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ABSTRACT

Millennials and Live Music Culture. (May 2015)

Caitlin Alexandria Curbello
Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications
Texas A&M University

Research Advisor: Dr. Billy R. McKim
Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications

The purpose of this cross-sectional, quantitative study was to describe and compare generational perspectives of live music culture. Specifically, this study aimed to describe and compare how live music environments, individuals’ behavioral, and individuals’ demographic and psychographic factors that influenced their engagement in live music culture. During the summer and fall of 2014, data were collected using a paper, self-completed questionnaire that was distributed to a stratified sample in seven cities in three western states. The outcome of this study yielded a deeper understanding of today’s live music culture and the factors that influence individuals’ participation in live music performances. Findings of this study could be used by artists and record labels to better target and engage individuals by generation, and as a general resource for more effectively guiding live music venues’ promotion, atmosphere, and artist-recruitment.
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**NOMENCLATURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SXSW</td>
<td>South by Southwest music festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS®</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Social Cognitive Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>An individual born between 1945 and 1960 (Nielsen, 2014; Pew, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMB</td>
<td>Drop Off – Mail Back; a variation of the home delivery method of distributing questionnaires to individual residences. Individuals are asked to return the completed questionnaire using the pre-addressed, business reply envelope before a noted response deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOPU</td>
<td>Drop Off – Pick Up; a variation of the home delivery method of distributing questionnaires to individual residences and returning to retrieve completed questionnaires after a specified time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>A person born between 1961 and 1979 (Nielsen, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Delivery Method</td>
<td>A method of distributing questionnaires to individual residences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPS</td>
<td>A method of distributing questionnaires using the US Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>A place where events of a specific type are held (Merriam-Webster Online, 2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this cross-sectional, quantitative study was to describe and compare generational perspectives of live music culture. Specifically, this study aimed to describe and compare how live music environments, individuals’ behavioral, and individuals’ demographic and psychographic factors that influenced their engagement in live music culture.

Referring to live music venues and events, Kronenburg (2011) said…

“Popular music is a creative art form that is experiential, and transient. Though it is marketed via the recorded medium and totally transportable in this form, it is also very definitely rooted in time and place. You can listen to a concert packaged in CD or MP3 format, even watch a DVD transferred from film of the actual event, but nothing can replace the actual experiences, the authentic experience, of having been at that event.”

The Millennial Generation

Millennials are those ranging in age from 18-34 and are projected to outnumber the Baby Boomer generation (ages 51-69) in 2015, also exceeding other generational populations (Pew Research Center, 2015). They are “digital natives,” meaning that new technologies are not something they have had to adapt to or live without (Pew Research Center, 2014). According to a report from Pew Research Center (2014), Millennials are one of the most racially diverse generations, more liberal than previous generations and also have a higher disaffiliation with religion and politics than previous generations.
**Live Music Culture**

In the past century, the need to attend live performances to appreciate music or pay respect to skillful musicians has declined; however, records continue to be measured by the number of seats sold for concert tours (Earl, 2001). New technologies have made it possible to effortlessly listen to high-caliber recordings of almost any artist’s music; yet, the demand for live music is still prevalent. Several studies have described factors of live music performances and the audience’s emotional state. There have also been studies appealing more to the performance promoter’s processes of organizing and producing a live music event. However, many of these studies are centered on the use of classical music instead of contemporary artist’s performances to evaluate audience members’ reactions and level of engagement. Hagen (2005) states that, “At any popular music concert, there are almost invariably a number of different levels of engagement on an individual level”. This study seeks to uncover which factors most often spark and sustain Millennials engagement at live music venues and events.

In classical music performances, Frith (2012) noted…

“As a social institution, then, the classical concert depended on – and made possible in the way it organised [sic] space—silent listening, listening in which the only relevant sounds came from a specific site, the platform on which the orchestra sat, but which were ideally heard within each individual’s head. And to achieve this effect, concert promoters had to minimise [sic] the possibilities of distraction, distraction that came to be understood as “noise””.

5
There are appropriate and inappropriate listening practices with live classical music performances. This was developed as a part of the higher-society social environment associated with classical music. In classical music, an individual does not simply listen, but instead show that he or she is listening, actively identifying the music’s structure and showcasing an understanding of the complexities of the pieces performed. This etiquette is much more structured and formal than a contemporary live music performance environment; thus, it may not be the most representative of today’s live music culture and the factors that influence individuals’ participation in live music performances.

Live music venues are settings which facilitate social interaction and also provide an experience by which all other musical experiences will be judged (Frith, 2012). “Rather than simply being in an audience, fans consider their participation in music fandoms to be a significant and lasting part of their lives,” (Hagen, 2005). These live music performances must be presented in an appropriate manner, which hinges on the type of event, the genre of music and of course the type of individual whom attends these events (Frith, 2012).

Artist and venue owner’s success are driven by audience’s loyalty to a particular venue and also the personal interest towards a particular act (Frith, 2013). Any kind of live performance is created to fulfill the wants and anticipations of those in attendance, so designing such an experience is based on an understanding of the needs, anticipations, and individual behaviors of potential attendees (Tussyadiah, 2011). For live music, many ordinary things must be structured—including sound, lights, and seating/standing space—for audience members to value the musical performance as something exceptional and moving (Frith, 2012). The specific factors
that create a live music experience should be identified and categorized to better serve the Millennial audience.

Carter (2009) mentions that digital media have reshaped the live music business, with aggregation revolutionizing how fans find out about events. Now, the next wave of digital-driven innovation in live music is expected to be social: recommending events and sharing music-related content. Mobile capabilities are a part of this next wave of innovation, with more sophisticated location-specific and personalized information and entertainment. In this study, the method of discovery is also investigated.

Carter (2009), goes on to say…

"Historically, live music was an offline event promoted via flyers, ticketed on paper and the gig itself captured on tape. The movement to digital has happened in two distinct phases. "The first wave involved ticketing, the second has been how people find out about concerts. The next will be about sharing content," says Ian Hogarth, co-founder and CEO of social concert database Songkick. "Live music has yet to move online in an aggregated, structured way. It continues to be an industry driven by passion, providing a unique connection between a fan and an artist. The web can deepen this engagement at a time when recorded music is tending towards being free."

Hagen (2005) says that the spectrum of fan experience and engagement invariably fluctuate over time; individuals may remain fans but are unable to participate regularly in their music scene because of increasing obligations and responsibilities, rendering them less visible to those
observing the live music venue and events. This is an indicator that age is an important factor concerning live music venues and events participant engagement, and thus why this studies respondents were sorted by generational groups.

Behr, Brennan & Cloonan (2014) investigated factors that influence engagement at live music venues and events. They found that no matter the differences that exist between audience members value on certain aspects of the event or venue, these values were not based on how much it actually cost. Cost is a consideration, but the price of the ticket alongside other crucial factors (travel and accommodation) only affected the initial decision whether to attend or not. Kronenburg (2011) found that when an audience grows to more than a few dozen people, more sophisticated amenities are required to facilitate the event, including a control desk area, dressing rooms, toilets, box office and bar and catering.

Example of the Live Music Industry in Texas

In Texas alone, there are more than 2,000 nightclubs, dancehalls, and venues where live music takes place, and attendance to these events exceeds 9 million persons per year, according to the Texas Office of Music (2014). South by Southwest (SXSW) is a well-known music festival held annually in Austin, Texas. In 2013, SXSW drew 2,372 showcasing acts, including 553 international acts from 57 foreign countries—out of the 7,960 festival acts that applied (SXSW, 2014). The festival includes performances at more than 100 venues with 28,000 music industry professionals and artists in attendance, making a total of more than 72,000 participants registered for attendance. The attendance for the main stage, Butler Park stage, during 3 days was 55,000.
CHAPTER II

QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION METHODS

In this chapter, the quantitative data collection methods, population, sample, and specific distribution methods were presented. Social cognitive theory and social exchange theory provided theoretical guidance for this study; therefore, the purpose of this cross-sectional, quantitative study was to describe and compare generational perspectives of live music culture. Specifically, this study aimed to describe and compare how live music environments, individuals’ behavioral, and individuals’ demographic and psychographic factors that influenced their engagement in live music culture.

To pursue this purpose and aim, the following research questions and objectives guided this study:

Research Question 1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.0.0: Describe and compare the cognitive and affective aspects of personal determinants

RO1.1.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences by generation

RO1.1.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences by generation.

RO1.2.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation.
RO1.2.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation.

RO1.3.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance by generation.

RO1.3.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance by generation.

RO1.4.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on method of discovery by generation.

RO1.4.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on method of discovery by generation.

RO1.5.1: Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on venue features by generation.

RO1.5.2: Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on venue features by generation.

RO1.6.1: Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre by generation.

RO1.6.2: Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre by generation.

RO1.7.1: Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance by generation.

RO1.7.2: Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance by generation.
Research Question 2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.1.0: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants

RO2.1.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation

RO2.1.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation

RO2.2.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation

RO2.2.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation

RO2.3.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on household income by generation

RO2.3.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on household income by generation

RO2.4.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation

RO2.4.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation

RO2.5.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation

Research Question 3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?
RO 3.1.0: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants

RO3.1.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel by generation

RO3.1.2: Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel by generation

RO3.2.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation

RO3.2.2: Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation

RO3.3.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation

RO3.3.2: Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation

RO3.4.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation

The quantitative data and data collection methods noted in this study, were derived from a larger study developed to test survey methods. Within this larger study, the method of sampling used was stratified random sampling which is “a sample in which units are randomly sampled from a population that has been divided into categories (strata)” (Bryman, 2012). In this larger study, six different versions of a self-completion questionnaire were distributed to homes in randomly selected zip codes of each geographical area including Houston, TX; College Station, TX; San
Diego, CA; San Francisco, CA; Fresno, CA; and Denver, CO. These cities are considered the strata of the sample.

Because the live music study was a smaller component of a larger study, two different perspectives of sampling could be identified. The first, a stratified sample similar to the larger study because the procedures used to collect data were the same. The second, a convenience sample because these data for the live music study were available based on the larger study. This makes it difficult to say one contributed to the other because the live music study was a basis for the larger study, but the larger study provided the data for the live music study. So, the larger study did contribute the data for the live music study, however, this particular component (live music study) contributed to the content for the larger study. The two study’s methods are interconnected in a way that is difficult to disaggregate. So again, this study’s sample could be described as similar to the larger study’s stratified sample (cities = strata), or more conservatively as a convenience sample because only 1/6 of the data were drawn from the larger study.

**Context and Description of Larger Study**

Through the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communications (ALEC) at Texas A&M University, assistance from student researches enrolled in field research courses facilitated the quantitative data collection for this larger study. These courses were a part of a domestic study away program and participants included graduate and undergraduate research students, as well as one university faculty member, totaling 18 people. The duration of the domestic study away program was 37 days (June 2014 – July 2014) and field research/data
collection spanned the Southwest United States. Another phase of quantitative data collection occurred during the fall academic semester (August to November 2014) within Texas only. Students newly enrolled in ALEC research courses during the fall semester joined the already established study away students in collecting data as a part of course requirements in Houston, TX; College Station; TX; and Dallas, TX. Students with their own research projects (lead researchers) and supervising faculty member remained the same throughout both sets of data collection.

During preliminary stages of development in the spring semester of 2014, lead researchers discussed and refined their projects and the few joint components of each (i.e., data collection methods, theoretical guidance, data needed to address each individual project’s aims and so on). Then, each individual project leader developed a self-completion questionnaire with questions and responses unique to their project aims and theoretical guidance. This resulted in the development of six versions of questionnaires, each version representing a different project. The similarities of data needed for several of the projects led to the creation of six versions of a two-section questionnaire. The first section was identical and included demographic questions and media consumption questions. The second section contained questions solely pertaining to the individual lead researcher’s project.

The first section’s demographic and media consumption questions were drawn from Nielsen’s *U.S. Digital Consumer Report* and Pew Research. This allowed for comparison between a lead researcher’s data and data collected by Nielsen and Pew Research. [DIAGRAM/figure reference]
Version one of the questionnaire (Millennial perceptions of live music events) was unique to this study’s questions and aims.

The visual design of web or paper questionnaires are key for best understandability and response rate. One of the primary functions of visual design is to help the respondent process the questionnaire and it’s components, but it can also make the questionnaire appear more appealing (Dilman et al., 2009). Thus, visual design increases the likelihood of a respondent comprehending and completing the questionnaire. The questionnaires were made into 8.5” x 7” booklets with a consistent design throughout, including the front cover.

**Validity**

For this study, data collection instruments (questionnaires) were designed to include face and content validity. Validity is “whether an indicator (or set of indicators) that is devised to gauge a concept really measures that concept” (Bryman, 2012). Face validity was accounted for through public review of the questionnaire with more than 55 people examining the questionnaire. Each person made note of any grammatical or punctuation errors, confusing instructions, questions, responses and also unclear design choices. Content validity was accounted for by constructing survey questions from literature and widely-accepted industry questions such as Nielsen’s household media survey. These were the foundation for the demographic portion of the questionnaire. For this specific version of the questionnaire, questions were formed through in-depth literature review. This included identifying topics that were not at all addressed in previous studies, or topics that had not yielded an adequate amount of in-depth information.
Reliability

Reliability is “the extent to which measurements are repeatable – when different persons perform the measurements, on different occasions, with supposedly alternative instruments which measure the same thing” (Drost, 2011, p. 106). There are three key concerns with reliability which need to be addressed. These are equivalence, internal consistency and stability over time. A pilot test was conducted in College Station, TX to address reliability before questionnaires were used for data collection. A test-retest was conducted three weeks before distribution to calculate the coefficient of stability. Cohen’s Kappa (κ) coefficient was then determined for each item.

Summary

Student researchers then consolidated and entered data from each of the six versions of the questionnaires. Data from version one of the questionnaires pertain to this study. Respondent data from questionnaires were entered into a Microsoft® Excel® document.

Data analysis and interpretation

After all completed surveys had been collected, organized and the responses recorded into a master Microsoft® Excel® sheet (shared by all individual project leaders), the data were imported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS®) version 22 for Windows® for further analysis. Data types included in this study are nominal, ordinal, interval and ratio. Data from individual variables were categorized based on determinants derived from the social cognitive theory; personal, behavioral and environmental. The relationship between each research question and each corresponding variable from the survey will be explained and categorized, along with
their respective determinant categorization. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency and percent and also cross-tabs, were ran for specific variables to better visualize comparisons and concepts.

Framework

Social Cognitive Theory

To yield a more thorough understanding of the factors which engage Millennials at live music venues and events, Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) was used to guide my research questions and objectives. SCT describes psychosocial functioning as a model of triadic reciprocal causation (Bandura, 1986).

“In this transactional view of self and society, personal factors in the form of cognitive, affective, and biological events, behavioral patterns, and environmental events all operate as interacting determinants that influence each other bidirectionally.” (Bryman, 2001b, p. 266).

Live music venues and events encompass personal, behavioral and environmental determinants and their influences all at once. Each person’s experiences are unique to them, however, their thoughts, actions and reactions are all formed through similar cognitive processes. Understanding these processes and their end result will lead to a better comprehension of what influences Millennials engagement with live music venues and events. SCT provides guidance on interpreting how people are affected by stimuli such as media, social, environmental, and behavioral influences. Figure X below represents a simple model of SCT.
Social Exchange Theory

The social exchange theory introduces an affective aspect to interactions between persons, thereby giving someone an opportunity to better understand the other’s feelings or intent (Lawler, 2001). Lawler (2001) says that if the interaction generates a positive result successfully, then the participants interacting may both feel good about the interaction. “This will motivate each to interact with the same others in the future, expecting another enjoyable result” (Lawler 2001, p. 348). Because people seek and form exchanges to receive benefits, the emotional process affects the outcome of the exchange (Lawler, 2001).

This type of positive interaction would be applied when distributing surveys. Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009) stated that if the researcher has a positive attitude then it could encourage participation (p. 23). Historically, Homans (1958) noted that exchanges are directly affected by a person’s behavior. “Social behavior is an exchange of goods, material goods but also non-material ones, such as the symbols of approval or prestige” (Homans, 1958, p. 606).
Variables Specific to this Study

Through Bandura’s SCT, survey questions were developed to establish the personal, behavioral and environmental determinants necessary to address my research questions and objectives. Through these questions, a person’s perceptions concerning live music venues and events are categorized as one of the three determinants. For example, several environmental amenities are listed in the survey and the respondent rates each item on a 1-5 Likert scale, 1 being “not at all important” and 5 being “very important”. This information allows for a better view of some of the environmental determinants which influence Millennials engagement with live music venues and events. It is possible these questions will give rise to topics for further research.

Subject Characteristics

To create a better view of participating respondents across all generational groups, Table X was created to report the count, study total (column total percent), mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum values for respondent age (D001_RC_E) by generational group (D001_RC_D).

Table 1

Respondent Age by Generational Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Column Count</th>
<th>Column Total %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generationa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Generationa (D001_RC_D); Respondent Ageb (D001_RC_E)
To better describe the participants in this study, respondents were then described using respondent gender (VA_D002) by generational group (D001_RC_D).

Table 2

*Generational Groups by Gender*<sup>e</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>Baby Boomers = born between 1945-1960; <sup>b</sup>Generation X = born between 1961-1979; <sup>c</sup>Millennials = born between 1980-1995; <sup>d</sup>Column total, indicating percent of sample; <sup>e</sup>Traditionalists and Generation Z were excluded for this study.

To break the respondents demographics down further, Table 3 describes respondent sex (VA_D002) by generation (D001_RC_D) by household income (VA_D008).

Table 3

*Generational Groups by Sex and Household Income*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$99,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$250,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1

Research question 1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events? The objectives for this question were to describe and compare personal (affective and cognitive) factors that engage Millennials at contemporary live music venues and events. Each participant was asked several questions relating to their personal preferences connected to live music venues and events, if any: preference on attendance (V1_Q003), past experience satisfaction level (V1_Q005), agreement/disagreement with hypothetical statements pertaining to attendance motivation (V1_Q006), distance willing to travel (V1_Q007), whether alcohol has been or may be consumed at an event (V1_Q008), what genre of music would most likely draw them to an event (V1_Q009), the importance of safety (V1_Q010_R), the importance of merchandise (V1_Q010_S), the importance of comfort (V1_Q010_T), likeliness to attend future live music venue or event (V1_Q013), and at what age they first attended a live music venue or event (V1_Q014).

Research Question 2

The purpose of research question three was to discover and explore the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events. Participants were asked questions such as if they have ever attended a live music venue or event and if so, how many times. Frequencies and percentages were reported to visualize behavioral determinants influencing Millennial engagement with live music venues and events: Have they attended (V1_Q001), how many times (V1_Q002), and the importance of the crowd (V1_Q010_L).
Research Question 3

The purpose of research question four was to describe the environmental determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events. Respondents were asked questions relating to environmental amenities available, and perhaps not available, that influence their engagement with live music venues and events. Behr, Brennan, & Cloonan (2014) investigated some of the same factors considered in this study. In their study, the intimacy or spectacle of the event was investigated, as well as performance equipment, unique atmosphere, character of the venue and expectations of how the event would operate. They found that audience members often valued these aspects to some degree, meaning the environmental setup is in fact important in creating engagement at a live music venue or event. Frequencies and percentages of variables were reported to help visualize the environmental determinants influencing Millennials at live music events and venues: Method Millennial heard about live music venue or event (V1_Q004), distance willing to travel (V1_Q007), whether alcohol has been or may be consumed at an event (V1_Q008), what genre of music would most likely draw them to an event (V1_Q009), environmental amenities rated by importance (atmosphere, energy, food specials, sound quality, volume, seating, lighting, décor, drink quality, smoking area, non-smoking area, crowd, drink specials, spaciousness, cleanliness, uniqueness, safety, merchandise, comfort and food quality) (V1_Q010_A-U), and amount willing to pay for admission/ticket (V1_Q015).
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to better understand what perceptions Millennials have of live music culture and what specific factors engage them. Millennials are the focus of this study, but other generations (Baby Boomers and Generation X) were also included for comparison versus the Millennial generation. This study was a part of a larger study conducted with the Texas A&M ALEC summer research trip and fall research courses. Thus, subject selection and samples were selected purposively by the lead faculty member on the project. Data were analyzed using IBM® SPSS® Statistics version 22.0.

There was an overall total of 214 responses for version one of the survey, before generational filters were used to exclude Traditionalists (born 1901-1944) and Generation Z (born after 1995) respondents. Four Generation Z and 21 Traditionalist respondents were excluded from this study. There were also 12 cases of missing data in the sample of this study that were excluded. This brought the new total of respondents to 177 for version one of the questionnaire.

The larger study total response and cooperation rates are outlined in Table 4. The response rate for this version of the survey was calculated by dividing the number of version one surveys distributed, by the number of version one surveys completed and retrieved. Because this study was a part of the larger study on data collection methods, it could assumed that one-sixth of the questionnaires distributed were version one, totaling approximately 1,290. Using the previous assumption, this study yielded an overall response rate of 14.58%. Quantitative coding recodes
and analyses results specific to this study will be visually presented by each research question and its corresponding research objectives.

Table 4

Response and Cooperation Rates of the larger study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Response Rate(^a) (%)</th>
<th>Cooperation Rate(^b) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMB</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOPU</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>62.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOPU</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>48.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOPU</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>70.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOPU</td>
<td>Ramona, CA</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td>69.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOPU</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>57.48</td>
<td>60.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOPU</td>
<td>Bryan/College Station, TX</td>
<td>76.43</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMB</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOPU</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>68.42</td>
<td>48.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMB</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOPU</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>64.08</td>
<td>42.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMB</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(^a\) Response rate was calculated by dividing the number of questionnaires distributed by the number retrieved \(\times\) 100. \(^b\) Cooperation rate was calculated by dividing the number of face-to-face contacts made by the number of surveys retrieved \(\times\) 100. USPS does not have a Cooperation Rate because no face-to-face contact was made.

Respondents were recoded into generational groups (D001_RC_B – Bosse Coding) from year of birth (V1_D001) by respondent age (D001_RC_E). These generational groups (Traditionalist, Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennial and Generation Z) were then recoded into a truncated variable, excluding Traditionalists and Generation Z respondents (D001_RC_D – Curbello Coding). Traditionalists were excluded because they held a substantially smaller cell size than the other generational groups. Generation Z respondents were excluded because of IRB limitations for this study. Table 5 represents the cell size of generational groups, by gender, from
Recodes and their root variable, syntax and new variable coding are shown in Appendix G.

### Table 5

*Generational Groups by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

- Baby Boomers = born between 1945-1960;
- Generation X = born between 1961-1979;
- Millennials = born between 1980-1995;
- Column total, indicating percent of sample;
- Traditionalists and Generation Z were excluded for this study.

### Research Question 1

The purpose of Research Question 1 was to understand the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events, which were also compared with other generational groups (Baby Boomer and Generation X). Research Question 1 was divided into several research objectives; 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7. These research objectives were then further divided into subsequent research objectives; 1.1.1, 1.1.2, etc. These sub-research questions (respectively) were designated for descriptive (mean, standard deviation and frequency, percent) and comparative analyses (ANOVA, MANOVA, Chi Square), of each research objective and its respective variables.

#### Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.1.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.1.1 was used to describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences (V1_Q005), by generation (D001_RC_D).
Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) was calculated for description of the dependent variable past experiences (V1_Q005), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 6. Most Millennials rated their past experience as mostly satisfactory according to the descriptive mean score.

Table 6

1.1.1 Describe the Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, based on past experiences by generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baby Boomers (n = 56)</th>
<th>Generation X (n = 67)</th>
<th>Millennials (n = 54)</th>
<th>Total (n = 177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Bipolar Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Very satisfied*

**Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.1.2**

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.1.2 was to test for the effect of generation (D001_RC_D) on respondents’ past experience at live music venues (V1_Q005). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated. Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was not significant (p = .333); therefore, the assumptions of homogeneity of variance was not violated. To protect against inflated Type I error (Field, 2009), a Bonferroni correction was calculated and resulted in an adjusted *a priori* alpha of .05. The power of analysis did not reach or exceed the minimum requirement of .80 (1 – β = .092), which was an indication that the results of the ANOVA could have been due to chance or error. Using the adjusted alpha to interpret the results of the ANOVA, we concluded that generation did not have a statistically significant effect (p < 0.05) on respondents’ past experience at live music venues (see Table 7).
1.1.2 Compare Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Past Experience, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>1 - β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>87.112</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>87.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ** Indicates significant results (p = < .05)*

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.2.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.2.1 was used for description of the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) was calculated for the description of the dependent variable amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015), and also for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 8. Millennials most frequently chose the range $100-$150 for the amount willing to pay for admission to a live music venue or event. Baby Boomers more often chose the range $1-$49, while Generation X most often chose the range $50-$99 for the amount willing to pay for admission to a live music venue or event.
Table 8

1.2.1 Describe Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Amount Willing to Pay for Admission by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Willing to Pay for Admission</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 - $99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $149</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 - $199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.2.2

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.2.2 was used to compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between the amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) and generation (D001_RC_D). The greatest chi-square value and only significant relationship was found between the amount willing to pay $1 - $49 (V1_Q015_B) to generation $\chi^2 (7.860, n = 43) = .020, p < .05$ and the least chi-square value was between the amount willing to pay $50 - $99 (V1_Q015_C) to generation $\chi^2 (0.286, n = 63) = .867, p > .05$. The comparative results for amount willing to pay (V1_Q015) by generation (D001_RC_D) are shown in Table 9.
Table 9

1.2.2 Comparing the Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Amount Willing to Pay for Admission, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>( % )</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0^1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $49**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>7.860</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>7.860</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 - $99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>5.692</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>5.692</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 - $199</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.3.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.3.1 was used for the description of cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance (V1_Q006_A through V1_Q006_D), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) was calculated for the description of the dependent variable motivations of attendance (V1_Q006_A through V1_Q006_D), and also for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 10.
Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.3.2

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.3.2 was used to compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance (V1_Q006_A through V1_Q006_D), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between motivations of attendance (V1_Q006_A through V1_Q006_D) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between (V1_Q006_A, V1_Q006_C and V1_Q006_D) and generation (D001_RC_D) was not significant. However, there was a significant relationship between (V1_Q006_B) and generation (D001_RC_D). The greatest chi-square value was “I come for the people and the party” (V1_Q006_B) to generation $\chi^2$ (11.598, $n = 165$) = .003, $p < .05$ and the least chi-square value was “I come to find new music” (V1_Q006_A) to generation $\chi^2$ (3.110, $n = 168$) = .211, $p < .05$. The comparative analysis results for generation were presented in Table 11.
### Table 11

**1.3.2 Compare the Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Motivations of Attendance, by Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations of Attendance</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I come to find new music&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I come for the people and the party&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It's just something to do&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would follow this band anywhere&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

- "I come to find new music" = (V1_Q006_A);
- "I come for the people and the party" = (V1_Q006_B);
- "It's just something to do" = (V1_Q006_C);
- "I would follow this band anywhere" = (V1_Q006_D)
Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.4.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.4.1 was used for the description of cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on method of discovery (V1_Q004_A through V1_Q004_G), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) was calculated for the description of the dependent variable method of discovery (V1_Q004_A through V1_Q004_G), and also for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 12.

Table 12

1.4.1 Describe Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Method of Discovery, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Family</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flier/Print</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.4.2

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.4.2 was used to compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on method of discovery (V1_Q004_A through V1_Q004_G), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between method of discovery (V1_Q004_A through V1_Q004_G) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between (V1_Q004_C through V1_Q004_G) and generation (D001_RC_D) was not significant. However, there was a significant relationship between social
media (V1_Q004_A) and website (V1_Q004_B) to generation (D001_RC_D). The greatest chi-square value was website (V1_Q004_B) to generation $\chi^2 (10.399, n = 160) = .006, p < .05$ and the least chi-square value was television (V1_Q004_E) to generation $\chi^2 (.071, n = 154) = .965, p < .05$. The comparative analysis results for generation were presented in Table 13.

Table 13

1.4.2 Compare the Cognitive Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Motivations of Attendance, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Discovery</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.173</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.399</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flier/Print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.883</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.5.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.5.1 was used for the description of affective aspects of personal determinants, based on venue features (V1_Q010_B; V1_Q010_Q; V1_Q010_T), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were calculated for description of the dependent variable venue features (V1_Q010_B; V1_Q010_Q; V1_Q010_T) and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 14.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baby Boomers (n =)</th>
<th>Generation X (n =)</th>
<th>Millennials (n =)</th>
<th>Total (n =)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bipolar Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 5 = Very important

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.5.2

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.5.2 was used to compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on venue features energy (V1_Q010_B), uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) and comfort (V1_Q010_T), by generation (D001_RC_D). A MANOVA was used to compare the mean scores of independent variables, venue features (V1_Q010_B; V1_Q010_Q; V1_Q010_T) across conditions and test interactions among dependent variables, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 15.
Box’s test of equality of covariance was significant ($p = .015$), which was an indicator that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was violated (Field, 2012). Based on this outcome of the Box’s Test, results of the MANOVA used to address RO 1.5.2 should be approached cautiously because the results of the test are completely reliant on the robustness of the test (Newton & Rudestam, 1999). Comparison groups were unequal in size. We chose to interpret MANOVA results using the Wilk’s lambda statistic because with three or more independent variables (generational groups), “it serves as criteria for evaluating differences across the dimensions of dependent variables” (Newton & Rudestam, 1999).

Results of the MANOVA indicated the effect of time of generation (D001_RC_D) on venue features energy (V1_Q010_B), uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) and comfort (V1_Q010_T) was not significant, $\Lambda = .925; F (2.009, 304.000) = 1.714; p = .064; \eta^2_p = .038; 1 – \beta = .730$. MANOVA results for energy (V1_Q010_B), uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) and comfort (V1_Q010_T) did not meet the minimum requirements ($1 – \beta \geq .80$) for power of analysis ($1 – \beta = .730$) and, therefore, should be approached with caution.

Subsequent univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) were carried out on each of the dependent variables venue features energy (V1_Q010_B), uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) and comfort (V1_Q010_T). A Bonferonni correction was applied to each of the subsequent ANOVAs to protect against inflated Type I error (Field, 2009). ANOVA results indicated significant interactions between subjects in the variable uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) ($p = .034, \eta^2 = .042, 1 – \beta = .640$) for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D). ANOVA results indicated non-significant interactions between subjects in the variables energy (V1_Q010_B) and comfort (V1_Q010_T).
(V1_Q010_B) ($p = .194$, $\eta^2 = .021$, $1 - \beta = .346$), and comfort (V1_Q010_T) ($p = .756$, $\eta^2 = .004$, $1 - \beta = .094$) for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D). Results for energy (V1_Q010_B), uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) and comfort (V1_Q010_T) did not meet the minimum requirements for power of analysis ($\geq .80$) and, therefore, should be approached with caution. Results for follow-up ANOVAS are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

1.5.2 Compare Affective Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Venue Features by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>$1 - \beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.934</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.814</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1755.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.680</td>
<td>2.340</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>218.795</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2145.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>146.223</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2557.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Indicates significant results

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.6.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.6.1 was used for the description of affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre (V1_Q009), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were calculated for description of the dependent
variable music genre (V1_Q009) and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Genre</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip Hop/R&amp;B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed AC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap/Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.6.2

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.6.2 was used to compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre (V1_Q009), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between music genre (V1_Q009) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between these variables was not significant. The greatest chi-square value was between Hip Hop/R&B (V1_Q009) to generation $\chi^2 (5.818, n = 22) = .055, p > .05$ and the least chi-square value was between Folk (V1_Q009) to generation $\chi^2 (.200, n =10) = .905, p > .05$. The comparative analysis results were presented in Table 17.
### Table 17

#### 1.6.2 Compare Affective Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Music Genre, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Music Genre</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hip Hop/R&amp;B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.818</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mix AC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rap/Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reggae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.7.1

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.7.1 was used for the description of affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance (V1_Q003), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were calculated for description of the dependent variable preference of attendance (V1_Q009) and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 18.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference of Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a Group</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.7.2

Research Question 1: Research Objective 1.7.2 was used to compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance (V1_Q003), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between preference of attendance (V1_Q003) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between these variables was not significant. The greatest chi-square value was between with a group (V1_Q003) to generation $\chi^2 (1.684, n = 133) = .431, p > .05$ and the least chi-square value...
was between not at all (V1_Q003) to generation $\chi^2 (.500, n = 4) = .779, p > .05$ The comparative analysis results for generation were presented in Table 19.

Table 19

1.7.2 Compare Affective Aspects of Personal Determinants, Based on Preference of Attendance, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference of Attendance</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>1.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>1.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

The purpose of Research Question 2 was to understand the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events, which were also compared with other generational groups (Baby Boomer and Generation X). Research Question 2 was divided into several research objectives; 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5. These research objectives were then further divided into subsequent research objectives; 2.1.1, 2.1.2, etc. These sub-research questions (respectively) were designated for descriptive (mean, standard deviation
Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.1.1

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.1.1 was used to describe the aspects of behavioral determinants, based on alcohol consumption (V1_Q008), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) was calculated for description of the dependent variable alcohol consumption (V1_Q008), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 20.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.1.2

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.1.2 was used to compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) and generation (D001_RC_B). The relationship between these variables was significant. The chi-square and significance level for alcohol consumption and generational group was significant.
consumption (V1_Q008) to generation was $\chi^2 (8.174, n = 170) = .017, p < .05$. The comparative analysis results were presented in Table 21.

Table 21

2.1.2 Compare Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, based on Alcohol Consumption, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Consumption</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.2.1

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.2.1 was used to describe the aspects of behavioral determinants, based on music genre (V1_Q009), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) was calculated for description of the dependent variable music genre (V1_Q009), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 22.
### Table 22

**2.2.1 Describe the Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events Based on Music Genre, by Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Genre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip Hop/R&amp;B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed AC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap/Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.2.2**

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.2.2 was used to compare the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre (V1_Q009) by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between music genre (V1_Q009) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between these variables was not significant. The greatest chi-square value was between Hip Hop/R&B (V1_Q009) to generation $\chi^2 (5.818, n = 22) = .055, p > .05$ and the least chi-square value was between Folk (V1_Q009) to generation $\chi^2 (200, n = 10) = .905, p > .05$. The comparative analysis results were presented in Table 23.
### Table 23

2.2.2 Compare the Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events Based on Music Genre, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Genre</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hip Hop/R&amp;B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.818</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mix AC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rap/Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reggae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.3.1

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.3.1 was used to describe the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on household income (V1_D008), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) was calculated for description of the dependent variable household income (V1_D008), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 24.

Table 24

2.3.1 Describe the Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events Based on Household Income, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$49,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$99,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$250,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.3.2

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.3.2 was used to compare the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on household income (V1_D008) by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square (χ²) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between household income (V1_D008) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between the income level ($30,000-$49,999) and generation (D001_RC_D) was significant (6.400, n = 15) = .041, p < .05. The relationship between the income level ($100,000-$249,999) and generation (D001_RC_D) was significant (16.381, n = 63) = .000, p < .05. The least chi-square
value was between the household income level $50,000-$99,999 (V1_D008) to generation $\chi^2$ (.737, \(n = 57\)) = .692, \(p > .05\). The comparative analysis results were presented in Table 25.

Table 25

2.3.2 Compare the Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events Based on Household Income, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.895</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$49,999**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$249,999**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.381</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.4.1

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.4.1 was used to describe the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were calculated for description of the dependent variables venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G),
and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 26.

Table 26

2.4.1 Describe the Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Venue Features, By Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue Features</th>
<th>Baby Boomers (n = 50)</th>
<th>Generation X (n = 55)</th>
<th>Millennials (n = 42)</th>
<th>Total (n = 147)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Quality</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bipolar Scale: 1 = not at all important; 5 = very important

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.4.2

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.4.2 was used to compare the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G), by generation (D001_RC_D). A MANOVA was used to compare the mean scores of independent variables, venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G) across conditions and test interactions among dependent variables, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 27.

Box’s test of equality of covariance was significant ($p = .002$), which was an indicator that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was violated (Field, 2012). Based on this outcome of the Box’s Test, results of the MANOVA used to address RO 2.4.2 should be approached
cautiously because the results of the test are completely reliant on the robustness of the test (Newton & Rudestam, 1999). Comparison groups were unequal in size. We chose to interpret MANOVA results using the Wilk’s lambda statistic because with three or more independent variables (generational groups), “it serves as criteria for evaluating differences across the dimensions of dependent variables” (Newton & Rudestam, 1999).

Results of the MANOVA indicated the effect of time of generation (D001_RC_D) on venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G) was significant, \( \Lambda = .760; F(2.894, 276.000) = 1.714; p = .000; \eta^2 = .128; 1 – \beta = .995 \). MANOVA results for (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G) exceeded the minimum requirements (1 – \( \beta \) ≥ .80) for power of analysis (1 – \( \beta \) = .995) and, therefore, significant results were not due to chance or error.

After identifying a significant MANOVA, subsequent ANOVAs were carried out on each of the dependent variables venue features energy (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G). A Bonferonni correction was applied to each of the subsequent ANOVAs to protect against inflated Type I error (Field, 2009). ANOVA results indicated significant interactions between subjects in the variable atmosphere (V1_Q010_A) (\( p = .028, \eta^2 = .045, 1 – \beta = .666 \)) and variable food specials (V1_Q010_C) (\( p = .001, \eta^2 = .083, 1 – \beta = .923 \)) for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D).

ANOVA results indicated non-significant interactions between subjects in the variables energy (V1_Q010_B) (\( p = .194, \eta^2 = .021, 1 – \beta = .346 \)), sound quality (V1_Q010_D) (\( p = .198, \eta^2 = .021, 1 – \beta = .341 \)), volume (V1_Q010_E) (\( p = .186, \eta^2 = .021, 1 – \beta = .354 \)), seating
(V1_Q010_F) ($p = .781$, $\eta^2 = .003$, $1 - \beta = .089$), and lighting (V1_Q010_G) ($p = .402$, $\eta^2 = .012$, $1 - \beta = .206$) for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D). Only results for food specials (V1_Q010_C) exceeded the threshold for the power of analysis ($\geq .80$) therefore, significant results were not due to chance or error. Results for energy (V1_Q010_B), sound quality (V1_Q010_D), volume (V1_Q010_E), seating (V1_Q010_F), lighting (V1_Q010_G) did not meet the minimum requirements for power of analysis ($\geq .80$) and, therefore, should be approached with caution. Results for follow-up ANOVAS are shown in Table 27.

Table 27

2.4.2 Compare Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Past Experience by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>$1 - \beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.381</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135.392</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2622.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.680</td>
<td>2.340</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>218.795</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2145.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Specials**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.819</td>
<td>12.909</td>
<td>6.987</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>284.538</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1566.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>118.066</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2896.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>150.922</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2457.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2 Compare Behavioral Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Past Experience by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Willing to Pay</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1-$49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-$149</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-$199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Indicates significant results (p = < .05)

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.5.1

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.5.1 was used to describe the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on the amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were calculated for description of the dependent variables venue features (V1_Q015), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 28.
Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.5.2

Research Question 2: Research Objective 2.5.2 was used to compare the behavioral aspects of live music venues and events, based on the amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015), by generation (D001_RC_D). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for comparison of the dependent variables amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) and independent variables generation (D001_RC_D). This test is a “rank-based nonparametric test that can be used to determine if there are statistically significant differences between two or more groups of an independent variable on a continuous or ordinal dependent variable” (LAERD Statistics, 2013). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in amounts willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) score between 3 groups of different generational groups (D001_RC_D). Distributions of amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median scores for amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) were statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi^2(3) = 13.003, p = .002$. Subsequently, pairwise comparisons were performed using Dunn’s (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted $p$-values are presented. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences in amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) scores between Baby Boomers ($Mdn = 3.00$) and Millennials ($Mdn = 3.00$) ($p = .019$) and Baby Boomers and Generation X ($Mdn = 3.00$) ($p = .002$) generational groups, but not between Generation X and Millennials ($Mdn = 1.000$) generational groups. Visual results for 2.5.2 can be found in Appendix I.
Research Question 3

The purpose of Research Question 3 was to understand the environmental determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events, which were also compared with other generational groups (Baby Boomer and Generation X). Research Question 3 was divided into several research objectives; 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. These research objectives were then further divided into subsequent research objectives; 3.1.1, 3.1.2, etc. These sub-research questions (respectively) were designated for descriptive analyses (mean, standard deviation and frequency, percent) and comparative analyses (MANOVA, Chi Square, Mann-Whitney U) of each research objective and its respective variables.

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.1.1

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.1.1 was used to describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel (V1_Q007), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were calculated for description of the dependent variables distance willing to travel (V1_Q007), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 29.
3.1.1 Describe the Environmental Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Distance Willing to Travel, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 hour</td>
<td>28 (48.3%)</td>
<td>20 (34.5%)</td>
<td>10 (17.2%)</td>
<td>58 (34.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>15 (20.3%)</td>
<td>36 (48.6%)</td>
<td>23 (31.1%)</td>
<td>74 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>8 (29.6%)</td>
<td>6 (22.2%)</td>
<td>13 (48.1%)</td>
<td>27 (16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 hours</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 hours</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 hours</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55 (32.5%)</td>
<td>65 (38.5%)</td>
<td>49 (29.0%)</td>
<td>169 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.1.2

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.1.2 was used to compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel (V1_Q007), by generation (D001_RC_D). A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) between generations (D001_RC_D). Distributions of the distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) for Baby Boomers and Generation X were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Median distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) score was not statistically significantly different between Baby Boomers (Mdn = 1.00; mean rank = 56.66) and Generation X (Mdn = 2.00; mean rank = 63.75), U = 1576.500, z = -1.200, p = .230. Therefore, we retain the null hypothesis.

Distributions of the distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) for Baby Boomers and Millennials were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) scores for Millennials (mean rank = 60.22) were statistically significantly higher than for Baby Boomers (mean rank = 45.62), U = 969, z = -2.067, p = .009. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis.
Distributions of the distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) for Generation X and Millennials were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) scores for Millennials (mean rank = 64.42) were statistically significantly higher than for Generation X (mean rank = 52.28), $U = 1253.500, z = -2.119, p = .034$. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis. Mann-Whitney U test results for all three comparisons are shown in Table 30.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation Comparison</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer vs.</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>1576.500</td>
<td>-1.200</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>GX</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer vs.</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>969.000</td>
<td>-2.067</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>60.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial vs.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>64.42</td>
<td>1253.500</td>
<td>-2.119</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>GX</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. aTotal N of respondents in designated combined generation categories.

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.2.1

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.2.1 was used to describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption (V1_Q008), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were calculated for description of the dependent variables alcohol consumption (V1_Q008), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 31.
Table 31

3.2.1 Describe the Environmental Aspects Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Alcohol Consumption (Venue Serves Alcohol), by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th></th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.2.2

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.2.2 was used to compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption (V1_Q008), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between these variables was significant. The results were alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) to generation $\chi^2 (8.174, n = 170) = .017, p < .05$. The comparative analysis results were presented in Table 32.

Table 32

3.2.2 Compare the Environmental Aspects of Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Alcohol Consumption (Venue Serves Alcohol), by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Consumption</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>8.174</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.3.1

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.3.1 was used to describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre (V1_Q009), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were calculated for description of the dependent variables music genre (V1_Q009), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 33.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
<th>Millennials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip Hop/R&amp;B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed AC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rap/Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.3.2

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.3.2 was used to compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre (V1_Q009), by generation (D001_RC_D). A chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was performed to examine the relation between music genre (V1_Q009), and generation (D001_RC_D). The relationship between these variables was not significant; $\chi^2 (18.245, n = 171) = .196, p > .05$. The comparative analysis results were presented in Table 34.
### Table 34

3.3.2 Compare the Environmental Aspects of Live Music Venues and Events Based on Music by Genre, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Genre</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hip Hop/R&amp;B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.818</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mix AC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rap/Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reggae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.4.1

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.4.1 was used to describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U), by generation (D001_RC_D). Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were calculated for description of the dependent variables venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U), and (frequency and percent) for the independent variable, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 35.

Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue Features</th>
<th>Baby Boomers (n = 56)</th>
<th>Generation X (n = 67)</th>
<th>Millennials (n = 54)</th>
<th>Total (n = 177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Specials</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Quality</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Décor</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Quality</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Specials</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.1 Describe the Environmental Aspects of Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Venue Features, by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>3.6</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaciousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Quality</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bipolar Scale: 1 = not at all important; 5 = very important

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.4.2

Research Question 3: Research Objective 3.4.2 was used to compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U), by generation (D001_RC_D). A MANOVA was used to compare the mean scores of independent variables, venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U) across conditions and test interactions among dependent variables, generational groups (D001_RC_D), shown in Table 36.

Box’s test of equality of covariance was significant ($p = .039$), which was an indicator that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was violated (Field, 2012). Based on this outcome of the Box’s Test, results of the MANOVA used to address RO 3.4.2 should be approached cautiously because the results of the test are completely reliant on the robustness of the test (Newton & Rudestam, 1999). Comparison groups were unequal in size. We chose to interpret MANOVA results using the Wilk’s lambda statistic because with three or more independent variables (generational groups), “it serves as criteria for evaluating differences across the dimensions of dependent variables” (Newton & Rudestam, 1999).
Results of the MANOVA indicated the effect of time of generation (D001_RC_D) on venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U) was significant, $\Lambda = .681; F(28.00, 254.00) = 1.714; p = .005; \eta^2 = .175; 1 - \beta = .996)$. MANOVA results for venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U) exceeded the minimum requirements ($1 - \beta \geq .80$) for power of analysis ($1 - \beta = .996$) and, therefore, significant results were not due to chance or error.

After identifying a significant MANOVA, subsequent ANOVAs were carried out on each of the dependent variables venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_E, V1_Q010_G, V1_Q010_H, V1_Q010_I, V1_Q010_L, V1_Q010_M, V1_Q010_N, V1_Q010_Q, V1_Q010_T, V1_Q010_U). A Bonferonni correction was applied to each of the subsequent ANOVAs to protect against inflated Type I error (Field, 2009). ANOVA results indicated significant interactions between subjects in the variable atmosphere (V1_Q010_A) ($p = .028, \eta^2 = .045, 1 - \beta = .666$), food specials (V1_Q010_C) ($p = .001, \eta^2 = .083, 1 - \beta = .923$), drink quality (V1_Q010_I) ($p = .000, \eta^2 = .157, 1 - \beta = .999$), drink specials (V1_Q010_M) ($p = .000, \eta^2 = .140, 1 - \beta = .996$) and uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) ($p = .034, \eta^2 = .042, 1 - \beta = .640$ for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D).

Only results for food specials (V1_Q010_C), drink quality (V1_Q010_I) and drink specials (V1_Q010_M) exceeded the threshold for the power of analysis ($\geq .80$) therefore, significant results for these variables were not due to chance or error. Results for atmosphere (V1_Q010_A),
and uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) did not meet the minimum requirements for power of analysis (≥.80) and, therefore, should be approached with caution. Results for follow-up ANOVAS are shown in Table 36.

Table 36

3.4.2 Compare Environmental Associated with Live Music Venues and Events, Based on Venue Features by Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ηp²</th>
<th>1 – β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.381</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135.392</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2622.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Specials**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.819</td>
<td>12.909</td>
<td>6.987</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>284.538</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1566.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Quality**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.783</td>
<td>22.391</td>
<td>14.430</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>240.515</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1461.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Specials**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.254</td>
<td>19.127</td>
<td>12.603</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>235.240</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1266.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.934</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156.814</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1755.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Indicates significant results.
Data analyses were presented in three sections. The first addressed the descriptive and comparative analyses results for research objectives related to Research Question 1, quantitatively. The second addressed the descriptive and comparative analyses results for research objectives related to Research Question 2, quantitatively. The third addressed the descriptive and comparative analyses results for research objectives related to Research Question 3, quantitatively. Chapter IV summarizes the findings and results of this study. An explanation will be given of the meaning of the results for practitioners and researchers, as well as decision-making criteria moving forward. Recommendations for future research will be presented to increase scholarly productivity for the Millennial generation group.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Study
The primary purpose of this study was to explore what factors engage the Millennial generation within live music venues and events, or the live music culture. Guided by Bandura’s SCT, we categorized factors of engagement as personal, behavioral and environmental determinants of live music venues and events. Millennials were compared with other generational groups (Baby Boomers and Generation X) to better recognize which factors were of greater importance to, or had a greater effect on the Millennial generation. This information may help to further understand Millennials’ perceptions, participation, engagement, motivations and decisions related to live music venues and events. The generational groups involved were Baby Boomers (born 1945 – 1960), Generation X (born 1961 – 1979), and Millennials (born 1980 – 1995). Nielsen (2014) acknowledged the largest 10 U.S. markets for highly concentrated Millennials. Of the 10 locations, five were sampled in this study (San Diego, CA; Denver, CO; Houston, TX; San Francisco, CA; Dallas, TX).

Research has been performed depicting audience members emotional reactions to live music, but often times these studies focus on the use of classical music performances. This may not accurately reflect Millennials reactions and engagement with contemporary live music venues and events, which are more diversified in respect to genre than classical performances. Music is a social activity that is experienced uniquely by each participant, but it is experienced together at live music venues and events. “Christopher Small’s concept of “musicking” distills this idea
down into the notion that every musical activity is a form of social acknowledgment and affirmation in which each person present is participating.” (Smalls, n.d.) At a music concert, there are varying levels of engagement happening across each individual’s experience. Some may be invested in every aspect of the performance, while others are merely there for the social interaction facilitated by the gathering of more than likely large crowds, many of whom share the same musical tastes and possibly other social values. Hagen (2005) begins to explore the different “zones” associated with live music venues and events found by Fonarow (2006), each zone containing a different type of participant, all of varying degrees of engagement. I believe that this would be valuable to follow-up on in future studies related to this topic.

A conservative approach was taken when analyzing the data and interpreting the results and findings by using adjusted alpha levels; because of unknown amounts and sources of error (e.g., sampling error, non-response error, frame error), the results and findings of this study were restricted to the participants of this study.

This study was a part of a larger study on data collection methods and, therefore, limitations in the sampling, methods, and processes existed. Following the social exchange theory, we noticed an increased response rate. However, this method was not the most efficient nor cost-effective way to obtain data for this study. For future and duplicate studies, web-based surveys should be considered for instrumentation. Also, by conducting this study in conjunction with five other projects, many questions included in the questionnaire did not directly pertain to this specific study. In the future, individualizing a project with this scope will allow more focused and specific data to be collected. Population and sampling may be further refined for efficiency.
The live music industry is not exempt from technological changes of recent decades. The way in which Millennials participate in the live music culture is different than previous generations. Although this is true because of things such as live music event streaming online, personal videos collected at the venue or event shared with fellow fans, among other items, some of the basic wants and needs are still similar. To address these needs, it should be known what physical, behavioral and environmental aspects determine a participant’s engagement with the live music venue or event. Frith (2012) mentions that a venue owners success and profits stem from the audiences’ loyalty to the location as much as it is from the appeal of a particular performer or act.

This study can be relevant for performers, venue/event coordinators and promoters involved in the live music industry. Millennials will represent the largest share of U.S. spending power by 2017 (Pew, 2010) and it is important for these individuals to be able to market to this segment of consumers.

Summary of Findings
Research Question 1 and its objectives were meant to describe and compare the cognitive and affective personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events. Based on quantitative results, a better understanding of which personal determinants influenced Millennials engagement was formed. Millennials rated their past experiences with live music venues and events (RO1.1.1) as mostly satisfactory according to the descriptive mean score ($M = 4.1, SD = .8$), which was the same if not slightly higher than Baby Boomers ($M = 4.0, SD = .9$) and Generation X’s ($M = 4.1, SD = .7$) mean scores. However, an
ANOVA was run for comparative analysis (RO1.1.2) for the effect of generation (D001_RC_D) on past experiences (V1_Q005) and it showed there was no statistically significant association between the two variables.

The descriptive analysis for amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) between generations (D001_RC_D) (RO1.2.1) revealed that most Millennials surveyed were willing to pay higher amounts, ranging from $50 and up to $149, for admission to a live music venue or event. This was compared to Baby Boomers who more often chose lower amount ranges ($1-$99) and Generation X respondents who chose similarly higher amounts ($50-$149), as Millennials. This indicates that Millennials may be more than likely willing to pay higher amounts for admission to live music venues and events than other generations, excluding Generation X. A nonparametric chi-square test of independence (RO1.2.2) showed that there was only a statistically significant (p< .05 = .020) effect between generations and the amount willing to pay for admission $1-$49 (V1_Q015_B). Millennials appear to be willing to pay more for admission to live music venues and events, and this supports Behr, Brennan & Cloonan’s (2014) statement that cost only affects the initial decision to go to the event or not, but does not affect the value of the experience or expectations. Value for money “decisions do not really apply to the perceived quality/enjoyment of the show in ways, they might other commodities.” (Behr, Brennan & Cloonan, 2014).

The descriptive analysis for (RO1.3.1) respondents’ motivations of attendance (V1_Q006_A through V1_Q006_D) between generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennials most often agreed with the statement “I come to find new music”. Baby Boomers and Generation X also
most often agreed with the statement “I come to find new music”, meaning 68.5% of respondents (all generations) chose this as their motivation for attendance. A nonparametric chi-square test was run for comparison, and there was a significant relationship between generation (D001_RC_D) and the motivation for attendance statement “I come for the people and the party”. For future related studies, it is suggested that these motivations of attendance are better categorized or established by Millennials themselves through qualitative interviews and observations.

The descriptive analysis for (RO1.4.1) respondents method of discovery (V1_Q004_A through V1_Q004_G) for each generation (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennials most often discovered live music venues and events from websites or family/friends, and the next highest response was through social media sources. Baby Boomers most often selected family/friends as their method of discovery, with radio following as the next highest response. Generation X respondents most often chose friends/family, followed by website and radio sources as their method of discovery for live music venues and events. A nonparametric chi-square test was run for comparison, and there was a significant relationship between generations (D001_RC_D) and social media and websites as method of discovery. This supports the claim by Carter (2009) that digital media has reshaped the live music business and is now the more popular method of discovery for live music venues and events, especially among Millennials.

The descriptive analysis for (RO1.5.1) venue features energy, uniqueness and comfort (V1_Q010_B; V1_Q010_Q; V1_Q010_T) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that on a scale from 1-5 (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important) Millennials ranked comfort highest
(\(M = 3.8\)) and uniqueness lowest (\(M = 3.5\)) when describing the mean scores for each venue feature. Baby Boomers scored comfort highest (\(M = 4.0\)), and Generation X also scored comfort highest (\(M = 3.9\)). Overall, the lowest scored venue feature was uniqueness.

Based on the quantitative results of the MANOVA (RO1.5.2) used to compare the mean scores of the influence of venue features (energy, uniqueness, comfort) across generations, there was no observed significant relationship between these venue features importance across generations. The follow-up ANOVAs reported there was a difference in the influence of uniqueness across generational groups. The data included in this study were analyzed conservatively. In future research, a Bonferroni adjustment may not be necessary, thus, yield more significant findings with a \textit{priori} alpha level of .05.

The descriptive analysis for (RO1.6.1) music genre (V1_Q009) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennials most often chose Hip Hop/R&B as an enticing genre for a live music venue or event. Millennials also equally chose the ‘other’ option in the questionnaire and proceeded to input a choice that was not already available to them. Baby Boomers most often responded with Mixed Adult Contemporary as an enticing genre for a live music venue and event, followed by the ‘other’ option in the questionnaire. Generation X respondents most often chose Mixed Adult Contemporary as an enticing genre for a live music venue and event, followed by the ‘other’ option the questionnaire. This shows that out of all of the genres available for selection, the generations all had varied opinions on what would be the most enticing genre. Hagen (2005) states that “modern music consumers also often value a more omnivorous approach in their tastes” – meaning that this may be the reason why there wasn’t any
overwhelming, unified consensus about which genre was most enticing. A nonparametric chi-square test (RO1.6.2) was run for comparative analysis, and there were no observed statistically significant relationships between generations (D001_RC_D) and enticing music genres (V1_Q009).

The descriptive analysis for (RO1.7.1) preference of attendance (V1_Q003) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennials most often preferred to attend live music venues and events with a group. Baby Boomers and Generation X also most often preferred to attend with a group. There were no responses across all generations for attending a live music venue and event alone. A nonparametric chi-square test was run for comparative analysis (RO1.7.2), and there were no observed statistically significant relationships between generations (D001_RC_D) and preferences of attendance (V1_Q003). This supplements the claim by Behr, Brennan & Cloonan (2014) that many audiences frequently observe the “communal experience of music” as valuable. However, for future related studies, qualitative observation and interviewing would be ideal to further support and explain these preferences.

Research Question 2 and its objectives were meant to describe and compare the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events. Based on quantitative results, a better understanding of which behavioral determinants influenced Millennials engagement was formed. Descriptive analysis for (RO2.1.1) alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that most Millennial respondents would or have consumed alcohol at a live music venue or event. Generation X respondents mostly agreed they would or have consumed alcohol at a live music venue or event.
Baby Boomers had a smaller margin of yes responses for alcohol consumption, but alcohol consumption was still favored at live music venues and events. A nonparametric chi-square test was run for comparison (RO2.1.2), and there was an observed significant relationship between generations (D001_RC_D) and alcohol consumption (V1_Q008).

The descriptive analysis for (RO2.3.1) household income (V1_D008) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that most Millennial respondents fell in the $50,000-$99,999 income bracket, followed by the <$30,000 bracket. Baby Boomer and Generation X respondents mostly fell within the same and higher brackets of $50,000-$249,000. A nonparametric chi-square test was run for comparative analysis (RO2.3.2), and there were observed statistically significant relationships between household income levels $30,000-$49,999 and $100,000-$249,999 (V1_D008) across generations (D001_RC_D). The reason for this comparative analysis (combined with information from RO1.2.1 analysis relating to amount willing to pay for admission across generations) was to explore if there was any relationship between generations’ household income (V1_D008) and price willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015).

The descriptive analysis for (RO2.4.1) venue features atmosphere, energy, food specials, sound quality, volume, seating and lighting (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G, respectively) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that on a scale from 1-5 (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important) Millennial respondents ranked atmosphere (V1_Q010_A) (M = 4.1), sound quality (V1_Q010_D) (M = 4.3) and volume (V1_Q010_E) (M = 4.0) as the most important venue features when describing the mean scores for each venue feature. Baby Boomers scored sound quality (V1_Q010_D) highest (M = 4.0), and Generation X also scored sound quality highest (M
Overall, the lowest scored (least important) venue feature across all generations was food specials (V1_Q010_C) (total $M = 2.8$).

A MANOVA was used to compare the mean scores of independent variables (RO2.4.2), venue features (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G) across conditions and test interactions among dependent variables, generational groups (D001_RC_D). After identifying a significant MANOVA, subsequent ANOVAs were carried out on each of the dependent variables venue features energy (V1_Q010_A through V1_Q010_G). A Bonferonni correction was applied to each of the subsequent ANOVAs to protect against inflated Type I error (Field, 2009). ANOVA results indicated significant interactions between subjects in the variable atmosphere (V1_Q010_A) ($p = .028$, $\eta^2 = .045$, $1 - \beta = .666$) and variable food specials (V1_Q010_C) ($p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .083$, $1 - \beta = .923$) for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D). Only results for food specials (V1_Q010_C) exceeded the threshold for the power of analysis ($\geq .80$) therefore, significant results were not due to chance or error. Results for energy (V1_Q010_B), sound quality (V1_Q010_D), volume (V1_Q010_E), seating (V1_Q010_F), lighting (V1_Q010_G) did not meet the minimum requirements for power of analysis ($\geq .80$).

The descriptive analysis for (RO2.5.1) the amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennial respondents most often chose the amount of $100-$149 for the highest amount they would be willing to pay for admission to a live music venue or event. This range was followed by the second most often chosen admission price, $150-$199 by Millennial respondents. Baby Boomer respondents chose the price range of $1-$49, while Generation X respondents most often chose the $50-$99 price range for the amount
willing to pay for admission to a live music venue or event. This indicates that Millennials are far more likely to spend higher amounts on tickets for live music venues and events compared to other generations. Meaning, Millennials are the demographic that should be targeted and accommodated by live music venues and events.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for comparison (RO2.5.2) of the dependent variables amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) and independent variable generations (D001_RC_D). Median scores for amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) were statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi^2(3) = 13.003, p = .002$. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences in amount willing to pay for admission (V1_Q015) scores between Baby Boomers ($Mdn = 3.00$) and Millennials ($Mdn = 3.00$) ($p = .019$) and Baby Boomers and Generation X ($Mdn = 3.00$) ($p = .002$) generational groups, but not between Generation X and Millennials ($Mdn = 1.000$) generational groups. Visual results for 2.5.2 can be found in Appendix --.

Research Question 3 and its objectives were meant to describe and compare the environmental determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events. Mencarelli and Pulh (2006) claim that the venue is an essential catalyst for the interaction of the audiences with all of the amenities of said venue, and affects the audience’s interaction with the venue itself and its personnel. Based on quantitative results, a better understanding of which environmental determinants influenced Millennials engagement was formed.
The descriptive analysis for (RO3.1.1) distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) across generational groups (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennials were most willing to travel 1-2 hours to a live music venue or event, followed by 3-4 hours of travel. The majority of Baby Boomer respondents chose a distance less than 1 hour to travel for a live music venue or event, while Generation X most often chose a distance of 1-2 hours of travel to a live music venue or event. Along with typically choosing to pay more for admission, Millennials are also willing to travel farther compared to other generational groups (Baby Boomers and Generation X) to a live music venue or event. According to Kronenburg (2011), ease of access to a live music venue or event is important; this including location, entrance, waiting areas and overall effective use of space. There were no distance parameters set in this study, but in general Millennials appear to be the most dedicated toward traveling longer distances. This is important for the engagement of Millennials at live music venues and events because since Millennials are often willing to travel further, their experience should be heightened and satisfactory when they do arrive from the venue amenities and more. For future studies, the different type of venues should be further categorized and investigated; including outdoor, indoor, adopted and mobile spaces.

A Mann-Whitney U test (RO3.1.2) was run to determine if there were differences in distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) between generations (D001_RC_D). Population pyramids were created to compare the median scores of each comparison group (Baby Boomers vs. Generation X; Baby Boomers vs. Millennials; Generation X vs. Millennials). Distributions of the distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) for Baby Boomers and Generation X were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Median distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) score was not statistically significantly different between Baby Boomers (Mdn = 1.00; mean rank = 56.66) and Generation
X (Mdn = 2.00; mean rank = 63.75), U = 1576.500, z = -1.200, p = .230. Therefore, we retain the null hypothesis. Distributions of the distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) for Baby Boomers and Millennials were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) scores for Millennials (mean rank = 60.22) were statistically significantly higher than for Baby Boomers (mean rank = 45.62), U = 969, z = -2.067, p = .009. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis. Distributions of the distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) for Generation X and Millennials were similar, as assessed by visual inspection. Distance willing to travel (V1_Q007) scores for Millennials (mean rank = 64.42) were statistically significantly higher than for Generation X (mean rank = 52.28), U = 1253.500, z = -2.119, p = .034. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis.

The descriptive analysis for (RO3.2.1) alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that a majority of Millennial respondents have consumed or would consider consuming alcohol at a live music venue or event. Baby Boomers and Generation X respondents most often agreed they have or would consume alcohol at a live music venue or event, but are represented by smaller margins than the Millennial respondents. A chi-square (χ²) test of independence was performed for comparative analysis (RO3.2.2) to examine the relation between alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) across generations (D001_RC_D). The relationship between these variables was significant. The results were alcohol consumption (V1_Q008) to generation χ² (8.174, n = 170) = .017, p < .05. These results indicate that Millennials are receptive to live music venues and events that serve alcohol or allow alcohol on the premises.
The descriptive analysis for (RO3.3.1) enticing music genre (V1_Q009) across generations (D001_RC_D) revealed that Millennials most often chose Hip Hop/R&B as an enticing genre for a live music venue or event. Millennials also equally chose the ‘other’ option in the questionnaire and proceeded to input a choice that was not already available to them. Baby Boomers most often responded with Mixed Adult Contemporary as an enticing genre for a live music venue and event, followed by the ‘other’ option in the questionnaire. Generation X respondents most often chose Mixed Adult Contemporary as an enticing genre for a live music venue and event, followed by the ‘other’ option the questionnaire. A nonparametric chi-square test (RO3.3.2) was run for comparative analysis, and there were no observed statistically significant relationships between generations (D001_RC_D) and enticing music genres (V1_Q009).

The descriptive analysis for (RO3.4.1) venue features atmosphere (V1_Q010_A), energy (V1_Q010_B), food specials (V1_Q010_C), sound quality (V1_Q010_D), volume (V1_Q010_E), lighting (V1_Q010_G), décor (V1_Q010_H), drink quality (V1_Q010_I), crowd (V1_Q010_L), drink specials (V1_Q010_M), spaciousness (V1_Q010_N), uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) comfort (V1_Q010_T) and food quality (V1_Q010_U) across generational groups (D001_RC_D) revealed that, on a 1-5 Likert scale (1 = not important at all; 5 = very important), most Millennial respondents scored atmosphere (M = 4.1), sound quality (M = 4.3) and volume (M = 4.0) the highest out of the venue features associated with this research objective. Millennial respondents scored décor (M = 2.6), drink specials (M = 3.2) and lighting (M = 3.2) the lowest among the venue features associated with this research objective. A MANOVA test was run for comparative analysis (RO3.4.2).
After identifying a significant MANOVA, subsequent ANOVAs were carried out on each of the dependent variable venue features. A Bonferroni correction was applied to each of the subsequent ANOVAs to protect against inflated Type I error (Field, 2009). ANOVA results indicated significant interactions between subjects in the variable atmosphere (V1_Q010_A) ($p = .028, \eta^2 = .045, 1 – \beta = .666$), food specials (V1_Q010_C) ($p = .001, \eta^2 = .083, 1 – \beta = .923$), drink quality (V1_Q010_I) ($p = .000, \eta^2 = .157, 1 – \beta = .999$), drink specials (V1_Q010_M) ($p = .000, \eta^2 = .140, 1 – \beta = .996$) and uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) ($p = .034, \eta^2 = .042, 1 – \beta = .640$) for the effects of venue features on generation (D001_RC_D). However, only results for food specials (V1_Q010_C), drink quality (V1_Q010_I) and drink specials (V1_Q010_M) exceeded the threshold for the power of analysis ($\geq .80$) therefore, significant results for these variables were not due to chance or error. Results for atmosphere (V1_Q010_A), and uniqueness (V1_Q010_Q) did not meet the minimum requirements for power of analysis ($\geq .80$). For a future study, it would be ideal to collect more data only for Millennial respondents since several of the variables did not exceed the threshold for power of analysis. Otherwise, these results may have supported the claim by Behr, Brennan, & Cloonan (2014) that the physical and listening environmental aspects were valued by audience members at live music venues and events.
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APPENDIX A

Data Collection Methods for the Larger Study

Distribution of the questionnaires was coordinated as a group effort among all student researchers. In preparation for distribution, questionnaires were sorted into numeric order, version one through six and placed in bins after packaging, each designated for a specific distribution location and method of delivery. The Julian date (day of the year 001 to 365), zip code and sample number were recorded on the back cover of each questionnaire for better organization as packets were put together. The packaging of questionnaires included a cover letter (hand-signed by student researchers) and information sheet, all placed in a plastic, door-hanging bag.

Population and Sample of the Larger Study

The nature of the larger study was to test questionnaire distribution methods, thus multiple methods were used and adjusted after each distribution in order to increase overall efficiency. A multi-stage, stratified random sampling method describes the overall trend of our distribution. For the live music study, I would consider the distribution method as a convenience sample because we were operating within a larger study and taking courses through the domestic study away program, and used these locations/methods for the ease of accessibility. The locations selected for data collection each had a large metropolitan and suburban population, along with a small rural population. Again, the locations selected were: Denver, CO; San Diego, CA; San Francisco, CA; Fresno, CA; Houston, TX; Dallas, TX; and College Station, TX. The diversity of populations within these locations allow for the use of stratified sampling.
Using the MELISSA generator, a database system that can be used for geographical coding, project leaders randomly selected zip codes within each area. Then, streets within the randomly chosen zip codes were also put into a randomizer. Starting at the top of the randomized street list, each street was visually scrutinized using the street view of Google Maps for safety reasons since some questionnaires would be delivered door-to-door. Other factors such as whether the street was in a commercial or industrial area, or were mostly multifamily dwellings, came into account when choosing streets. If any issues appeared on a particular street, the next one on the list was chosen instead. After completion of visual inspection and planning foot-routes for data collection in each zip code, maps were distributed to each plastic bin housing the packaged surveys. Streets were highlighted and each map was color-coded according to method of distribution and zip code. There were instances when distribution teams ran out of participating homes in an area, therefore traveled to a nearby neighborhood still inside the specified zip code.

There were several unanticipated problems encountered along the way in various locations, so at times the distribution was relocated to nearby areas for safety purposes and better response rate. Some issues that surfaced include, but are not limited to: unoccupied homes, gated communities and unsafe neighborhoods, regardless of previous visual inspection.

**Data Collection Methods for the Larger Study; DOMB, DOPU and USPS**

In this larger study, methods of data collection were adjusted over time because the aim was to test and sharpen survey methods. In this section each method, any adjustments made, procedures and the locations they were implemented will be described. Methods include drop-off-mail-back
DOMB, drop-off-pick-up (DOPU) and USPS (United States Postal Service). During data collection, picture IDs were worn visibly by team members with their names, student ID number (UIN), university name and specific affiliation.

**DOMB Denver**

The DOMB method was used to collect data in Denver, CO. Student researchers were divided into groups of four or five, being led by a designated group leader. Responsibilities among the group members included: all members taking observational notes about the distribution areas (which after distribution was complete were revisited and discussed among group members, and later the entire domestic study away group), recording whether contact with a resident was made or not, their response, and documenting homes and their neighborhoods via photo. A script was provided for each distribution team describing what to say in scenarios if contact with a resident was made [provide script in appendix?]. If a resident opted not to participate in the study, we did not leave a questionnaire with them. However, if there was no contact made with a resident, a preassembled questionnaire, cover letter and brochure would still be left hanging on the front door, including instructions for the resident. At this point, distribution teams were given 700 pre-packaged questionnaires in bins to hand out, transporting them by wagon until all questionnaires were given out.

**Limitations**

If the resident did not appear to be home or did not answer, the packaged questionnaire, cover letter and brochure were left hanging on the front door. Because of these types of occurrences,
social exchange theory was not successfully implemented due to the lack of face-to-face contact with the resident.

**DOPU San Francisco/Fresno**

For the drop-off-pick up method (DOPU) used in San Francisco, CA, and Fresno, CA, student researchers returned to participating residents at a specified, later date to retrieve completed questionnaires. When speaking with a resident, distribution team members communicated that a student researcher would return at a specific time and date to pick up the completed questionnaire. In addition, residents were also told to leave the completed questionnaire in the bag provided hanging on their front door. This allowed for a more convenient and less intrusive process of return for the resident.

If the resident agreed to participate, a questionnaire was left with them to complete within three days. This was noted in the cover letter as a reminder to those who completed the questionnaire or did not receive information from direct contact with a student researcher. In other words, the student researcher was unable to make face-to-face contact with the resident before, and left the questionnaire package hanging on their front door. After that time had passed, we returned to retrieve the completed questionnaire as iterated to the resident beforehand. If the questionnaire was hanging on the front door as instructed, a distribution team member would retrieve the questionnaire without disturbing the resident. If the questionnaire was not hanging on the door, a distribution team member would knock on the resident’s door. This was an attempt at secondary contact and opportunity to retrieve the completed questionnaire.
As with DOMB in Denver, all members took observational and reflective notes about the distribution areas, interaction with residents and strategies. These items were revisited and discussed among group members, and later the entire domestic study away group. Team leaders recorded whether contact with a resident was made or not, their response, and this time only took pictures of streets for later reflection. Team leaders also consolidated their entire distribution team’s reflections in their personal Red ‘n Black notebook. A script was provided for each distribution team describing what to say in scenarios if contact with a resident was made.

Post drop-off, student researchers would total the number of houses visited, face-to-face contact made and total accepted questionnaires. At the end of each pick-up day, each group consolidated their total number of questionnaires completed. As questionnaires were gathered, a team member confirmed a zip code, sample and specific street name were noted on the questionnaire. In further discussion, student researchers would note why questionnaires had not been retrieved (e.g., no face-to-face contact, resident not home, misplaced questionnaire or claim that the resident did not receive a questionnaire).

Limitations

The drop-off procedure for questionnaires took up to 10 hours for each distribution team and the same time frame applied to pick-up, also. This method of data collection proved to be time-consuming. It was also difficult to know if a resident had actually received a questionnaire in instances where no face-to-face contact had been made, and the packaged questionnaire was only left hanging on their front door. During pick-up there were also residents who team members had made contact with, but who claimed they never spoke with a student researcher or they didn’t’
received a questionnaire at all. After this round of DOPU, it was agreed upon that leaving questionnaires on residents’ doors with no face-to-face contact yielded deficient results.

DOPU San Diego

During this phase of data collection, our methods were adjusted for more efficient uses of our resources. Surveys, brochures and cover letters were not packaged in the plastic, door-hanging bags but instead kept separate to cut down on assembly time. While distributing, the questionnaires and other materials (brochure, cover letter and door-hanging bag) were only given to those resident’s whom a distribution team member made contact with and agreed to participate. Also, during assembly questionnaires remained organized in a manner that guaranteed the same randomization as before.

The distribution teams sent to each zip code remained the same as before. Instead of allowing three days to pass before picking up the questionnaires, teams notified residents that a representative would be back sometime later that same day to retrieve the completed questionnaire. This seemed to yield a higher completion rate because the questionnaire was fresh in the residents mind and were now under time constraints for completion.

Instead of noting data collection information in Red ‘n Black notebooks, group leaders were given premade forms to fill in information as questionnaires were dropped off and picked up. On these forms were places to record house numbers, contact (made or not made) and participation (agree or disagree). This allowed for easier pick-up because teams did not approach residents who were not originally contacted or that disagreed to participate. If a questionnaire was left
hanging outside as instructed, it would be marked as received. If a questionnaire was not outside, a team member would attempt secondary contact to retrieve the questionnaire. If a team member failed to make secondary contact, it was noted on the data collection form that no secondary contact could be made. Red ‘n Black notebooks were still used for individual and team observation and reflection notes.

After drop-off, the totals of homes visited, contact (made or not made), and participation (agree or disagree) were calculated for each distribution group and then merged together. The number of complete and incomplete questionnaires was then totaled, and teams also noted reasons why they were incomplete.

For the initial DOPU in San Francisco and Fresno, each distribution team delivered 700 questionnaires to homes whether a resident was contacted or not. In San Diego, questionnaires were left only with residents that distribution teams made contact with and who agreed to participate. Through these means, distribution teams were only able to give out 100 questionnaires in a day. This is a significant change from 700 to 100 questionnaires, however, the number of questionnaires returned remained the same and the response rate was higher.

Limitations
This method of data collection decreased the number of questionnaires given out because they were only left with residents teams had made contact with. There were many homes where contact could not be made.
APPENDIX B

Sample survey

Questions?

Your input is very valuable to us. Be assured that we will not share any of your information, as confidentiality is very important to us. Remember this survey is completely optional.

If you have any questions regarding this project please contact us at:

Deanna Bosse
Project Lead
deanabosse@tamu.edu
(979) 458-7900

Thank you for your input!

We appreciate the time you took to answer our survey. Your input is very valuable to us. Be assured that we will not share any of your information, as confidentiality is very important to us.

If you have any further questions regarding this project please contact us at:

Deanna Bosse
Project Lead
deanabosse@tamu.edu
(979) 458-7900
APPENDIX C

Drop-off Pick-up Researcher Script

DOPU Researcher Script

Hi, my name is (insert name), and I am a student at Texas A&M University. Your neighborhood has been randomly selected to receive our consumer engagement survey. This survey is completely optional, but your participation will help graduate and undergraduate research projects.

(hand the resident the packet)

In this packet there is a survey, a brochure explaining more about the project, and a letter that tells you who you can contact if you have any questions.

Option 1: We will be back by on (specific date and time) to pick you survey up. If you will please complete it and place it back in the plastic bag and hang it on your door, we will pick it up. Do you feel this is something you will be able to complete for us?

If yes: (hand the resident the packet)
If no: (thank resident for their time and leave)

Option 2: This is very easy to participate. All you have to do is fill out the survey and place it in the pre-paid envelope in your bag and drop it in any USPS location or in your mailbox. Do you feel this is something you will be able to complete for us?

If yes: (hand the resident the packet)
If no: (thank resident for their time and leave)

If researcher is uncomfortable and/or has questions they do not know the answer to, the lead researcher (group leader) should be consulted with.}
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## Version 1 Data Coding Sheet Page 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description (label)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q001</td>
<td>Have you been to a live music event or venue? [V1_Q21]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q002</td>
<td>If yes, how many times have you been to a live music venue or event? [V1_Q22]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = 1 - 4; 2 = 5 - 9; 3 = 10 - 14; 4 = 15 or more</td>
<td>V1_Q002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q003</td>
<td>How would you prefer to attend a live music venue or event? [V1_Q23]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = alone; 2 = with a group; 3 = either; 4 = not at all</td>
<td>V1_Q003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? [V1_Q24]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_A</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Social Media [V1_Q24_A]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_B</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Website (for specific venue, band, Ticketmaster, etc.) [V1_Q24_B]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_C</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Friend/Family Member [V1_Q24_C]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_D</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Film/Print Advertisement [V1_Q24_D]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_E</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Radio [V1_Q24_E]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_F</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Television [V1_Q24_F]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_G</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Other [V1_Q24_G]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q004_G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_G_TEXT</td>
<td>How did you hear about the live music venue or event(s)? Other [V1_Q24_G]</td>
<td>String</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1_Q004_G_TEXT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Quantitative Data Coding Sheet

**Caitlin Curbello - Millennial Engagement within Live Music Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V1_Q005</th>
<th>How would you rate your experience(s) at live music venues and events overall?</th>
<th align="center">Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very Satisfied</th>
<th>V1_Q005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006</td>
<td>Which statement(s) would you agree with? Nominal (Please select all that apply)</td>
<td align="center">1 = &quot;I come to find new music&quot;; 2 = &quot;I come for the people and the party!&quot;; 3 = &quot;It's just something to do!&quot;; 4 = &quot;I would follow this band anywhere!&quot;</td>
<td>V1_Q006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_A</td>
<td>Which statement(s) would you agree with? Nominal (Please select all that apply)</td>
<td align="center">1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_B</td>
<td>Which statement(s) would you agree with? Nominal (Please select all that apply)</td>
<td align="center">1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_C</td>
<td>Which statement(s) would you agree with? Nominal (Please select all that apply)</td>
<td align="center">1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_D</td>
<td>Which statement(s) would you agree with? Nominal (Please select all that apply)</td>
<td align="center">1 = Yes; 2 = No</td>
<td>V1_Q006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| V1_Q009_C | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_D | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Rap/Urban [V1_Q029_D] | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_E | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Rock [V1_Q029_E] | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_F | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Christian [V1_Q029_F] | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_G | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Reggae [V1_Q029_G] | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_H | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Folk [V1_Q029_H] | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_I | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Other [V1_Q029_I] | Nominal | 1 = Yes; 2 = No | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q009_J | What genre of music would most likely entice you to attend a live music venue or event? Other [V1_Q029_J] | String | | V1_Q009 |
| V1_Q010 | What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? [V1_Q037] | Scale | 1 = Atmosphere; 2 = Energy; 3 = Food Specials; 4 = Sound Quality; 5 = Volume; 6 = Seating; 7 = Lighting; 8 = Decor; 9 = Drink quality; 10 = Smoking area; 11 = Non-smoking area; 12 = Crowd; 13 = Drink specials; 14 = Spaciousness; 15 = Historical significance; 16 = | V1_Q010 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V1_Q010_A</strong></th>
<th>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Atmosphere [V1_Q37_A]</th>
<th>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</th>
<th>V1_Q010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_B</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Energy [V1_Q37_B]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_C</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Food specials [V1_Q37_C]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_D</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Sound Quality [V1_Q37_D]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_E</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Volume [V1_Q37_E]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_F</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Seating [V1_Q37_F]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_G</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Lighting [V1_Q37_G]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_H</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Décor [V1_Q37_H]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V1_Q010_I</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Drink quality [V1_Q37_I]</td>
<td>Scale: 1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quantitative Data Coding Sheet

**Caitlin Curbello - Millennial Engagement within Live Music Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V1_Q010_J</th>
<th>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Smoking area [V1_Q37_J]</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</th>
<th>V1_Q010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_K</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Non-smoking area [V1_Q37_K]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_L</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Crowd [V1_Q37_L]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_M</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Drink specials [V1_Q37_M]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_N</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Spaciousness [V1_Q37_N]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_O</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Historical significance [V1_Q37_O]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_P</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Cleanliness [V1_Q37_P]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_Q</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Uniqueness [V1_Q37_Q]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_R</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Safety [V1_Q37_R]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_S</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Merchandise [V1_Q37_S]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 ≠ Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_T</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Comfort [V1_Q07_T]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q010_U</td>
<td>What are the most important features of a live music venue or event to you? Food quality [V1_Q07_U]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 = Not at all important; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very important</td>
<td>V1_Q010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q013</td>
<td>How likely are you to attend a future live music venue or event? [V1_Q03]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 = Not at all likely; 2 = 2; 3 = 3; 4 = 4; 5 = Very likely</td>
<td>V1_Q013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q014_TEXT</td>
<td>At what age did you first attend a live music String venue or event? [V1_Q03]</td>
<td>(NN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1_Q014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? [V1_Q015]</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1 = 50; 2 = 51 - 59; 3 = 50 - 59; 4 = 500 - 599; 5 = 600 - 699; 6 = 700 or more</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015_A</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? $1-$50 [V1_Q015_A]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015_B</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? $1-$50 [V1_Q015_B]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015_C</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? $50-$99 [V1_Q015_C]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015_D</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? $100-$149 [V1_Q015_D]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015_E</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? $150-$199 [V1_Q015_E]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q015_F</td>
<td>What is the most you would be willing to pay for admission/tickets to a live music venue or event? $200 or more [V1_Q015_F]</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>V1_Q015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Version 1 Data Coding Sheet

#### CAITLIN CURBELLO – MILLENNIAL ENGAGEMENT WITHIN LIVE MUSIC CULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D001_RC_E</td>
<td>Respondent Age</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>VA_D002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA_D002</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>VA_D002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA_D008</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>VA_D008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DIGITAL MEDIA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LAB

Texas A&M University
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APPENDIX E

Your household was randomly selected to participate in a consumer engagement survey. As you’ve probably heard in the news lately, market research is incredibly valuable to our economy and to the success of many industries. This summer, our research team, from Texas A&M University, is traveling across the Western U.S. conducting this important market research.

In this bag, there is one consumer engagement survey. We ask that you please take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete the survey. Other than your time, there is NO cost to you and your participation is completely voluntary. However, your participation is very valuable and enables undergraduate and graduate students at Texas A&M University to engage in research that contributes to solving real-world problems.

**How does this work?**

We will only be in your area for three days. We have left you a consumer engagement survey with you today, along with more information regarding the study. After you complete the survey, please place it in the clear bag and hang it on your door. One of the student researchers will stop by your home to pick up your completed survey **Sunday, July 6, 2014** during the **between 12:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m.**

We truly value your participation and trust. Thank you for being an anonymous voice of consumer research.
APPENDIX F

USPS Envelope Received by Respondents
APPENDIX G

Drop-off Mail-back Envelope Received by Respondents
Visio Diagrams for Data Analysis continued

**Recode**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root Variable(s)</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>New Variable and Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"

IF (V1_Q009_A EQ 1) V1_Q009=1.
IF (V1_Q009_B EQ 1) V1_Q009=2.
IF (V1_Q009_C EQ 1) V1_Q009=3.
IF (V1_Q009_D EQ 1) V1_Q009=4.
IF (V1_Q009_E EQ 1) V1_Q009=5.
IF (V1_Q009_F EQ 1) V1_Q009=6.
IF (V1_Q009_G EQ 1) V1_Q009=7.
IF (V1_Q009_H EQ 1) V1_Q009=8.
IF (V1_Q009_I EQ 1) V1_Q009=9.

VALUE LABELS
V1_Q009
1 "Country"
2 "HipHopRB"
3 "MixAdultContemporary"
4 "RapUrban"
5 "Rock"
6 "Christian"
7 "Reggae"
8 "Folk"
9 "Other"

FILTER BY Form1_filter_$. EXECUTE.
Visio Diagrams for Data Analysis continued

Subject Characteristics

Characteristics

Variable(s)

Analyses

Age and Generation

Respondent Age: D001_RC_E
Scale
Generation D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomer;
2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennial
Nominal

M, SD, Min, Max
Respondent Age: D001_RC_E
Scale
by
f, %
Generation D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomer;
2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennial
Nominal
*include total
Report by f and % for male, female, and total
Use generation and income groups for column

Sex, Generation, and Income

Sex D002
1 = Male; 2 = Female
Nominal
Generation D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomer;
2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennial
Nominal

f, %
Sex D002
1 = Male; 2 = Female
Nominal
*include total
by
f, %
Generation D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomer;
2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennial
Nominal
Report by f and % for male, female, and total
Use generation and income groups for column
Subject Characteristics

Characteristics

Generation, Sex, and Income

Variable(s)

Generation
D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomer;
2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennial
Nominal

Sex
D002
1 = Male; 2 = Female
Nominal

Income
D008
1 = <$30,000; 2 = $30,000 - $49,999;
3 = $50,000 - $90,000; 4 = $100,000 -
$249,999; 5 = >$250,000
Nominal

Analyses

f, %
Generation
D001_RC2_D
Nominal
Split File by Generation
group
1 = Baby Boomer;
2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennial
by

f, %
Sex
D002
1 = Male; 2 = Female
Nominal

f, %
Income
D008
1 = <$30,000; 2 = $30,000 - $49,999;
3 = $50,000 - $90,000; 4 = $100,000 -
$249,999; 5 = >$250,000
Nominal

Report by f and % for male, female, and total
Use generation group for column
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.1: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants

Research Objective

RO1.1.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences by generation.

Variable(s)

- Generation (Truncated)
  - D001_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
- Past Experience (at live music venues/events)
  - V1_Q005

Descriptive Analyses

- f, %
  - Generation (Truncated)
  - D001_RC_D
  - Nominal
- M, SD
  - Past Experience
  - V1_Q005
  - Scale

RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.1: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants

Research Objective

RO1.1.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences by generation.

Variable(s)

- Generation (Truncated)
  - D001_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
- Past Experience (at live music venues/events)
  - V1_Q005

Comparative Analyses

- ANOVA
  - IV
    - Generation (Truncated)
      - D001_RC_D
      - Nominal
  - by
    - DV
      - Past Experience
      - V1_Q005
      - Scale
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.2: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants

Research Objective

RO1.2.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation.

Variable(s)

- Generation (Truncated)
  - D001_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - Nominal

- Amount Willing to Pay (for admission to live music/venue)
  - 1 = $0
  - 2 = $1 - $49
  - 3 = $50 - $99
  - 4 = $100 - $149
  - 5 = $150 - $199
  - 6 = $200 or more
  - V1_Q015
  - Ordinal

Descriptive Analyses

- f and %
  - Generation (Truncated)
    - D001_RC_D
    - Nominal
  - by
    - f and %
      - Amount Willing to Pay (for admission to live music/venue)
        - 1 = $0
        - 2 = $1 - $49
        - 3 = $50 - $99
        - 4 = $100 - $149
        - 5 = $150 - $199
        - 6 = $200 or more
        - V1_Q015
        - Ordinal
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.2: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants

- **Research Objective**
  - RO1.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation.

- **Variable(s)**
  - Generation (Truncated)
    - D001_RC_D
    - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
    - Nominal
  - Amount Willing to Pay
    - (for admission to live music/venue)
    - 1 = $0
    - 2 = $1 - $49
    - 3 = $50 - $99
    - 4 = $100 - $149
    - 5 = $150 - $199
    - 6 = $200 or more
    - V1_Q015
    - Ordinal

- **Comparative Analyses**
  - **Chi Square**
    - IV
      - Generation (Truncated)
        - D001_RC_D
        - Nominal
    - by
    - DV
      - Amount Willing to Pay
        - (for admission to live music/venue)
        - 1 = $0
        - 2 = $1 - $49
        - 3 = $50 - $99
        - 4 = $100 - $149
        - 5 = $150 - $199
        - 6 = $200 or more
        - V1_Q015
        - Ordinal
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.3: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants

Research Objective

RO1.3.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance by generation.

Variable(s)

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DO01_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - Nominal

- Statements (describing motivations of attendance)
  - V1_Q006_A
  - V1_Q006_B
  - V1_Q006_C
  - V1_Q006_D
  - Nominal

Descriptive Analyses

- f and %
  - Generation (Truncated)
    - DO01_RC_D
    - Nominal

- by

- f and %
  - Statements (describing motivations of attendance)
    - V1_Q006_A
    - V1_Q006_B
    - V1_Q006_C
    - V1_Q006_D
    - Nominal
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.3: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants.

Variable(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation (Truncated)</th>
<th>1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D001_RC_D</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Statements             |
| (describing motivations of attendance) |
| V1_Q006_A              |
| V1_Q006_B              |
| V1_Q006_C              |
| V1_Q006_D              |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation (Truncated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D001_RC_D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(describing motivations of attendance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q006_D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.4: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants.

Variable(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation (Truncated)</th>
<th>1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D001_RC_D</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Method of Discovery    |
| (live music venue or event) |
| 1 = Yes; 2 = No         |
| V1_Q004_A              |
| V1_Q004_B              |
| V1_Q004_C              |
| V1_Q004_D              |
| V1_Q004_E              |
| V1_Q004_F              |
| V1_Q004_G              |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f and %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation (Truncated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D001_RC_D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f and %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(live music venue or event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1_Q004_G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.4: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants.

- Variable(s):
  - Generation (Truncated)
    - DOO1_RC_D
      - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
        - Nominal
    - Method of Discovery
      - (live music venue or event)
        - 1 = Yes; 2 = No
        - V1_Q004_A
        - V1_Q004_B
        - V1_Q004_C
        - V1_Q004_D
        - V1_Q004_E
        - V1_Q004_F
        - V1_Q004_G
        - Nominal

- Comparative Analyses:
  - Chi Square
    - IV
      - Generation (Truncated)
        - DOO1_RC_D
        - Nominal
    - by
      - DV
        - Method of Discovery
          - (live music venue or event)
            - 1 = Yes; 2 = No
            - V1_Q004_A
            - V1_Q004_B
            - V1_Q004_C
            - V1_Q004_D
            - V1_Q004_E
            - V1_Q004_F
            - V1_Q004_G
            - Nominal
RO 1.5.1: Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on venue features by generation.

**Research Objective**

**Variable(s)**

- Generation (Truncated)
  
  D001_RC_D
  
  1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  
  Nominal

- Venue Feature
  
  V1_Q010_B
  
  V1_Q010_Q
  
  V1_Q010_T
  
  Scale

**Descriptive Analyses**

- \( f \) and %
  
  Generation (Truncated)
  
  D001_RC_D
  
  Nominal

  by

  \( M, SD \)

  Venue Feature
  
  V1_Q010_B
  
  V1_Q010_Q
  
  V1_Q010_T
  
  Scale

RO 1.5.2: Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on venue features by generation.

**Research Objective**

**Variable(s)**

- Generation (Truncated)
  
  D001_RC_D
  
  1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  
  Nominal

- Venue Feature
  
  V1_Q010_B
  
  V1_Q010_Q
  
  V1_Q010_T
  
  Scale

**Comparative Analyses**

- MANOVA
  
  IV
  
  Generation (Truncated)
  
  D001_RC_D
  
  Nominal

  by

  DV

  Venue Feature
  
  V1_Q010_B
  
  V1_Q010_Q
  
  V1_Q010_T
  
  Scale
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.6: Describe and compare the affective aspects of personal determinants.

**Research Objective**

RO1.6.1: Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre by generation.

**Variable(s)**

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DOO1_RC_D
    - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
    - Nominal

- EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
  - [V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
  - 1 = Country
  - 2 = "HipHopRB"
  - 3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
  - 4 = "RapUrban"
  - 5 = "Rock"
  - 6 = "Christian"
  - 7 = "Reggae"
  - 8 = "Folk"
  - 9 = "Other"
  - Nominal

**Descriptive Analyses**

$f$ and %

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DOO1_RC_D
    - Nominal

- by

$f$ and %

- EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
  - [V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
  - 1 = Country
  - 2 = "HipHopRB"
  - 3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
  - 4 = "RapUrban"
  - 5 = "Rock"
  - 6 = "Christian"
  - 7 = "Reggae"
  - 8 = "Folk"
  - 9 = "Other"
  - Nominal
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.6: Describe and compare the affective aspects of personal determinants.

Research Objective

RO1.6.2: Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
DOO1_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal

Comparative Analyses

Chi Square

IV
Generation (Truncated)
DOO1_RC_D
Nominal

by

DV
EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal
RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO1.7: Describe and compare the affective aspects of personal determinants.

**Research Objective**

RO1.7.1: Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance by generation.

**Variable(s)**

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DOO1_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - Nominal
- Preference of Attendance
  - V1_Q003
  - Nominal

**Descriptive Analyses**

- \( f \) and \( \% \)
- Generation (Truncated)
  - DOO1_RC_D
  - Nominal
  - by
- \( f \) and \( \% \)
  - Preference of Attendance
  - V1_Q003
  - Nominal

RO1.7.2: Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance by generation.

**Comparative Analyses**

- Chi Square
  - IV
    - Generation (Truncated)
      - DOO1_RC_D
      - Nominal
      - by
  - DV
    - Preference of Attendance
      - V1_Q003
      - Nominal
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.1: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

Variable(s)

Descriptive Analyses

RO2.1.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation.

Generation (Truncated)
DO01_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

Alcohol Consumption (Venue serves alcohol)
1 = Yes; 2 = No
V1_Q008
Nominal

f and %
Generation (Truncated)
DO01_RC_D
Nominal

By

f and %
Alcohol Consumption (Venue serves alcohol)
1 = Yes; 2 = No
V1_Q008
Nominal

RO2.1.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation.

Chi Square

IV
Generation (Truncated)
DO01_RC_D
Nominal

By

DV
Alcohol Consumption (Venue serves alcohol)
1 = Yes; 2 = No
V1_Q008
Nominal
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.2: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

Variable(s)

EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"

Nominal

Descriptive Analyses

f and %
Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
Nominal
By
EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal

RO2.2.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation.
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.2: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

RO2.2.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal

Comparative Analyses

Chi Square

IV
Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
Nominal

By

DV
EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.3: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

RO2.3.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on household income by generation.

Variable(s)

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DO01_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials 
  - Nominal
- Household Income
  - VA_D008 
  - Ordinal

Descriptive Analyses

- f and %
  - Generation (Truncated)
    - DO01_RC_D 
    - Nominal
  - By
- f and %
  - Household Income
    - VA_D008 
    - Ordinal

RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.3: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

RO2.3.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on household income by generation.

Variable(s)

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DO01_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials 
  - Nominal
- Household Income
  - VA_D008 
  - Ordinal

Comparative Analyses

Chi Square

- f and %
  - Generation (Truncated)
    - DO01_RC_D 
    - Nominal
  - By
- f and %
  - Household Income
    - VA_D008 
    - Ordinal
RO2.4: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

RO2.4.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
DD01_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal
Venue Features
V1.Q010_A
V1.Q010_B
V1.Q010_C
V1.Q010_D
V1.Q010_E
V1.Q010_F
V1.Q010_G
Scale

Descriptive Analyses

f and %
Generation (Truncated)
DD01_RC_D
Nominal
By
M, SD
Venue Features
V1.Q010_A
V1.Q010_B
V1.Q010_C
V1.Q010_D
V1.Q010_E
V1.Q010_F
V1.Q010_G
Scale
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.4: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

**Research Objective**

RO2.4.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation.

**Variable(s)**

- **Generation (Truncated)**
  - D001_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - Nominal

- **Venue Features**
  - V1_Q010_A
  - V1_Q010_B
  - V1_Q010_C
  - V1_Q010_D
  - V1_Q010_E
  - V1_Q010_F
  - V1_Q010_G
  - V1_D008
  - Scale

**Comparative Analyses**

- **MANOVA**

  - **IV**
    - Generation (Truncated)
    - D001_RC_D
    - Nominal
    - By

  - **DV**
    - Venue Features
    - V1_Q010_A
    - V1_Q010_B
    - V1_Q010_C
    - V1_Q010_D
    - V1_Q010_E
    - V1_Q010_F
    - V1_Q010_G
    - V1_D008
    - Scale
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.5: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

RO2.5.1: Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

Willing to Pay
(for admission to live music venue/event)
1 = $0
2 = $1 - $49
3 = $50 - $99
4 = $100 - $149
5 = $150 - $199
6 = $200 or more
V1_Q015
Ordinal

Descriptive Analyses

f and %
Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
Nominal

By

f and %
Willing to Pay
(for admission to live music venue/event)
1 = $0
2 = $1 - $49
3 = $50 - $99
4 = $100 - $149
5 = $150 - $199
6 = $200 or more
V1_Q015
Ordinal
RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO2.5: Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants.

Research Objective

RO2.5.2: Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
DOO1_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

Willing to Pay
(for admission to live music venue/event)
1 = $0
2 = $1 - $49
3 = $50 - $99
4 = $100 - $149
5 = $150 - $199
6 = $200 or more
V1_Q015
Scale

Comparative Analyses

Kruskal-Wallis H

IV
Generation (Truncated)
DOO1_RC_D
Nominal

By
DV
Willing to Pay
(for admission to live music venue/event)
1 = $0
2 = $1 - $49
3 = $50 - $99
4 = $100 - $149
5 = $150 - $199
6 = $200 or more
V1_Q015
Scale

RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO3.1: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.

Research Objective

RO3.1.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
DOO1_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

Travel Distance
(Travel Distance willing to travel)
V1_Q007
Ordinal

Descriptive Analyses

f, %
Generation (Truncated)
DOO1_RC_D
Nominal

by
f, %
Travel Distance
V1_Q007
Ordinal
RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO3.1: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.

Research Objective

RO3.1.2: Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

Travel Distance
(Distance willing to travel)
V1_Q007
Ordinal

Comparative Analyses

Mann-Whitney U
IV
Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
Nominal
by
DV
Travel Distance
V1_Q007
Ordinal

RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO3.2: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.

Research Objective

RO3.2.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

Alcohol Consumption
(Venue serves alcohol)
1 = Yes; 2 = No
V1_Q008
Nominal

Descriptive Analyses

f, %
Generation (Truncated)
D001_RC_D
Nominal
by
f, %
Alcohol Consumption
(Venue serves alcohol)
V1_Q008
Nominal
**RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?**

**RO3.2: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.**

- **Research Objective**
  - RO3.2.2: Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation.

- **Variable(s)**
  - **Generation (Truncated)**
    - D001_RC_D
    - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - Alcohol Consumption (Venue serves alcohol)
    - 1 = Yes; 2 = No

- **Comparative Analyses**
  - Chi Square
    - **IV**
      - Generation (Truncated)
      - D001_RC_D
      - Nominal
    - by
      - **DV**
        - Alcohol Consumption (Venue serves alcohol)
        - V1_Q008
        - Nominal

**RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?**

**RO3.3: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.**

- **Research Objective**
  - RO3.3.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation.

- **Variable(s)**
  - **Generation (Truncated)**
    - D001_RC_D
    - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
    - [V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
    - 1 = Country
    - 2 = "HipHopRB"
    - 3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
    - 4 = "RapUrban"
    - 5 = "Rock"
    - 6 = "Christian"
    - 7 = "Reggae"
    - 8 = "Folk"
    - 9 = "Other"

- **Descriptive Analyses**
  - \(f, \%\)
    - Generation (Truncated)
      - D001_RC_D
      - Nominal
    - by
      - \(f, \%\)
        - EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
          - [V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
          - 1 = Country
          - 2 = "HipHopRB"
          - 3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
          - 4 = "RapUrban"
          - 5 = "Rock"
          - 6 = "Christian"
          - 7 = "Reggae"
          - 8 = "Folk"
          - 9 = "Other"
          - Nominal
RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO3.3: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.

Research Objective

RO3.3.2: Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation.

Variable(s)

Generation (Truncated)
DO01_RC_D
1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
Nominal

EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal

Comparative Analyses

Chi Square
IV
Generation (Truncated)
DO01_RC_D
Nominal
By
DV
EnticeMusicGenre: V1_Q009
[V1_Q29 – Curbello Coding]
1 = Country
2 = "HipHopRB"
3 = "MixAdultContemporary"
4 = "RapUrban"
5 = "Rock"
6 = "Christian"
7 = "Reggae"
8 = "Folk"
9 = "Other"
Nominal
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**RQ3**: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

**RO3.4**: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.

**Research Objective**

- RO3.4.1: Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation.

**Variable(s)**

- Generation (Truncated)
  - DOO1_RC_D
  - 1 = Baby Boomers; 2 = Gen X; 3 = Millennials
  - Nominal

- Venue Feature
  - V1_Q010_A
  - V1_Q010_B
  - V1_Q010_C
  - V1_Q010_D
  - V1_Q010_E
  - V1_Q010_G
  - V1_Q010_H
  - V1_Q010_I
  - V1_Q010_L
  - V1_Q010_M
  - V1_Q010_N
  - V1_Q010_Q
  - V1_Q010_T
  - V1_Q010_U

**Descriptive Analyses**

- $f, \%$
  - Generation (Truncated)
  - DOO1_RC_D
  - Nominal
  - by

- $M, SD$
  - Venue Feature
  - V1_Q010_A
  - V1_Q010_B
  - V1_Q010_C
  - V1_Q010_D
  - V1_Q010_E
  - V1_Q010_G
  - V1_Q010_H
  - V1_Q010_I
  - V1_Q010_L
  - V1_Q010_M
  - V1_Q010_N
  - V1_Q010_Q
  - V1_Q010_T
  - V1_Q010_U

Scale
RQ3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials’ engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?

RO3.4: Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants.

Analysis Note: If significant MANOVA ($p < .05$), follow up with t-tests for each DV. Calculate Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons to adjust the alpha.
APPENDIX I

Syntax for Data Analysis

********************Curbello Thesis Syntax March 2015********************

******Use only Curbello Surveys******

USE ALL.
COMPUTE Form1_filter_S=1 if Form =1.
VARIABLE LABELS Form1_filter_S 'Form = 1 (FILTER).
VALUE LABELS Form1_filter_S 0 'Not Selected' 1 'Selected'.
FORMATS Form1_filter_S (f1.0).
FILTER BY Form1_filter_S.
EXECUTE.

***Recode YOB into Generation - Bosse Coding***

USE ALL.
VARIABLE LABELS D001_RC_B 'Generation [D001 - Generational Groups - Bosse Coding].'
FORMATS D001_RC_B (F1.0).
VARIABLE LEVEL D001_RC_B (NOMINAL).
VALUE LABELS D001_RC_B 1 'Traditionalist' 2 'Baby Boomer' 3 'Gen X' 4 'Millennial' 5 'Other'.

***Recode YOB into Generation - Bosse Coding truncated into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and others***

USE ALL.
VARIABLE LABELS D001_RC_D 'Curbello Truncated Generation [D001 - Bosse Coding into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and others].'
EXECUTE.
FORMATS D001_RC_D (F1.0).
VARIABLE LEVEL D001_RC_D (NOMINAL).
VALUE LABELS D001_RC_D 1 'Baby Boomers' 2 'Gen X' 3 'Millennials'.
EXECUTE.

***Compute Age***

COMPUTE D001_RC_E=2014-D001.
VARIABLE LABELS D001_RC_E 'Respondent Age'.
EXECUTE.
FORMATS D001_RC_E (F1.0).
VARIABLE LEVEL D001_RC_E (SCALE).
EXECUTE.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

```plaintext
****Collapse Genre "Yes/No" Responses into truncated variable****

IF (V1_Q009_A EQ 1) V1_Q009=1.
IF (V1_Q009_B EQ 1) V1_Q009=2.
IF (V1_Q009_C EQ 1) V1_Q009=3.
IF (V1_Q009_D EQ 1) V1_Q009=4.
IF (V1_Q009_E EQ 1) V1_Q009=5.
IF (V1_Q009_F EQ 1) V1_Q009=6.
IF (V1_Q009_G EQ 1) V1_Q009=7.
IF (V1_Q009_H EQ 1) V1_Q009=8.
IF (V1_Q009_I EQ 1) V1_Q009=9.

VALUE LABELS
/V1_Q009
  1 "Country"
  2 "HipHopR&B"
  3 "Mix/AdultContemporary"
  4 "RapUrban"
  5 "Rock"
  6 "Christian"
  7 "Reggae"
  8 "Folk"
  9 "Other"

**********************************************************Begin Analyses*******************************************************************************

****** Subject Characteristics*****

USE ALL.

******Use only Curbello Surveys*****

FILTER BY Form1_filter_$. EXECUTE.

***Table 1 - Age by Generation***

* Custom Tables.

CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=D001_RC_D D001_RC_E DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE D001_RC_D [C] BY D001_RC_E [S][COUNT F4.0, COLPCT TOTALN COMMA4.1, MEAN, STDDEV, MINIMUM, MAXIMUM]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES LABEL="Study Total"
```
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

**Table 2 - Sex and Total by Generation**

* Custom Tables.
**CTABLES**
/VLABELS VARIABLES=D001_RC_D D002 DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE D001_RC_D [C] BY D002 [C][COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT COUNT F40.1, TOTALS][COUNT F40.0, COLPCT COUNT COMMA40.1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D001_RC_D D002 ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

**Table 3 - Generation by Sex and Income**

* Custom Tables.
**CTABLES**
/VLABELS VARIABLES=D002 D008 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE D002 [C] + D008 [C] BY D001_RC_D [C][COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT COUNT F40.1, TOTALS][COUNT F40.0, COLPCT COUNT COMMA40.1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D002 D008 ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

**********************************************************************Begin Research Questions**********************************************************************

FILTER BY Form1_filter_S.
EXECUTE.

***RQ1: What are the personal determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?***

**RQ1.1 Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants**

*RQ1.1.1 Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences by generation*

* Custom Tables.
**CTABLES**
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q005 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q005 [S][MEAN, STDDEV, ROWPCT COUNT PCT40, TOTALN F40.0] BY D001_RC_D [C]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

*RQ1.1.2 Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on past experiences by generation*

**UNIANOVA** V1_Q005 BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/PRINT=DESCRIPTIVE
/CRIERIA=A=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

"RO1.2 Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants"
"RO 1.2.1 Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation"

"Custom Tables"
CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q016 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q016 (C) BY D001_RC_D (C) [COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT COUNT PCT40.1, TOTALS] [COUNT F40.0, TOTALN F40.0, COLUMPCOUNT PCT40.1]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q016 D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER

"RO1.2.2 Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation"

SORT CASES BY V1_Q016.
SPLIT FILE LAYERED BY V1_Q016.

*Nonparametric Tests: One Sample.
NPARTESTS
/ONESAMPLE TEST (V1_Q015 D001_RC_D)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USERMISSING=EXCLUDE
/CRITERIA ALPHA=0.05 CILEVEL=95.
SPLIT FILE OFF.

"**RO1.3: Describe and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants**"

**"RO1.3.1: Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance by generation **"

"Custom Tables"
CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q006_A V1_Q006_B V1_Q006_C V1_Q006_D D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q006_A + V1_Q006_B + V1_Q006_C + V1_Q006_D BY D001_RC_D [COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT COUNT PCT40.1, TOTALS] [COUNT F40.0, COLUMPCOUNT PCT40.1]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q006_A V1_Q006_B V1_Q006_C V1_Q006_D D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER

**"RO1.3.2: Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on motivations of attendance by generation.**"

CROSSTABS
/TABLES=V1_Q005_A V1_Q005_B V1_Q005_C V1_Q005_D BY D001_RC_D
/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ CORR
/CELLS=COUNT
/COUNT ROUND CELL.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

```plaintext
***M1.4. Decode and compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants.***

***M1.4.1. Describe the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on method of discovery.***

* Custom Tasks *

```plaintext
**TABLES**

```plaintext
**VARIABLES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**DISPLAY**

```plaintext
COUNT A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z
```

```plaintext
**CATEGORIES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**FILTER**

```plaintext
BY G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**EXECUTE**

```plaintext
***M1.4.2. Compare the cognitive aspects of personal determinants, based on method of discovery.***

```plaintext
**INDEPENDENTS**

```plaintext
**VARIABLES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**STATISTICS**

```plaintext
MEAN CORR
```

```plaintext
**DISPLAY**

```plaintext
COUNT A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z
```

```plaintext
**CATEGORIES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

***Use only Cell(s) Syntax.***

**FILTER** BY G101_R, D

**EXECUTE**

***M1.5. Describe and compare the affective aspects of personal determinants.***

* Custom Tasks *

```plaintext
**TABLES**

```plaintext
**VARIABLES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**DISPLAY**

```plaintext
COUNT A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z
```

***Use only Cell(s) Syntax.***

**FILTER** BY G101_R, D

**EXECUTE**

***M1.5.1. Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on various factors.***

* Custom Tasks *

```plaintext
**TABLES**

```plaintext
**VARIABLES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**DISPLAY**

```plaintext
COUNT A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z
```

***Use only Cell(s) Syntax.***

**FILTER** BY G101_R, D

**EXECUTE**

***M1.5.2. Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on various factors.***

* Custom Tasks *

```plaintext
**TABLES**

```plaintext
**VARIABLES** V1, G004_A, V1, G004_B, V1, G004_C, V1, G004_D, V1, G004_E, V1, G004_F, V1, G008_G, G101_R, D
```

```plaintext
**DISPLAY**

```plaintext
COUNT A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z
```

***Use only Cell(s) Syntax.***

**FILTER** BY G101_R, D

**EXECUTE**
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Syntax for Data Analysis continued

*****Bonferroni Correction is necessary for multiple comparisons*****

UNIANOVA V1_Q010 Q BY D001 RC D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001 RC D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001 RC D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010 B BY D001 RC D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001 RC D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001 RC D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010 T BY D001 RC D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001 RC D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001 RC D.

*****RO1.6 Describe and compare the affective aspects of personal determinants*****

*****RO1.6.1 Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre by generation*****

* Custom Tables.

CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q009 D001 RC D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q009 BY D001 RC D [COUNT F=0.0, ROWPCT.COUNT PCT40.1, TOTALS[COUNT F=0.0, COLPCT.COUNT PCT40.1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009 D001 RC D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

*****RO1.5.2 Compare the effective aspects of personal determinants, based on music genre by generation*****

SORT CASES BY V1.Q009.
SPLIT FILE LAYERED BY V1.Q009.

*Nonparametric Tests: One Sample.
NPTESTS
/OBSAMPLE TEST (V1.Q009 D001_RC_D)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USERMISSING=EXCLUDE
/Criteria ALPHA=0.05 CILEVEL=95.

SPLIT FILE OFF.

******RO1.7 Describe and compare the affective aspects of personal determinants******

******RO1.7.1 Describe the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance by generation******

* Custom Tables.
CTABLES
/LABELS VARIABLES=V1.Q003 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1.Q003 BY D001_RC_D [COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT,COUNT PCT40.1, TOTALS[COUNT F40.0, COLPCT,COUNT PCT40.1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1.Q003 D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

******RO1.7.2 Compare the affective aspects of personal determinants, based on preference of attendance by generation******

SORT CASES BY V1.Q003.
SPLIT FILE LAYERED BY V1.Q003.

*Nonparametric Tests: One Sample.
NPTESTS
/OBSAMPLE TEST (V1.Q003 D001_RC_D)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USERMISSING=EXCLUDE
/Criteria ALPHA=0.05 CILEVEL=95.

SPLIT FILE OFF.

***RQ2: What are the behavioral determinants that influence Millennials engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?***

*RO2.1 Describe and compare the aspects of behavioral determinants*
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

RO2.1.1 Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation

* Custom Tables.
CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q008 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=_LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q008 BY D001_RC_D [COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT COUNT PCT40.1] TOTALS [COUNT F40.0, COLPCT COUNT PCT40.1]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q008 D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

RO2.1.2 Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on alcohol consumption by generation

CROSSTABS
/Table V1_Q008 BY D001_RC_D
/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ CORR
/Cells=COUNT
/Count ROUND CELL.

"RO2.2 Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants"

"RO2.2.1 Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation"

* Custom Tables.
CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q009_A V1_Q009_B V1_Q009_C V1_Q009_D V1_Q009_E V1_Q009_F V1_Q009_G
/V1_Q009_H V1_Q009_J D001_RC_D
DISPLAY=_LABEL
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_A [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_B [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_C [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_D [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_E [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_F [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_G [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_H [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009_J [1,0] EMPTY=INCLUDE
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

```
**RO2 2.2 Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation**

SORT CASES BY V1_Q009.
SPLIT FILE LAYERED BY V1_Q009.

*Nonparametric Tests: One Sample.

NPTESTS
/ONESAMPLE TEST (V1_Q009 D001_RC_D)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USRMISSING=EXCLUDE
/Criteria ALPHA=0.05 CILEVEL=95.

SPLIT FILE OFF.

***RO2.3 Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants***

*******Use only Curbello Surveys*******

FILTER BY Form1_filter_5.
EXECUTE.

***RO2.3.1 Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on household income by generation***

* Custom Tables.

CTABLES
/NOBSERV LABELS VARIABLES=D008 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE D008 BY D001_RC_D [COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT COUNT PCT40.1, TOTALS[COUNT F40.0, COLPCT COUNT PCT40.1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D008 D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

***RO2.3.2 Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on household income by generation***

SORT CASES BY D008.
SPLIT FILE LAYERED BY D008.

*Nonparametric Tests: One Sample.

NPTESTS
/ONESAMPLE TEST (D008 D001_RC_D)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USRMISSING=EXCLUDE
/Criteria ALPHA=0.05 CILEVEL=95.

SPLIT FILE OFF.
```
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

****RO2 4 Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants****

****RO2 4.1 Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation****

' Custom Tables.
CTABLES
/VLABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q010_A V1_Q010_B V1_Q010_C V1_Q010_D V1_Q010_E V1_Q010_F V1_Q010_G D001_RC_D
DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q010_A [S][COUNT F40.0, MEAN COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] + V1_Q010_B [S][COUNT F40.0,
MEAN COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] + V1_Q010_C [S][COUNT F40.0, MEAN COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] +
V1_Q010_D [S][COUNT F40.0, MEAN COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] + V1_Q010_E [S][COUNT F40.0, MEAN
COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] + V1_Q010_F [S][COUNT F40.0, MEAN COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] +
V1_Q010_G [S][COUNT F40.0, MEAN COMMA40.1, STDDEV COMMA40.1] BY D001_RC_D [C]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES LABEL='All' +
'Generations Total' POSITION=AFTER.

****RO2 4.2 Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation****

GLM V1_Q010_A V1_Q010_B V1_Q010_C V1_Q010_D V1_Q010_E V1_Q010_F V1_Q010_G BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=DESCRIPTIVE ETC DPOWER HOMOGENEITY
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

*****Bonferroni Correction is necessary for multiple comparisons*****

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_A BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_B BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_C BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_D BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_E BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_F BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

**UNIANOVA V1_Q010_G BY D001_RC_D**
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=POWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/CRIERAS=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

****RO2.5 Describe and compare aspects of behavioral determinants****

****RO2.5.1 Describe the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation****

* Custom Tables.

CTABLES

/LABELS VARIABLES=v1_q016 d001 Rc_d DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE v1_q016 by d001 Rc_d [count f49, rowpct count pct40, 1, totals[COUNT F49 0, COLPCT COUNT PCT40 1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=v1_q015 d001 Rc_d ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

******************************************************************************
Use ONLY Curbello Surveys******************************************************************************

FILTER BY Form1_filter_5.

EXECUTE.

****RO2.5.2 Compare the behavioral aspects associated with live music venues and events, based on amount willing to pay for admission by generation****

*Nonparametric Tests: Independent Samples.

NPTESTS

/INDEPENDENT TEST (V1_Q016) GROUP (D001_RC_D) KRUSKAL_WALLIS(COMPARE=PAIRWISE)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USERMISSING=EXCLUDE
/CRIERAS ALPHA=.05 CILEVEL=95.

******COMPARE MEDIANS TABLE******

MEANS TABLES=V1_Q015 BY D001_RC_D
/************

***RO3: What are the environmental determinants that influence Millennials' engagement with contemporary live music venues and events?***

*RO1.3 Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants*
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

"RO3.1.1 Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel by generation"

* Custom Tables.
CTABLES
/ALERTS VARIABLES=V1 Q007 D001 RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1 Q007 BY D001 RC_D [COUNT F49.0, ROWPCT COUNT PCT49.1, TOTALS(COUNT F49.0, COLPCT COUNT PCT49.1)]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1 Q007 D001 RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

*******RO3.1.2 Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on distance willing to travel by generation*******

**********COMPARE MEDIANS (ALL Generations) TABLE 3.1.2**********
SAVE OUTFILE=E:/Spring Semester 2019/Research/Syntax/WorkingData_Corbello_4-9.sav
/COMPRESSED.
MEANS TABLES=V1 Q007 BY D001 RC_D
/CEDDS=MEDIAN.

**********POPULATION PYRAMID BABY BOOMERS VS GEN X - EXCLUDE MILLENNIAL**********

* Chart Builder.
GGRAPH
/DATASET NAME=graph_dataset VARIABLES=COUNT([name="COUNT"] V1 Q007 D001 RC_D MISSING=LISTWISE REPORTMISSING=NO
/GGRAPHIC SOURCE=INLINE.
BEGIN GPL
SOURCE: sasviewSource("graph_dataset")
DATA: COUNT=col(source(s), name="COUNT")
DATA: V1 Q007=col(source(s), name="V1 Q007"), unit.category()=
DATA: D001 RC_D=col(source(s), name="D001 RC_D")
NOT("") unit.category()
COORD: transpose(mirror(col(dim(1, 2))))
GUIDE: axis(dim(1), label("V1_Q007",TravelDistance"))
GUIDE: axis(dim(2), label("D001 RC_D", [ ]))
GUIDE: axis(dim(2), [ ])
GUIDE: axis(dim(3), label("Corbello Truncated Generation [D001 - Bosse Coding into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and other*]", opposite), gap(0px))
GUIDE: legend(aesthetic="color", null())
SCALE: cat(dim(1)), includes("1", "2", "3", "4", "5", "6")
SCALE: cat(dim(3), includes("1", "2")
ELEMENT: interval(position(V1 Q007 COUNT*D001 RC_D), color.interior(D001 RC_D))
END GPL.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

******MANN-WHITNEY U (Baby Boomers vs Millennials)******

**NPAR TESTS**
/NP-V= V1 Q007 BY D001 RC_D1 3
/NSTATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVES QUARTILES
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

******POPULATION PYRAMID GEN X VS MILLENNIAL - EXCLUDE BABY BOOMER******

* Chart Builder
**GGGRAPH**
**/GRAPHDATASET NAME=“graphdataset” VARIABLES=COUNT[(name=“COUNT”)] V1 Q007 D001 RC D NULLWISE REPORTMISSING=NO**
**/GRAPHSPEC SOURCE=INLINE.
BEGIN GPL
**SOURCE: studioSource(id("graphdataset"))**
**DATA: COUNT=col(source(s), name("COUNT"))**
**DATA: V1 Q007=col(source(s), name("V1 Q007"), unit.category())**
**DATA: D001 RC D=col(source(s), name("D001 RC D"), unit.category())**
**COORD: transpose(mirror(rect(dim(1,2))))**
**GUIDE: axis(dim(1), label("V1 Q027"))**
**GUIDE: axis(dim(2), opposite(), label("D001 RC D"))**
**ELEMENT: text(position(V1 Q007*COUNT*D001 RC D), color.interior(D001 RC D))**
END GPL.

******MANN-WHITNEY U (Gen X vs Millennials)******

**NPAR TESTS**
/NP-V= V1 Q007 BY D001 RC D2 3
/NSTATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVES QUARTILES
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

"RO3.2 Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants"
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

CROSSTABS
/TABLES=V1_Q009 BY D001_RC_D
/FORMAT=AVGVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ CORR
/CELLS=COUNT BPROP
/COUNT ROUND CELL.

***RO3.3 Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants***

***RO3.3.1 Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation***

* Custom Tables.

CTABLES
/LABELS VARIABLES=V1_Q009 D001_RC_D DISPLAY=LABEL
/TABLE V1_Q009 BY D001_RC_D [COUNT F40.0, ROWPCT.COUNT PCT40.1, TOTALS[COUNT F40.0, COLPCT.COUNT PCT40.1]]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=V1_Q009 D001_RC_D ORDER=A KEY=VALUE EMPTY=INCLUDE TOTAL=YES POSITION=AFTER.

***RO3.3.2 Compare the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on music genre by generation***

SORT CASES BY V1_Q009.
SPLIT FILE LAYERED BY V1_Q009.

*Nonparametric Tests: One Sample.

NPTESTS
/ONESAMPLE TEST (V1_Q009 D001_RC_D)
/MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS USERMISSING=EXCLUDE
/CRIPTERIA ALPHA=0.05 CILEVEL=95.

SPLIT FILE OFF.

******Use only Curtello Surveys******

FILTER BY Form1_filter_3.
EXECUTE.

****RO3.4 Describe and compare aspects of environmental determinants****
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

CSTATES

/VARIABLES=V1_Q010_A V1_Q010_B V1_Q010_C V1_Q010_D V1_Q010_E V1_Q010_G V1_Q010_H

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/DESCRIPTIVES=MEAN

/STATISTICS=MISSING

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/ESTIMATE=DIFF

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(0.05)

/DESIGN=DO01_RC_D.

******RO3.4.2 Describe the environmental aspects of live music venues and events, based on venue features by generation******

GLM V1_Q010_A V1_Q010_B V1_Q010_C V1_Q010_D V1_Q010_E V1_Q010_G V1_Q010_H V1_Q010_J V1_Q010_L

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/DESCRIPTIVES=MEAN

/STATISTICS=MISSING

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/ESTIMATE=DIFF

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(0.05)

/DESIGN=DO01_RC_D.

******Bonferroni Correction is necessary for multiple comparisons******

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_A BY DO01_RC_D

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/DESCRIPTIVES=MEAN

/STATISTICS=MISSING

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/ESTIMATE=DIFF

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(0.05)

/DESIGN=DO01_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_B BY DO01_RC_D

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/DESCRIPTIVES=MEAN

/STATISTICS=MISSING

/MISSING=LISTWISE

/ESTIMATE=DIFF

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(0.05)

/DESIGN=DO01_RC_D.
Syntax for Data Analysis continued

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_C BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_D BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_E BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_G BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_H BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_I BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.
UNIANOVA V1_Q010_L BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_N BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_Q BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_T BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.

UNIANOVA V1_Q010_U BY D001_RC_D
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(D001_RC_D) COMPARE ADJ(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT=OPOWER ETASQ HOMOGENEITY DESCRIPTIVE
/Criteria=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=D001_RC_D.
Results for Kruskal-H Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The distribution of [V1_Q40] WillingToPayForAdmissionTicket is the same across categories of Curbello Truncated Generation [D001 - Bosse Coding into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and others].</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Reject the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

Categorical Field Information

![Bar chart with categories Baby Boomers, Gen X, Millennials and counts]
Results for Kruskal-H Wallis Test continued

Continuous Field Information

- $N = 201$
- $\text{Min} = 1.00$
- $\text{Max} = 6.00$
- $\text{Mean} = 3.19$
- $\text{Std. Dev.} = 1.21$

 Histogram for [V1_Q49] WillingToPayForAdmissionTicket
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Results for Kruskal-H Wallis Test continued

Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test

Curbello Truncated Generation [D001 - Bosse Coding into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and others]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>13.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptotic Sig. (2-sided test)</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The test statistic is adjusted for ties.
Results for Kruskal-H Wallis Test continued

Pairwise Comparisons of Curbello Truncated Generation [D001 - Bosse Coding into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and others]

Each node shows the sample average rank of Curbello Truncated Generation [D001 - Bosse Coding into Millennial, Gen X, Baby Boomers - Exclude Traditionalists and others]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample1-Sample2</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Test Statistic</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Adj.Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers, Millennials</td>
<td>-24.884</td>
<td>9.007</td>
<td>-2.737</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers, Gen X</td>
<td>-29.526</td>
<td>8.640</td>
<td>-3.417</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials, Gen X</td>
<td>4.652</td>
<td>8.776</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-tailed tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05.