodness of free admission to musical performances. Literatures over consumption dynamics of music audience meanwhile have stressed significance of past experiences regarding consumer decision as well. As Castiglione and Infante (2016) suggest, knowing 'what they are paying for' is important for music audience, indeed.

Music audiences is the umbrella term that includes various categories corresponding to diverse demographics. Grounding on this variety, academic approaches on audience analysis have explored how interplays between different mediums and audience members shape their interactions with music (Bennett, 2012). Scholars have especially focused on socio-cultural dynamics' impact on music consumption. Age, gender, education levels have been continuously reported to characterize and even intensify one's consumption habits. Hierarchized patterns of music choices have been observed among audience groups (Hesmondhalgh, 2008). Audience's emotional realization via music has merely been a simple expression of personal preferences, in this sense. Scholars rather have regarded it as a status-seeking competition (Favaro and Frateschi, 2007) that embodies self-identity.

The advent of cultural omnivores, however, has challenged this notion of cultural choices in musical domains. Cultural omnivores have been known to conditionally appropriate cultural artifacts using their intellectual capacities (Peters, Eijck, & Michael, 2017). Their diverse consumption patterns have signaled the importance of questioning 'how' rather than 'what' a person consumes. Cultural omnivores' cherry-picking across highbrow and lowbrow musical genres has been importantly thought to invalidate the previous status distinction (Jarness, 2015) discussed above. Relevant studies meanwhile have subdivided the term 'omnivore' to further investigate varying types of omnivores and univores (Bergham, & Eijck, 2009). Continuous explorations ironically have assured that omnivorousness does not always incapacitate class distinction.

Cultural omnivores are generally known to hold decent education levels. They have appropriated popular arts not because they are ignorant of what it is. In short, being acknowledged a cultural omnivore is another manifestation of the unprecedented status. The impacts of educational attainment show strong validity, therefore, as what audience knows defines its music tastes (Bryson, 1996). Roose (2010) find that music consumption, in this regard, is positively associated with every indicators of audience's cultural capital-educational achievements; art workshops and public engagement of the individual's parents.

---

[4] Performing arts generally embraces theater, music, opera, and dance from both 'highbrow' and 'lowbrow' arts. Such a range includes live arts executed at venues and non-live arts performed through diverse form of mass media (McCarthy, & Pew Charitable Trusts, 2001).

3-2. Impacts of digitalization on music industry

The circumstances surrounding music audience meanwhile have gone through major shifts with digitalization in the music industry. Technological developments have shaped novel frameworks for consumption, communication, distribution and reception in musical domains. On the supply side, digitalization has incurred convergence of markets, which has integrated spheres of intermediaries in the cultural sector. They have accordingly found ways to more directly interact with consumers. This conditional change has lowered fixed-cost, mainly regarding costs of product dissemination than costs of creation. Consequent production environments have attracted more competitors by facilitating market entry. This highly competitive environment has brought some positive impacts on the consumer side. It has importantly granted music audience a richness of information. This process has renovated diverse elements, changing conventional understandings of music audience and their roles in those practices in academic perspectives.

Music audience nowadays are equipped with extensive technological tools to navigate through abundance of information. Suppliers have consequently competed among each other to persuade consumers with the most convincing, high-quality advertising claims. Including free admission, at the same time, suppliers have operated attraction strategies to get audience to their concert halls. Suppliers are aware that simply giving names of actors who stage a performance is not always bringing audience to their shows. The overall circumstances have enormously enlarged the scale of advertising claims that consumers appropriate in advance. Regardless of their cultural capitals, music audience can simply search for record histories on streaming platforms to get information about a performer's latest works. Those activities effectively heighten the probability of finding the ones that match their tastes. Free admission might not sound tempting to music audience, regarding this, because it focuses on abating uncertainty due to insufficient information.

4. The Impact of Musical Performances' Characteristics on Consumer Decisions

4-1. Attributes of musical performances

Despite those merits embodied by digitalization, navigating information on the demand side might be indefinitely unsatisfying. This has been deeply related to the characteristics of cultural goods that encompass musical performances. As briefly referred above, musical performances are basically experience goods. Evaluation of experience goods presumes a consumer's experiences with the artifacts themselves. It should be even difficult to assess musical performances without actual experiences with them. As Phelan (1993) says, because musical performances are short-lived, non-reproducible process, each musical performance is distinguished from another, even when all of them ground on the same content. Personal situations as well uniquely influence the moment that audience experience performances. An

individual's impression of the same content could enormously vary, therefore. There is no absolute conviction that pre-access information would precisely depict a person's experience with the actual performances.

Another critical aspect of identifying musical performances is its time-based provision of embodied services in terms of having a live audience. Related studies represented by Lacy's (1995) analysis of the impact of new genre public art, Bourriaude's (1998) study on relational aesthetics and Bishop's (2006) idea of engagement indicate that live spectators' intensive participation is frequently sought. Deserpa (1994) finds, for instance, that live concert spectators do not only consume performances on a stage. They simultaneously consume interactions shared among the audience. Such an entire set of products emphasizes the concert's characteristics as a 'crowd good' (1994). Considering this, the gap between holding a front fence at a live concert and watching that concert DVD at home sounds natural. Advertising claims cannot surpass the real experiences anyway. On the demand side, trusted, accessible information before an actual experience is always insufficient.

4-2. Circumstances surrounding Live Music Venues

As mentioned above, information asymmetry issues still cause uncertainty in music audiences as for their decision making. To make the situation more complicated, some issues have remained disputed in the cultural sector as well.

Advance of multiple superstars (Adler, 2006) was expected to change the market dynamics by dispersing Rosen's (1981) superstar effect[5]. It has been undeniable, nevertheless, that better production conditions are given to superstars. St. Matthew's effects of accumulated advantage has indicated this throughout the past years (Merton, 1968). Less competitive suppliers have hardly gained chances to perform in their rivalry against the dominant incumbents. It seems clear that non-substitutability of talent among performers has long gone to explain rampant income discrepancies. Other classical issues are no exception. With snowballing effect[6], Adler finds Oversupply of artists, highly competitive environment and typical low wages (2006), also have been known to aggravate the imbalanced distribution of opportunities in the cultural industry. Under such conditions, it could be much difficult for the majority, except superstars, to convince music audience about their qualities.

Places in which live musical performances are given also could be problematic, because the Each live arts' attributes have been particularly discussed in its association with places. As Hill and Paris (2006) suggest, audience perception of performing arts could vary depending on natures of venues. As mentioned above, live music venues appeal informal, unofficial attributes (Bennet and Rodgers, 2016) that professional platforms do not. Shadow aspects of such characteristics are related to live music venues' obscure status. Audience could perceive it as a

---

[5] "… relatively small numbers of people earn enormous amounts of money and dominate the activity in which they engage (Rosen, 1981, p. 845)."
[6] A critical intervention of luck in success determination across cultural sector, which alludes that attention perpetuates itself (Adler, 1985).

signal that discredits the quality of the services provided at those venues. This possibly gives an impression that their products, musical performances, in this case, are not professional as well. Meanwhile, it is not that every supplier who enters the market is gifted in skills to survive in the long term. Audiences are aware of this, too. They consider the risk of paying for disappointing suppliers with insufficient professional expertise. The outcome could be that consumer decisions lean too much towards profitable products with a lower probability of dissatisfaction (Dolgin, 2009). Such conditions make the management of asymmetrical information issue more complex for suppliers.

5. Free Admission's Potential Impacts on Music Audience

What penetrates consumption dynamics of music audience is trustworthiness of service qualities. Consumers invest resources, time and money, to match their expectations about cultural goods. They want to confirm that such efforts ultimately pay off. The most important task for suppliers, in this sense, is to fulfill perceived fairness on the demand side (Dolgin, 2009). This matter of persuasion signifies free admission as a powerful attraction tool. By removing tickets as indicators of their services' values, this price-setting intends to maximize consumer utility regarding fairness. As mentioned above, efficiency of this mechanism in the performing arts sector has been yet to be verified. Literature on consumer decision models in performing arts, nevertheless, might provide some hints at this question.

5-1. Academic contemplations over consumer's decision models in performing arts

As Castiglione and Infante (2016) show, consumer decision models in the performing arts sector have been categorized into two. On one side, scholars consider the impact of past consumption while on the other side they do not. When it comes to the former group, researchers perceive cultural capitals as a sum of accumulated cultural participations. They ground on the idea that accordingly shaped consumer behavior affects cultural consumption. Falk and Katz-Gerro (2015) find education has a slightly bigger impacts on people's cultural participation than economic capital. Meanwhile, Ateca-Amestoy (2008) illustrates how some constraints, particularly economic capital levels and prices, discourage theatre goers' maximization of utility. The impact of financial status becomes more conspicuous when it comes to the latter group. Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996), for instance, approach this issue based on intertemporal separability of utility conditional on past consumption. Their investigation suggests that consumers' demand of theatrical performances rather rely on their income elasticity of demand and prices.

The listed academic works above reveal several significant issues. It is firstly specified that a long-learning process shapes cultural consumption. Castiglione and Infante's (2016) study on beneficial addiction of theatrical performances corroborates this. According to their research, past consumption and prices raise the marginal utility of current consumption. This implies accumulated consumptions enhance consumer perception of performances. This

mechanism, in this regard, shows that initially inducing consumers' encounter with cultural goods is significant. Those literatures, at the same time, shows how audience choose not to consume performing arts despite the accumulated past consumptions. Overall, what matters the most to consumers' decision seems to be their financial situations.

This impact of financial conditions could be even more apparent among low-end products than high-end ones in the cultural industry. Numerous studies already have confirmed how consumers' price elasticity of demand shifts between them. Towse (2012) finds that consumers' expression of price inelastic demands for high-end goods turns into high price elastic demands for low-end ones. Arts is not necessarily a luxury good with own-price elastic demands, therefore. This makes low-end goods hard to appeal to consumers. For most of live music venues, regarded as suppliers of low-end performances, this is a tough task. For audience without previous experience with musical performances, such venues might not sound credible enough to spend their money on. Free admission, thus, could be a powerful strategy to attract them.

Results for price elasticity in cultural consumption have been mixed and ambiguous (Seaman, 2005). There still exist some aspects to be considered. Audience's future consumption of musical performance might differ as well, depending on numerous variables which include economic capital. Laamanen's (2013) investigation of demand on Finnish national opera shows that demand is inelastic during the premieres, but elastic for the performances that come after. Nevertheless, audience's positive evaluation of experienced performances seems to play an important role. Their experiences could be weighty cues that lead other purchases after on. One of performing arts general characteristics particularly corroborates this aspect. Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996), as such, find that high, positive cross elasticity of demands among the performances has been observed despite their heterogeneity. This consequently suggests that a good memory of performances has potentials to enlarge audience's spectrum of cultural consumption in the performing arts sector.

How this research could contribute to the academic field is categorized into four domains. It firstly broadens the economic analysis of consumers' cultural consumption in the performing arts sector. Such an approach seeks connections between their past, current and future consumption. Inference of future consumption importantly strengthens the train of the related arguments mentioned above. This research, going further, benefits both commercial and non-commercial organizations in the cultural sector. It particularly attempts to measure audience's satisfaction with musical performance by applying WTP. Quantifying such non-market values is expected to provide suppliers with more direct overviews of free admission's impacts. It could be a useful indicator to set the direction of consumer marketing strategies later on. Moreover, understanding of free admission's impacts could also related to donation model in pricing strategies. This could be particularly applied to a type of donation where audience can voluntarily price a concert.

This research, also, benefits musicians as direct suppliers of musical performances. Verifying the efficiency of free admission is ineluctably associated with labor exploitation issues in the cultural sector. Free admission imposes both live music venues and artists a huge sunk cost [7] to attract more audiences. For the majority of artists, free admission is not at all a special occasion. Providing concerts for free has been somewhat conventional in the cultural sector to develop artists' careers and raise brand awareness. Investigating free admission's efficiency is accordingly expected to help musicians to be respected and be reasonably compensated for their works. This series of consideration ultimately benefits consumers, who are the integral elements in the free admission mechanism, verifying if free admission possibly grows audience's accessibility to musical performances. This can bring more diversity in audience's consumption dynamics, adding richness to their cultural participation. To sum up, this research could contribute to exploring the social significances of consumer behavior in

---

[7] Sunken cost refers to inputs to a flopped creative effort that are unsure of being salvaged and reused. The ubiquitous sunk costs across the cultural sector does not protect producers from not snagging sufficient rent from hits to recoup the losses on flops (Caves, 2003).

Commented [Office50]: This is exactly like the introduction

Commented [Office51]: what do you refer to?

Commented [Office52R51]: You haven't talked about it in the literature review, you need to add something about this

Commented [Office53]: What do you refer to?

Commented [Office54]: What do you refer to? Please elaborate or explain in a footnote e

Commented [Office55]: Providing concerts for free?

Commented [Office56]: Please rephrase

further research.

This research specifically takes the case of BIRD to investigate free admission's influence on audience's perception of musical performances. The following chapter will delineate the methodology adopted to develop the analysis.

Chapter 3. Methodology and Research Designs

Introduction

This chapter illustrates the methodology used to investigate the RQ; "To what extent does free admission to live music venues influences consumer perception of musical performances?". With an introduction of the 4 hypotheses that comprise the RQ, it proceeds to a suitable research design that delineates how and why this research chooses BIRD as a case study.

No.	Hypothesis
1	Consumers' previous experiences with musical performances influence their current consumption patterns
2	Pre-accessible information influences consumption of free admission performances
3	Free admission positively influences consumer evaluation of a musical performance experienced at BIRD
4	The positive evaluation of the musical performance leads a consumer's future consumption

The series of hypotheses above regards cultural goods as experience goods. As McCain (2003) suggests, consumer preferences for cultural goods ground on a life-time experiences with similar goods. Such constructed preferences influence individuals' perception of cultural artifacts. This determines their consumption pattern, which implies that consumer decision rarely grounds on rational thinking. What determines their selection is rather habitual, unconscious motives that are structuralized within one's social and physical context (Zaltman, 2003). It becomes clear that how and why the consumer's past, present and future consumption could be interrelated do matter. To understand what significances a consumer imbues with his/her own experiences, thus, the RQ considers consumers' experience with free admission at BIRD. Experiences with free admission become conditions to consumers' subsequent knowledge development regarding musical performances. Consumer perception of musical performances is, in this sense, considered as knowledge derived from their own experiences.

Methodology

This research finds quantitative methodology more suitable. This decision grounds on both external factors and characteristics of methodology that influence data gathering and analysis.

The outbreak of Corona VD-19, to begin with, made qualitative methodology hardly

Commented [Office57]: Before it seems that performing arts are separated and correspond to more classical performances. Was that so? If yes here you need to change the term

Commented [Office58]: Better: To what extent does free admission to live music ….

Commented [Office59]: Idem

Commented [MS60R59]:

Commented [Office61]: Does it influence evaluation or access?

Commented [MS62R61]: Their evaluation, I expect their positive evaluation will trigger their future purchases

Commented [Office63]: What?

Commented [Office64]: All this part seems to consider consumption as a "meaning construction process" and it seems that this is your focus. Is that so? Also I would specify that you talk about cultural consumption as here the characteristics of cultural goods as experience goods, of course, affect the outcome.

Commented [Office65]: In what sense internal?

applicable. With prohibition to face-to-face interaction, the majority of performance venues has been closed and scheduled performances cancelled. Such conditions have made securing sufficient respondents difficult. Apart from circumstantial factors, also, qualitative methodology could put credibility of collected data at risk. Qualitative methodology could suit better to grasp the respondents' subjective dimensions behind monolithic data such as statistics. It nevertheless has some pitfalls regarding objectivity. Interviews have a higher possibility to attract a limited number of participants with optimistic views on the RQ. Accordingly gathered data might not be trustworthy.

Such considerations emphasize the advantages of applying quantitative methodology to this research. Among its tools, survey sounded suitable to gather data for this analysis. Survey firstly helps to collect extensive data within a limited period. It has a higher chance than qualitative methodology to encompass various aspects of research demographics. How the survey questions are communicated also emphasizes collected data's objectivity, as no direct interaction between the researcher and the participants occurs.

The Venue

The targeted performance club, BIRD, is a cultural complex located in Rotterdam. BIRD has been particularly known for its pursuit of cultural omnivorousness (BIRD, 2020), which has been embodied on its multi-attributes. Its dynamics functions encompassing its restaurant, a performance stage, and a club area signifies that they are more than just a music venue. BIRD has also reflected its identity on the choice of extensive range of music genres. Not only Jazz, its core interest, but also electronic, funk, hip-hop, soul, etc. have taken turns to be displayed.

Such characteristics have attracted various audience groups tanks to the different marketing strategies that BIRD applied. It especially granted free admission to several performances executed at its venue. This combination of free admission and broad music choices suits the RQ, with a high chance of attracting diverse demographics. More importantly, Rotterdam's infrastructures that BIRD is situated in raise the possibility of securing relevant consumer data.

The location of the performance club, Rotterdam, values cultural infrastructures embodied in the city. Richards and Wilson (2006) argue that after the redevelopment process that focused on urbanization, Rotterdam has undergone deficiency of cultural attractions[8]. To tackle this, the city has embarked on developing cultural infrastructures represented by the art festivals and leisure events it holds. The birth of creative and artistic spaces has supported this policy.

This growth of artistic venues has provided artists with opportunities and networks to

---

[8] Compared to other cities, e.g. Amsterdam, Rotterdam lacked cultural heritages with long-standing traditions and history (Richards and Wilson, 2006).

Commented [Office66]: What are demographics for you? Do you mean respondents? OK

Commented [Office67]: I think this is an interesting point that you want to elaborate as, not only you get to know about the effect of free entrance but you can also see if there are differences among genres

Commented [Office68]: what do you mean?

Commented [Office69]: Attractions/venues/

develop their careers. Such a change has also entailed the application of means such as 'CJP'[9] and 'Rotterdam Pass' [10] to foster cultural participation. Active artistic interactions in Rotterdam nowadays have enriched both artists and consumers through diverse performances. Such an environment was accordingly thought to heighten the probability of finding suitable samples for this research.

Sample

Concerning the analysis, browsing sufficient data through comparisons corroborates the conclusion's logic. Richness of content, overall, increases the credibility of this research. Sampling for the survey was a mixture of criterion sampling and snowball sampling. Spreading the survey was largely grounded on the researcher's network. This ascribed to the impossibility to publish the survey on BIRD's social media or newsletter due to the pandemic crisis. Such an approach was thought to secure survey participants faster than other sampling methods. To collect relevant data for the RQ, also, it was helpful to set certain qualities that survey participants should present. The condition for criterion sampling was specified as 'those who experienced free admission to a live music performance club (BIRD) in Rotterdam at least one time'.

When it came to respondents, there was an age limit of above 16 that considered BIRD's average show time and partial attribute as a pub. Criterions referred as gender or education levels of demographics were not specified. They were rather regarded as variables which would add richness to the survey analysis. Whether the respondents attended any other musical performances after free admission was also not considered

As for the implementation of the survey, the online survey took place on Facebook for 6 days from April 30th to May 5th. The survey was published online since a written form was not attainable under the pandemic crisis. An online survey was more efficient as well in terms of processing the collected data. Spreading the survey via SNS (Social network sites), in particular, had an advantage of not only appropriating existing social connections but also infinitely reaching out to new connections (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). The online survey was accordingly an adequate option to have better accessibility to respondents.

Facebook was the only platform where the survey was published. The researcher herself had a limitation of using SNS as her safety has been under threat. Publishing the survey was accordingly assisted by several personal accounts from the researcher's acquaintances and two Facebook groups that included Erasmus University Rotterdam and Pole Inspiration Studio.

---

[9] CJP is a culture card to encourage different groups of audiences' cultural participation within the Netherlands. It financially supports cultural participation by applying discount to major museums and leisure activities (CJP, 2020).
[10] Rotterdampass is the culture pass with one-year duration that provides free admissions and discounts for attractions in The Hague and Rotterdam area. The local attractions include performance studio, music venues and museums in Rotterdam (Rotterdampass, 2020).

Comments:

Commented [Office70]: Add a footnote to explain what they are

Commented [Office71]: What do you refer to?

Commented [Office72]: I would move it below where you talk of sampling

Commented [Office73]: What do you mean?

Commented [MS74]: Professor, Would it be better to honestly mention this? Otherwise I think people could question why Marielle and the dance studio's people helped me with the survey because it seems unfair...

Commented [Office75R74]: I agree and it shows how you did find ways to overcome extra difficulties!

Spreading the survey within the two groups was approved by those organizations in advance.

Survey

The survey was anonymous and designed in English. The questionnaire included 33 close-ended questions and one open-ended question to ask survey participants' general comments. The close-ended questions consisted of 25 main questions and 8 sub questions, which were divided into four section; Past Experiences with Musical Performances, Evaluation of Free Admission Performance at BIRD, Free Admission's Influence on Future Consumption, General Information. The concepts and their sub-categories that constitutes the 34 questions within these 4 sections are the following:

No.	Concepts	Sub-categories
1	Past Experiences with Musical Performances	• Interest in musical performances, • favored music genres, • Frequency of attending musical performances, • Evaluation of past experiences with musical performances, • max. amount of money paid for musical performances, • WTP for musical performances in general
2	Evaluation of Free Admission Performance at BIRD	Period when a participant attended the free admission performance, effectiveness of information regarding free admission, main reason a participant chose the free admission performance, Evaluation of free admission performance, WTP for the free admission performance, change of interest in BIRD after the free admission, Interest in attending musical performances at BIRD after free admission
3	Free Admission's Influence on Future Consumption	WTP for future consumption, change of interest in other performance venues, Interest in attending other venue's performances after free admission, time when a concert was attended after free admission, evaluation of the next performance after free admission, willingness to attend other music performances in the future
4	General Information	Age, Gender, Occupation, Education Level

As a starter, section one with 9 questions handles information regarding past experiences with musical performances. The range of information also covers participants' past consumption and consumption habits regarding musical performances. Such an approach intends to figure out any potential connections between participants' cultural and symbolic contexts and their consumption patterns.

Section two with 10 questions handles information about participants' evaluation of free admission at BIRD. This section focuses on verifying whether a free admission positively influences participant's perception of musical performances. Considering information asymmetry issues, the scope of evaluation also includes participants' experiences with appropriated information regarding free admission. Participants' evaluation of free admission is reassessed by considering potential changes in their interest in BIRD after their free admissions.

24

Comments (margin):

Commented [Office76]: I would arrange all the table like this as it is more clear to read

Commented [Office77]: What do you mean? Period?

Commented [Office78]: In the sense that BIRD offered other free performances, or that the visitors had time available to attend? In the second case I would say "interest in attending"

Commented [Office79]: See previous comment

Commented [Office80]: How so?

Commented [Office81]: What do you mean? Previous to the performance,

Connected to section two, section three with 10 questions tackles free admission's influences on future consumption. The range of information, thus, covers actual behavioral of participants after free admission. Accordingly gathered information concentrates on assuring the relation between positive consumption experiences and future consumption.

Last section with 5 questions focus on survey participants' socio-cultural context related data referred as age, gender, occupation and education level. Gathering such general information intends to explore how socio-cultural backgrounds have influenced the participants' cultural consumption.

Analysis Framework

To implement analysis, this research will tests the 4 hypotheses using ordinal regression. More specifically, this research will use ordered logit regression. This type of regression analysis is used when, like in this case, the response variables are ordinal. In case of this research, variables have more than two categories. Since most of variables use interval and Likert-scale, the values of each category also have a sequential order where a value is higher than the previous one.

Operationalization

This research will use SPSS to run the ordinal logistic models mentioned above.

Statistical Analysis Methods

The data that this research obtained via the online survey will be analyzed in 4 stages according to the 4 hypotheses. Each hypothesis consists of different sub-hypotheses with different sets of variables. First, this research sorts 33 variables based on the collected data. This procedure intends to enable this research to determine the characteristics of some information extracted from the analysis. After that, this research conducts ordinal logit regression for each hypothesis. For the sub-hypotheses regarding the demographics' WTP for free admission performances in the 3rd hypothesis, this research exceptionally performs ANOVA. Each analysis is performed using SPSS for Windows and p-values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.

Chapter 4. General Overview of Data

As mentioned, the online survey took place on Facebook from April 30th to May 6th. The period secured 193 survey participants in total. 43 participants out of 193 were recorded as null, bringing the amount of usable survey to 150. The proportion of survey participants' gender was almost balanced out, recording 59.3% of female and 40.7 % of male. The distribution of the demographics' age was focused on the age group 20-30 which recorded 59.3%. The age group 30-40, the second largest group, corresponded to 26.7%. The age group 40-50 and 10-20 displayed similar figures, recording 7.3% and 6% respectively. The age group 50-60 recorded the least number of participants with 0.7%.

When it came to education level, the overall distribution of the demographic shaped a non-normal distribution. The distribution leaned toward higher education levels while the extreme values in total took up marginal proportions. The lowest education level was secondary education (VMBO, HAVO, VWO) which recorded 3.3%. The highest education level was Post-graduate (PhD) that occupied 2%. The ultimate majority of survey participants graduated from institutions corresponding to or above college degree (HBO). 49.3%, the largest figure, turned out to hold university degree (WO). The participants with college degree (HBO) occupied the second largest proportion with 41.3%. (what this mean)

Distribution of employment status was largely divided between student and working groups. This reflected the age distribution mentioned above. 52% of respondents consisted of students while 46.7 % answered they were working. The working group was divided into three different types of employment; groups of self-employed/freelancers and private employees showed similar figures, recording 21.3% and 24.7% respectively, while the group of public employees corresponded to 0.7 %.

Distribution of time-input on labor varied. Only 3.4% answered they were students, which did not match 52% that described their vocation as students. The gap of 48.6% between students' employment status and time-input on labor indicated that the majority of students differently defined their time-input on labor. 34.7% as such answered that they were in between jobs. 22.7% answered they had a flexible work schedule while 16 % said they worked part-time. 22.3% of the demographics turned out to have full-time jobs. Considering 46.7 % who clarified their employment status as being employed, it was assumable that 48.6% of students were likely to be absorbed by 'I'm looking for a job' and 'I work part-time' groups.

When it came to distribution of the demographics' interest in musical performances, the data mirrored high education levels of the demographics, in general. The majority of the participants reacted positively toward musical performances. 21.3% and 54% of the demographics chose 'very much' and 'quite' for each, corresponding to 75.3% in total. 20.7%, the third largest group,

answered 'Fairly' while only 4% chose 'Barely'.

As demographics' interest in musical performances was high in general, preferred genres among them were various. While multiple selection was available for favored genres, particular genres turned out to be more intensively favored than others. The demographics' preference for Pop and Jazz recorded respectively 84%, the highest among at all, and 64.7%, the second highest. Hip-hop secured 40.7%, and preferences for Classic corresponded to 34%, recording the third and fourth highest figure for each. Preferences for Rock recorded 27.3% while Heavy Metal, Blues and Country reached around 20%. Around 15% favored Reggae, Rhythm and blues and Folk music. Others genres such as K-pop, R&B, Soul, Techno, House, World, Opera, Club house, Cross-over, Electronic house, Afro beats almost equally recorded around 1%.

When asked frequency of attending Musical performances, the overall result was in line with the demographics' high interest in musical performances. 41.3% answered '5-7 times', recording the highest figure. 25.3%, the second largest figure, visited musical performances 8-10 times a year. 12.7% answered they visited performances more than 10 times a year while 19.3% visited performances 1-3 times a year. 1.3% answered 'Never', which ascribed to lack of time.

Regarding the evaluation of past experiences with musical performances, the majority of demographics showed a positive attitude. The groups of participants who answered 'satisfied' and 'considerably satisfied' recorded 52.7% and 38.7% each, occupying 91.4% in total. 8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 0.7% were somewhat dissatisfied. When asked why, the majority chose 'quality of performers', corresponding to 78% of the demographics. 14% answered it ascribed to 'atmosphere of performances'. Others referred to length of performances, other factors, matters of infrastructures all recorded around 2-3%. The overall responses implied the positive relation between quality of performers and the demographics' evaluation of past experiences.

When asked how much they paid for the most recent performance, 88.1% of the demographics in total paid more than 10-50 Euros. 40.7%, the largest group, answered '10-50 Euros' and the '50-100 Euros' group occupied the second largest portion of 18.7%. 12.7% paid 100-150 while 6.7% paid more than 200 Euros and 9.3% paid '150-200 Euros'. 10.7% paid less than 10 Euros, and 1.3% was unable to remember the amount. The demographics' general WTP for musical performances meanwhile did not necessarily correspond to musical performances' prices attended by the demographics. 30.7%, the largest, thought '50-100 euros' were reasonable. Those who answered the money did not matter occupied the equal proportion as '10-50 Euros' group, recording 26%. 12.7% found '100-200 Euros' made sense while 4% answered '150-200 Euros'.

Moving on to the period that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD, 36% attended free admission 'more than a year ago'. This occupied the largest proportion. 20.7%, the second largest, answered '8-10 months ago' and 20% chose 5-7 months ago. 13.3% responded that they attended free admission 11 months – a year ago while 10% chose 2-4 months ago. The answer 'Less than a month ago' was, of course, not chosen, considering the pandemic crisis that started about 2 months ago. When asked the source of information about free admission,

41.4%, which recorded the highest, said they relied on words of mouth. Those who chose 'Social media' were 31.3%, taking up the second largest proportion. 18% encountered promotions at BIRD's venue, while 6.7% did self-searching, and 2% got to know free admission at BIRD by chance.

The demographics' levels of trust about such sources were meanwhile not extremely high, implying a positive relation with information asymmetry. 50.7%, around a half of the demographics, replied it was moderately helpful while 36% chose 'Very'. 9.3% answered 'Extremely' while 4% chose 'Slightly'. The demographics' motivation to choose performances at BIRD, in this regard, was not necessarily confined to words of mouths as well. Of course, 35.3% was convinced by companions' suggestion, taking up the largest proportion. 0.7% said they were brought to the place, which could be referred as companions' suggestion as well. Such data corresponded to the demographics' source of information about free admission. 28% nevertheless chose the performance due to free admission and 26.7% replied that they had personal interest in BIRD. 8% of the demographics had personal affection for BIRD while 1.3% favored particular performers who executed free performances there.

When asked about levels of satisfaction with the performance, the overall response turned out to be positive. 52% responded that the free concerts were satisfying with 26.7% who found them very satisfying. 19.3% expressed neutral attitude while 2% said the performances were somewhat dissatisfying. The strongest reason that impacted the demographics' satisfaction turned out to be qualities of performers, which recorded 63.3%. 26.7%, the second largest proportion, chose atmosphere of performance. 5.3% responded BIRD's infrastructures affected their experiences while 4.6% picked 'other factors'. The question about WTP for the free concerts mirrored the demographics' levels of satisfaction. 58%, the majority, picked '10-50 Euros' and 26.7% chose '50-100 Euros'. 6.7% said they would have paid 100-150 Euros for the free concerts they attended. 8.7% of the demographics said they would have paid less than 10 Euros.

When it came to the demographics' levels of interest in BIRD's upcoming performances after free admission, the overall result displayed positive responses. Distribution of the participants was meanwhile comparatively varied. The gap between the participants who chose 'Fairly' and 'A lot' was only 1.3% as they recorded 33.3% and 32% for each. 21.3% replied they have been very much interested. 12.7% chose 'hardly' while 0.7% answered they have been not at all interested. Among the participants who chose 'hardly' and 'not at all' the main reason for their interest ascribed to mismatch of tastes. 10% replied they did not have enough time. 5% responded they wanted to explore other musical venues while another 5% expressed a strong dissatisfaction with the performance. Reflecting the changes in interest, 75.3% of the demographics in total visited BIRD's performances at least one time after free admission. 48%, the majority, chose '1-4 times' while 18% responded that they visited BIRD's performances 4-7 times. 4% visited the performances at this venue 7-10 times while 5.3% visited more than 10 times. 24.7% of the demographics said they haven't been to any of BIRD's performances.

When asked their levels of interest in other musical venues after free admission, those who

answered 'Quite', the largest group, occupied 52.7%. 29.3% replied they have been moderately interested while 14.7% chose 'Very much'. 2.7% said they have been rarely attracted while 0.7% said never. The participants who chose 'Rarely' and 'Never' all ascribed this to 'Lack of time'. The number of performances the demographics attended after free admission did not necessarily correspond to such results. As such, 52.7% of them replied they visited 1-4 musical performances. Those who visited other venues' musical performances '4-7 times' and 'More than 10 times' recorded 19.3% and 9.3% respectively, corresponding to the second and third largest figures. 8.7% showed 7-10 times of visits, while 10% visited none. The period the demographics visited the next concert after free admission, on the other hand, seemed to be influenced by changes in the demographics' interest in musical performances. 54%, the majority, paid a visit within 1-3 months. 29.3% did within one month, occupying the second largest proportion. 6.7% attended the next concert after 4-6 months while 6% visited none. The groups who attended after 9-11 months and after 6-8 months recorded 2.7% and 1.3% respectively.

The demographics' evaluation of the next concert was positive in general. This indicated that experiences with free admission concerts could potentially influence the demographics' further interest in musical performances. 51.8% of the demographics found the next concert very satisfying and 29.8% answered they were considerably satisfied. 17.7% expressed a neutral attitude toward the next concert while only 0.7% was somewhat dissatisfied. When asked the main reason behind their levels of satisfaction, the ultimate majority picked quality of performers, recording 78%. 15.6% found the reasons behind their answer related to the atmosphere of performances while other options displayed similar figures.

When asked the demographics' willingness to attend musical performances afterwards, 74% of the demographics, the absolute majority, chose 'definitely'. 23.3% said they were likely to do so while 2.7% kept neutral standpoint. The demographics' WTP was meanwhile relatively varied. 36.5% of the demographics' WTP was more than 200 Euros, which took up the largest proportion. 23.6%, the second largest, said they would pay up to 100-150 euros. 17.6% and 12.2% of the demographics chose '150-200 euros' and '10-50 euros' for each. 8.8% said they were willing to pay 50-100 euros while 1.4% of the demographics' WTP was less than 10 euros. The data overall should be tackled with caution since WTP is often overstated. Consideration of this limitation suggests that in-depth analysis of the data is required, which will be elaborated in chapter 5.

Chapter 5. Data Analysis

In this chapter, the results of the analysis are illustrated. The overall analysis grounds on the four hypothesis of this research. Each hypothesis consists of different sets of variables and sub-hypotheses to prove the main hypotheses.

No.	Hypothesis
1	Consumers' previous experiences with musical performances influence their current consumption patterns
2	Pre-accessible information influences the respondents' consumption of free admission performances
3	Free admission positively influences consumer evaluation of a musical performance that a consumer experience at BIRD
4	The positive evaluation of the musical performance leads a consumer's future consumption

This research uses SPSS to analyze the data, which mainly applies ordered logit models consist of ordinal logistic regression and Chi-square goodness of fit. Only one sub-hypothesis in the 3rd hypothesis exceptionally uses ANOVA to roughly compare mean differences between age groups. Focusing on ordered logit models ascribes to characteristics of the data. The collected data is either nominal or ordinal that encompasses interval and Likert-scale data. Specifically calculating the data's mean, variance and standard deviation is not possible, which makes relevant models not applicable. Ordered logit models are accordingly suitable to explore the data since looking at relations or measuring predictions between variables is available.

1st H: 'Consumers' previous experiences with musical performances influence their current consumption patterns'

This section begins with exploring relations between the variables that might have shaped the demographics' cultural tastes. The suggested hypothesis grounds on the consumer consumption model (Castiglione and Infante, 2016) that values audience's past encounters with musical performances. In this model, what greatly determines consumers' cultural participation is their socio-cultural contexts. Depending on socio-cultural contexts, usually referred as *gender, age, education levels,* individuals' past experiences vary to uniquely shape each consumption pattern (Bennett, 2012). Audience's consumption patterns, *frequency of attending musical performances and interest in musical performances*, let's say, are outcomes of

interactions between accumulated past experiences and socio-cultural dynamics. This implies, vice versa, consumers' patternized consumption might be a key to infer their evaluation of past experiences with musical performances. Exploring this aspect could help grasping the connection between past, present and future consumption. It should be questioned, hence, whether the respondents' socio-cultural dynamics could predict their evaluation of past experiences with musical performances. Among the data, *gender, age, levels of highest education, profession* comprise the demographics' socio-cultural context. The demographics' patternized consumption consists of *general frequency of attending musical performances, levels of interest in musical performances*. Those are accordingly chosen as independent variables. When implementing ordinal logistic regression[11],

H[1]: Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession, general frequency of attending musical performances, levels of interest in musical performances can predict evaluation of past experiences with musical performance.

Referring to its parameter estimates, only responses from *Q27 (education levels)* report statistically significant scores. This verifies Roose (2010) finding that music consumption, in this regard, is positively associated with every indicators of audience's cultural capital-educational achievements. *Gender, age, profession, frequency of attending musical performances, interest in musical performances* have no predictive power when it comes to the demographics' *evaluation of past experiences with musical performance*. This is interesting, considering that age, gender, education levels have been continuously reported to characterize and even intensify one's consumption habits (Bryson, 1996).

Comparing estimates to the reference level for Q27 *(education levels),* every group expressed more negative evaluation of past experiences with musical performances than *'6=Post-graduate(PhD)'*. by -17.649 for *'2= Secondary education (VMBO, HAVO, VWO)'*, -18.246 for *'3= Lower tertiary education(MBO)'*, -17.982 for *'4= College degree (HBO)'* and -.17.541 for *'5= University degree (WO)'.* As Roose (2010) find, music consumption is positively associated with every indicators of audience's cultural capital-educational achievements; art workshops and public engagement of the individual's parents.

As notified above, however, there is no substantial difference between responses from Q27 *(education levels),* regarding *evaluation of past experiences with musical performances*. This suggests elaborating a relation between education level and evaluation of past experiences is required for clarification. When implementing Chi Square Goodness-of-fit[12] test to figure out

---

[11] Referring its model fitting information, p < *α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, p> α=0.05*. Thus, the observed data has no goodness of fit with the fitted model. With $R^2 = 0.352$, our model explains 35.2% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > *α=0.05.*

[12] The data displays with Chi-square obtained (18.018), the degrees of freedom (8) and a p score 0.021. The p

why,

H¹: There is a relationship between levels of highest education and evaluation of past experiences with musical performance.

It is identifiable that everyone in *'6=Post-graduate(PhD)'* group have been considerably satisfied with their past experiences. This result seems to form substantial gaps between *'6=Post-graduate(PhD)'* and other groups' satisfaction levels. Because only respondents comprise *'6=Post-graduate(PhD)',* it is hard to conclude that the data

  Comparison of scores between other groups' satisfaction are meanwhile less noticeable. Concerning proportion of the demographics who have been *'satisfied'* and *'considerably satisfied'* with their past experiences, the majority of participants for each group chose either *'satisfied'* or *'considerably satisfied'.*

It is still unclear, thus, whether the higher education levels become, more positive evaluation of past experiences with musical performance becomes.

Only people comprise *'6=Post-graduate(PhD)'*

This makes it necessary to explore more direct connection between levels of interest in musical performances and other socio-cultural dynamics related variables that possibly have affected them. Whether independent variables represented as *Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession* could predict *interest in musical performances* matters. This research accordingly implements ordinal logistic aggression[13] again to see if

H¹: Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession can predict interest in musical performances.

Referring its parameter estimates, 5 locations from *Q30 (age) and Q33 (profession)* are statistically significant. Gender and education, interestingly, have no predictive power when it comes to the demographics' interest in musical performances. Comparing estimates to the reference level for each variable, Q30 *(age)* displays that lower cumulative scores are more likely with negative values. According to the parameter estimates result, every group expresses lower interest in musical performances compared to group *'50-60', with* -19.346 for *'1= 10-20',* -17.846 for *'2= 20-30',* -18.014 for *'3= 30-40',* -19.513 for *'4=40-50'.* Since there is no substantial difference between groups, however, it is hard to say that age strongly influences

---

score of 0.021 < *α=0.05, which rejects the null hypothesis.*

[13] Referring its model fitting information, p < *α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p> α=0.05. The* observed data has no goodness of fit with the fitted model, thus. With $R^2 = 0.256$, our model explains 25.6% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > *α=0.05.*

interest in musical performances.

When it comes to *Q33 (profession),* profession as well shows that lower cumulative scores are more likely with negative values. *'I'm a student'* displays less interest in musical performance than 'self-employed/freelancer', with -1.3. *'I'm a private employee'* shows less interest in musical performance than '*self-employed/freelancer'* with -1.153. The overall result indicates that the classic categories considered to shape one's cultural tastes might not be applied the same nowadays. Due to changes of circumstances surrounding the demographics, technological innovation and digitalization, let's say, other types of variables can intervene to shape the audience's cultural tastes. The impact of education levels, in this regard, might not be as critical as it used to be nowadays.

Since '*self-employed/freelancer'* group shows highest levels of interest in musical performances among others, instead, this raises a question if the respondents' works-related dynamics influence their consumption of musical performances. Among the variables, works related variables are referred as *Times spent on work, profession.* Together with them, the demographics' *levels of interest in musical performances* and *reasons make the demographics' attending musical performances difficult* are considered as independent variables to see which one is stronger predictor of the demographics' consumption. his research, thus, explore whether they could predict *general frequency of attending musical performances* by ordinal logistic regression[14].

H[1]: Times spent on work, profession, levels of interest in musical performances, reasons make the demographics' attending musical performances difficult can predict general frequency of attending musical performances.

Comparing estimates to the reference level for each variable, *'Q34(time spent on works)'s* locations have significant scores for *'1=I work full time'* and *'2=I work part time'*. Together they show that lower cumulative scores are more likely with negative values. compared to *'5= I'm looking for a job',* those two attend musical performances less by -1.575 for *'1=I work full time'* and -1.141 for '*2=I work part time'*. It is expected, in this sense, that times spent on work could influence the demographics' visiting musical performances. 'Q5=*Reasons make the demographics' attending musical performances difficult'*, meanwhile, have no significant scores. This suggests that examining a relation between times spent on work and reasons make the demographics' attending musical performance difficult should be done as well with crosstab.

According to the table, the two full-time workers replied that they lacked time to attend musical

---

[14] Referring its model fitting information, p < *α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p > α=0.05.* The observed data do not have a goodness of fit with the fitted model. With $R^2 = 0.855$, our model explains 85.5% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > *α=0.05.*

performances. This confirms that times spent on work do have influence on the demographics' cultural participation, which shapes their cultural tastes.

Returning to parameter estimates table again, for *Q33 (profession),* it shows that lower cumulative scores are more likely with negative values. Only *'I'm a student'* has significant scores. *'I'm a student' group attend musical performances less than* '*self-employed/freelancer' by -1.594.* Professions have influences on the demographics' general frequency of attending musical performances. This result makes it wonder if professions and times spent on work has any relations. Professions, because, are predictive of both the demographics' interest in musical performances and general frequency of attending musical performances. This research implement Chi Square Goodness-of-fit[15], thus, to see if it does.

H[1]: There is a relationship between times spent on works and profession.

Based on the table, despite being students, *50, the majority of 'I am a student',* say that they are looking for a job. Other 28 students also describe themselves as different types of workers. This suggests that 78 students' definition of working status could vary depending on how they perceive their situations. Only two people meanwhile said they were looking for a job and they defined their working status as *'looking for a job'.* This result explains why, when going back to the parameter estimates of *'Q34(time spent on works)',* it defines that the gap between *'I'm looking for a job'* and *'I have a flexible working schedule'* is insignificant; between *'I'm looking for a job' group* mostly belong to *'I am a student' group'* who attend musical performances less than '*self-employed/freelancer'.* The overall result confirms, in this regard, times spent on work depend on profession. This determines the final impact on the demographics' frequency of attending musical performances.

Returning to parameter estimates table again, for *'Q1(levels of interest in musical performances)',* the data indicate that lower cumulative scores are more likely with negative values. Two locations*, '3=Moderate' and '4=Quite',* have statistically significant scores lower than *α=0.05.* The data shows that both *'3=Moderate' and '4=Quite' attend musical performances less than '5=Very much' by -4.424 and -1.386 for each. The gap between '3=Moderate' and '5=Very much' is much bigger than the gap between '5=Very much' and '4=Quite'. It is clear, needless to say, that levels of interest in musical performances are predictive of frequency of attending musical performances. It seems important, however, to also see how levels of interest in musical performance are distributed among different levels of times spent on work. When looking at the crosstab with* Chi Square Goodness-of-fit[16],

---

[15] The data displays with Chi-square obtained (190.909), the degrees of freedom (16) and a p score 0.000. The p score of 0.000 < *α=0.05, which rejects the null hypothesis.*

[16] The data displays with Chi-square obtained (17.004), the degrees of freedom (12) and a p score 0.149. The p

It is identifiable that there is no relation between levels of interest in musical performances and times spent on work. The overall data imply, in this regard, the impact of times spent on work might preempts the influence of the demographics' interest in musical performances on frequency of attending musical performance. This corresponds to several scholars' discovery of how some constraints ultimately discourage consumers' cultural participation. As this research did not investigate the demographics' economic capital levels, it is hard to say that their financial conditions strongly impact their consumption as Ateca-Amestoy (2008) illustrates. *It is meanwhile mostly expected that the demographics adjust their attending musical performances depending on profession and times spent on their work. Their occupations are also their crucial income sources. Considering such, it is presumable that the demographics' financial condition influences their cultural consumption. When it comes to shaped consumption patterns, thus, profession and times spent on work are closely intertwined with interest in musical performances to determine the amount of attending musical performances.*

This make it wonder whether the demographics' WTP for musical performances, then, corresponds to their interest in musical performances, evaluation of past experiences and frequency of attending musical performances. To see if there's any relation, this research implements ordinal logistic regression[17] again.

H^1: Interest in musical performances, evaluation of past experiences with musical performance, frequency of attending musical performances can predict WTP for musical performances.

Comparing estimates to the reference level for each variable, only two locations from *Q1 (interest in musical performances)* are statistically significant. For Q *4 (general frequency of attending musical performances)* and *Q 6(general WTP for musical performances),* differences between locations are not significant. '*Q1=2 (Barely)*' attends musical performances less than '*Q1=5 (Very much)*' by -3.603. *'Q1=3 (Fairly)'* visits musical performances less than '*Q1=5 (Very much)*' by -1.345. According to the data, the difference between '*Q1=4 (Quite)' and 'Q1=5 (Very much)'* is insignificant. This means the demographics' WTPs for musical performances well reflect their interest in musical performances. What has to be questioned, here, is whether their WTPs could be predictive of their most recent consumption of musical performances. Since WTP is often overstated, it matters to also look at the influences of other variables that could influence the demographics' recent consumption. Together with WTP for musical performances, what could be related to this is *interest in musical performances,*

---

score of 0.149 > *α=0.05, which accepts the null hypothesis.*

[17] Referring its model fitting information, p < *α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p> α=0.05.* The observed data do not have a goodness of fit with the fitted model. With $R^2 = 0.273$, our model explains 27.3% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > *α=0.05,* which proves that *the location parameters are identical across response categories.*

frequency of attending musical performances and evaluation of past experiences with musical performance. Among the variables, the price of the most recent musical performances as a dependent variable is related to the respondents' recent consumption. This research, thus, explore if interest in musical performances, WTP for musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances and evaluation of past experiences with musical performances can predict the price of the most recent musical performance. When implementing ordinal logistic regression[18],

H[1]: Interest in musical performances, WTP for musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances and evaluation of past experiences with musical performances can predict the price of the most recent musical performance.

Comparing estimates to the reference level for each variable, *'Q1 (interest in musical performances) =3 (Moderate)', 'Q6 (Evaluation of past experiences with musical performances) = 3 (Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied)' and 'Q9 (WTP for musical performances) = 2(10-50 euros)'* have statistically significant scores. *Q4 (frequency of attending musical performances)* has no predictive power.

For *'Q9 (WTP for musical performances)'s '2=10-50 euros', it paid less than '6=prices do not matter'.* When considering this result, it seems that WTP for musical performances is predictive of the most recently attended musical performances. According to the data above, WTP for musical performances mirror the demographics' interest in musical performances. It sounds reasonable, in this regard, the higher interest in musical performances, the higher the price of the most recently attended musical performances.

'Q1 (levels of interest in musical performances)'s '3=Moderate', however, paid higher prices of tickets than *'5(very much)'* by 1.283. For *'Q6 (Evaluation of past experiences with musical performances)'s '3=Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied',* interestingly, it paid less than *'5= Considerably Satisfied'* by -1.682. Since this research already has proved that there is a relation between interest in musical performances and evaluation of past experiences with musical performances, this makes it curious if there are relations between those two and the price of the most recent musical performances. When testing their relationships with Chi square goodness-of-fit[19][20]

1) A relation between evaluation of past experiences with musical experiences and the price of the most recently attended musical performance

---

[18] Referring its model fitting information, p < $\alpha=0.05$. *When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both significance values are greater than $\alpha=0.05$.* With $X^2 = 0.242$, our model explains 24.2% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > $\alpha=0.05$.

[19] The data displays with ($X^2 = (12, n=193)$ 17.204, p> $\alpha=0.05$) *which accepts the null hypothesis.*

[20] The data displays with ($X^2 = (18, n=193)$ 22.753, p> $\alpha=0.05$), *which accepts the null hypothesis.*

H^0: There is no relationship between evaluation of past experiences with musical experiences and the price of the most recently attended musical performance.

H^1: between evaluation of past experiences with musical experiences and the price of the most recently attended musical performance.

2) A relation between interest in musical performances and the price of the most recently attended musical performance.

H^0: There is no relationship between interest in musical performances and the price of the most recently attended musical performance.

H^1: There is a relationship between interest in musical performances and the price of the most recently attended musical performance.

When testing two models above, there is no relation between those two variables and the price of the most recently attended musical performance. It can be concluded, in this sense, that the price of the most recently attended musical performances does not always reflect the demographics interest in musical performances. This is not surprising as ticket prices do not always correspond to quality of performances. This makes it wonder, at the same time, how and why the demographics were attracted to free admission, which will be explored further in the next section.

2nd H: Pre-accessible information influences the demographics' consumption free admission performances

As the next chapter, this research explores relations between the demographics and pre-accessible information regarding free admission performances. A power of information has been critical regarding both production and consumption of cultural goods. Depending on how an individual perceives pre-accessible information, consumption patterns could enormously vary. This has been known to be free admission's key attribute, which mitigates monetary distance between museums and people instead by reducing opportunity cost (Gally et al., 2007). The series of implications make it wonder, thus, whether they are also applied to this research. *Trustworthiness of the information, reasons to choose free admission performances* and *sources of information* are related to such among the data. To begin with, this research investigates whether trustworthiness of information, reasons to choose free admission performances can trace back sources of information. Trustworthiness of information could influence the reasons to choose free admission performances. it might not greatly differ depending on types of information, however, due to information asymmetry. This suggests checking which one is more predictive of sources of information could help figuring out their relations. *Trustworthiness of information and reasons to choose free admission performances* as independent variables are accordingly questioned together for comparisons. When implementing ordinal logistic regression[21],

H^0: Trustworthiness of the information, reasons to choose free admission performances cannot predict sources of information.

H^1: Trustworthiness of the information, reasons to choose free admission performances can predict sources of information.

Comparing estimates to the reference level for each variable, *Q12 (Trustworthiness of the information)* has no predictive power. All of Q13(*reasons to choose free admission performances)'s* locations, on the contrary, have statistically significant scores. According to the data, higher cumulative scores are more likely with positive values. Every location predicts sources of information better than *'6= I was brought to the place'* by 39.578 for *'5=Personal affection for BIRD',* 38.090 for *'4= Free admission',* 40.434 for *'3= The performer',* 38.667 for *'2= Self-interest'* and 41.259 for *'1= Companions' suggestion'.* There are no significant differences between the locations' values. When looking at the crosstab between *reasons to*

---

[21] Referring its model fitting information, p < *α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p > α=0.05*, which represents the data are not expected to be found in the actual population. With $R^2 = 0.702$, our model explains 70.2% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > *α=0.05.*

choose free admission performances and sources of information,

Only one participant chose *'6= I was brought to the place' with the different answer from others.* The result above makes sense, in this regard. The table shows that 'words of mouth', 63 in total including the participant who got to know BIRD by friends, takes the majority among other sources. 44 of them chose free admission performances due to companions' suggestion. For other sources of information, Social media recorded the 2nd largest amount with 47 and Promotion at BIRD's venue took the 3rd place with 27 people. Regardless of sources of information, however, 53 participants, the majority group, chose free admission performances due to companions' suggestion. This indicates daily conversations, referred as words of mouth, greatly influence the audience's decision making among different advertising claims ((Nelson, 1970). However, when looking at a relation between trustworthiness of information and sources of information with Chi-square goodness of fit[22].

H[1]: There is a relationship between trustworthiness of information and sources of information.

Based on the table, it is noticeable that 75, the half of the demographics, found the information moderately helpful. Despite the influence of words of mouths, the levels of trust in information was not that high. As Nelson (1970) finds, consumers express the strongest skepticism against attributes of goods that require actual experiences to verify their values. Whatever information consumers encounter before the real experiences are insufficient anyway. This makes it wonder, then, how information-related variables (*Sources of information, trustworthiness of the sources of information, reasons to choose free admission performances*) could influence the demographics satisfaction with free admission performances. Implementing ordinal logistic regression[23] could help grasping their relations.

H[1]: Sources of information, trustworthiness of the sources of information, reasons to choose free admission performances can predict satisfaction with free admission performances.

Comparing estimates to the reference level for each variable, Q13(*Sources of information*) has *no predictive power. Q11 (the reason to attend the free admission performance),* meanwhile, displays that higher cumulative scores are more likely with positive values. Among its locations, '*Self-searching for musical performances*' are statistically significant. It expresses higher satisfaction with free admission performances than '*Words of mouth*' by 2.020. This indicates that, admitting the power of words of mouth, what matters the most is a consumer's self-will.

---

[22] The data displays with Chi-square obtained (41.254), the degrees of freedom (15) and a p score 0.000

<α=0.05, which rejects the null hypothesis.

[23] Referring its model fitting information, p < *α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, the first p < α=0.05.* This data is expected to be found in the actual population. *Meanwhile, the mixed result's p >α=0.05.* With R^2 = 0.325, our model explains 32.5% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p >α=0.05.

Regardless of information types, because, pro-activeness of consumer motivation influences the audience's experience with musical performances a lot.

Getting back to the parameter estimates table, *Q12 (Trustworthiness of information),* displays that lower cumulative scores are more likely with negative values. Two locations, *'2=Slightly' and '3=Moderately'*, have statistically significant scores. They express lower satisfaction with free admission performances than *'5= Extremely'* by -.2.644 for *'2=Slightly',* -2.430 for *'3=Moderately'.* The more the demographics trusted pre-accessible information, the more they found free admission performances interesting. This verifies Dolgin (2009)'s argument that most important task for suppliers, in this sense, is to fulfill perceived fairness on the demand side. The overall result suggests, in this sense, what determines the demographics' consumption is their perceived trustworthiness of information, rather than sources themselves. This implication is in line with the finding above, which questions whether free admission truly affects the audience perception of musical performances.

Commented [Office94]: What do you mean by this? Why fairness?

3rd H: *Free admission positively* influences consumer evaluation *of a musical performance that a consumer experience at BIRD*

To test this hypothesis, this research compares the results between the data collected from 42 participants who chose the performance due to free admission and the data collected from the entire demographics. This ascribes to several reasons. Analyzing the 42 demographics could directly show free admission's impact on their decision making. This data is extremely exclusive, however, and it remains unclear whether free admission is effective compared to other motivations.

To carry out this process, this research firstly selects 42 demographics who chose the performance due to free admission. What needs to be proved are relations between the 42 survey participants and evaluation of a musical performance that a consumer experiences at BIRD. Among the variables*, 'satisfaction with the performance', 'reasons behind levels of satisfaction with the performance' and 'WTP for the free admission performance'* are related to evaluation of a musical performance that a consumer experiences at BIRD. When testing relations between each variables and the demographics who chose the performance due to free admission,

   1) A relation between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and levels of satisfaction with the free admission performance

H¹: There is a relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and levels of satisfaction with the free admission performance.

The data (X^2 = (3, n=193) 14.039, p $<\alpha=0.05$) displays that the majority of 42 participants expressed positive attitude toward the performance. 20 found free admission performances very satisfying while 17 evaluated the performances were satisfying. 4 participants were neutral while 1 participant found the performance somewhat dissatisfying.

   2) A relation between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and the reason to like the free admission performance.

H¹: There is a relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and the reason to like the free admission performance.

The data (X^2 = (4, n=193) 26.402, p$<\alpha=0.05$) *shows that 30* out of 42 participants chose quality

of performers while 11 people chose atmosphere of the performance. 1 person chose BIRD's infrastructure.

3) A relation between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and WTP for the free admission performance.

H^1: *There is a relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and WTP for the free admission performance.*

The data ($X^2 = (3, n=193)$ 14.907, p<α=0.05) displays that among 42 demographics, 33 people showed WTP of 10-50 euros while 3 people said they would have paid 50-100 euros for the free admission performance. 5 people's WTP was less than 10 euros while one participant's WTP was 100-150 euros. In general, the majority of demographics expressed higher WTP than free admission.

The data above, in general, suggest that there is a high chance that free admission positively influences consumer evaluation of the free admission performance. It has not been revealed, meanwhile, what types of survey participants chose musical performances at BIRD due to free admission. As mentioned above, only considering the responses analyzed under limited conditions could draw a biased conclusion. This research, in this sense, also take a look at the tendency of the entire demographics. A relation between *frequency of attending musical performances* and *the reason to choose the free admission performances at BIRD* is accordingly tested with Chi-square goodness of fit.

H^1: *There is a relationship between frequency of attending musical performances and the reason to choose the free admission performance.*

When scrutinizing the data ($X^2 = (20, n=193)$ 52.702, p <α=0.05), it is noticeable that the absolute majority of the demographics already have high amount of cultural participation. For each group with different reasons to choose free performances, more than half of the group member attend musical performances at least 5 times a year. *S*elf-interest group, in particular, had 10 people who responded that they visited musical performances more than 10 times a year. This occupied the largest proportion among other groups of people who replied the same. *14 out of self-interest group also replied that they attended musical performances 8-10 times a year, which occupied the largest proportion within the group. This verifies again that* past consumption and prices raise the marginal utility of current consumption. Accumulated consumptions enhance consumer perception of the performances (Castiglione and Infante, 2016).

Meanwhile, 53 participants, the largest group among other reasons, chose the free admission

performance due to companion's suggestion. Free admission group recorded the 2nd place with 42 participants while 40 people belonged to Self-interest group. This result suggests that free admission could be a useful attraction tool, in this regard, but not necessarily powerful than words of mouth. It should be questioned, then, whether reasons to choose the free admission performance are related to levels of satisfaction with the performance. Since the demographics already have experiences with musical performances before their encounter with free admission, the reasons might not be strongly affecting their satisfaction with free admission performances. When testing this relation using Chi-square goodness of fit,

H1: There is a relationship between the reason to choose the free admission performance and satisfaction with the performance.

  p> 0.05 already shows that there is no significant relationship between the reason to choose the free admission performance and the level of satisfaction with the performance in the population. For clarification, however, this research again takes a sample of 42 demographics who chose the performance due to free admission to check their frequency of attending musical performances. When implementing Chi-square goodness of fit to test a relation between *the participants who chose the performance due to free admission* and *frequency of attending musical performances,*

H1: There is a relationship between the demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and frequency of attending musical performances.

  Based on the data (X^2 = (4, n=193) 14.875, p *<α=0.05), a*mong the demographic, 28 participants, the majority, visited musical performances 5-7 times a year. 8 people replied that they visited musical performances 1-3 times a year while 4 people visited musical performances 8-10 times a year. 2 people visited musical performances more than 10 times a year. Interestingly, those who never visited musical performances, 2 of the entire population, did not attend musical performances at BIRD due to free admission.

As indicated above, the majority of 42 demographics had experiences with musical performances. Also, this research already clarified above that there was a relation between levels of interest in musical performance and general frequency of attending musical performances. This implies that 42 demographics have at least moderate interest in musical performances. It is assumable, in this regard, that free admission has more influence on music audience with previous cultural participations than those who without such. By lessening financial burdens, free admission enables culturally well-educated audience to still engage in cultural consumption. This finding corresponds with Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette's (1996) research which suggests that consumers' demand on theatrical performances rather rely on their income elasticity of demand and prices.

Such results make it wonder whether there exist any differences in the demographics' WTP depending on the demographics' reasons to attend the free admission performance. One effective way to do this is comparing mean differences of WTP between each group.

'WTP for the free admission performance' in this research was collected by Likert-scale, displayed as ordinal data. The data's characteristic is not suitable to implement scale-related data analysis. The result would show mean differences between values, not mean differences between exact monetary values. Since money itself is ratio, this still enables rough assumptions about differences between groups. To implement ANOVA test, thus, this research temporarily changes the characteristic of variable 'WTP for the free admission performance' into a scale variable. Among the values of variable 'Reasons to choose free musical performances', '6=I was brought to the place' were exempted since both had less than 2 cases. For the variable 'WTP for the free admission performance', '5=150-200 Euros' and '6=More than 200 Euros' were exempted for the same reason. The hypothesis is accordingly formulated as;

$$H^1: \quad \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5$$

Mean square score of for 'between groups' and 'within groups' display 12.885 and 64.913 for each. Its $F_{obtained}$ score = 7.146, $p < 0.05$. The null hypothesis that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5$ is accordingly rejected. When it comes to Post Hoc table, however, there were not many statistically significant differences between each group's mean. Only 2 of Sig. scores are $< \alpha = 0.05$, *as such. People who chose the performance due to companion's suggestion showed significantly lower WTP than people who expressed self-interest in the performance. The mean difference between two group is -.505 with Sig. score of 0.014. Also, people who chose the performance due to free admission shows significantly lower WTP than people who expressed self-interest in the performance. The mean difference between two group is -.675 with Sig. score 0.001. This outcome makes it wonder if demographics' WTP for free admission performances at BIRD varies depending on their satisfaction with the performances. There's a probability that the demographics with self-interest express high levels of satisfaction with free admission performances at BIRD. The gap of WTP between them and other groups could be significant. This research, hence, implement ANOVA again to explore a relation between levels of satisfaction with free performances and WTP for free performances. Unlike the expectation, however,*

$$H^1: \quad \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5$$

Mean square score of for 'between groups' and 'within groups' display 4.332 and 73.951 for each. Its $F_{obtained}$ score = 1.441, $p < 0.05$. The null hypothesis $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5$ is accordingly rejected. When it comes to Post Hoc table, however, all of Sig. score is $> \alpha = 0.05$. *This implies that there is no significant difference between each group with varying levels of satisfaction.*

The series of data overall indicates that free admission does attract audience. The demographics' WTPs for free admission reflect that they perceive free performances deserve higher prices. It is meanwhile more persuasive on people with certain amount of experiences with musical performances. When considering this, it is unclear if free admission really influenced their perception of musical performances or just assisted their attending another musical performance. What influences the audience's consumption the most, also, is the audience's socio-cultural contexts, financial status, in particular. Such implications suggest exploring the demographics' consumption after free admission is also required, which will be explained in the next section.

4th H: The positive evaluation of the musical performance leads a consumer's future consumption

In this last section, this research test how selected variables influence the demographics' cultural participation in many different ways. Before all, it should be clarified first whether the amount of musical performances the demographics attended after free admission differs a lot based on the timeline they visited free admission performances. In case they are related, it should be taken into account that higher numbers of attendances could simply be an outcome of accumulation throughout long periods. This research, thus, starts this section by exploring a relation between the timeline that the demographics visited free admission at BIRD and the amount of musical performances the demographics have attended since free admission. The amount of musical performances the demographics have attended since free admission consists of their attendances to both other venue's and BIRD's performances. When implementing Chi-square goodness of fit,

H^1: There is a relationship between the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of other venues' performances that the demographics attended since free admission.

For this case, the data (X^2 = (16, n=193) 20.359, p *>0.05)* fails to reject the null hypothesis. When testing a relation between *the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of BIRD's performances the demographics attended since free admission* with Chi-square goodness of it*, however,*

H^1: There is a relationship between the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of BIRD's performances the demographics attended since free admission.

For this case, the data (X^2 = (16, n=193) 29.059, p<0.05) *rejects the null hypothesis.* According to the data, the demographics who visited free admission more than a year ago was the largest group the entire population. As such, 'more than a year ago' took the majority among every group with varying amount of attendance to BIRD's performances. Particularly, this group was the only group which had the participants who visited BIRD's performances more than 10 times since free admission. It was not that, however, the older the timeline places itself, the more the demographics have attended performances at BIRD. The majority of each timeline group's members, for instance, attended BIRD's performances for 1 - 4 times since free admission. The overall result indicates, in this regard, further exploration is required to see how the demographics' experiences with free admission performances have influenced their consumption represented as their attendances BIRD and other venues' performances.

Among the variables, *WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD* display the demographics' experiences with free admission performances. With their experiences, it is important to see whether the demographics' interest in BIRD and other venues' performances after free admission has been connected to their consumption. This aspect is, in this sense,

considered together as an independent variable. It was meanwhile confirmed meanwhile that the majority of the demographics' already had decent amount of attendance to musical performances. Their consumption after free admission could be reflection of their consumption patterns. This makes comparing predictive powers between the demographics' experiences with free admission performance and their consumption patterns matters. *Interest in musical performances* and *frequency of attending musical performances* are accordingly chosen as additional independent variables as well. When implementing ordinal logistic regression[24],

1) Attendance to BIRD's performances after free admission

H^1: Interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission can predict actual amount of attending BIRD's performance after free admission.

Referring its parameter estimates, interestingly, *Q1 (interest in musical performances and Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD)* are not predictive of *Q19 (amount of attending BIRD's performances since free admission).* This result indicates that interest in musical performance does not necessarily correspond to the amount of actual participation, as suggested above in the previous section. When comparing each variable's estimates to their reference levels,

For *Q4(frequency of attending musical performances),* the overall results correspond well with Q19. As such, *'2= 1-3 times a year'* and *'4=8-10 times a year'* have statistically significant scores. *'2= 1-3 times a year'* and *'4=8-10 times a year'* have visited BIRD's performances less than *'5=More than 10 times a year'* by -2.529 and -1.360 for each.

For *Q15(reasons behind satisfaction with free admission performances),* *'Atmosphere of performance'* has statistically significant scores. *'Atmosphere of performance'* visited BIRD's performances less than *'Quality of performer'* by -1.337. Since there was no significant relation between reasons behind satisfaction with free admission performances and satisfaction with free admission performances, this could simply reflect the majority of demographics' preferences. The next two locations, meanwhile, display some notable results.

For Q16(WTP for free admission performances), *'3=50-100 Euros'* has statistically significant scores. Interestingly, *'3=50-100 Euros'* visited BIRD's performances more than *'4=100-150 Euros'.*

In case of Q17(*Interest in BIRD's performances after free admission),* *'2=Hardly'* and *'3=Fairly'* visited BIRD's performances less than *'5='* by -1.935 for *'3=Fairly'* and by -5.399

---

[24] Referring its model fitting information, p<*0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p >0.05. This data is* not expected to be found in the actual population. With $R^2 = 0.628$, our model explains 62.8% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > *0.05*.

for *'2=Hardly'*. When considering Q1(interest in musical performances) has no predictive power, this makes it wonder why the demographics interest in BIRD's performances does not originate from interest in musical performances. To see if this is applied to other cases, this research also takes a look at other venues' cases[25].

2) Attendance to other music venues' performances after free admission

H[1]: Interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in other venues' performances after free admission can predict actual amount of attending other venues' performance after free admission.

Referring its parameter estimates, again, *Q1 (interest in musical performances and Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD)* are not predictive of actual amount of attending other venues' performance after free admission. *Q 15(reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances)* as well, this time. When comparing each variable's estimates to their reference levels,

For Q4(frequency of attending musical performances), *'2= 1-3 times a year'*, *'3=5-7 times a year'* and *'4=8-10 times a year'* have attended other music venues' performances less than *'5=More than 10 times a year'* by -1.844 for *'4=8-10 times a year'*, -2.299 for *'3=5-7 times a year'*, -4.650 for *'2= 1-3 times a year'*.

For Q16(WTP for free admission performances), all of its locations have statistically significant scores. For this case as well, they have attended other music venues' performances more than *'4=100-150 Euros'* by 2.633 for *'1=less than 10 Euros'*, 1.757 for *'2=10-50 Euros'* and 2.493 for *'3=50-100 Euros'*.

For 'Q20 (levels of interest in other music venues after free admission), '3=Moderately' and '4=Quite'* have attended other musical venues' performances less than *'5=Very much' by* -2.038and -2.039 for each.

It is identifiable that *WTP for free admission performances* displays the identical tendency also in this model. There could be several reasons. First, there is no significant gap among the demographics' satisfaction with free admission performances. It is hard, thus, to say they could effectively predict the demographics attendance to musical performances after free admission. The demographics' WTP for musical performances has more credibility. The demographics satisfaction with musical performances meanwhile did not necessarily correspond to their WTP for free admission performances. Regardless of satisfaction levels, the majority of them expressed around 10-100 euros of WTPS, 10-50 euros, in particular, for free admission

---

[25] Referring its model fitting information, p *<0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p >0.05*. This data is not expected to be found in the actual population. With $R^2 = 0.519$, our model explains 51.9% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p> *0.05,* which accepts null hypothesis.

performances. This implies the participants with higher WTP actually had similar or lower levels of satisfaction than the participants with lower WTP. Lastly, it has been clarified, before the demographics' interest in musical performances, circumstances surrounding them intervenes a lot to determine the actual amount of attending musical performances. Considering this pandemic crisis, in this sense, the participants with higher WTP might not have attended musical performances due to such conditions.

Since this research still wants to figure out the impacts of satisfaction with free admission performance on future consumption, however, the result above makes it wonder whether satisfaction with free admission performances has no influence on the demographics' musical performances consumption at all. To figure out this issue, this research approaches the demographics' consumption differently instead of measuring the amount of attendances to musical performances after free admission. This time, the timelines that the demographics attended the next concert after the free admission represent their consumption. This research meanwhile selects the variables only related to experiences with free admission performances referred as satisfaction with free admission performances, reasons behind satisfaction with free admission performances and WTP for free admission performances as independent variables. When implementing ordinal logistic regression[26],

H^1: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD can predict timelines that the demographics attended the next concert after the free admission.

Referring its parameter estimates, again, *Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD)* and *Q15(reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances)* are not predictive of *timelines that the demographics attended the next concert after the free admission.* For *Q16(WTP for free admission performances),* all of the locations are statistically significant. They visited the next concert later than '*4=100-150 Euros'* by -2.085 for *'1=less than 10 Euros',* -1.769 for *'2=10-50 Euros'* and -1.607 for *'3=50-100 Euros'.*

Q14 and Q15 is not surprising. Considering the result above, *Q16* is surprising because the data shows that the participants with higher WTP visited the next concerts significantly earlier than others. This gives more conviction that the amount of attending musical performances after free admission could ascribe to other external conditions. As indicated in the previous sections, the demographics' financial status and work-related conditions could have impacted their consumption. The outbreak of pandemic crisis could have as well, since any concerts or festivals across cultural industry have been on hold. It's hard to say that the timelines that the

---

[26] Referring its model fitting information, p $<\alpha=0.05$. *When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p $>\alpha=0.05$. This data is accordingly not expected to be found in the actual population. With $R^2 = 0.134$, our model explains 13.4% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p > $\alpha=0.05$.*

demographics attended the next concert is an effective notion to show their changes in cultural participation after free admission.

The result suggests referring another dependent variable, the demographics' satisfaction with the next concert, for instance, might be an alternative. To estimate the demographics' consumption, however, independent variables are more inclusively selected this time. The independent variables also encompass the variables used in other sub-hypothesis, *'interest in musical performances, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission, interest in other musical venues' performances after free admission*, in this section. The variables associated with the demographics' interest intend to compare their connections to the dependent variables. Whether the demographics' consumption is more related to general interest than interest in particular venues after free admission could be a key to grasp free admission's influences. When implementing ordinal logistic regression[27],

H¹: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in musical performances, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission, interest in other musical venues' performances after free admission can predict satisfaction with the next concert after the free admission.

Referring its parameter estimates, *Q15(reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances), Q16 (WTP for free admission performance at BIRD),* Q17(*Interest in BIRD's performances after free admission) and Q20 (levels of interest in different music venues)* are not predictive of satisfaction with the next concert after free admission performances at BIRD.

Confirming the findings above, WTP for free admission performances did not necessarily correspond to the demographics' satisfaction. The variables related to the demographics' interest also shows some interesting results. Unlike Q17(*Interest in BIRD's performances after free admission) and Q20 (levels of interest in different music venues), Q1(interest in musical performances)* has the significant responses. For *Q1(interest in musical performances), '2=Barely' and '3=Fairly'* expressed lower satisfaction with the next concert after free admission than *'5=Very much'* by -4.178 for *'2=Barely'* and -1.347 for *'3=Fairly'.* It is unidentifiable whether the demographics' next concert was either from BIRD or other musical venues. This instead verifies the previous finding that accumulated cultural participations influence the demographics consumption.

The variables related to the demographics' satisfaction meanwhile show some consistency. For

---

[27] Referring its model fitting information, p *<α=0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, only mixed result's p >α=0.05. The first p <α=0.05 indicates that* this data is not expected to be found in the actual population. With R-Square of 0.470, our model explains 47% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' significance value is 0.897 > *α=0.05,* which accepts null hypothesis.

Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD), '3=Neutral' expressed lower satisfaction with the next concert after free admission at BIRD than *'5= Very satisfying'* by -2.523 in sequential order. This raises credibility of the demographics' expressing satisfaction with musical performances. *Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD)* is not predictive of their attendances to musical performances as mentioned above, however. WTP depending on their satisfaction does not siginifically differ as well. This rather verifies that subjective evaluation of interest or satisfaction with musical performances are not absolute. The demographics who defined their satisfaction as '*Satisfying'* could have higher interest than those who defined their satisfaction as *'Very satisfying'*. What importantly displays the demographics' actual consumption is, in this regard, WTP and frequency of attending musical performances. This confirms the impact of financial status on the demographics' consumption, which has been suggested in the previous section. This further corroborates Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996) finding that consumers' demand of theatrical performances rather relys on their income elasticity of demand and prices.

The overall result indicates that the demographics' willingness to attend other musical performances might not precisely mirror their WTP for future consumption. Analyzing the two aspects should be done separately for clarification. This research accordingly explores how those two aspects differ when presuming the demographics' cultural consumption after free admission. To represent the demographics' cultural consumption after free admission, the independent variables applied in the sub-hypothesis above are identically applied with additional independent variables referred as *timelines that the demographics visited the next concert after free admission and satisfaction with the next concert after free admission.* As the demographics' cultural consumption embraces these two, it is reasonable to count them as independent variables as well. When implementing ordinal logistic regression,

1) **willingness to attend musical performances later on**[28]

H[1]: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in BIRD's and other musical venues' performances after free admission, timelines that the demographics visited the next concert after free admission and satisfaction with the next concert after free admission cannot predict willingness to attend musical performances later on.

Referring its parameter estimates, again, *Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD), Q15(reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances)* and *Q17(Interest in BIRD's performances after free admission)* have no predictive powers.

For other variables, their outcomes are in line with the previous findings above.

---

[28] Referring its model fitting information, p *<0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit, both p >α=0.05, which indicates that* this data is not expected to be found in the actual population. With R^2 = 0.626, our model explains 62.6% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p *> 0.05,* which accepts null hypothesis.

For *Q16(WTP for free admission performances), '1=Less than 10 Euros'* and *'2=10-50 Euros'* express lower willingness to attend musical performances after on than *'4=100-150 Euros'* than -18.987 for *'1=Less than 10 Euros'* and -15.416 for *'2=10-50 Euros'*.

For *'Q20 (levels of interest in different music venues)', '4=Quite'* expressed more willingness to attend musical performances after on than *'5=Very much'* by 2.67.

For *Q23(timeline that the demographic attended the next concert after free admission), '3= After 9 months -11 months', '5= After 4 months -6 months'* and *'6= After a month-3 months'* expressed lower willingness to attend musical concert after on than *'7=within a month'* by - 4.411 for *'3= After 9 months -11 months'*, -4.157 for *'5= After 4 months -6 months'* and -2.561 for *'6= After a month-3 months'*.

For *Q24(satisfaction with the next concert after free admission), '2=Somewhat dissatisfied'* and *'3=Neutral'* are statistically significant. Both express lower willingness to attend musical performances after on than '*5=Considerably satisfied'* by -9.295 for *'2=Somewhat dissatisfied'* and -3.570 for *'3=Neutral'*. It has been verified that the demographics' satisfaction with musical performances turned out to be less convincing than WTP. The result, still, shows the relevance of the demographics satisfaction with musical performances are not ignorable.

2) WTP for future consumption of musical performances[29]

H^1: WTP for musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, satisfaction with the next concert after free admission, willingness to attend musical performances after on can predict WTP for future consumption of musical performances.

Referring its parameter estimates, again, *Q14(satisfaction with free performances at BIRD)* has no predictive powers.

For *Q9 (WTP for musical performances),* all of the location except *'5=150-200 euros'* are statistically significant. '*2=10-50 euros', '3=50-100 euros', '4=100-150 euros'* express lower WTP for future consumption of musical performances by -6.070, -4.433 and -3.958 for each.

For *Q16(WTP for free admission performance), '1=less than 10 euros'* and *'3=50-100 euros'* express lower WTP for future consumption of musical performances than '4=100-150 euros' by -5.162 and -2.122 for each.

For *Q24(satisfaction with the next concert after free admission)*, '*4=satisfied'* expresses lower WTP for future consumption of musical performances than '5=considerably satisfied'.

---

[29] Referring its model fitting information, p *<0.05. When it comes to goodness-of-fit >0.05, which indicates that* this data is not expected to be found in the actual population. With R^2 = 0.703, our model explains 70.3% of the population. The assumption of proportional odds' p *> 0.05,* which accepts null hypothesis.

For Q26(Willingness to attend musical performances later on), '3=neutral' is statistically significant. '3=neutral' expresses lower WTP for future consumption of musical performances than '5=definitely' by -4.541.

The overall data suggests that the demographics positive experiences with free admission performances have been reflected on their consumption of musical performances. Satisfaction with free admission meanwhile does not effectively show the connection between free admission and the demographics' consumption of musical performances after on. Levels of interest in BIRD and other musical venues, as well. Such tendencies ascribe to subjectivity of defining their satisfaction and interest. Instead, quantified figures, frequency of attending musical performances and WTP for free admission, suggest more direct guidance to their willingness to attend musical performances and WTP for musical performances after on. It is identifiable, the higher WTP for free admission become, the higher WTP for future consumption become in general.

Chapter 6. Conclusion

In this last chapter, this research summarizes the result of analysis with concluding remarks. Mention limitations of this research and modest recommendations for future research are followed. In chapter 5, this research explored how free admission influences the music audience's perception of musical performances. 4 hypotheses were accordingly tested with different sub-hypotheses to verify the impact of free admission.

Testing *1st H: 'Consumers' previous experiences with musical performances influence their current consumption patterns'* indicated that classic variables considered to hugely influence the audience's cultural consumption were not as strong as they used to be. *Gender, age, profession, frequency of attending musical performances, levels of interest in musical performances*, interestingly, had no predictive power when it came to the demographics' *evaluation of past experiences with musical performance*. Only *education levels* turned out to influence the demographics' evaluation of past experiences with musical performances. The result was meanwhile unclear to conclude that the higher education levels become, more positive evaluation of past experiences with musical performance becomes. This research accordingly tested another sub-hypothesis to explore more direct connection between levels of interest in musical performances and other socio-cultural dynamics related variables that possibly have affected them.

This result showed *age and profession* were statistically significant while *gender and even education levels* were not predictive of *the demographics' interest in musical performances*. There was no significant gap between age groups compared to that of profession, however. This implied that age might not have strong impact on the demographics' interest in musical performances. The overall result indicated that the classic categories considered to shape one's cultural tastes might not be applied the same nowadays. Such were expected to happen due to circumstantial changes surrounding the demographics. It was not astonishing that, in further investigations, professions were reported to influence the demographics' frequency of attending musical performances. As the demographics' times spent on work relied on their professions, interactions between two determined the final impact on their attending musical performances.

Concerning frequency of attending musical performances, the demographics' interest in musical performances was predictive of it as well. There was, however, no relation between levels of interest in musical performances and times spent on work. The result rather suggested impacts of times spent on work might preempts impacts of interest in musical performances on frequency of attending musical performance. It was highly expected that the demographics adjusted their attending musical performances depending on work-related variables. When it came to consumption patterns, hence, profession and times spent on work were closely related to interest in musical performances to determine the amount of the demographics' attendance.

The demographics' *WTP for musical performances* meanwhile corresponded to their *interest in musical performances*. *WTP for musical performances* was also predictive of the *most recently attended musical performances*. It seemed the higher interest in musical performances, the higher the price of the most recently attended musical performances. The price of the most recently attended musical performances did not necessarily match the demographics interest in musical performances.

Testing ***2nd H: Pre-accessible information influences the demographics' consumption free admission performances*** firstly showed that *the sources of information* influenced decision making rather than *satisfaction with free admission performances*. Daily conversations, referred as words of mouth, was reported to greatly influence the audience's decision making among other advertising claims. When it came to *reasons to choose free admission performances*, however, the result showed that the demographics who did *Self-searching for musical performances* expressed significantly higher satisfaction with free admission performances than '*Words of mouth'*.

Meanwhile, *the demographics' trustworthiness regarding the information sources* did not significantly differ from one another. Despite words of mouths' impact, the level of trust in the source itself was not substantially high. *This trustworthiness of information* was meanwhile predictive of *the demographics' satisfaction with free admission performances*. The more the demographics trusted pre-accessible information, the more they found free admission performances interesting. The result suggested what determined the demographics' consumption was their perceived trustworthiness of information, rather than sources themselves. The overall result implied what mattered the most was a consumer's self-will. Regardless of information types, because, pro-activeness of consumer motivation influenced the audience's experience with musical performances a lot.

Testing ***3rd H: Free admission positively influences consumer evaluation of a musical performance that a consumer experience at BIRD*** done separately for the 42 demographics who chose free performances due to free admission and the entire demographics. This process was meant to compare the data and preclude possibly biased conclusions. The sub-hypotheses targeting the 42 demographics firstly suggested *free admission* was likely to positively influence *consumer evaluation of free performances*. When looking at the data from the entire demographics, however, companions' suggestion recorded the highest response rates. Free admission recorded the second highest response rate. The result suggested that free admission could be a useful attraction tool, but not necessarily powerful than words of mouth.

When looking at which respondents chose free performances due to free admission, the data showed free admission influenced music audience with past consumptions more than those who without such. This result corresponded with Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996)'s research which indicated that consumers' demand on theatrical performances relied on their income elasticity of demand and prices. When considering this, it was unclear if free admission really affected their perception of musical performances or just assisted their attending another musical performance. What influenced the audience's consumption the most, also, was the audience's socio-cultural contexts, financial status, in particular.

Concerning *levels of satisfaction with free performances,* it was hard to say free admission influenced the demographics significantly than other reasons. There was no substantial difference between groups with different reasons. WTP for free performances displayed a similar tendency that invalidated differentiation between the groups. Instead, WTP for free admission quantitatively showed the demographics' increased WTP for free performances. It implied they found free performances deserve higher prices.

Testing **4ᵗʰ H: The positive evaluation of the musical performance leads a consumer's future consumption** started with testing a relation between *the timeline that the demographics attended free performances* and *the amount of performances the demographics attended after free admission.* There was no relation between *the timelines* and *the amount of other venues' performances they attended.* When it came to *BIRD's performances*, however, the data was statistically significant. The result indicated it was not that the older the timeline places itself, the more demographics have attended performances at BIRD. The majority of each timeline group's members, for instance, attended BIRD's performances for 1 - 4 times since free admission. The overall result indicated further exploration was required to understand how the demographics' experiences with free admission performances have influenced their consumption.

When it came *to attending BIRD's performances after free admission*, *interest in musical performance and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD* were not predictive of *the amount of actual participation.* Whereas, *the demographics' frequency of attending musical performances, reasons behind satisfaction with free admission performances* and *interest in BIRD's performances* proportionated with *the amount of attendance after free admission. WTP for free admission performances* had statistically significant responses, but the responses were not in sequential order. When it came to *attending other venues' performances after free admission, interest in musical performances, satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons of satisfaction with free admission performa*nces were not predictive of *the amount of actual participation. Frequency of attending musical performances* instead proportionated with *the amount of attendance after free admission. WTP for free admission performances and levels of interest in different music venues* had statistically significant responses. Their responses were meanwhile not in sequential order.

Scrutinizing the data indicated that the demographics' satisfaction with free performances might not effectively predict their attending other performances after free admission. The demographics satisfaction with musical performances also did not necessarily correspond to their WTP for free admission performances. It seemed that their WTP for musical performances had more credibility. The demographics' WTP meanwhile did not increase in sequential order according to increase in amount of attendances to BIRD's and other venues' performances. The result implied the participants with higher WTP could have expressed similar or lower levels of satisfaction than the participants with lower WTP. The result, based on findings in other hypotheses, also suggested that it could ascribe to the demographics' circumstances that determined the actual amount of attending musical performances. The demographics' financial status and work-related conditions could have impacted their consumption. Also, considering the advent of the pandemic crisis this year, the participants

with higher WTP might not have attended musical performances due to such issues.

Confirming the result above, *satisfaction with free performances at BIRD and reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances* turned out to be not predictive of *timelines that the demographics attended the next concert after the free admission*. The demographics with higher WTP, whereas, visited the next concerts significantly earlier than others. This gave more conviction that the amount of attending musical performances after free admission could ascribe to other external conditions. The result suggested considering timelines that the demographics attended the next concert might not reflect any changes in their cultural participation after free admission.

When considering *satisfaction with the next concert after the free admission* instead of *timelines that the demographics attended the next concert*, the result showed that *reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances, WTP for free admission performance at BIRD, Interest in BIRD's performances after free admission and interest in different music venues* were not predictive of *satisfaction with the next concert after the free admission*. This result confirmed that *WTP for free admission performances* did not necessarily reflect the demographics' satisfaction. *Interest in musical performances* proportionated with the previous finding that accumulated experiences influenced the demographics consumption. The variables related to the demographics' satisfaction meanwhile showed some consistency. *Satisfaction with free performances at BIRD* also proportionated with *satisfaction with the next concert after the free admission*.

The overall result indicated subjective evaluation of interest or satisfaction with musical performances were not absolute. What importantly displayed the demographics' actual consumption were rather WTP and frequency of attending musical performances. This confirmed the impact of financial status on the demographics' consumption, which was suggested while analyzing the 3rd hypothesis. This further corroborated Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette (1996) finding that consumers' demand of theatrical performances rather depended on their income elasticity of demand and prices.

When it came to *willingness to attend musical performances later on, satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons of satisfaction with free admission performances and Interest in BIRD's performances after free admission* had no predictive powers. The demographics' *WTP for free admission performances*, *timeline that the demographic attended the next concert after free admission and satisfaction with the next concert after free admission* proportionated with *willingness to attend musical performances later on. Levels of interest in different music venues* had statistically significant responses. The responses were meanwhile not in sequential order as *'4=Quite'* expressed more willingness to attend musical performances after on than *'5=Very much'*. This result again implied subjective evaluation of interest or satisfaction with musical performances were not absolute. Responses from *satisfaction with the next concert after free admission*, however, indicated the relevance of the demographics satisfaction with musical performances could not be disregarded.

Reminding the implications above, when it came to *WTP for future consumption of musical performances,* again, *satisfaction with free performances at BIRD* had no power. *Satisfaction*

with the next concert after free admission and *Willingness to attend musical performances later on*, however, proportionated with *WTP for future consumption of musical performances.* Both *WTP for musical performances* and *WTP for free admission performance* proportionated with *WTP for future consumption of musical performances.* The overall result showed that quantified measures referred as WTP suggested more direct guidance to their willingness to attend musical performances and WTP for musical performances after on. It was identifiable, the higher WTP for free admission become, the higher WTP for future consumption became in general.

Along with such findings above, this research could contribute to exploring social significances of consumer behavior for further research. This research, at the same time, had several limitations. To begin with, the majority of demographics consisted of student groups and people with high amount of past consumption. This ascribed to characteristic of the platforms that the survey was published. Erasmus university had higher chances of attracting student participants and PID (Pole Inspiration Studio) were possibly attracting respondents who were passionate about performing arts sector. This research accordingly failed to secure participants various characteristics. Proving whether free admission encouraged audience with less or no past consumptions' cultural participations became hard. Second, this research neglected to test impact of the demographics' cultural tastes on their consumption. This research concentrated more on exploring the impact of socio-cultural dynamics on the demographics' consumption. The demographics' music tastes and reasons they were satisfied with free admission performances were comparatively overlooked. It was not sufficiently explored, thus, how their tastes influenced their motivation to attend free performances and how their tastes influenced their evaluation of the performances. Third, this research did not investigate the demographics' economic capital levels. This allowed analysis to only assume financial status' impact on the demographics' consumption based on the collected data. Lastly, intervention of external conditions, outbreak of CovidN19, in particular, made period-related variables less useful. The demographics who recently attended free admission might not have attended other performances due to the pandemic crisis. An insight for the relation between timelines that the demographics attended free performances and the amount of performances attended after on became unclear, thus.

Based on those limitations, this research makes humble suggestions for future research. Securing diverse respondents could help exploring the influence of free admission more extensively. Considering the participants' cultural tastes could also allow in-depth analysis over their decision making. Lastly, grasping the demographics' economic capital levels could clarify the relation between the demographics' cultural consumption and their financial status.

Appendix

1. Survey Questionnaire

Survey Question List

Question No.	Type of Q	The Content of Question
		<Section 1> Past Experiences with Musical Performances
1	Q 1-1	How much do you find musical performances interesting? 1) Very much 2) Quite 3) Fairly 4) Barely 5) Not at all - Participants except those who choose 'Not at all interested' go to Q 1-2 - Participants who choose 'Not at all interested' go to Q 1-3
	Q 1-2	Could you please choose at least one genre you favor? (multiple selection available) 1) Jazz 2) Rock 3) Hip-hop 4) Classic 5) Pop 6) Blues 7) Folk music 8) Heavy metal 9) Country 10) Reggae 11) Rhythm and Blues 12) Etc

	Q 1-3	Could you please describe why? (multiple selections available) 1) Lack of time 2) Lack of opportunities 3) Quality of performances 4) Ticket prices 5) Other reasons (Please free to describe)	
	Q 1-4	How often do you attend musical performances? 1) more than 10 times a year 2) 8-10 times a year 3) 5-7 times a year 4) 1-3 times a year 5) Never Participants who choose 5) go to Q 1-5) before move on to Q 1-6)	
	Q 1-5	What would be the major reason? 1) Lack of time 2) Lack of supply 3) Quality of performances 4) Ticket prices 5) Other reasons (Please free to describe)	Commented [MS98]:
	Q 1-6	Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how much have you been satisfied with them? 1) Considerably satisfied 2) Satisfied 3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4) Somewhat dissatisfied 5) Very dissatisfied	
	Q 1-7	What was the main reason? 1) Matters of infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.) 2) Quality of performers 3) Atmosphere of performances 4) Length of performances 5) Other issues (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	

	Q 1-8	How much did you pay for the most recent performance you watched? 1) More than 200 Euros 2) 150-200 Euros 3) 100-150 Euros 4) 50-100 Euros 5) 10-50 Euros 6) Less than 10 Euros 7) Unable to remember
	Q 1-9	What is a reasonable price according to you? 1)Price does not matter 2)150-200 Euros 3)100-150 Euros 4)50-100 Euros 5)10-50 Euros 6)Less than 10 Euros
1		
	\<Section 2\> Evaluation of Free Admission Performance at BIRD	
2	Q 2-1	When did you attend BIRD's free admission performance? 1) Less than a month ago 2) 2 months - 4 months ago 3) 5 months - 7 months ago 4) 8 months - 10 months ago 5) 11 months – a year ago 6) More than a year ago
	Q 2-2	How did you get to know about it? 1) Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.) 2) Promotions at BIRD's venue 3) Words of mouth (Family, Friends, Colleagues, etc.) 4) Self-searching for musical performances 5) By chance 6) Others (Please feel free to describe)
	Q 2-3	How much was the information about the performance helpful?

		1) Extremely 2) Very 3) Moderately 4) Slightly 5) Not at all
	Q 2-4	Why did you chose that performance? 1) Companions' suggestion 2) Self-interest 3) The performer 4) Free admission 5) Personal affection for BIRD 6) Others (please feel free to describe)
	Q 2-5	How much was the performance satisfying? 1) Very satisfying 2) Satisfying 3) Neutral 4) Somewhat dissatisfying 5) Very dissatisfying
	Q 2-6	What was the main reason? 1) BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.) 2) Quality of performer 3) Atmosphere of Performance 4) Length of performance 5) Other issues (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)
	Q 2-7	If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid? 1) More than 200 Euros 2) 150-200 Euros 3) 100-150 Euros 4) 50-100 Euros 5) 10-50 Euros 6) Less than 10 Euros

2	Q 2-8	After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances? 1) Very much 2) A lot 3) Fairly 4) Hardly 5) Not at all Participants who choose 1), 2), 3) go to Q 2-10 Participants who choose 4), 5) go to Q 2-9
	Q 2-9	What is the main reason? 1) Do not suit my taste 2) Lack of information 3) Want to explore other musical venues 4) Lack of time 5) Others (please feel free to describe) Participants who answer Q 2-9 goes to Q 2-10
	Q 2-10	How many BIRD's performances have you attended since the free admission? 1) More than 10 times 2) 7 - 10 times 3) 4 - 7 times 4) 1 - 4 times 5) None
	<Section 3> Free Admission's Influence on Future Consumption	
	Q 3-1	After free admission at BIRD, have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating? 1) Very much 2) Quite 3) Moderately 4) Rarely 5) Never Participants who answer 1), 2), 3) go to Q 3-3 Participants who answer 4), 5) go to Q 3-2
	Q 3-2	What would be the reason? 1) Not enough information 2) Ticket prices 3) Lack of time

		4) Not my taste
		5) Others (please feel free to describe)
		Participants who answer Q 3-2 go to Q 3-3
Q 3-3		How many other venues' performances have you attended since the free admission at BIRD?
		1) More than 10 2) 7 - 10 3) 4 - 7 4) 1 - 4 5) None
Q 3-4		When did you go to the next concert after the free admission at BIRD?
		1) Within one month 2) After a month-3 months 3) After 4 months -6 months 4) After 6 months -8 months 5) After 9 months -11 months 6) More than a year later 7) None Except participants who choose 7), others go to Q 3-5 Participants who choose 7) go to Q 3-7
Q 3-5		How much was the performance satisfying?
		1) Very satisfied 2) Satisfied 3) Neutral 4) Somewhat dissatisfied 5) Very dissatisfied
Q 3-6		What made you think so?
		1) Quality of performer 2) Air of performance 3) Length of performance 4) Other factor (weather conditions, personal changes of moods, etc.) 5) Quality of infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)
Q 3-7		Are you willing to attend any musical performances in the future?
		1) Definitely

Commented [MS99]:

		2) Likely 3) Neutral 4) Not really 5) Never Participants who answer 4) and 5) go to Q 3-8 Except those who pick 4) and 5), participants go to Q 3-9
	Q3-8	What would be the reason? 1) Lack of supply 2) Lack of time 3) Quality of performances 4) Ticket prices 5) Other reasons (Please free to describe) Participants who answer Q 3-8 go to Q 3-10
	Q 3-9	How much would you pay for any other musical performances after on? 1) More than 200 Euros 2) 150-200 Euros 3) 100-150 Euros 4) 50-100 Euros 5) 10-50 Euros 6) Less than 10 Euros
	Q3-10	Comments? or Others?
	<Section 4> General Information	
4	Q 4-1	What is your age? 1) 10-20 2) 20-30 3) 30-40 4) 40-50 5) 50-60
	Q 4-2	What is your gender? 1) Male 2) Female 3) Others (Please feel free to describe) 4) Prefer not to say
	Q 4-3	What is your highest degree of education? 1) Primary education 2) Secondary education (VMBO, HAVO, VWO)

		3) Lower tertiary education(MBO) 4) College degree (HBO) 5) University degree (WO) 6) Post-graduate (PhD)
	Q 4-4	What is your profession? 1) I am a student 2) I am a public employee 3) I am a private employee 4) I am self-employed / a freelancer 5) I am looking for a job 6) Other: (open space)
	Q 4-5	How much time do you work? 1) I work full-time 2) I work part-time 3) I have a flexible work schedule 4) I am looking for a job 5) Others

2. SPSS Datasets

1st H: 'Consumers' previous experiences with musical performances influence their current consumption patterns'

H^0: Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession, general frequency of attending musical performances, levels of interest in musical performances cannot predict evaluation of past experiences with musical performance.

H^1: Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession, general frequency of attending musical performances, levels of interest in musical performances can predict evaluation of past experiences with musical performance.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how much have you been satisfied with them?	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13	8.7%
	Satisfied	79	52.7%
	Considerably Satisfied	58	38.7%
What is your profession?	I am a private employee	37	24.7%
	I am a public employee	1	0.7%
	I am a student	78	52.0%
	I am looking for a job	2	1.3%
	I am self-employed / a freelancer	32	21.3%
What is your highest degree of education?	Secondary education (VMBO, HAVO, VWO)	5	3.3%
	Lower tertiary education(MBO)	6	4.0%
	College degree (HBO)	62	41.3%
	University degree (WO)	74	49.3%
	Post-graduate (PhD)	3	2.0%
What is your gender?	Female	89	59.3%
	Male	61	40.7%
What is your age?	10-20	9	6.0%
	20-30	89	59.3%
	30-40	40	26.7%

	40-50	11	7.3%
	50-60	1	0.7%
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.3%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.3%
	5-7 times a year	62	41.3%
	8-10 times a year	37	24.7%
	More than 10 times a year	20	13.3%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	224.943			
Final	172.433	52.510	20	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	138.584	166	.941
Deviance	141.166	166	.919

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.295
Nagelkerke	.352
McFadden	.191

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q6 = 3]	-38.803	5106.355	.000	1	.994	-10047.076	9969.469
	[Q6 = 4]	-35.043	5106.355	.000	1	.995	-10043.316	9973.229
Location	[Q33=I am a private employee]	.067	.534	.016	1	.901	-.980	1.114
	[Q33=I am a public employee]	-1.849	2.326	.632	1	.427	-6.408	2.710
	[Q33=I am a student]	.310	.600	.267	1	.605	-.867	1.487
	[Q33=I am looking for a job]	.154	1.533	.010	1	.920	-2.850	3.158
	[Q33=I am self-employed / a freelancer]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q32=2]	-17.649	2.175	65.858	1	.000	-21.912	-13.387
	[Q32=3]	-18.246	1.340	185.494	1	.000	-20.872	-15.620
	[Q32=4]	-17.982	.413	1897.674	1	.000	-18.792	-17.173
	[Q32=5]	-17.541	.000	.	1	.	-17.541	-17.541
	[Q32=6]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q31=Female]	.511	.384	1.770	1	.183	-.242	1.264
	[Q31=Male]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q30=1]	-17.255	5106.356	.000	1	.997	-10025.528	9991.018
	[Q30=2]	-17.597	5106.355	.000	1	.997	-10025.869	9990.675
	[Q30=3]	-17.409	5106.355	.000	1	.997	-10025.682	9990.863
	[Q30=4]	-17.980	5106.355	.000	1	.997	-10026.253	9990.292
	[Q30=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q4=1]	-20.541	2736.324	.000	1	.994	-5383.637	5342.555
	[Q4=2]	-1.099	.873	1.583	1	.208	-2.811	.613
	[Q4=3]	-.426	.617	.477	1	.490	-1.635	.783
	[Q4=4]	.351	.632	.308	1	.579	-.888	1.589
	[Q4=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-2.538	1.191	4.545	1	.033	-4.872	-.205
	[Q1=3]	-1.199	.720	2.768	1	.096	-2.611	.213
	[Q1=4]	-.475	.506	.883	1	.347	-1.466	.516
	[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	172.433			
General	147.511[b]	24.922[c]	20	.204

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

H^0: *There is no relationship between levels of highest education and evaluation of past experiences with musical performance.*

H^1: *There is a relationship between levels of highest education and evaluation of past experiences with musical performance.*

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how much have you been satisfied with them? * What is your highest degree of education?	150	77.7%	43	22.3%	193	100.0%

Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how much have you been satisfied with them? * What is your highest degree of education? Crosstabulation

Count

		What is your highest degree of education?					
		Secondary education (VMBO, HAVO, VWO)	Lower tertiary education(MBO)	College degree (HBO)	University degree (WO)	Post-graduate (PhD)	Total
Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	0	9	4	0	13
	Satisfied	4	6	34	35	0	79

much have you been satisfied with them?	Considerably Satisfied	1	0	19	35	3	58
Total		5	6	62	74	3	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.018[a]	8	.021
Likelihood Ratio	21.418	8	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.638	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

H^0: *Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession cannot predict interest in musical performances.*

H^1: *Gender, age, levels of highest education, profession can predict interest in musical performances.*

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
What is your gender?	Female	89	59.3%
	Male	61	40.7%
What is your age?	10-20	9	6.0%
	20-30	89	59.3%
	30-40	40	26.7%
	40-50	11	7.3%
	50-60	1	0.7%
What is your highest degree of education?	Secondary education (VMBO, HAVO, VWO)	5	3.3%
	Lower tertiary education(MBO)	6	4.0%
	College degree (HBO)	62	41.3%
	University degree (WO)	74	49.3%
	Post-graduate (PhD)	3	2.0%
What is your profession?	I am a private employee	37	24.7%
	I am a public employee	1	0.7%
	I am a student	78	52.0%
	I am looking for a job	2	1.3%
	I am self-employed / a freelancer	32	21.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

74

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	180.698			
Final	141.742	38.957	13	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	98.607	101	.549
Deviance	87.242	101	.834

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.229
Nagelkerke	.256
McFadden	.116

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q1 = 2]	-22.950	1.403	267.650	1	.000	-25.699	-20.200
	[Q1 = 3]	-20.618	1.351	232.959	1	.000	-23.265	-17.970
	[Q1 = 4]	-17.655	1.357	169.277	1	.000	-20.314	-14.995
Location	[Q31=Female]	.421	.348	1.462	1	.227	-.262	1.104
	[Q31=Male]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q30=1]	-19.346	1.478	171.327	1	.000	-22.243	-16.449
	[Q30=2]	-17.846	.757	556.144	1	.000	-19.329	-16.363
	[Q30=3]	-18.014	.678	706.027	1	.000	-19.343	-16.685
	[Q30=4]	-19.513	.000	.	1	.	-19.513	-19.513
	[Q30=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q32=2]	.111	1.909	.003	1	.954	-3.630	3.852
	[Q32=3]	-1.181	1.559	.573	1	.449	-4.237	1.876
	[Q32=4]	-1.287	1.222	1.109	1	.292	-3.683	1.109

75

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
[Q32=5]	.198	1.232	.026	1	.873	-2.217	2.612
[Q32=6]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q33=I am a private employee]	-1.153	.493	5.477	1	.019	-2.118	-.187
[Q33=I am a public employee]	-1.320	2.079	.403	1	.525	-5.394	2.754
[Q33=I am a student]	-1.290	.575	5.038	1	.025	-2.417	-.164
[Q33=I am looking for a job]	-.108	1.506	.005	1	.943	-3.060	2.844
[Q33=I am self-employed / a freelancer]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Linesᵃ

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	141.742			
General	107.632ᵇ	34.110ᶜ	26	.132

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. Maximum number of iterations were exceeded, and the log-likelihood value and/or the parameter estimates cannot converge.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

H⁰: Times spent on work, profession, levels of interest in musical performances, reasons make the demographics' attending musical performances difficult cannot predict general frequency of attending musical performances.

H¹: Times spent on work, profession, levels of interest in musical performances, reasons make the demographics' attending musical performances difficult can predict general frequency of attending musical performances.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.3%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.3%
	5-7 times a year	62	41.3%
	8-10 times a year	37	24.7%
	More than 10 times a year	20	13.3%
How much time do you work?	I work full-time	35	23.3%
	I work part-time	24	16.0%
	I have a flexible work schedule	34	22.7%
	I'm a student	5	3.3%
	I am looking for a job	52	34.7%
What is your profession?	I am a private employee	37	24.7%
	I am a public employee	1	0.7%
	I am a student	78	52.0%
	I am looking for a job	2	1.3%
	I am self-employed / a freelancer	32	21.3%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
What would be the major reason?		148	98.7%
	Lack of time	2	1.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	239.841			
Final	.000	239.841	12	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	105.492	132	.957
Deviance	76.082	132	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.798
Nagelkerke	.855
McFadden	.590

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q4 = 1]	7.624	256.219	.001	1	.976	-494.556	509.804
	[Q4 = 2]	30.331	293.622	.011	1	.918	-545.156	605.819
	[Q4 = 3]	33.335	293.622	.013	1	.910	-542.153	608.823
	[Q4 = 4]	35.184	293.622	.014	1	.905	-540.304	610.671
Location	[Q34=1]	-1.575	.752	4.384	1	.036	-3.049	-.101
	[Q34=2]	-1.141	.566	4.071	1	.044	-2.250	-.033
	[Q34=3]	-1.282	.790	2.630	1	.105	-2.831	.267
	[Q34=4]	-2.064	1.199	2.961	1	.085	-4.414	.287

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
[Q34=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q33=I am a private employee]	-.300	.746	.161	1	.688	-1.762	1.163
[Q33=I am a public employee]	1.185	2.015	.346	1	.556	-2.764	5.134
[Q33=I am a student]	-1.594	.746	4.566	1	.033	-3.055	-.132
[Q33=I am looking for a job]	-2.315	1.592	2.114	1	.146	-5.436	.806
[Q33=I am self-employed / a freelancer]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q1=2]	-15.303	100.681	.023	1	.879	-212.635	182.028
[Q1=3]	-4.424	.646	46.853	1	.000	-5.691	-3.157
[Q1=4]	-1.836	.433	17.965	1	.000	-2.685	-.987
[Q1=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q5=]	36.485	293.620	.015	1	.901	-539.000	611.971
[Q5=Lack of time]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Linesᵃ

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	.000			
General	.000ᵇ	.000	36	1.000

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value is practically zero. There may be a complete separation in the data. The maximum likelihood estimates do not exist.

a relation between times spent on work and reasons make the demographics' attending musical performance difficult should be done as well with crosstab

What would be the major reason? * How much time do you work? Crosstabulation

Count

		How much time do you work?					Total
		I work full-time	I work part-time	I have a flexible work schedule	I'm a student	I am looking for a job	
What would be the major reason?		33	24	34	5	52	148
	Lack of time	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total		35	24	34	5	52	150

H^0: There is no relationship between times spent on works and profession.

H^1: There is a relationship between times spent on works and profession

How much time do you work? * What is your profession?   Crosstabulation

Count

		What is your profession?					Total
		I am a private employee	I am a public employee	I am a student	I am looking for a job	I am self-employed / a freelancer	
How much time do you work?	I work full-time	28	1	4	0	2	35
	I work part-time	7	0	15	0	2	24
	I have a flexible work schedule	2	0	4	0	28	34
	I'm a student	0	0	5	0	0	5
	I am looking for a job	0	0	50	2	0	52
Total		37	1	78	2	32	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	190.909[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	185.778	16	.000
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 13 cells (52.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

H^0: Levels of interest in musical performances, evaluation of past experiences with musical performance, frequency of attending musical performances cannot predict WTP for musical performances.

H^1: Levels of interest in musical performances, evaluation of past experiences with musical performance, frequency of attending musical performances can predict WTP for musical performances.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
What is a reasonable price according to you?	Less than 10 euros	1	0.7%
	10-50 euros	39	26.0%
	50-100 euros	46	30.7%
	100-150 euros	19	12.7%
	150-200 euros	6	4.0%
	prices do not matter	39	26.0%
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.3%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.3%
	5-7 times a year	62	41.3%
	8-10 times a year	37	24.7%
	More than 10 times a year	20	13.3%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how much have you been satisfied with them?	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13	8.7%
	Satisfied	79	52.7%
	Considerably Satisfied	58	38.7%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	212.548			

Final	167.601	44.947	9	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	121.092	121	.481
Deviance	85.365	121	.994

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.259
Nagelkerke	.273
McFadden	.101

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q9 = 1]	-7.117	1.334	28.463	1	.000	-9.732	-4.502
	[Q9 = 2]	-2.106	.489	18.529	1	.000	-3.064	-1.147
	[Q9 = 3]	-.479	.453	1.117	1	.290	-1.367	.409
	[Q9 = 4]	.178	.452	.156	1	.693	-.707	1.064
	[Q9 = 5]	.408	.453	.809	1	.369	-.481	1.296
Location	[Q4=1]	-3.460	2.236	2.393	1	.122	-7.843	.924
	[Q4=2]	-.224	.674	.110	1	.740	-1.545	1.098
	[Q4=3]	-.212	.532	.159	1	.690	-1.254	.830
	[Q4=4]	.319	.535	.355	1	.551	-.730	1.368
	[Q4=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-3.603	1.444	6.225	1	.013	-6.433	-.773

[Q1=3]	-1.345	.590	5.204	1	.023	-2.500	-.189
[Q1=4]	-.070	.427	.027	1	.870	-.908	.768
[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q6=3]	-1.081	.776	1.940	1	.164	-2.603	.440
[Q6=4]	-.489	.324	2.267	1	.132	-1.124	.147
[Q6=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	167.601			
General	130.078[b]	37.522[c]	36	.399

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

H⁰: Interest in musical performances, WTP for musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances and evaluation of past experiences with musical performances cannot predict the price of the most recent musical performance.

H¹: Interest in musical performances, WTP for musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances and evaluation of past experiences with musical performances cannot predict the price of the most recent musical performance.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much did you pay for the most recent performance you watched?	Unable to remember	2	1.3%
	Less than 10 euros	16	10.7%
	10-50 euros	61	40.7%
	50-100 euros	28	18.7%
	100-150 euros	19	12.7%
	150-200 euros	14	9.3%
	More than 200 euros	10	6.7%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
Evaluating your past experiences with musical performances, how much have you been satisfied with them?	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13	8.7%
	Satisfied	79	52.7%
	Considerably Satisfied	58	38.7%
What is a reasonable price according to you?	Less than 10 euros	1	0.7%
	10-50 euros	39	26.0%
	50-100 euros	46	30.7%
	100-150 euros	19	12.7%
	150-200 euros	6	4.0%
	prices do not matter	39	26.0%
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.3%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.3%
	5-7 times a year	62	41.3%
	8-10 times a year	37	24.7%
	More than 10 times a year	20	13.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	

	193
Total	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	376.247			
Final	336.549	39.697	14	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	351.253	382	.869
Deviance	262.952	382	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.233
Nagelkerke	.242
McFadden	.081

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q8 = 0]	-5.476	.891	37.793	1	.000	-7.222	-3.730
	[Q8 = 1]	-2.968	.559	28.201	1	.000	-4.063	-1.873
	[Q8 = 2]	-.519	.498	1.089	1	.297	-1.495	.456
	[Q8 = 3]	.448	.496	.816	1	.366	-.524	1.420
	[Q8 = 4]	1.312	.509	6.634	1	.010	.314	2.310
	[Q8 = 5]	2.395	.561	18.218	1	.000	1.295	3.495
Location	[Q1=2]	1.357	1.044	1.689	1	.194	-.690	3.404
	[Q1=3]	1.283	.602	4.541	1	.033	.103	2.463
	[Q1=4]	.724	.439	2.722	1	.099	-.136	1.585
	[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

86

[Q6=3]	-1.682	.756	4.948	1	.026	-3.164	-.200
[Q6=4]	-.432	.333	1.689	1	.194	-1.084	.220
[Q6=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q9=1]	-1.329	2.081	.408	1	.523	-5.407	2.749
[Q9=2]	-2.270	.508	19.987	1	.000	-3.265	-1.275
[Q9=3]	-1.063	.423	6.306	1	.012	-1.893	-.233
[Q9=4]	-1.115	.529	4.439	1	.035	-2.152	-.078
[Q9=5]	-2.112	.853	6.134	1	.013	-3.783	-.441
[Q9=6]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q4=1]	-1.060	1.681	.397	1	.528	-4.354	2.235
[Q4=2]	1.198	.688	3.030	1	.082	-.151	2.546
[Q4=3]	-.016	.542	.001	1	.977	-1.078	1.046
[Q4=4]	-.028	.545	.003	1	.958	-1.097	1.040
[Q4=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	336.549			
General	265.518[b]	71.031[c]	70	.443

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

2nd H: Pre-accessible information influences the demographics' consumption free admission performances

H^0: Trustworthiness of the information, reasons to choose free admission performances cannot predict sources of information.

H^1: Trustworthiness of the information, reasons to choose free admission performances can predict sources of information.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How did you get to know about it?	A part of the program for School's introduction day	1	0.7%
	By chance	2	1.3%
	by friends	1	0.7%
	Promotions at BIRD's venue	27	18.0%
	Self-searching for musical performances	10	6.7%
	Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)	47	31.3%
	Words of mouth (Family, Friends, Colleagues, etc.)	62	41.3%
Why did you chose that performance?	Companions' suggestion	53	35.3%
	Self-interest	40	26.7%
	The performer	2	1.3%
	Free admission	42	28.0%
	Personal affection for BIRD	12	8.0%
	I was brought to the place	1	0.7%
How much was the information about the performance helpful?	Slightly	6	4.0%
	Moderately	75	50.0%
	Very	55	36.7%
	Extremely	14	9.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	206.571			
Final	47.372	159.199	8	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	94.598	88	.296
Deviance	62.038	88	.984

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.654
Nagelkerke	.702
McFadden	.395

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q11 = A part of the program for School's introduction day]	17.835	2644.894	.000	1	.995	-5166.062	5201.732
	[Q11 = By chance]	34.520	1.008	1171.969	1	.000	32.544	36.497
	[Q11 = by friends]	34.934	.922	1437.001	1	.000	33.127	36.740
	[Q11 = Promotions at BIRD's venue]	37.649	.724	2707.785	1	.000	36.231	39.067
	[Q11 = Self-searching for musical performances]	38.099	.714	2848.430	1	.000	36.700	39.498

	[Q11 = Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)]	40.066	.699	3288.109	1	.000	38.697	41.436
Location	[Q13=1]	41.259	.682	3655.117	1	.000	39.922	42.597
	[Q13=2]	38.667	.623	3856.742	1	.000	37.447	39.888
	[Q13=3]	40.434	1.486	740.675	1	.000	37.522	43.346
	[Q13=4]	38.090	.644	3500.214	1	.000	36.828	39.352
	[Q13=5]	39.578	.000	.	1	.	39.578	39.578
	[Q13=6]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q12=2]	2.424	1.308	3.433	1	.064	-.140	4.988
	[Q12=3]	.439	.620	.502	1	.479	-.775	1.653
	[Q12=4]	-.378	.596	.401	1	.526	-1.547	.791
	[Q12=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	47.372			
General	7.710[b]	39.661[c]	40	.485

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

the crosstab between reasons to choose free admission performances and sources of information

Count

		How did you get to know about it?						
		A part of the program for School's introduction day	By chance	by friends	Promotions at BIRD's venue	Self-searching for musical performances	Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)	Words of mo (Family, Frie Colleagues, e
Why did you chose that performance?	Companions' suggestion	0	0	0	3	1	5	
	Self-interest	0	1	0	8	3	22	
	The performer	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	Free admission	0	1	1	15	3	16	
	Personal affection for BIRD	0	0	0	1	3	3	
	I was brought to the place	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Total		1	2	1				

Commented [MS100]:

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	227.852ᵃ	30	.000
Likelihood Ratio	90.776	30	.000
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 33 cells (78.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

H^0: There is no relationship between trustworthiness of information and sources of information.

H^1: There is a relationship between trustworthiness of information and sources of information.

How much was the information about the performance helpful? * Why did you chose that performance? Crosstabulation

Count

		Why did you chose that performance?						Total
		Companions' suggestion	Self-interest	The performer	Free admission	Personal affection for BIRD	I was brought to the place	
How much was the information about the performance helpful?	Slightly	3	2	0	1	0	0	6
	Moderately	39	13	0	20	2	1	75
	Very	9	17	1	21	7	0	55
	Extremely	2	8	1	0	3	0	14
Total		53	40	2	42	12	1	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.254[a]	15	.000
Likelihood Ratio	45.070	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.361	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 17 cells (70.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

H[0]: Sources of information, trustworthiness of the sources of information, reasons to choose free admission performances cannot predict satisfaction with free admission performances.

H[1]: Sources of information, trustworthiness of the sources of information, reasons to choose free admission performances can predict satisfaction with free admission performances.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfying	3	2.0%
	Neutral	29	19.3%
	Satisfying	78	52.0%
	Very satisfying	40	26.7%
How did you get to know about it?	A part of the program for School's introduction day	1	0.7%
	By chance	2	1.3%
	by friends	1	0.7%
	Promotions at BIRD's venue	27	18.0%
	Self-searching for musical performances	10	6.7%
	Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)	47	31.3%
	Words of mouth (Family, Friends, Colleagues, etc.)	62	41.3%
Why did you chose that performance?	Companions' suggestion	53	35.3%
	Self-interest	40	26.7%
	The performer	2	1.3%
	Free admission	42	28.0%
	Personal affection for BIRD	12	8.0%
	I was brought to the place	1	0.7%
How much was the information about the performance helpful?	Slightly	6	4.0%
	Moderately	75	50.0%
	Very	55	36.7%
	Extremely	14	9.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	188.893			
Final	137.940	50.954	13	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	144.481	116	.038
Deviance	91.583	116	.954

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.288
Nagelkerke	.325
McFadden	.156

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14 = 2]	-5.355	.994	29.016	1	.000	-7.303	-3.406
	[Q14 = 3]	-2.600	.824	9.957	1	.002	-4.214	-.985
	[Q14 = 4]	.487	.779	.391	1	.532	-1.040	2.015
Location	[Q11=A part of the program for School's introduction day]	1.374	2.170	.401	1	.527	-2.880	5.628
	[Q11=By chance]	2.653	1.543	2.956	1	.086	-.371	5.677
	[Q11=by friends]	.297	2.107	.020	1	.888	-3.833	4.427
	[Q11=Promotions at BIRD's venue]	.718	.594	1.461	1	.227	-.446	1.882
	[Q11=Self-searching for musical performances]	2.020	.776	6.782	1	.009	.500	3.540

[Q11=Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)]	.451	.494	.834	1	.361	-.517	1.419
[Q11=Words of mouth (Family, Friends, Colleagues, etc.)]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q13=1]	.121	.720	.028	1	.866	-1.290	1.532
[Q13=2]	-.236	.702	.113	1	.737	-1.612	1.140
[Q13=3]	-.958	1.553	.380	1	.537	-4.000	2.085
[Q13=4]	1.077	.737	2.135	1	.144	-.368	2.522
[Q13=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q13=6]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q12=2]	-2.644	1.036	6.511	1	.011	-4.675	-.613
[Q12=3]	-2.430	.698	12.129	1	.000	-3.798	-1.063
[Q12=4]	-.648	.625	1.075	1	.300	-1.874	.577
[Q12=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	137.940			
General	113.322[b]	24.618[c]	26	.541

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

3rd H: *Free admission positively influences consumer evaluation of a musical performance that a consumer experience at BIRD*

H^0: There is no relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and levels of satisfaction with the free admission performance.

H^1: There is a relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and levels of satisfaction with the free admission performance.

| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
How much was the performance satisfying? * FreeAdk	150	77.7%	43	22.3%	193	100.0%

How much was the performance satisfying?   * FreeAdk Crosstabulation

Count

| | | FreeAdk | | |
		.00	1.00	Total
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfying	2	1	3
	Neutral	25	4	29
	Satisfying	61	17	78
	Very satisfying	20	20	40
Total		108	42	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.039^a	3	.003
Likelihood Ratio	13.555	3	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.677	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .84.

H^0: There is no relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and the reason to like the free admission performance.

H^1: There is a relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and the reason to like the free admission performance.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
What was the main reason? * FreeAdk	193	100.0%	0	0.0%	193	100.0%

What was the main reason? * FreeAdk Crosstabulation

Count

		FreeAdk		Total
		.00	1.00	
What was the main reason?		43	0	43
	Atmosphere of performance	29	11	40
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	7	1	8
	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	7	0	7
	Quality of performer	65	30	95
Total		151	42	193

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.462[a]	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.639	4	.000
N of Valid Cases	193		

97

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.52.

H^0: There is no relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and WTP for the free admission performance.

H^1: There is a relationship between demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and WTP for the free admission performance

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid? * FreeAdk	150	77.7%	43	22.3%	193	100.0%

If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid? * FreeAdk Crosstabulation

Count

		FreeAdk		Total
		.00	1.00	
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	8	5	13
	10-50 Euros	54	33	87
	50-100 Euros	37	3	40
	100-150 Euros	9	1	10
Total		108	42	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.907a	3	.002

Likelihood Ratio	17.262	3	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.902	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 2 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.80.

H⁰: There is no relationship between frequency of attending musical performances and the reason to choose the free admission performance.

H¹: There is a relationship between frequency of attending musical performances and the reason to choose the free admission performance.

How often do you attend musical performances? * Why did you chose that performance? Crosstabulation

Count

		Why did you chose that performance?						
		Companions' suggestion	Free admission	I was brought to the place	Personal affection for BIRD	Self-interest	The performer	Total
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
	1-3 times a year	16	8	0	0	5	0	29
	5-7 times a year	22	28	0	2	10	0	62
	8-10 times a year	10	4	0	7	14	2	37
	More than 10 times a year	4	2	1	3	10	0	20
Total		53	42	1	12	40	2	150

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
How often do you attend musical performances? * Why did you chose that performance?	150	77.7%	43	22.3%	193	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	52.072[a]	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	51.056	20	.000
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 18 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count
is .01.

H^0: There is no relationship between the reason to choose the free admission performance and satisfaction with the performance.

H^1: There is a relationship between the reason to choose the free admission performance and satisfaction with the performance.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Why did you chose that performance? * How much was the performance satisfying?	150	77.7%	43	22.3%	193	100.0%

Why did you chose that performance? * How much was the performance satisfying?　Crosstabulation

Count

		How much was the performance satisfying?				Total
		Somewhat dissatisfying	Neutral	Satisfying	Very satisfying	
Why did you chose that performance?	Companions' suggestion	2	16	29	6	53
	Free admission	1	4	17	20	42
	I was brought to the place	0	0	1	0	1
	Personal affection for BIRD	0	1	7	4	12
	Self-interest	0	8	22	10	40
	The performer	0	0	2	0	2
Total		3	29	78	40	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.900[a]	15	.067
Likelihood Ratio	26.186	15	.036
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 14 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

H^0: There is no relationship between the demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and frequency of attending musical performances.

H^1: There is a relationship between the demographics who chose the performance due to free admission and frequency of attending musical performances.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
How often do you attend musical performances? * FreeAdk	150	77.7%	43	22.3%	193	100.0%

How often do you attend musical performances? * FreeAdk Crosstabulation

Count

		FreeAdk		Total
		.00	1.00	
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	0	2
	1-3 times a year	21	8	29
	5-7 times a year	34	28	62
	8-10 times a year	33	4	37
	More than 10 times a year	18	2	20
Total		108	42	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.475[a]	4	.001
Likelihood Ratio	20.004	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.301	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count

is .56.

differences in the demographics' WTP depending on the demographics' reasons to attend the free admission performance

H^0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5$

H^1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5$

ANOVA

If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.885	4	3.221	7.146	.000
Within Groups	64.913	144	.451		
Total	77.799	148			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?

Scheffe

(I) Why did you chose that performance?	(J) Why did you chose that performance?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Companions' suggestion	Self-interest	-.505*	.141	.014	-.94	-.07
	The performer	-.830	.484	.568	-2.34	.68
	Free admission	.170	.139	.826	-.26	.60
	Personal affection for BIRD	-.497	.215	.258	-1.17	.17
Self-interest	Companions' suggestion	.505*	.141	.014	.07	.94
	The performer	-.325	.486	.978	-1.84	1.19
	Free admission	.675*	.148	.001	.21	1.14
	Personal affection for BIRD	.008	.221	1.000	-.68	.70
The performer	Companions' suggestion	.830	.484	.568	-.68	2.34
	Self-interest	.325	.486	.978	-1.19	1.84
	Free admission	1.000	.486	.379	-.52	2.52
	Personal affection for BIRD	.333	.513	.980	-1.27	1.93
Free admission	Companions' suggestion	-.170	.139	.826	-.60	.26

	Self-interest	-.675[*]	.148	.001	-1.14	-.21
	The performer	-1.000	.486	.379	-2.52	.52
	Personal affection for BIRD	-.667	.220	.062	-1.35	.02
Personal affection for BIRD	Companions' suggestion	.497	.215	.258	-.17	1.17
	Self-interest	-.008	.221	1.000	-.70	.68
	The performer	-.333	.513	.980	-1.93	1.27
	Free admission	.667	.220	.062	-.02	1.35

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

a relation between levels of satisfaction with free performances and WTP for free performances

H^0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5$

H^1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5$

ANOVA

If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.322	3	1.441	2.844	.040
Within Groups	73.951	146	.507		
Total	78.273	149			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?

Scheffe

(I) How much was the performance satisfying?	(J) How much was the performance satisfying?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Somewhat dissatisfying	Neutral	-.805	.432	.328	-2.03	.42
	Satisfying	-1.051	.419	.103	-2.24	.13
	Very satisfying	-1.042	.426	.118	-2.25	.16
Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfying	.805	.432	.328	-.42	2.03
	Satisfying	-.247	.155	.471	-.68	.19
	Very satisfying	-.237	.174	.602	-.73	.25
Satisfying	Somewhat dissatisfying	1.051	.419	.103	-.13	2.24

	Neutral	.247	.155	.471	-.19	.68
	Very satisfying	.010	.138	1.000	-.38	.40
Very satisfying	Somewhat dissatisfying	1.042	.426	.118	-.16	2.25
	Neutral	.237	.174	.602	-.25	.73
	Satisfying	-.010	.138	1.000	-.40	.38

4th H: The positive evaluation of the musical performance leads a consumer's future consumption

H^0: There is no relationship between the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of other venues' performances that the demographics attended since free admission.

H^1: There is a relationship between the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of other venues' performances that the demographics attended since free admission.

Crosstab

Count

		How many other venues' performances have you attended since the free admission at BIRD?					Total
		None	1 - 4	4 - 7	7 - 10	More than 10	
When did you attend BIRD's free admission performance?	11 months - a year ago	1	13	4	0	2	2
	2 months - 4 months ago	3	10	0	2	0	1
	5 months - 7 months ago	5	16	5	2	2	3
	8 months - 10 months ago	3	17	7	3	1	3
	More than a year ago	3	23	10	9	9	5
Total		15	79	26	16	14	15

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.359[a]	16	.204
Likelihood Ratio	25.835	16	.056
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 14 cells (56.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.40.

H^0: There is no relationship between the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of BIRD's performances the demographics attended since free admission.

H^1: There is a relationship between the timeline that the demographics attended free admission at BIRD and the amount of BIRD's performances the demographics attended since free admission.

Crosstab

Count

| | | How many BIRD's performances have you attended since the free admission? | | | | | |
		None	1 - 4 times	4 - 7 times	7-10 times	More than 10 times	Total
When did you attend BIRD's free admission performance?	11 months - a year ago	4	11	4	1	0	20
	2 months - 4 months ago	5	9	1	0	0	15
	5 months - 7 months ago	13	13	3	1	0	30
	8 months - 10 months ago	8	17	5	1	0	31
	More than a year ago	7	22	13	4	8	54
Total		37	72	26	7	8	150

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.059[a]	16	.024
Likelihood Ratio	31.889	16	.010
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 14 cells (56.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .70.

Attendance to BIRD's performances after free admission

H^0: *Interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission cannot predict actual amount of attending BIRD's performance after free admission.*

H^1: *Interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission can predict actual amount of attending BIRD's performance after free admission.*

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How many BIRD's performances have you attended since the free admission?	None	37	24.7%
	1 - 4 times	72	48.0%
	4 - 7 times	26	17.3%
	7-10 times	7	4.7%
	More than 10 times	8	5.3%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfying	3	2.0%
	Neutral	29	19.3%
	Satisfying	78	52.0%
	Very satisfying	40	26.7%
After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances?	Not at all	1	0.7%
	Hardly	20	13.3%
	Fairly	49	32.7%
	A lot	48	32.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	13	8.7%
	10-50 Euros	87	58.0%
	50-100 Euros	40	26.7%
	100-150 Euros	10	6.7%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.3%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.3%
	5-7 times a year	62	41.3%

	8-10 times a year	37	24.7%
	More than 10 times a year	20	13.3%
What was the main reason?	Atmosphere of performance	40	26.7%
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	8	5.3%
	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	7	4.7%
	Quality of performer	95	63.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	347.652			
Final	216.914	130.738	20	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	300.414	384	.999
Deviance	190.191	384	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.582
Nagelkerke	.628
McFadden	.335

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q19 = 1]	-4.582	.970	22.325	1	.000	-6.482	-2.681
	[Q19 = 2]	-.537	.866	.385	1	.535	-2.235	1.161
	[Q19 = 3]	1.328	.875	2.304	1	.129	-.387	3.043
	[Q19 = 4]	2.209	.908	5.919	1	.015	.429	3.988
Location	[Q14=2]	-16.584	6857.072	.000	1	.998	-13456.200	13423.031
	[Q14=3]	.068	1.010	.005	1	.946	-1.911	2.048
	[Q14=4]	-.336	.479	.494	1	.482	-1.275	.602
	[Q14=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q17=1]	-4.124	.000	.	1	.	-4.124	-4.124
	[Q17=2]	-5.399	1.225	19.425	1	.000	-7.800	-2.998
	[Q17=3]	-1.935	.651	8.827	1	.003	-3.211	-.658
	[Q17=4]	-1.150	.497	5.353	1	.021	-2.124	-.176
	[Q17=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q16=1]	.099	.993	.010	1	.921	-1.848	2.046
	[Q16=2]	1.395	.781	3.188	1	.074	-.136	2.926
	[Q16=3]	1.952	.789	6.116	1	.013	.405	3.499
	[Q16=4]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-17.329	4514.546	.000	1	.997	-8865.677	8831.019
	[Q1=3]	-.180	.702	.066	1	.798	-1.557	1.197
	[Q1=4]	.238	.508	.220	1	.639	-.758	1.234
	[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q4=1]	-1.993	2.040	.954	1	.329	-5.992	2.006
	[Q4=2]	-2.529	.857	8.711	1	.003	-4.208	-.850
	[Q4=3]	-1.227	.671	3.343	1	.067	-2.542	.088
	[Q4=4]	-1.360	.645	4.448	1	.035	-2.624	-.096
	[Q4=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q15=Atmosphere of performance]	-1.337	.517	6.686	1	.010	-2.350	-.323
	[Q15=BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)]	-1.487	1.391	1.142	1	.285	-4.213	1.240
	[Q15=Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)]	-2.986	1.600	3.483	1	.062	-6.122	.150
	[Q15=Quality of performer]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines^a

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	216.914			
General	163.260[b]	53.654[c]	60	.705

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

Attendance to other music venues' performances after free admission

H^0: *Interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in other venues' performances after free admission cannot predict actual amount of attending other venues' performances after free admission.*

H^1: *Interest in musical performances, frequency of attending musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in other venues' performances after free admission can predict actual amount of attending other venues' performance after free admission.*

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How many other venues' performances have you attended since the free admission at BIRD?	None	15	10.2%
	1 - 4	79	53.7%
	4 - 7	23	15.6%
	7 - 10	16	10.9%
	More than 10	14	9.5%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Neutral	29	19.7%
	Satisfying	78	53.1%
	Very satisfying	40	27.2%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	11	7.5%
	10-50 Euros	86	58.5%
	50-100 Euros	40	27.2%
	100-150 Euros	10	6.8%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.1%
	Fairly	29	19.7%
	Quite	81	55.1%
	Very much	31	21.1%
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.4%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.7%
	5-7 times a year	60	40.8%
	8-10 times a year	37	25.2%
	More than 10 times a year	19	12.9%
What was the main reason?	Atmosphere of performance	38	25.9%
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	7	4.8%

113

	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	7	4.8%
	Quality of performer	95	64.6%
After free admission at BIRD, have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating?	Never	1	0.7%
	Rarely	4	2.7%
	Moderately	42	28.6%
	Quite	79	53.7%
	Very much	21	14.3%
Valid		147	100.0%
Missing		46	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	329.521			
Final	232.816	96.705	19	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	281.065	381	1.000
Deviance	197.881	381	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.482
Nagelkerke	.519
McFadden	.249

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval

114

							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q22 = 1]	-5.147	.968	28.266	1	.000	-7.045	-3.250
	[Q22 = 2]	-.730	.822	.788	1	.375	-2.341	.882
	[Q22 = 3]	.437	.818	.286	1	.593	-1.165	2.040
	[Q22 = 4]	1.720	.832	4.276	1	.039	.090	3.350
Location	[Q14=3]	.849	.706	1.447	1	.229	-.534	2.233
	[Q14=4]	.133	.429	.096	1	.756	-.708	.975
	[Q14=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q16=1]	2.633	1.000	6.942	1	.008	.674	4.593
	[Q16=2]	1.757	.798	4.854	1	.028	.194	3.321
	[Q16=3]	2.493	.813	9.411	1	.002	.900	4.085
	[Q16=4]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-.718	1.308	.302	1	.583	-3.282	1.845
	[Q1=3]	.316	.716	.195	1	.659	-1.087	1.719
	[Q1=4]	.861	.530	2.636	1	.104	-.178	1.901
	[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q4=1]	-4.847	2.823	2.948	1	.086	-10.379	.686
	[Q4=2]	-4.650	.976	22.714	1	.000	-6.562	-2.738
	[Q4=3]	-2.299	.659	12.180	1	.000	-3.590	-1.008
	[Q4=4]	-1.844	.617	8.929	1	.003	-3.054	-.635
	[Q4=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q15=Atmosphere of performance]	-.071	.440	.026	1	.872	-.933	.791
	[Q15=BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)]	-.491	1.012	.236	1	.627	-2.474	1.492
	[Q15=Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)]	-.257	1.095	.055	1	.815	-2.403	1.889
	[Q15=Quality of performer]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q20=1]	-20.886	.000	.	1	.	-20.886	-20.886
	[Q20=2]	-22.672	4870.600	.000	1	.996	-9568.873	9523.529
	[Q20=3]	-2.038	.703	8.400	1	.004	-3.416	-.660
	[Q20=4]	-2.039	.581	12.297	1	.000	-3.178	-.899
	[Q20=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	232.816			
General	200.884[b]	31.932[c]	57	.997

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

H^0: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD cannot predict timelines that the demographics attended the next concert after the free admission.

H^1: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD can predict timelines that the demographics attended the next concert after the free admission.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
When did you go to the next concert after the free admission at BIRD?	None	9	6.2%
	After a year	1	0.7%
	After 9 months -11 months	3	2.1%
	4) After 6 months -8 months	2	1.4%
	3) After 4 months -6 months	10	6.8%
	2) After a month-3 months	78	53.4%
	1) Within one month	43	29.5%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Neutral	29	19.9%
	Satisfying	77	52.7%
	Very satisfying	40	27.4%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	11	7.5%
	10-50 Euros	85	58.2%
	50-100 Euros	40	27.4%
	100-150 Euros	10	6.8%
What was the main reason?	Atmosphere of performance	37	25.3%
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	7	4.8%
	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	7	4.8%
	Quality of performer	95	65.1%
Valid		146	100.0%
Missing		47	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	159.153			
Final	140.109	19.044	8	.015

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	111.909	130	.872
Deviance	73.381	130	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.122
Nagelkerke	.134
McFadden	.053

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q23 = 1]	-4.881	.830	34.557	1	.000	-6.508	-3.254
	[Q23 = 2]	-4.762	.823	33.468	1	.000	-6.375	-3.149
	[Q23 = 3]	-4.459	.808	30.488	1	.000	-6.042	-2.876
	[Q23 = 4]	-4.288	.800	28.706	1	.000	-5.857	-2.719
	[Q23 = 5]	-3.641	.780	21.802	1	.000	-5.169	-2.112
	[Q23 = 6]	-.955	.733	1.698	1	.192	-2.391	.481
Location	[Q14=3]	-.769	.600	1.643	1	.200	-1.946	.407
	[Q14=4]	-.118	.394	.090	1	.764	-.891	.654
	[Q14=5]	0a	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q16=1]	-2.085	.929	5.034	1	.025	-3.906	-.264
	[Q16=2]	-1.769	.738	5.746	1	.017	-3.215	-.322
	[Q16=3]	-1.607	.766	4.408	1	.036	-3.108	-.107
	[Q16=4]	0a	.	.	0	.	.	.

	B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
[Q15=Atmosphere of performance]	.041	.403	.010	1	.919	-.749	.831
[Q15=BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)]	-.716	.892	.645	1	.422	-2.465	1.032
[Q15=Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)]	-1.381	.844	2.680	1	.102	-3.034	.272
[Q15=Quality of performer]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	140.109			
General	116.633[b]	23.476[c]	40	.983

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

H^0: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in musical performances, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission, interest in other musical venues' performances after free admission, timelines that the demographics visited the next concert after free admission cannot predict satisfaction with the next concert after the free admission.

H^1: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in musical performances, interest in BIRD's performances after free admission, interest in other musical venues' performances after free admission, timelines that the demographics visited the next concert after free admission can predict satisfaction with the next concert after the free admission.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfied	1	0.7%
	Neutral	25	17.9%
	Very satisfied	72	51.4%
	Considerably satisfied	42	30.0%
When did you go to the next concert after the free admission at BIRD?	After a year	1	0.7%
	After 9 months -11 months	3	2.1%
	4) After 6 months -8 months	2	1.4%
	3) After 4 months -6 months	10	7.1%
	2) After a month-3 months	80	57.1%
	1) Within one month	44	31.4%
After free admission at BIRD, have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating?	Moderately	42	30.0%
	Quite	76	54.3%
	Very much	22	15.7%
After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances?	Not at all	1	0.7%
	Hardly	17	12.1%
	Fairly	46	32.9%
	A lot	46	32.9%
	Very much	30	21.4%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	2	1.4%
	Fairly	30	21.4%
	Quite	79	56.4%
	Very much	29	20.7%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would	Less than 10 Euros	12	8.6%
	10-50 Euros	80	57.1%

120

you have paid?	50-100 Euros	38	27.1%
	100-150 Euros	10	7.1%
What was the main reason?	Atmosphere of performance	36	25.7%
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	7	5.0%
	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	5	3.6%
	Quality of performer	92	65.7%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfying	3	2.1%
	Neutral	24	17.1%
	Satisfying	74	52.9%
	Very satisfying	39	27.9%
Valid		140	100.0%
Missing		53	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	266.368			
Final	181.958	84.410	23	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	1026.161	295	.000
Deviance	165.638	295	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.453
Nagelkerke	.517
McFadden	.288

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q24 = 2]	-8.878	1.608	30.488	1	.000	-12.029	-5.726
	[Q24 = 3]	-3.826	.965	15.707	1	.000	-5.718	-1.934
	[Q24 = 4]	.097	.845	.013	1	.909	-1.560	1.754
Location	[Q23=2]	-5.334	2.999	3.164	1	.075	-11.212	.543
	[Q23=3]	-2.944	1.404	4.398	1	.036	-5.696	-.193
	[Q23=4]	2.063	1.807	1.303	1	.254	-1.479	5.606
	[Q23=5]	-.079	.836	.009	1	.925	-1.717	1.560
	[Q23=6]	.001	.438	.000	1	.998	-.858	.860
	[Q23=7]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q20=3]	-1.124	.747	2.267	1	.132	-2.588	.339
	[Q20=4]	-.691	.602	1.318	1	.251	-1.870	.488
	[Q20=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q17=1]	1.193	3.552	.113	1	.737	-5.769	8.156
	[Q17=2]	1.613	1.148	1.973	1	.160	-.638	3.863
	[Q17=3]	.386	.717	.291	1	.590	-1.019	1.791
	[Q17=4]	.412	.566	.529	1	.467	-.698	1.521
	[Q17=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-4.692	2.244	4.370	1	.037	-9.090	-.293
	[Q1=3]	-1.495	.655	5.210	1	.022	-2.778	-.211
	[Q1=4]	-.176	.508	.120	1	.729	-1.172	.819
	[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q16=1]	-1.992	1.067	3.487	1	.062	-4.082	.099
	[Q16=2]	1.168	.800	2.129	1	.144	-.401	2.736
	[Q16=3]	.491	.824	.355	1	.551	-1.124	2.106
	[Q16=4]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q15=Atmosphere of performance]	-.827	.502	2.715	1	.099	-1.810	.157
	[Q15=BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)]	-2.479	1.278	3.764	1	.052	-4.983	.025

[Q15=Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)]	-1.600	1.373	1.358	1	.244	-4.291	1.091
[Q15=Quality of performer]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q14=2]	-2.109	1.930	1.194	1	.275	-5.892	1.674
[Q14=3]	-2.904	1.059	7.521	1	.006	-4.979	-.828
[Q14=4]	-.594	.523	1.292	1	.256	-1.619	.430
[Q14=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	181.958			
General	147.228ᵇ	34.730ᶜ	46	.888

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfied	1	0.7%
	Neutral	25	17.7%
	Very satisfied	73	51.8%
	Considerably satisfied	42	29.8%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfying	3	2.1%
	Neutral	24	17.0%
	Satisfying	75	53.2%
	Very satisfying	39	27.7%
What was the main reason?	Atmosphere of performance	37	26.2%
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	7	5.0%
	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	5	3.5%
	Quality of performer	92	65.2%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	12	8.5%
	10-50 Euros	81	57.4%
	50-100 Euros	38	27.0%
	100-150 Euros	10	7.1%
After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances?	Not at all	1	0.7%
	Hardly	17	12.1%
	Fairly	47	33.3%
	A lot	46	32.6%
	Very much	30	21.3%
After free admission at BIRD, have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating?	Moderately	42	29.8%
	Quite	77	54.6%
	Very much	22	15.6%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	2	1.4%
	Fairly	30	21.3%
	Quite	79	56.0%
	Very much	30	21.3%
Valid		141	100.0%
Missing		52	

Total	193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	248.127			
Final	173.377	74.750	18	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	349.487	252	.000
Deviance	146.414	252	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.411
Nagelkerke	.470
McFadden	.254

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q24 = 2]	-8.312	1.477	31.687	1	.000	-11.205	-5.418
	[Q24 = 3]	-3.728	.914	16.641	1	.000	-5.520	-1.937
	[Q24 = 4]	-.034	.803	.002	1	.967	-1.607	1.540
Location	[Q14=2]	-2.085	1.873	1.239	1	.266	-5.757	1.586
	[Q14=3]	-2.523	1.014	6.186	1	.013	-4.511	-.535
	[Q14=4]	-.601	.517	1.351	1	.245	-1.615	.413
	[Q14=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q15=Atmosphere of performance]	-.861	.480	3.225	1	.073	-1.801	.079

[Q15=BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)]	-1.804	1.138	2.512	1	.113	-4.035	.427
[Q15=Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)]	-1.885	1.328	2.016	1	.156	-4.487	.717
[Q15=Quality of performer]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q16=1]	-1.740	1.005	2.999	1	.083	-3.709	.229
[Q16=2]	.962	.766	1.577	1	.209	-.539	2.464
[Q16=3]	.104	.787	.017	1	.895	-1.438	1.646
[Q16=4]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q17=1]	1.143	3.324	.118	1	.731	-5.373	7.659
[Q17=2]	1.279	1.085	1.389	1	.239	-.848	3.406
[Q17=3]	.248	.700	.125	1	.723	-1.125	1.621
[Q17=4]	.330	.542	.372	1	.542	-.732	1.392
[Q17=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q20=3]	-1.130	.714	2.501	1	.114	-2.530	.270
[Q20=4]	-.432	.574	.568	1	.451	-1.557	.692
[Q20=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q1=2]	-4.178	2.054	4.138	1	.042	-8.204	-.153
[Q1=3]	-1.347	.609	4.897	1	.027	-2.540	-.154
[Q1=4]	-.284	.479	.352	1	.553	-1.223	.654
[Q1=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	173.377			
General	147.619[b]	25.758[c]	36	.897

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration
of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

H^0: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in BIRD's and other musical venues' performances after free admission, timelines that the demographics visited the next concert after free admission and satisfaction with the next concert after free admission cannot predict willingness to attend musical performances later on.

H^1: WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, interest in BIRD's and other musical venues' performances after free admission, timelines that the demographics visited the next concert after free admission and satisfaction with the next concert after free admission cannot predict willingness to attend musical performances later on.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
Are you willing to attend any musical performances in the future?	Neutral	3	2.2%
	Likely	30	21.9%
	Definitely	104	75.9%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Neutral	24	17.5%
	Satisfying	74	54.0%
	Very satisfying	39	28.5%
What was the main reason?	Atmosphere of performance	34	24.8%
	BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)	6	4.4%
	Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)	5	3.6%
	Quality of performer	92	67.2%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	10	7.3%
	10-50 Euros	79	57.7%
	50-100 Euros	38	27.7%
	100-150 Euros	10	7.3%
After free admission at BIRD,	Moderately	40	29.2%

128

have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating?	Quite	76	55.5%
	Very much	21	15.3%
After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances?	Hardly	15	10.9%
	Fairly	46	33.6%
	A lot	46	33.6%
	Very much	30	21.9%
When did you go to the next concert after the free admission at BIRD?	After a year	1	0.7%
	After 9 months -11 months	3	2.2%
	4) After 6 months -8 months	2	1.5%
	3) After 4 months -6 months	10	7.3%
	2) After a month-3 months	78	56.9%
	1) Within one month	43	31.4%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfied	1	0.7%
	Neutral	23	16.8%
	Very satisfied	71	51.8%
	Considerably satisfied	42	30.7%
Valid		137	100.0%
Missing		56	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	164.211			
Final	83.065	81.146	21	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	116.072	187	1.000
Deviance	77.048	187	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell		.447
Nagelkerke		.626
McFadden		.473

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q26 = 3]	-28.339	2.423	136.808	1	.000	-33.088	-23.590
	[Q26 = 4]	-23.923	2.060	134.832	1	.000	-27.961	-19.885
Location	[Q14=3]	-1.977	1.566	1.594	1	.207	-5.045	1.092
	[Q14=4]	-.968	1.052	.847	1	.357	-3.030	1.094
	[Q14=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q15=Atmosphere of performance]	.655	.738	.788	1	.375	-.792	2.102
	[Q15=BIRD's infrastructures (sound equipment's, performance venues, etc.)]	-.979	1.415	.479	1	.489	-3.753	1.794
	[Q15=Other factors (traffic conditions, personal changes of moods, troubles with companions, etc.)]	2.358	1.826	1.668	1	.197	-1.221	5.937
	[Q15=Quality of performer]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q16=1]	-15.416	1.470	109.942	1	.000	-18.297	-12.534
	[Q16=2]	-18.987	.925	421.503	1	.000	-20.800	-17.175
	[Q16=3]	-16.635	.000	.	1	.	-16.635	-16.635
	[Q16=4]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q20=3]	1.888	1.106	2.914	1	.088	-.280	4.055
	[Q20=4]	2.671	.996	7.185	1	.007	.718	4.624
	[Q20=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q17=2]	-1.325	1.969	.453	1	.501	-5.184	2.535
	[Q17=3]	-2.558	1.570	2.656	1	.103	-5.634	.518
	[Q17=4]	-2.376	1.391	2.919	1	.088	-5.101	.350
	[Q17=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q23=2]	-4.287	2.974	2.078	1	.149	-10.116	1.542
	[Q23=3]	-4.411	1.844	5.722	1	.017	-8.026	-.797
	[Q23=4]	.055	3.084	.000	1	.986	-5.990	6.101

[Q23=5]	-4.157	1.349	9.502	1	.002	-6.800	-1.514
[Q23=6]	-2.561	1.067	5.761	1	.016	-4.651	-.470
[Q23=7]	0^a	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q24=2]	-9.295	3.221	8.330	1	.004	-15.608	-2.983
[Q24=3]	-3.570	1.289	7.675	1	.006	-6.096	-1.044
[Q24=4]	-1.171	.875	1.791	1	.181	-2.886	.544
[Q24=5]	0^a	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines^a

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	83.065			
General	62.122	20.943	21	.462

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

H^0: WTP for musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, satisfaction with the next concert after free admission, willingness to attend musical performances after on cannot predict WTP for future consumption of musical performances.

H^1: WTP for musical performances, WTP and satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, reasons behind satisfaction with free performances at BIRD, satisfaction with the next concert after free admission, willingness to attend musical performances after on can predict WTP for future consumption of musical performances.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much would you pay for any other musical performances after on?	Less than 10 Euros	1	0.7%
	10-50 Euros	14	10.3%
	50-100 Euros	11	8.1%
	100-150 Euros	31	22.8%
	150-200 Euros	25	18.4%
	More than 200 Euros	54	39.7%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Neutral	24	17.6%
	Satisfying	73	53.7%
	Very satisfying	39	28.7%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	10	7.4%
	10-50 Euros	80	58.8%
	50-100 Euros	36	26.5%
	100-150 Euros	10	7.4%
Are you willing to attend any musical performances in the future?	Neutral	3	2.2%
	Likely	29	21.3%
	Definitely	104	76.5%
What is a reasonable price according to you?	10-50 euros	31	22.8%
	50-100 euros	44	32.4%
	100-150 euros	16	11.8%
	150-200 euros	6	4.4%
	prices do not matter	39	28.7%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfied	1	0.7%
	Neutral	21	15.4%

	Very satisfied	72	52.9%
	Considerably satisfied	42	30.9%
Valid		136	100.0%
Missing		57	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	340.348			
Final	190.607	149.741	14	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	212.603	306	1.000
Deviance	152.311	306	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.667
Nagelkerke	.703
McFadden	.370

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q28 = 1]	-14.994	1.961	58.460	1	.000	-18.837	-11.150
	[Q28 = 2]	-10.492	1.463	51.419	1	.000	-13.360	-7.624
	[Q28 = 3]	-9.100	1.406	41.872	1	.000	-11.856	-6.344
	[Q28 = 4]	-6.955	1.329	27.388	1	.000	-9.560	-4.350
	[Q28 = 5]	-5.330	1.247	18.267	1	.000	-7.774	-2.886
Location	[Q14=3]	-1.109	.746	2.206	1	.137	-2.571	.354

[Q14=4]	-.225	.484	.216	1	.642	-1.174	.724
[Q14=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q16=1]	-5.162	1.319	15.318	1	.000	-7.746	-2.577
[Q16=2]	-.979	1.036	.893	1	.345	-3.010	1.051
[Q16=3]	-2.122	1.005	4.458	1	.035	-4.091	-.152
[Q16=4]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q26=3]	-4.541	1.635	7.713	1	.005	-7.746	-1.336
[Q26=4]	-.669	.512	1.708	1	.191	-1.673	.334
[Q26=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q9=2]	-6.070	.939	41.807	1	.000	-7.910	-4.230
[Q9=3]	-4.433	.848	27.305	1	.000	-6.096	-2.770
[Q9=4]	-3.958	.922	18.435	1	.000	-5.765	-2.151
[Q9=5]	-2.122	1.081	3.855	1	.050	-4.241	-.004
[Q9=6]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q24=2]	.832	2.015	.170	1	.680	-3.118	4.782
[Q24=3]	-.771	.842	.838	1	.360	-2.420	.879
[Q24=4]	-1.138	.509	5.002	1	.025	-2.134	-.141
[Q24=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Linesᵃ

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	190.607			
General	164.255ᵇ	26.351ᶜ	56	1.000

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
Why did you chose that performance?	Companions' suggestion	53	35.3%
	Self-interest	40	26.7%
	The performer	2	1.3%
	Free admission	42	28.0%
	Personal affection for BIRD	12	8.0%
	I was brought to the place	1	0.7%
How much was the information about the performance helpful?	Slightly	6	4.0%
	Moderately	75	50.0%
	Very	55	36.7%
	Extremely	14	9.3%
How did you get to know about it?	A part of the program for School's introduction day	1	0.7%
	By chance	2	1.3%
	by friends	1	0.7%
	Promotions at BIRD's venue	27	18.0%
	Self-searching for musical performances	10	6.7%
	Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)	47	31.3%
	Words of mouth (Family, Friends, Colleagues, etc.)	62	41.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	209.371			

	Final	144.999	64.373	9	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	144.285	66	.000
Deviance	84.911	66	.058

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.349
Nagelkerke	.373
McFadden	.157

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q13 = 1]	.378	.571	.439	1	.508	-.741	1.497
	[Q13 = 2]	1.885	.595	10.053	1	.002	.720	3.051
	[Q13 = 3]	1.953	.596	10.747	1	.001	.785	3.121
	[Q13 = 4]	4.031	.664	36.909	1	.000	2.731	5.332
	[Q13 = 5]	23.644	4434.062	.000	1	.996	-8666.957	8714.245
Location	[Q12=2]	.109	.952	.013	1	.909	-1.758	1.975
	[Q12=3]	-.571	.569	1.007	1	.316	-1.685	.544
	[Q12=4]	.348	.560	.385	1	.535	-.751	1.447
	[Q12=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q11=A part of the program for School's introduction day]	42.838	.000	.	1	.	42.838	42.838
	[Q11=By chance]	2.582	1.334	3.748	1	.053	-.032	5.197
	[Q11=by friends]	3.563	1.900	3.517	1	.061	-.161	7.287
	[Q11=Promotions at BIRD's venue]	1.992	.499	15.911	1	.000	1.013	2.971

[Q11=Self-searching for musical performances]	3.045	.680	20.041	1	.000	1.712	4.378
[Q11=Social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)]	1.802	.412	19.160	1	.000	.995	2.609
[Q11=Words of mouth (Family, Friends, Colleagues, etc.)]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Linesᵃ

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	144.999			
General	.000ᵇ	144.999	36	.000

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value is practically zero. There may be a complete separation in the data. The maximum likelihood estimates do not exist.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances?	Not at all	1	0.7%
	Hardly	20	13.3%
	Fairly	49	32.7%
	A lot	48	32.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfying	3	2.0%
	Neutral	29	19.3%
	Satisfying	78	52.0%
	Very satisfying	40	26.7%
How often do you attend musical performances?	Never	2	1.3%
	1-3 times a year	29	19.3%
	5-7 times a year	62	41.3%
	8-10 times a year	37	24.7%
	More than 10 times a year	20	13.3%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	6	4.0%
	Fairly	31	20.7%
	Quite	81	54.0%
	Very much	32	21.3%
After free admission at BIRD, have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating?	Never	1	0.7%
	Rarely	4	2.7%
	Moderately	44	29.3%
	Quite	79	52.7%
	Very much	22	14.7%
How many BIRD's performances have you attended since the free admission?	None	37	24.7%
	1 - 4 times	72	48.0%
	4 - 7 times	26	17.3%
	7-10 times	7	4.7%
	More than 10 times	8	5.3%
Valid		150	100.0%
Missing		43	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

140

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	353.617			
Final	158.248	195.369	18	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	150.154	310	1.000
Deviance	127.237	310	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.728
Nagelkerke	.779
McFadden	.478

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q17 = 1]	-28.641	1325.441	.000	1	.983	-2626.458	2569.176
	[Q17 = 2]	-9.391	1.414	44.080	1	.000	-12.163	-6.618
	[Q17 = 3]	-4.632	1.112	17.359	1	.000	-6.810	-2.453
	[Q17 = 4]	-1.354	1.011	1.791	1	.181	-3.336	.629
Location	[Q14=2]	-21.844	1325.441	.000	1	.987	-2619.661	2575.973
	[Q14=3]	-4.607	.968	22.664	1	.000	-6.503	-2.710
	[Q14=4]	-2.176	.496	19.282	1	.000	-3.147	-1.205
	[Q14=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q4=1]	6.276	2.014	9.714	1	.002	2.329	10.223
	[Q4=2]	1.433	.952	2.265	1	.132	-.433	3.299
	[Q4=3]	1.026	.754	1.851	1	.174	-.452	2.504
	[Q4=4]	1.293	.716	3.261	1	.071	-.110	2.695
	[Q4=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-1.332	1.610	.685	1	.408	-4.488	1.823

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
[Q1=3]	.379	.743	.261	1	.610	-1.076	1.835
[Q1=4]	.627	.549	1.300	1	.254	-.450	1.703
[Q1=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q20=1]	22.877	.000	.	1	.	22.877	22.877
[Q20=2]	.044	1.530	.001	1	.977	-2.955	3.043
[Q20=3]	-3.024	.744	16.513	1	.000	-4.483	-1.566
[Q20=4]	-.893	.589	2.295	1	.130	-2.049	.262
[Q20=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q19=1]	-4.913	1.122	19.174	1	.000	-7.112	-2.714
[Q19=2]	-2.670	.977	7.460	1	.006	-4.585	-.754
[Q19=3]	-.858	1.032	.692	1	.406	-2.880	1.164
[Q19=4]	-.263	1.252	.044	1	.834	-2.716	2.191
[Q19=5]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Lines[a]

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	158.248			
General	126.181[b]	32.067[c]	54	.992

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

Case Processing Summary

		N	Marginal Percentage
How much was the performance satisfying?	Somewhat dissatisfied	1	0.7%
	Neutral	23	16.8%
	Very satisfied	71	51.8%
	Considerably satisfied	42	30.7%
How much was the performance satisfying?	Neutral	24	17.5%
	Satisfying	74	54.0%
	Very satisfying	39	28.5%
If you could have priced the performance, how much would you have paid?	Less than 10 Euros	10	7.3%
	10-50 Euros	79	57.7%
	50-100 Euros	38	27.7%
	100-150 Euros	10	7.3%
How much do you find musical performances interesting?	Barely	2	1.5%
	Fairly	28	20.4%
	Quite	79	57.7%
	Very much	28	20.4%
After the free admission at BIRD, how much have you been interested in BIRD's upcoming musical performances?	Hardly	15	10.9%
	Fairly	46	33.6%
	A lot	46	33.6%
	Very much	30	21.9%
After free admission at BIRD, have you found any other musical venues' performances fascinating?	Moderately	40	29.2%
	Quite	76	55.5%
	Very much	21	15.3%
When did you go to the next concert after the free admission at BIRD?	After a year	1	0.7%
	After 9 months -11 months	3	2.2%
	4) After 6 months -8 months	2	1.5%
	3) After 4 months -6 months	10	7.3%
	2) After a month-3 months	78	56.9%
	1) Within one month	43	31.4%
Valid		137	100.0%
Missing		56	
Total		193	

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	244.664			
Final	170.475	74.189	18	.000

Link function: Logit.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	770.489	252	.000
Deviance	143.743	252	1.000

Link function: Logit.

Pseudo R-Square

Cox and Snell	.418
Nagelkerke	.478
McFadden	.261

Link function: Logit.

Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q24 = 2]	-8.455	1.605	27.736	1	.000	-11.601	-5.308
	[Q24 = 3]	-3.695	.951	15.095	1	.000	-5.559	-1.831
	[Q24 = 4]	.114	.843	.018	1	.892	-1.538	1.765
Location	[Q14=3]	-3.533	.934	14.313	1	.000	-5.363	-1.703
	[Q14=4]	-.478	.513	.871	1	.351	-1.483	.526
	[Q14=5]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q16=1]	-2.308	1.068	4.671	1	.031	-4.401	-.215
	[Q16=2]	1.024	.791	1.678	1	.195	-.526	2.574
	[Q16=3]	.285	.814	.122	1	.727	-1.310	1.879
	[Q16=4]	0ª	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Q1=2]	-3.769	2.133	3.122	1	.077	-7.949	.412
	[Q1=3]	-1.621	.640	6.419	1	.011	-2.874	-.367
	[Q1=4]	-.287	.497	.333	1	.564	-1.261	.688

	Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
[Q1=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q17=2]	1.267	1.060	1.428	1	.232	-.811	3.346
[Q17=3]	.107	.683	.024	1	.876	-1.233	1.446
[Q17=4]	.308	.556	.307	1	.580	-.782	1.399
[Q17=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q20=3]	-1.170	.739	2.509	1	.113	-2.618	.278
[Q20=4]	-.526	.595	.781	1	.377	-1.693	.641
[Q20=5]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.
[Q23=2]	-4.531	2.832	2.560	1	.110	-10.081	1.020
[Q23=3]	-2.885	1.429	4.075	1	.044	-5.686	-.084
[Q23=4]	1.604	1.772	.820	1	.365	-1.868	5.076
[Q23=5]	.183	.809	.051	1	.821	-1.401	1.768
[Q23=6]	.105	.436	.058	1	.810	-.749	.959
[Q23=7]	0ᵃ	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Test of Parallel Linesᵃ

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	170.475			
General	139.770ᵇ	30.705ᶜ	36	.718

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.

c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.

List of References

Adler, M. (1985). Stardom and Talent. *The American Economic Review,* 75(1), 208-212.
DOI: 10.1016/S1574-0676(06)01025-8.

Arlander, A. (2011). Characteristics of Visual and Performing Arts. In Biggs, M &Karlsson,
H (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts* (pp.315-332). London:
Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Ateca-Amestoy, V. (2008). Determining heterogeneous behavior for theater attendance.
Journal of Cultural Economics, 32(2), 127.

Bailey,S., Falconer, P., Foley, M., McPherson, G., & Graham, M. (1997). Charging for
Admission to Museums and Galleries: Arguments and Evidence. Museum Management and
Curatorship, 16(4), 355-369.

Bennett, L. (2012). Music audiences: An introduction, Journals of Audience and Reception
Studies, 9(2), 200-205.

Bennett, A., & Rogers, I. (2016). In the Scattered Fields of Memory: Unofficial Live Music
Venues, Intangible Heritage, and the Recreation of the Musical Past. *Space and
Culture*, 19(4), 490–501. DOI: 10.1177/1206331215623217

Berghman, M., & Van Eijck, K. (2009). Visual Aarts Aappreciation Ppatterns: Crossing
Horizontal and Vertical Boundaries within the Cultural Hierarchy. Poetics:
Journal of Empirical Research on Culture, the Media and the Arts, 37(4), pp.
348-365. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2009.06.003.

BIRD (2020). About. Retrieved on 02-12-19 from: https://bird-rotterdam.nl/info/about-bird/

BIRD (2020). Live @ BIRD. Retrieved on 02-12-19 from: https://bird-
rotterdam.nl/info/foundation/

Bishop, C. (2006). *Participation: Documents of Contemporary Art.* London: Whitechapel
Gallery.

Bourriaude, N. (2002 [1998]). *Relational Aesthetics.* Paris : Les Presses du réel.

Bryson, B. (1996). Anything but Heavy Metal: Symbolic Exclusion and Musical
Dislikes.American Sociological Review, 61(5), pp. 884-899. DOI: 10.2307/2096459.

Commented [Office103]: Not in the text?

Commented [Office104]: Author? Not in the text?

Castiglione, C., & Infante, D. (2016). Rational addiction and cultural goods: the case of the Italian theatregoer. *Journal of Cultural Economics,* 40(2), 163-190.

CJP (2020). ABOUT CJP. Retrieved on 24-04-2020 from: https://www.cjp.nl/wat-is-cjp/

Courty, P.   (2000). 'An economic guide to ticket pricing in the entertainment industry'. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/40724285?uid=3738672&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21106168578631

Cowell, B.   (2007). Measuring the Impact of Free Admission, *Cultural Trends*, 16(3), 203-224. DOI: 10.1080/09548960701479375

DeSerpa, A. (1994). To Err is Rational: A Theory of Excess Demand for Tickets. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 15(5), 511-518. DOI: 10.1002/mde.4090150513.

Dolgin, A. (2009). *The Economics of Symbolic Exchange.* Moscow: Springer.

Falk, M., & Katz-Gerro, T. (2015). Cultural participation in Europe: Can we identify common determinants?. Journal of Cultural Economics, 40(2), 127-162.

Favaro, D., & Frateschi, C. (2007). A discrete choice model of consumption of cultural goods: The case of music, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 31, 205–234. DOI: 10.1007/s10824-007-9043-x

Ferraro, A., Cerciell, M., Agovino, M., & Garofalo, A. (2019). The Role of Cultural Consumption in Reducing Social Exclusion: empirical evidence from Italy in a spatial framework. *Economica Politica,* 36, 139–166. DOI: 10.1007/s40888-019-00144-w

Frey, B. S., & Steiner, L. (2010). 'Pay as You Go: A New Proposal for Museum Pricing'. Retrieved from: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09647775.2012.701994#

Gall-Ely, M., Urbain, C., Bourgeon, D., Gombault, A., & Petr. C. (2007). Free Admission to Museums and Monuments: An exploration of Some Perceptions of the audiences. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*,13 (1), 7-72. DOI: 10.1002/nvsm.307.

Hesmondhalgh, DJ (2008). Towards a Critical Understanding of Music, Emotion and Self
-Identity. Consumption, markets and culture, 11 (4). 329 – 343. http://dx.doi.org/1
0.1080/10253860802391334

Hill, L. & H. Paris (eds.) (2006). *Performance and Place*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jarness, V. (2015). Cultural vs Economic Capital: Symbolic Boundaries within the Middle
Class. Sociology, 51(2), pp. 357-373. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038515596909.

Laamanen, J. P. (2013). Estimating demand for opera using sales system data: the case of
Finnish National Opera. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 37(4), 417- 432.

Lacy, S. (1995). Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art. Seattle: Bay Press.

Lévy-Garboua, L., & Montmarquette, C. (1996). A microeconometric study of theatre
demand. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 20(1), 25-50.

MFB Yahaya, CE Ting, MBA Amaran, NBA Nordin (2015). The Relationship between Ticke
t Price, Location and Qualityof a Live Musical Performance. Retrieved from:
https://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:Ys4IdM1h8YUJ:scholar.goo
gle.com/+Mohd+Fahmi+Bin+Yahaya1*Chuah+Ee+Ting2+Mazdan+Bin+Ali+Amara
n3+and+Nordiana+Bt.+Ahmad+Nordin4&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5.

Nelson, P. (1970). Information and Consumer Behavior. *The Journal of Political Economy*,
78(2), 311–329. Retrieved from:
https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:ucp:jpolec:v:78:y:1970:i:2:p:311-29

Commented [Office108]: In the text it's a different year check

Commented [Office109]: Referencing to check Initials after the name

Palmer, C. (1997). Music Performances. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 115-138. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.115.

Peters, J., Van Eijck, K., & Michael, J. (2018). Secretly Serious? Maintaining and Crossing Cultural Boundaries in the Karaoke Bar Through Ironic Consumption. Cultural Sociology, 12(1), pp. 1-17. DOI: 10.1177/1749975517700775.

Phelan, P. (1993). *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Richard, G., & Wilson, J. (2006). Developing Creativity in Tourist Experiences: A Solution to the Serial Reproduction of Culture? *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1209-1223. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2005.06.002.

Rosen, Sherwin. 1981. "The Economics of Superstars." *The American Economic Review* 71: 845–58.

Roose, H. (2010). Living room vs concert hall patterns of music consumption in flanders. SOCIAL FORCES, 89(1), 185-207. Retrieved from: https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/1093785.

Rotterdampass (2020). Informatie. Retrieved on 24-04-2020 from: https://www.rotterdampas.nl/informatie

Rushton, M. (2017). Should public and nonprofit museums have free admission? A defen

se of the membership model. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 32(3), 200-2

09. DOI: 10.1080/09647775.2016.1263969

Seaman, B. (2005). Empirical Studies of Demand for the Performing Arts. *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, 1(14), 416-449. DOI: 10.1016/S1574-0676(06)01014-3.

Volckner, F., & Hofmann, J. (2007). The Price-perceived Quality Relationship: A Meta-analytic Review and Assessment of Its Determinants. Marketing Letters, 18(3), 181-196. DOI: 10.1007/s11002-007-9013-2

Walster, E., & Walster, G. W. (1975). Equity and social justice. *Journal of Social Issues, 31*(3), 21–43.