

**RESISTING INVISIBILITY: ARTS ORGANIZATIONS
AND THE PURSUIT OF PERSISTENT PRESENCE**

By

Margaret J. Wyszomirski, Amy McClellan,
Shelly Power, and Darlene Rebello-Rao

Occasional Paper Number Four

Margaret J. Wyszomirski, Director
Arts Policy and Administration Program
Department of Art Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
wyszomirski.1@osu.edu

and

Amy McClellan
Shelly Power
Darlene Rebello-Rao
Mandel Center for Nonprofit Organizations
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
dxr2@po.cwru.edu

Prepared for presentation at the
Association for research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA)
Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference
Indianapolis, Indiana December 4-6, 1997

Introduction

As the next century approaches, a certain apprehension exists in the arts and cultural world. Arts policy makers worry about the relevance of the arts to people's daily lives; arts managers worry about the visibility and survival of their organizations; artists worry about sustainable opportunities to create and live as artists; and the person on the street doesn't seem to worry or think about any of this at all. Many who have studied and worked in arts and cultural organizations note that "something" is happening in their world. Organizational image and visibility and public perceptions and awareness of nonprofit arts organizations seem to be moving farther apart. This widening gap leaves arts organizations struggling to maintain or even attain what we call "persistent presence."

As a starting definition, we think of persistent presence as *an infrastructure for an organization and an awareness and attitudinal predisposition by its constituents and potential audience*. This predisposition and awareness forms the groundwork for an organization that, in turn, contributes to advocacy with institutional funders, as well as with individual people, to patronize the arts through attendance, donations, volunteer activities, and more. This continuum of activity is vital for the future of a healthy arts environment, because as the visibility of the arts erodes, they become less of a tangible presence within the community, and eventually fall off of the public agenda entirely.

Hopefully, all arts organizations have some presence in their community. For many, however, their presence is intermittent -- coming into focus as they offer a production/exhibit or conduct an event and then fading in between performances. Some arts organizations may have a presence with a particular cultural community or with their core audience, but enjoy little presence in the broader public arena. We are looking at and defining persistent presence because we suspect that some arts organizations may have lost sight of qualities that help to inspire an audience to come to their programs and citizens to recognize and value their community role. We offer that persistent presence helps an organization do just that, and move beyond mere organizational tactics such as audience development, fundraising, and marketing as catchall solutions. Instead, we will suggest that persistent presence is the foundation upon which organizational functions or tactics can build effectively.

By trying to define persistent presence, we can explore emerging issues for the arts and culture within a new framework that may suggest implications for future in-depth research. This paper also highlights five factors or ingredients in the establishment of persistent presence that contribute to the sustainability of arts and cultural organizations.

We discuss the concept of persistent presence by use of case examples from street interviews, conversations conducted with staff of major cultural institutions, public policy initiatives, and media reports. We concentrate primarily on the nonprofit performing arts in order to give more focus to our investigation. It is important to note that our conversations with institutional leaders and people on the street were just that -- conversations aimed at soliciting impressions and perceptions about how arts organizations make themselves known. As such, this paper's intent is exploratory. It is, we hope, a first step towards defining and therefore better understanding some powerful issues faced in the present and future arts and cultural world.

Note: We are grateful to Karen Grochau, Dennis Young, and John Palmer Smith for their helpful comments.

THE AMBIGUOUS IMAGE OF ARTS AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

We decided to conduct informal street interviews in order to get an external snapshot of people's knowledge of or perceptions about arts and cultural organizations. In an artistically rich community like Cleveland, Ohio, for example, how much were people aware of their arts and cultural organizations? If they were somewhat aware of these organizations, how was this awareness created -- through signage, advertisements in the paper, word-of-mouth, past experiences,

charismatic artistic personnel, buildings or performance halls?

For these person-on-the-street interviews, we targeted three different locations in Cleveland based upon their proximity to centers of arts and culture within the city, as well as for their ability to draw a wide cross section of the population: 1) an educational and cultural district, home to Case Western Reserve University and many leading arts organizations including The Cleveland Orchestra, the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Cleveland Institute of Music, the Natural History Museum, the Botanic Gardens, and others; 2) Playhouse Square, a performing arts venue that includes four theaters in downtown Cleveland. The venue is home to local nonprofit arts organizations such as Cleveland-San Jose Ballet and Great Lakes Theatre Festival, and touring Broadway shows; and 3) Tower City, an urban mall in a recently renovated historic building in the heart of downtown near major sports facilities. Part of the decision to conduct some of these interviews close to the homes of arts and cultural organizations was to note whether this proximity might skew people's answers to include the organizations located nearby. How much might physical presence itself play a part in people's general awareness?

We spoke with about ten people at each site for a total of 30 interviews. The informal survey covered four questions: 1) Can you name an arts or cultural organization? 2) [If so], Have you attended any of its programs or events? If yes, what? 3) Why do you suppose you thought of this organization first? 4) Can you name any other arts or cultural organizations? At the conclusion of each interview, we also asked the respondent their age range, their highest level of education attained, and their zip code in order to capture some basic demographic information.

Disconnects in Terminology

The "person-on-the-street" interviews revealed a lot about how people do or don't think about the arts and the organizations that produce them. First, we noticed that when asked to name an arts or cultural organization, respondents did not even understand what we meant by "arts or cultural." Once an example was given, such as the ballet, a play, or a musical performance, the respondent was better able to think of an example -- which in turn usually was discipline based or performance specific, such as "a comedy revue" or "the Nutcracker." When we tried to find out if the respondent knew the name of the organization responsible for putting on the comedy revue or the Nutcracker, they often could not make the connection between the event itself and the presenting or producing entity.

The exception to this occurred when respondents named either The Cleveland Orchestra or the Cleveland Museum of Art, two of the flagship arts organizations in the community. This may be a discipline-specific issue, since many people do not necessarily remember a specific composition or program that an orchestra plays, or an exhibition at a museum, but simply recall the experience of attending a symphony orchestra concert or an art museum. On the other hand, it may indicate that every community has one or two particularly prominent arts organizations that people in the community are generally aware of, even if they have never attended their programs.

The misunderstanding of the terms "arts" and "culture" (Filicko, 1996; "The Importance of the Arts...", 1993) and the disconnect between an art form and its producing institution suggests that on a sectoral/discipline level, arts institutions may have a more serious problem than their own visibility. When someone has been to and loves the "Nutcracker" ballet, yet cannot name the local ballet company that produced it, how is that organization going to capture that person for its other performance offerings or for a membership or financial contribution? These informal street interviews seem to indicate that people don't necessarily understand the connection between the "Nutcracker," their local ballet company, and the arts and cultural sector. This disconnect, however, is unlike the situation in many other fields. For example, we generally know that the New York

Mets and the Chicago Cubs are teams within the Major League Baseball network and part of the larger sports world. Or that Dartmouth is a private college and Indiana University is a public university, and both are part of the higher education system.

While terminology may be part of the problem, another may be the lack of more concrete connections between an arts event and a general discipline or arts field, or with the presenting and producing organizations of those fields. Thus, we will not only need to clarify the definitions of "arts" and "culture" in the public mind, but also make more visible the logical link between specific events/experiences and presenting organizations, an art form or field, and the arts and culture categorically.

The fact that the person on the street tends to be very specific in his/her interest in particular arts organizations or performances also suggests that while the marketing of cultural events and even of some organizations may be effective for their own purposes, public awareness of a community's cultural resources as a whole is underdeveloped. Indeed, this may be an instance where the whole is less than the sum of its parts since few people seem to even think of arts and cultural organizations as a category of organizations and activities. In other words, the arts do not seem to have a collective image as do sports or education. Rather, at the collective level, arts and culture may be largely invisible to many people, who only see "islands" of particular organizations or events.

Furthermore, the character of the artistic "islands" that do periodically emerge from the perceptual mists varies. In a few instances, organizations enjoy visibility while particular performances, exhibitions, and/or events blur into the background/institutional image. This seems to be the case more often for museums and orchestras. For others, like theater and dance, the performance is the thing and the company -- or producing organization -- lacks perceptual form for much of the public. And for still others, where they attend an event is taken to be an indicator of the kind of activity involved. ("If I am at Carnegie Hall, it must be art.") In each case, significant aspects of a cultural activity are submerged -- either the character of the event itself, the identity of the organization, or the relation among a number of organizations and activities. These brief conversations suggest that more in-depth, methodological work could be conducted to reveal whether these perceptions hold true in a larger context.

Tangible Markers of Presence

Another dimension of the problem of presence begins to emerge from comments by managers of arts organizations. Their reflections reveal that an arts organization's tangible elements such as facilities [buildings], signage, and advertising, are one of the most obvious ways in which an organization establishes presence in a community. However, organizations may not have all three elements of this kind of physical/visual presence, and their use or the importance of any one of them may vary greatly. But some level of activity or "appearance" seems to be an essential identifier for organizations.

Buildings have always provided an easy locus for arts activity within a community. However, the degree to which these spaces and facilities become an explicit part of an organization's personality varies. Gary Hanson, the marketing director of The Cleveland Orchestra contends that, "All great arts organizations have a physical presence in a building. . . . And while having a building, especially a much loved building, is a big advantage in terms of public perception and awareness, there are also significant artistic advantages to having your own building." Yet many arts organizations do not have a dedicated building or performance space. They are either nomadic performers or they perform in a facility used by many other arts organizations. These multi-use, performance venues can give an organization credibility if they are indeed "much loved" and perceived as a top-notch place to perform. Alternatively, performing arts centers may decrease organizational autonomy and

dilute an organization's perceived physical presence in the community.

Advertising and signage provide print and visual presence for arts organizations, including formats such as marquee placement, posters on buses, simple listings or full-page ads in newspapers, schedules in community calendars, and many other kinds of print materials. The use of advertising and signage can help offset an organization's facility problem and takes on increased importance if an organization has no permanent home or is one of many organizations using a single performance venue. However, these elements also have their limitations. Many ongoing advertising strategies are expensive and periodic placements provide little continuity of message and identity. Signage for individual organizations using a multi-purpose facility may be seasonal at best, or only offered during actual performance dates, creating a fleeting association in the minds of the public. In addition, whether or not these fleeting associations are related to the performance, the organization, the star player, or the building itself is difficult to discern. As a result, organizations may find it difficult to define when and how advertising and signage alone assist visibility and presence.

Some aspects of an organization's physical presence may be even more subtle than signage and buildings. Paul Bunker, executive director of the Delaware Symphony Orchestra (DSO), laments a loss of his organization's identity and visibility through their giving up of administrative functions such as ticketing to the Grand Opera House, the venue in which they perform. Bunker contends that an activity as simple as writing a check to his orchestra is an important part of giving the orchestra a real existence for the participant. The widespread use of Ticketron or other ticketing agencies removes the direct contact that an organization has with its ticket buyer, further veiling the organization's identity to one of its most important constituents.

At a time when many arts organizations are exploring cost saving and administrative collaborations, such conversations seem to indicate that organizations are worried about losing the kinds of functions that enable them to interact personally with their constituents. Funders in particular want to see partnerships and alliances between organizations in order to help create economies of scale in many business, administrative, technological, and marketing functions. As arts organizations pursue these opportunities, they may need to pay closer attention to retaining those functions that help them forge personal relationships with their community or to sharing these functions in ways that preserve organizational identity.

Seasons and Performances

Directly related to tangible markers of presence such as buildings and signage, is the amount and timing of an arts organization's programming. It goes without saying that organizations with a regular season of some substantial length have an easier time keeping themselves visible in the public eye. The length and regularity of most symphony orchestra seasons, for example, offer the public an ongoing opportunity to see, hear about, and potentially take part in concerts. Many of the country's most well-respected orchestras have also established a more informal presence at a summer venue, taking advantage of nearly year-round programming and its subsequent opportunities for continued organizational visibility. Periodic, if not weekly, broadcasts also help maintain a consistent image of vitality and accessibility.

Some disciplines such as theater, dance, and opera, however, are limited by the availability of guest performers and substantial up-front costs of staging productions, and can only program a few performances throughout the year. A typical season for a ballet company, for example, includes a fall production, something seasonal such as the "Nutcracker" at the holidays, and a spring selection. A common concern is what happens to an organization's visibility during pre- and post-production, or when one of the programs has to be canceled. John Regenbogen, the former marketing manager of the Cleveland/San Jose Ballet acknowledges that "off" times are indeed a

problem for maintaining visibility and interest, particularly between popular seasonal fare such as the Nutcracker in December and the traditional spring programming. And when programming needs to be dramatically changed or canceled due to other forces such as financial distress, organizations face a self-perpetuating, circular problem.

Arts managers acknowledge that they must rely on publicity -- especially stories of interest about their organizations and the people involved -- instead of paid marketing that promotes seasons or particular performances, to garner broader institutional coverage and visibility. Free editorial space, fund raising events, and other public activities are just a few of the ways in which arts organizations try to avoid the black hole of invisibility between performances and seasons. While down time is inevitable, the timing and sequence of programs becomes increasingly important, with little room for modifications or cancellations within a season.

Labeling and Validation

Conversations with and recent activity of arts organizations also illustrate that they are thinking about and reaching beyond their community not only for revenue, but also credibility and visibility.

Recently, the League of American Theaters and Producers created a logo for all Broadway-produced shows and projects in order to increase awareness of Broadway theater, particularly when on the road (Grimes, 1997). This new kind of identity labeling, fashioned after the likes of Disney, Playboy, or NFL branding strategies, is intended to create a distinction for Broadway-produced theater that implies quality and generates loyalty among consumers. Other examples of joint marketing ventures or labeling include an effort by the three most prestigious museums in New York -- the Metropolitan Museum, the Museum of Modern Art, and the American Museum of Natural History -- to market their exhibits outside of the New York metropolitan area. These high profile institutions feel that their marketing alliance will expand their visibility outside New York, bringing visitors and visibility from afar (Collins, 1996). Finally, the signing on of a talent agency by the Smithsonian Institution a year ago was intended as a way for the Institution to instigate revenue-generating projects based upon its vast historical resources and artifacts, as well as to "establish a presence beyond Washington" (Trescott, 1996, p. D6).

This phenomenon suggests that, aside from the revenue goals that these strategies address, some of the United States most recognized and venerated arts institutions feel as though their presence and reach are limited. Smaller arts organizations than these have understood for years the importance of recognition outside of their communities to increase validation and appeal locally. But even the largest and most sophisticated institutions are not immune to this image malaise.

Connie Linnartz, marketing director of the Houston Ballet confirms that local audiences "are waiting for someone outside of Houston to tell them how good we are. . . I think one is feeding the other. We need to be strong here and maintain that, but you've got to get that kind of national presence." And the marketing director of The Cleveland Orchestra added, "When the critics [in other cities] do write that it's America's greatest orchestra, we're not shy about distributing that." Arts organizations large and small, from major cities and smaller communities, all seem to express a need for recognition outside of their communities, whether to encourage actual participation through cultural tourism mechanisms, or simply to have their reputation elevated or validated from those outside their immediate circle.

Artistic Quality

In order to garner recognition locally or nationally, however, an organization=s artistic product seems to be the crucial element. While the merits of an organization=s artistic product are obvious factors in creating visibility, the frequency with which the notion of a high-quality product was mentioned in our institutional conversations, warrants a closer look. Even when people on the street

were asked why they remembered a particular organization, the artistic product itself was mentioned more often than image-building techniques such as signage, well-placed advertising, or special promotions. In the end, the product was the image that lasted the longest. A certain level of artistic quality seems to speak directly to how an organization is perceived. And this creates a tautological problem: a quality experience requires both artistic quality in presentation and the ability to draw people into the experience itself.

As might be expected, our conversations with arts managers indicate that they well understand the importance of this connection to an audience -- that artistic quality is one of the most fundamental elements of a successful arts organization. The Houston Ballet's Connie Linnartz observes that her "company looks great and I have nothing to do with that. I get to sit here and say 'thank goodness they are great.' A great product to market." Gary Hanson of The Cleveland Orchestra also notes "Far too many people are obsessed with marketing. . . . If you've got an Orchestra that doesn't play well in a lousy hall, with a boring music director, and nobody comes, it's very useful to blame the marketing effort. . . . But what you really need is better concerts." While the old myth that a good artistic product is all you need and "audiences will simply come," is naive at best, the comments seem to underscore the continued importance of quality to an arts organization's reputation and long-term viability.

People

Finally, many arts organizations rely upon passionate and visible personnel, whether artistic, administrative, or volunteer (such as Board members) to be ambassadors for specific programs, seasons, or the organization itself. In fact, arts organizations were often founded by artists who "become management in order to labor as artists" (White, 1986, p.____). While management based upon artistic vision has in some cases given away to the second and third generations of arts managers, some organizations still rely upon "star" power on stage or in the wings as Board members, to create the kind of charismatic personal face that launched the organization in the first place. Organizations continue to struggle for a balance between artistic vision and administrative savvy in their leaders, even though these traits are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

At the same time, organizations try to temper the appeal of only one charismatic leader or star in order to promote the identity of the organization as a whole or the art form itself. These mechanisms seem to be both an offensive and defensive strategy for when that particular personality may no longer be associated with an organization. The marketing director from the Houston Ballet notes, "We want to take advantage of the opportunities and hook not only [our artistic director's] name but Houston Ballet's name as well to draw attention back to the company." Organizations seem to understand the balance between a personality-based image hook and overriding the organization's own identity. However, they seem also to understand the importance of personality and "face identity" to their own organizational presence. Whether the "star" is in administration, at the Board level, or on the stage depends upon the organization's needs at a particular time, and need not be present at all levels simultaneously. Indeed such a situation can be as problematic as no stars at all.

The Obstacles to Persistent Presence

These initial conversations and thoughts suggest a variety of causes for the seeming invisibility of many nonprofit arts organizations. One of the most fundamental is the public's lack of awareness or understanding of what the arts are all about, including the connection between an art form and a particular arts organization. If the arts are such an enigma, then arts organizations begin their own struggle for viability and visibility in a disadvantaged position. Added to this tenuous foundation

are arts organizations worried about physical visibility manifested through logos, signage, buildings, and personal interaction with arts participants. Can people see, hear, touch, and interact with them as a real entity, not simply a wizard behind a curtain? Beyond the organization's physical presence is a national reputation or credibility from "outside" sources that encourages a level of acceptance by local constituents, a high quality artistic product, and the personnel that give an organization its face, including its artistic "stars," charismatic leaders, or Board ambassadors.

These different ingredients, when put together, seem to help form a collective consciousness of an organization, its artistic work, and its importance to a community. If persistent presence implies the way in which people come to know an organization, nonprofit arts organizations may need to focus more on *what* it is the public is getting to know, rather than the mechanics through which that knowledge is acquired.

STRATEGIZING ABOUT PERSISTENT PRESENCE

If one dimension of persistent presence is the personal link or in-depth understanding by a public of what the arts mean to them and their community, then there is no one way to think about the phenomena of persistent presence. The elements of a sustainable presence are moveable and malleable and exist in varying amounts for each organization. However, we do offer that the themes illustrated throughout this paper suggest key ingredients for a recipe that may help arts organizations create and continue to cultivate their own framework of persistent presence.

The themes that emerged consistently from our conversations with people on the street and arts administrators suggest five key factors or ingredients of persistent presence for nonprofit arts organizations:

- \$ facilities and signage (physical/visual elements)
- \$ seasons and performances
- \$ national reputation
- \$ artistic product
- \$ personalities (artistic, administrative, and Board)

These ingredients and their proportions may vary widely depending upon the kind of organization (particularly since our exploration centered only on performing arts organizations), and the degree to which some elements may already be in place.

While these ingredients or factors may seem to be obvious parts of how arts organizations operate, we suggest that they are often neglected or subverted in an organization's planning and operations because they are *assumed* to be present at all times. As a result, organizations often concentrate on mechanical issues and tools that have more finite or definable strategies and results such as marketing, public relations, audience development, technology applications, and fundraising. Instead, we offer that persistent presence is the *precondition* for these processes, affecting the baseline upon which everything else operates.

In addition to these ingredients that help create persistent presence on an institutional level, we have discussed the need for persistent presence on a sectoral/discipline and community level. Almost no one escapes the problem of persistent presence. Even the largest and most sophisticated institutions seem to be challenged in creating long-term and sustainable visibility. If people have trouble naming an arts organization or connecting the "Nutcracker" with a ballet company, then they also most likely have little if any sense of the entire mosaic of arts and cultural activities available within their community. Even if they have some level of awareness, they may feel that whatever is out

there has nothing much to do with them.

Today, nonprofit arts organizations operate in an increasingly cluttered marketplace of creative and recreational choices, of complex and competing demands for limited public policy resources and attention, and of patrons who have changing preferences who feel they have too little time. In fact, Richard A. Petersen (1992) argues that the audience for much of the "high" or nonprofit arts is becoming more of an omnivore than an aficionado. The typical arts audience member has broad and eclectic taste preferences, and is just as likely to go to a symphony performance one night and a rock concert the next. Indeed, a certain catholicity of cultural activity seems to be becoming more prevalent among arts audience members. One implication of this is that arts audiences are spreading themselves fairly thinly along a number of types of cultural activities and choices, therefore limiting the ability of any one arts organization or even art form to capture the loyalty of such attenders. Beyond then the challenge of garnering regular constituents, few nonprofit arts organizations have the promotional resources, distributional systems, or leverage to establish a strong, visible, and positive public image that even puts them on the public's agenda.

Persistent presence, then, is not only built within an organization but also through a vertical continuum that encompasses the institutional, sectoral/discipline and community levels. These three levels of persistent presence suggest that a range of solutions are necessary at each level in order to deal with the lack of persistent presence. Solutions for institutions may include building capacity in key areas that are most likely to bolster and extend an organization's image over the long term, such as the five key ingredients offered earlier. Discipline-based solutions may include collaborative efforts between like institutions, such as theater alliances, or dance consortiums. And community solutions suggest cultural planning, cultural tourism, and public policy-making mechanisms that develop an "arts sense" within a community from a variety of collective efforts.

Even though solutions may exist for persistent presence, they cannot be prescriptive because the elements of persistent presence -- facilities and signage; seasons and performances; reputation; artistic product; and personalities -- are intrinsic and distinctive to every organization. These distinctions are issues for strategic thinking and development within the organization, and cannot be addressed through standardized solutions. Many management techniques aimed at "solving" marketing and visibility problems have been geared towards the wrong level of action and missed the very nature of the problem of persistent presence.

As a result, the quandary or paradox for many organizations may lie in the recent rush to adopt "best practices" in order to standardize and simplify operations. Best practices may be effective at the tactical level of an organization, such as in marketing, fundraising, and technology development. In contrast, persistent presence is a concern that may be tactically enhanced but must be strategically derived. Persistent presence is likely to be cultivated through efforts at strategic thinking which can help focus and inform an organization's use of management tactics. Indeed, when it comes to cultivating a community presence that is persistent rather than intermittent, arts organizations need to understand and utilize the particular ingredients with which they have to work.

For example, an organization that already has a great building may need to investigate ways to support or supplement its programming in order to take advantage of its great physical assets. And an organization with a dynamic Board may create avenues for Board member visibility within the community in order to enhance organizational reputation. Even while these elements relate to and play off of one another, an organization may find it has even more dramatic tradeoffs -- that having a building, for example, may indeed mean a smaller dimension of something else such as signage. While the ingredients for the recipe may be prescriptive, *how* the recipe is executed and the proportions involved will most likely be different.

Conclusion

Ultimately, an organization must cultivate its own persistent presence within the construct of its own "kitchen." The foundation of the five ingredients, which must be present in some form or another, is built through strategic thinking and planning processes unique to the organization, its mission, members, and culture. Best practices are "best" only when used for tactical functions such as marketing, public relations, and fund raising. No one best practice can suggest how organizations establish their foundation of persistent presence or how each discipline or cultural community can articulate its persistent presence. They must explore and experiment, in a deliberate and creative way, to produce the kind of presence that strategically supports the institution, the discipline, and the arts community as a whole.

We have attempted to identify a phenomena happening in the nonprofit performing arts world. We hope that by moving this concept through these various layers of thought, that we have, in the end, created a practical framework that can guide administrators in their work every day and propel future research in this area.

The following questions may provoke greater insight into this challenging research area. At the institutional level: What does "successful" persistent presence look like? Are some of the five ingredients we suggest present? At what level, or in what proportion to each other? Do preconditions for cultivating persistent presence within an organization exist? How might these five ingredients help organizations establish authentic relationships with new audiences? What implication does persistent presence have on human resources? Who within the organization should take the responsibility for persistent presence?

At the sectoral and larger arts community level: Is there a different framework for sectoral and community solutions? How might the five ingredients play across these levels? What role can partnerships and collaboration play among organizations and across artistic disciplines? On a public policy level, how can we develop a clearer definition or general understanding of the terms "arts" and "culture" and how they connect to people's everyday lives? And finally, is the pursuit of persistent presence unique to the United States, or is it found in some form in other countries?

References

- Bunker, P. [personal communication by phone], September 13, 1997.
- Collins, G. "Manhattan Museums Combine Resources for Newspaper Campaign." *The New York Times*, July 19, 1996, p. C4.
- Filicko, T. "In What Spirit Do Americans Cultivate the Arts? A Review of Survey Questions on the Arts." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 1996 26, (3).
- Grimes, W. "And Now, Emblem to Show It's Broadway." *The New York Times*, January 21, 1997 p.B3.
- Hanson, G. [personal communication at The Cleveland Orchestra], Cleveland, Ohio, June 24, 1997.
- Linnartz, C. [personal communication at the Houston Ballet], Houston, Texas, June 12, 1997.
- Peterson, R. A. "Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore." *Poetics*, 1992, 21, pp. 243-258.
- Regenbogen, J. [personal communication at The Cleveland/San Jose Ballet], Cleveland, Ohio, July 18, 1997.
- Research and Forecasts, Inc. *The Importance of the Arts and Humanities to American Society. A National Survey of the American Public Commissioned by the National Cultural Alliance*, 1993.
- Trescott, J. "Smithsonian Gets Itself An Agent." *The Washington Post*, October 30, 1996, p. D6.
- White, D. "Professional Standards and Managerial Realities." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 1986, 16 (2), pp 9 - 36.