

Visitors to the *Czech Cubism* Exhibition

INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES



Smithsonian
Institution

Visitors to the *Czech Cubism* Exhibition

Research Note

Audrey E. Kindlon

Zahava D. Doering

October, 1993

INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES OFFICE
Smithsonian Institution
1000 Jefferson Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
(202) 786-2232

RN 93-4

Preface

This report presents the results from a study conducted by the Institutional Studies Office of the *Czech Cubism* exhibition at Cooper-Hewitt, National Museum of Design in June 1993. This study emphasized the demographic and social characteristics of visitors and their interaction with a range of exhibition techniques and components.

This study reflects the assistance and cooperation of many people and we appreciate the opportunity to acknowledge their contributions. At Cooper-Hewitt, Egle Zygus, Education Department, deserves special mention. In addition to assisting with the questionnaire she provided valuable background information. Lisa Podos, also at Cooper-Hewitt, supervised data collection and reviewed questionnaires. Twelve interviewers conducted the interviews in New York. The high cooperation rate with the study reflects their hard work.

In the Institutional Studies Office, several staff members participated. Ann R. Ziebarth aided in questionnaire development, developed procedures for questionnaire review, and coordinated our work with Cooper-Hewitt. Steve Smith, ably assisted by Lassa Skinner, prepared the data for analysis. In addition, Robert D. Manning and Elizabeth K. Ziebarth reviewed the report and made many helpful suggestions.

The participation of 391 visitors to Cooper-Hewitt is very much appreciated. Errors in interpretation are, of course, the responsibility of the authors.

Summary

This Research Note presents the results from a study conducted among visitors to the *Czech Cubism* exhibition at Cooper-Hewitt, National Museum of Design in June 1993. This study emphasized the demographic and social characteristics of visitors and their interaction with a range of exhibition techniques and components. From approximately 2,700 individuals who exited Cooper-Hewitt during the hours in which interviewing was conducted, 476 visitors were selected for the survey and 391 participated.

Demographic Characteristics

- o Female visitors outnumbered male visitors by a large margin (57.5 percent female and 42.5 percent male) during the *Czech Cubism* exhibition.
- o The majority, 97.8 percent, were adults age 25 and over. About four-fifths of the visitors came alone or accompanied by one other adult. (35.2 and 50.7 percent, respectively).
- o The visiting public is extremely well educated: 79.9 percent have at least a Bachelor's degree, and 94.5 percent have at least some college.
- o Visitors were predominately Caucasians (83.9 percent); Asians were 6.9 percent of the group, African Americans were 4.2 percent, Hispanics 3.8 percent, and Native Americans 1.2 percent.
- o Residents of New York City constituted well over half (57.8 percent) of the total number of visitors, while residents from the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut suburbs were an additional eleven percent; individuals from other parts of the country made 17.3 percent of the visits, while 13.9 percent were from foreign locations.
 - Over two thirds (68.8 percent-NYC and suburbs combined) were from the New York Metropolitan Area.
- o The visitors were almost entirely professionals: non-science (24.7 percent), arts and design (21.7 percent), science (13.4 percent), writers (3.9 percent).
 - Approximately ten percent were teachers/educators and an additional ten percent were in the clerical field. The remaining individuals were either students or not currently in the labor force.
- o Approximately 14 percent of visitors were members either of Cooper-Hewitt or of the Smithsonian.

Overall there was little change in visitorship between this study and the Fall 1992 *The Power of Maps* study, except that women increased slightly and the

racial/cultural/ethnic distribution saw an increase in the proportion of minorities. The proportion of visitors from the New York Metropolitan Area were almost equal, although the *Czech Cubism* audience saw an increase in the proportion of individuals from the city as opposed to the suburbs. The number of visitors who were members either of Cooper-Hewitt or of the Smithsonian decreased.

The Context of the Visit

- o Slightly more than half of the survey respondents (55.0 percent) were making their first visit to Cooper-Hewitt.
 - Among repeat visitors, three quarters (77.9 percent) made their most recent visit within the last two years.
- o One third (34.1 percent) of visitors in the *Czech Cubism* study stated that their main reason for coming to Cooper-Hewitt was to see the exhibition.
- o Visitors to Cooper-Hewitt were also frequent visitors to other museums. Nearly two-thirds (65.0 percent) of respondents stated that they attend art museums at least once a month or more.
 - Attendance at private art galleries was not as high. Just over one-third (34.6 percent) attended private art galleries at least one a month.
 - Visitors from outside the New York Metropolitan area reported visiting private art galleries more frequently than those from within the New York area. The reverse was true for art museums.

When we compare these results to those from *The Power of Maps* study, we see little difference with one exception. Namely, almost two thirds (63.2 percent) of visitors to Cooper-Hewitt during *The Power of Maps* study said the exhibition was their main reason for being there, about twice the percent for *Czech Cubism*.

Experience in the *Czech Cubism* Exhibition

- o Visitors were asked if five specific components enhanced or detracted from the exhibition experience: the introductory slides, the background music, the poetic quotes and definitions of Cubist terms, and the special display techniques:
 - The results indicate that most respondents reacted positively to the exhibition's approach.
 - Across all items, slightly over half of the responses (53.0%) are positive, and the remainder almost equally divided between negative (21.1%) and visitors either not noticing or having no opinion (25.8%). The display techniques received the most positive ratings, follow by the poetic quotes and definitions.
- o In rating other general exhibition components, object identifying labels and descriptive text panels are ranked as useful by over half of the visitors, with pamphlets by almost half.

- Catalogues placed in the exhibition are also welcomed by many visitors, with 25% giving them a "somewhat useful" rating and 41.3% a "useful" rating. "Museum staff to talk to" and "Lectures/:Public Programs," are rated positively by half or more of the visitors.
- The percent of visitors who indicate "lack of familiarity or experience" is highest for the "people," items -- lectures, staff, and guided tours. Computer/interactive displays are rated lowest by the Cooper-Hewitt audience.

Table of Contents

Preface	ii
Summary	iii
 Section	
A. Introduction	1
B. Study Overview	2
C. Demographic Characteristics	3
D. The Context of the Visit	7
E. Experience in the <i>Czech Cubism</i> Exhibition	10
 Appendices	
A. Questionnaire and Survey Schedule	15
B. Supplementary Tables	18

List of Tables

Table	
1. Visitor Characteristics, <i>The Power of Maps</i> and <i>Czech Cubism Studies</i>	4
2. Visitor Characteristics, <i>The Power of Maps</i> and <i>Czech Cubism Studies</i> (cont.)	6
3. The Context of the Visit, <i>The Power of Maps</i> and <i>Czech Cubism Studies</i>	8
4. Museum/Gallery Attendance, <i>Czech Cubism Study</i>	10
5. Visitor Reactions to Specific Exhibition Components	11
6. Did anything about the exhibition surprise you?	12
7. Visitor Reactions to General Exhibition Components	13
8. Time Spent in the <i>Czech Cubism</i> Exhibition	14
B.1 Sample Composition and Disposition - <i>Czech Cubism Survey</i>	18
B.2 Comparison of Participants and Non-Participants - <i>Czech Cubism Survey</i>	19

Visitors to the *Czech Cubism* Exhibition

Introduction

For the past several years, Cooper-Hewitt, National Museum of Design has undertaken a program to understand its various constituencies -- the members of Cooper-Hewitt, visitors to its exhibitions, and participants in its educational activities. The program has two key components: formal research studies undertaken in collaboration with the Institutional Studies Office (ISO) and informal assessments including field testing of exhibition components by the New York staff as part of their activities. To date, formal research has included studies of the Summer Concert Series, the Cooper-Hewitt Membership Program, *The Power of Maps* exhibition and this study of the *Czech Cubism* exhibition. Currently in the planning stages is a study of *Mechanical Brides: Women and Machines from Home to Office*.

The concert studies assessed the effectiveness of the series in attracting racially and ethnically diverse, non-traditional audiences to the museum in a celebration of their own traditions, as well as to gauge the overall audience response to a cultural, as opposed to object-based, approach to design.¹ The membership study provided information to senior management of the museum, as it plans to expand its membership and to assess the programs, benefits and services it offers to its members.² The *Power of Maps* Study had as its primary focus the experience of visitors in the exhibition.

This study emphasized the demographic and social characteristics of visitors and their interaction with a range of exhibition techniques and components. Because the results are primarily of interest to a limited audience, they are being presented in this form rather than a more widely distributed ISO report. When the study of *Mechanical Brides* is completed, Cooper-Hewitt will have information about its visitors collected at three different exhibitions during the course of one year. At that point, the *Czech Cubism* data will be integrated into a broad overview of Cooper-Hewitt audiences.³

This Research Note continues with a brief overview of the study. Results are then presented by comparing them to those from *The Power of Maps* Study. Most of

¹ See Z. D. Doering with the assistance of K. M. Lubell, *Nueva York Tropical: Caribbean Design and Music. A Study of a Lecture and Concert Series at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum*. Report 91-4. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1991), Z. D. Doering with the assistance of Adam Bickford, *Ritual and Celebration: African Cultures in the New World. A Study of a Lecture and Concert Series at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum*. Report 92-7. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1992) and A. Bickford and Z. D. Doering, *De Generación A Generación: Mexico's Living Traditions. A Study of a 1992 Lecture and Concert Series at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum*. Report 92-10. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1992).

² Z. D. Doering and Adam Bickford, with the assistance of S. Smith and E. K. Ziebarth, *A Description of Cooper-Hewitt Members*. A Report based on the 1992 Cooper-Hewitt, National Museum of Design, Membership Survey. Report 93-3. (Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1992). June 1993.

³ *Czech Cubism* was a traveling exhibition, rather than one which originated at Cooper-Hewitt. Since object selection and display techniques were outside the purview of Cooper-Hewitt staff, it was felt that a more extensive survey of visitor response would not be necessary.

the data discussed in the report are shown in tables; those that are not are available in the Institutional Studies Office.

Study Overview

The *Czech Cubism* Survey was based on personal interviews with respondents selected using a "continuous" systematic sample design. Depending on the time of day and day of the week, interviewers intercepted visitors exiting Cooper-Hewitt.⁴ They administered a short questionnaire, with both pre-coded and open-ended questions, to eligible respondents and thanked the participants with a booklet provided by the Museum. The questionnaire, based on previous ISO studies and extensive consultation with Cooper-Hewitt staff, is in Appendix A.

Data collection in New York was conducted from Wednesday, June 9 through Tuesday, June 22, 1993. In total, 12 days were spent interviewing. During the 12 survey days, we estimate that approximately 2,726 individuals exited Cooper-Hewitt during the hours in which interviewing was conducted. From these, 483 individuals were selected for the survey, including 7 employees who were not interviewed. The survey schedule is also in Appendix A.

The results of interviewing were quite successful. As seen in Table B.1, Appendix B, an overall response rate of 82.1 percent was achieved. However, 20 out of the 85 individuals who did not participate did not speak English. Thus, the cooperation rate among English-speaking respondents is 85.7 percent.⁵

It should be noted that, as in all ISO studies, we collect information from visitors whom we approach and ask to participate in our survey. If they decline, we still attempt to gather basic demographic information. Those who participate are asked the same demographic questions plus additional study-specific questions; in this case, we asked about the exhibition and their museum visiting habits.⁶

⁴ The procedures were identical to those used in *The Power of Maps* Study. See Appendix B, [cite] for additional details. Specific information about this study is on file in the Institutional Studies Office.

⁵ The response rate together with an analysis conducted using information from the people who refused, led to the decision not to weight for non-response bias. However, respondents were not selected with equal probability throughout the survey. Thus, each record received a weight.

⁶ The demographic characteristics of those who completed an interview and those who refused but gave limited information, as well as the total, are in Table B.2.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender and Age

During the *Czech Cubism* exhibition women represented a substantial majority (57.5 percent) of the population surveyed. This is a somewhat greater proportion than those interviewed in *The Power of Maps* exhibition where women represented a 52.9 percent majority.⁷ In addition, it appears to be somewhat higher than generally found at the Washington, D.C. Smithsonian museums where the number of women and men is approximately equal.⁸

Visitors to Cooper-Hewitt come from all age groups.⁹ Of the total, the number of young children, those 11 and younger, accounted for only 0.7 percent, those 65 years and older accounted for 8.5 percent, and those between the ages of 55 and 64 were 10.1 percent. The largest age group was between the ages of 25 and 34 (31.0 percent), followed by those between the ages of 35 and 44 (27.9 percent). In total, those between the ages of 25 and 44 represented well over half of the total visitorship (58.9 percent).¹⁰

Young people (24 and younger) were 8.6 percent of the total, which is only slightly less than the 9.9 percent of *The Power of Maps* visitorship in the same age group. During the *Czech Cubism* study, those 55 years of age and older, represented 18.6 percent of the total and 19.2 percent at *The Power of Maps* study. In the *Czech Cubism* study, we find that the 25-44 year old age group is the largest (58.9 percent). In *The Power of Maps* study, this group was smaller (46.2 percent). However, the next age group (45-54) balances this difference. In the *Czech Cubism* study we find 14.0 percent aged 45-54, while in *The Power of Maps* study it was almost one-quarter (24.9 percent). Audiences at Cooper-Hewitt have tended to be somewhat older than those at other Smithsonian museums. It may be that the Cooper-Hewitt attracts an "older" audience that is more specialized in its interests as mirrored in the age distribution of the membership.¹¹

7 See Table 1, top panel.

8 The exception is the National Air and Space Museum, where men outnumber women.

9 Please keep in mind that the ages of young children were ascertained from their parents; school groups were excluded from the study and thus the age distribution underrepresents school age children.

10 See Table 1, the second panel.

11 Overall, 40.6 percent of all Cooper-Hewitt members are male and 59.4 percent are female. The median age of Cooper-Hewitt membership is between 51 and 60 years old; 24.4 percent are between 51-60 and 40.4 percent are 61 years old or more. See Z. D. Doering and Adam Bickford, with the assistance of S. Smith and E. K. Ziebarth, *A Description of Cooper-Hewitt Members*. A Report based on the 1992 Cooper-Hewitt, National Museum of Design, Membership Survey. Report 93-3. (Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1992).

Geographic Origins of Visits

During the *Czech Cubism* study, people from 29 states and nine foreign countries were interviewed. However, most visitors were from the New York Metropolitan Area, 57.8 percent were from New York City and an additional eleven percent were from the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut suburbs. Those from other parts of the United States were 17.3 percent of the total and those from foreign countries were almost fourteen percent (13.9 percent).

Table 1

Visitor Characteristics, *The Power of Maps* and *Czech Cubism* Studies

Characteristics	<i>The Power of Maps</i> Oct-Nov 92	<i>Czech Cubism</i> June 1993
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	52.9	57.5
Male	<u>47.1</u>	<u>42.5</u>
Total	100.0	100.0
<u>Age</u>		
Less than 12	2.6	0.7
12-19	1.7	1.6
20-24	5.6	6.3
25-34	24.9	31.0
35-44	21.3	27.9
45-54	24.9	14.0
55-64	10.7	10.1
65 and over	<u>8.5</u>	<u>8.5</u>
Total	100.0	100.0
<u>Residence</u>		
New York City	52.1	57.8
NY/CT/NJ Suburbs	16.4	11.0
Other United States	23.3	17.3
Foreign	<u>8.2</u>	<u>13.9</u>
Total	100.0	100.0

In both studies, we find that the Cooper-Hewitt Museum attracts most of its audience from the "local" area -- visitors who live in New York City and the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut suburbs. In the *Czech Cubism* study, we found that over two-thirds (68.8 percent) were from New York City or its suburbs. This is essentially the same as found in *The Power of Maps* exhibition (68.5 percent). When we disaggregate the "local" audience we see that more visitors to the *Czech Cubism* exhibition were from New York City and fewer from the suburbs compared to those who came to *The Power of Maps* exhibition. The difference may be the result of different visiting patterns at different times of the year; *The Power of Maps* study was conducted in late October and early November 1992, while this study was conducted in June 1993. The most

notable residence difference between the two studies is in the proportions of foreign visitors and those from other parts of the United States.¹² The *Czech Cubism* study attracted a greater proportion of foreign visitors (13.9 percent) than *The Power of Maps* (8.2 percent), perhaps because of the explicit focus of the *Czech Cubism* show or a seasonal variation.

Cultural, Racial, and Ethnic Identification¹³

Of all Cooper-Hewitt visitors in the summer of 1993, 83.9 percent were Caucasian, 6.9 percent identified themselves as Asian, 4.2 percent as African Americans, 3.8 percent as Hispanics, and the remaining 1.2 percent as Native Americans. In the Fall 1992 study, Caucasians were 93.1 percent of the total sample; Asians were 3.8 percent, African Americans were 0.9 percent, Hispanics were 2.2 percent and Native Americans accounted for the remaining 0.1 percent. The increase in non-Caucasian visitors of 9.2 percent is primarily the result of an increase in Asian and Hispanic visitors from outside the United States as well as some increase in members of American racial/ethnic minorities.

Social Composition

Approximately 95 percent (97.8 percent) of the Cooper-Hewitt audience was adult (age 20 and older); 85.9 percent of the visits were made by one or two adults -- 35.2 percent alone and 50.7 percent as couples. When we add groups of several adults who visited together to the total, 93.5 percent of the audience is adults only. Of the visitors to the Cooper-Hewitt, 2.6 percent came as one adult with children and 3.9 percent came as two or more adults with children. As specified in the research design, groups were excluded from the study.

This overwhelmingly adult audience changed little from the previous Fall. During the interviewing for *Maps*, 38.5 percent came alone and 42.6 percent came as part of a couple. An additional ten percent (10.1 percent) came either with children or children and other adults, while the remaining 8.9 percent came in other configurations, such as a member of a school or tour group, with several adults or friends and peers.

Educational Attainment

As indicated in all ISO studies, the Smithsonian tends to draw a well educated audience, and visitors interviewed in both the *Czech Cubism* and *The Power of Maps* surveys are equally well-educated. During the *Czech Cubism* study almost eighty percent (79.9 percent) had at least a Bachelor's degree; this increases to 94.5 percent when some college is added. Almost half (49.4 percent) had either a graduate degree (M.A., Ph.D., M.D., J.D.) or some graduate study. This is essentially the same as in the Fall 1992 results, where four-fifths (82.4 percent) of the visits to the museum were made by people with at least a Bachelor's degree and 91.6 percent had some college. One half (49.8 percent) had advanced degrees or some graduate education.

¹² See Table 1, bottom panel .

¹³ See Table 2 for data discussed in the remainder of this section.

Table 2

Visitor Characteristics. *The Power of Maps* and *Czech Cubism Studies* (cont.)

Characteristics	<i>The Power of Maps</i> Oct-Nov 92	<i>Czech Cubism</i> June 1993
<u>Racial/Ethnic Identification</u>		
African American/Black	0.9	4.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.8	6.9
Hispanic/Latino	2.2	3.8
Native American	0.1	1.2
Caucasian	<u>93.1</u>	<u>83.9</u>
Total	100.0	100.0
<u>Social Composition of Group</u>		
Alone	38.5	35.2
Two adults	42.6	50.7
Adults w/ Children	10.1	6.4
Other Groups	<u>8.9</u>	<u>7.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0
<u>Education*</u>		
Pre-Grade School	3.1	0.9
Some HS	0.9	0.3
HS Graduate	4.3	4.3
Some College	9.2	14.6
Bachelor's Degree	32.6	30.5
Some Graduate School	8.7	9.4
MA/PhD/Professional	41.1	40.0
DK	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	100.0	100.0
<u>Occupation*</u>		
Prof. Non-Science	27.1	24.7
Prof. Science	12.0	13.4
Prof. Arts	10.7	12.7
Prof. Design	9.5	9.0
Prof. Writer	4.8	3.9
Teacher/Educators	11.3	10.5
Clerical	8.7	10.6
Student	8.6	9.4
Not in Labor Force	<u>7.3</u>	<u>5.9</u>
	100.0	100.1

*Available only for respondents who completed an interview.

Occupation

The majority of visitors, consistent with their high educational attainment is comprised of professionals. Because of the nature of Cooper-Hewitt, it tends to attract a high proportion of professionals from the art and design worlds. In the Summer 1993 study, over one-fifth (21.7 percent) were such professionals; this is essentially the same

as in the Fall 1992 study where 20.2 percent were arts or design professional. The greatest proportion of professionals were in the non-science fields -- 24.7 percent for the *Czech Cubism* study and 27.1 percent for *The Power of Maps* study. Science professionals comprised 13.4 percent of the respondents in the *Czech Cubism* study and 10.7 percent in *The Power of Maps* study. In both studies, teachers and educators made up approximately ten percent of the respondents and writers were less than five percent. The remaining individuals were either students, worked in the clerical field or were not currently in the labor field. Overall, the occupational profile of the two studies is quite similar.

The Context of the Visit¹⁴

In our objective to learn more about the visitorship of Cooper-Hewitt we need to understand various aspects of an individual's visit. We are interested in whether the visit at which the interview takes place was their first to the Cooper-Hewitt. It is a standard question, one which establishes one's familiarity with the museum. We are also interested in the main reason for coming to the museum, and if the visit was motivated by a specific exhibition, how they heard about it. These and other features mold the social context of the museum visit. In this section, we discuss individuals' experiences with Cooper-Hewitt, their reasons for coming, and how they heard about the *Czech Cubism* exhibition. We will also be able to better understand the museum attendance habits of people, and compare some of our results from the *Czech Cubism* study with *The Power of Maps* study.

First Visit to Cooper-Hewitt

One of the initial questions we asked of respondents is whether or not they have previously visited Cooper-Hewitt. Among those who completed the interview, 55.0 percent were making their first visit.¹⁵ Among the forty-five percent repeat visitors to Cooper-Hewitt, almost half (44.5 percent) had made their most recent visit within the last year and 33.4 percent had last visited the Cooper-Hewitt over a year ago but within two years. Put another way, 20 percent of the total had visited in the last year and another 15.0 percent the previous year. Understandably, more local area visitors than non-local visitors were likely to have visited the Cooper-Hewitt previously (52.6 and 30.8 percent, respectively).

In comparing these results to the Fall 1992 study of *The Power of Maps* we see that just over half (50.2 percent) were making a first time visit, and of the remaining 49.8 percent over half (52.6 percent) had last visited the C-H within the last year (26.2 percent of the total). As for local and non-local comparisons, approximately one-third (38.0 percent) of local visitors were making a first visit and almost two-thirds were repeat visitors (62.0 percent). Among the non-local visitors nearly three-quarters (74.8 percent) were making their first visit to the Cooper-Hewitt Museum and the remainder were repeat visitors (25.2 percent).

¹⁴ See Table 3 for data discussed in this section.

¹⁵ See Table 3, top panel.

Table 3

The Context of the Visit. *The Power of Maps* and *Czech Cubism Studies*

	<i>The Power of Maps</i> Oct-Nov 92	<i>Czech Cubism</i> June 1993
<u>First Visit to Cooper-Hewitt?</u>		
Yes	50.2	55.0
No	<u>49.8</u>	<u>45.0</u>
Total	100.0	100.0
<u>Time of Last Visit (for Repeat Visitors)</u>		
Within the last year	52.6	44.5
1-2 years ago	19.8	33.4
2-3 years ago	12.5	7.4
3-4 years ago	1.4	1.1
4+ years ago	<u>13.8</u>	<u>13.7</u>
Total	100.1	100.1
<u>Reason for Visit</u>		
See <i>Maps/Cubism</i> Exhibition	63.2	34.1
Visit Museum Shop	4.2	1.9
See Mansion/Building	4.0	3.6
Free admission/Tues. night	0.7	-
Garden Visit	-	18.7
See other C-H exhibition	-	0.2
Dining Show	-	0.5
General Visit	26.6	38.9
Guggenheim related	<u>1.2</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Total	99.9	99.9
<u>Membership</u>		
Neither	75.2	86.1
Cooper-Hewitt	5.3	3.7
Smithsonian	<u>19.5</u>	<u>10.2</u>
Total	100.0	100.0

Reason for visit

Visitors were also asked the primary reason for their visit. Almost two-fifths (38.9 percent) stated their visit was a general one, and 34.1 percent said their main reason was to see the *Czech Cubism* exhibition. Nearly one-fifth (18.7 percent) stated their purpose was to visit the garden. Other reasons given were the museum shop (1.9 percent), to see the mansion (3.6 percent), see the Dining Show (0.5 percent), see another Cooper-Hewitt exhibition (0.2 percent) or because of a Guggenheim related

reason (2.0 percent), i.e. either they were in the area and it is near or it was closed and they still wanted to visit a museum¹⁶.

In the previous Cooper-Hewitt study, we found that more than half (63.2 percent) of all visitors came specifically to see *The Power of Maps* exhibition. Just over one-quarter (26.6 percent) of the visitors were making a general visit to the museum. The remaining individuals were at Cooper-Hewitt either to visit the museum shop (4.2 percent), for a building specific reason (4.0 percent), because of the free admission (0.7 percent) or because of the Guggenheim (1.2 percent). These differences are not surprising for several reasons. First, *The Power of Maps* exhibition was much larger and received considerable media coverage in comparison to the *Czech Cubism* exhibition. Second, the *Czech Cubism* had been shown at other U.S. and Canadian venues, and it is likely that some individuals in the area who would have come to the Cooper-Hewitt presentation already had seen it elsewhere.

Membership

In 1992 we conducted an extensive study of the Cooper-Hewitt Membership Program. In both Cooper-Hewitt studies we ask visitors if they are members of either Cooper-Hewitt or the Smithsonian Institution. During the *Czech Cubism* study just under fourteen percent were members of either the Cooper-Hewitt (3.7 percent) or the Smithsonian (10.2 percent). This is a distinct change from the results of our *Power of Maps* study. In that study, nearly one quarter of all respondents were members of either organization (C-H 5.3 percent - Smithsonian 19.5 percent).

Examining the C-H audience and members further, we see that among the small percentage of Cooper-Hewitt members, 88.1 percent were from the local metropolitan area. This corresponds with the Membership Program study which found that 94.8 percent of members were from the New York area including the suburbs¹⁷. Among Smithsonian members, 53.1 percent were from the local area and 46.9 percent of Smithsonian members were from outside the New York City metropolitan area. (Please keep in mind that visitors from the New York City metropolitan area were 68.8 percent of the total.)

Museum Attendance¹⁸

Respondents were asked "On average, how often do you visit art museums?" and "How about private art galleries?" Almost two-thirds (65.0 percent) of respondents attend art museums at least once a month. Local residents attend art museums more frequently than non-local residents, but not by a great margin. Over two-thirds (68.2 percent) of those from the New York area attend art museums on average once a month, and 61.8 percent of those from outside the New York area attend art museums once a month or more. The real difference is between those who are from New York City versus everywhere else, including the suburbs. Nearly three quarters (74.8 percent) of visitors who are from New York City attend art museums at least once a month, and over one quarter (27.2 percent) attend art museums at least once a week.

¹⁶ Cooper-Hewitt is the closest museum to the Guggenheim.

¹⁷ See Z.D. Doering and A. Bickford, *Supporters of the Cooper-Hewitt, National Museum of Design*. Report 93-3 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1993).

¹⁸ See Table 4 for museum/gallery attendance data.

Among visitors from outside New York City, 55.5 percent attend art museums at least once a month, and 15.9 percent attend once a week. Even if there is some over-reporting in these data, the Cooper-Hewitt visitorship is clearly active in the arts.

Table 4

Museum/Gallery Attendance, Czech Cubism Study

<i>Czech Cubism</i>	
June 1993	
<u>On average how often do you visit art museums?</u>	
Once a week	21.7
Once a month	43.3
Every few months	30.0
Once a year	3.6
Every few years	<u>1.5</u>
Total	100.1
<u>How about private art galleries?</u>	
Once a week	14.1
Once a month	20.5
Every few months	29.9
Once a year	16.1
Every few years	5.4
Never	<u>14.1</u>
Total	100.1

As for private art galleries, understandably individuals attend those with less frequency. Less than thirty five percent (34.6 percent) attend private art galleries at least once a month. In a reversal of habits by art museum patrons a greater proportion of visitors from outside the New York metropolitan area attend private art galleries with greater frequency. Among New Yorkers and those from suburban New York less than one third (32.9 percent) attend private art galleries once a month or more. In contrast, among those visitors from outside the New York area, 40.2 percent attend private art galleries once a month or more. However, when one looks at the attendance habits of New Yorkers separately, they do attend private art galleries more frequently than those from all other locations. Almost two-fifths (37.5 percent) of New York City residents attend private art galleries at least once a month, which includes 16.1 percent who report attending once a week or more. Similarly, among all other visitors, 32.5 percent attend private art galleries once a month or more, including 12.4 percent that attend once a week or more.

Experience in the Czech Cubism Exhibition

Specific Exhibition Components. In an effort to understand those aspects of *Czech Cubism* which may have enhanced or detracted from the exhibition experience, Cooper-Hewitt staff identified the five components shown in Table 5: the introductory

slides, the background music, the poetic quotes and definitions of Cubist terms, and the special display techniques. For each of these, respondents were asked to indicate if they "detracted," "somewhat detracted," "somewhat enhanced" or "enhanced" the visit experience. In addition, interviewers noted if visitors said that they did not notice a component or if they had no comment or opinion.

Table 5

Visitor Reactions to Specific Exhibition Components

Response	Introductory Slides	Music	Poetic Quotes	Definitions	Display Techniques	Average*
<i>Detracted</i>	11.3	15.2	11.5	9.6	2.8	10.1
<i>Somewhat Detracted</i>	18.1	7.7	13.2	10.0	5.8	11.0
<i>Somewhat Enhanced</i>	17.9	15.4	25.3	27.9	31.7	23.6
<i>Enhanced</i>	16.4	13.5	32.2	29.9	55.8	29.4
Did Not Notice/ Don't know	<u>36.3</u>	<u>48.2</u>	<u>17.8</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>25.8</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
<i>Weighted N</i>	1649	1649	1647	1639	1617	8201

*Calculated across all responses

As shown in Table 5, respondents had quite different reactions to the exhibition components. About one-third (36.3%) did not notice or have comments about the Introductory slides. This is understandable as, in fact, the slides were somewhat obscured in the exhibition area. The rest of the visitors were split in their opinions, with 29.4% indicating that the slides were a handicap (Detracted and Somewhat Detracted combined) and 34.3% believing they were an enhancement (Enhanced and Somewhat Enhanced Combined). About half (48.2%) did not notice or hear the music; perhaps because of its subdued level. As with the slides, the other half were divided in their opinion. The Poetic Quotes and the Definitions received quite similar ratings, with essentially one-fifth (17.8% and 22.6%, respectively) not noticing or having an opinion and the majority (57.5% and 57.8% of the total) feeling that they made a positive contribution ((Enhanced and Somewhat Enhanced Combined). Finally, there were very positive responses to the display techniques, 87.5% of visitors gave positive responses.

An average calculated across these exhibition components is somewhat misleading, as they are of varying degree of importance in the exhibition. The average shown in the table supports the conclusion that most respondents reacted positively to the exhibition's approach. Slightly over half of the responses (53.0%) are positive, and the remainder almost equally divided between negative (21.1%) and either not noticing or having no opinion (25.8%).

As a summary question on the *Czech Cubism* exhibition, visitors were asked next "Did anything about the exhibition surprise you?" The 71.0% of visitors who indicated "Yes," were also asked to comment further. In Table 6, we have categorized the myriad of comments into major self-explanatory categories. We also find, as shown in the table, that the comments of individuals making their first visit to Cooper-Hewitt are somewhat different than those of repeat visitors. Repeat visitors were more likely to

comment on their lack of familiarity with Cubism and about the furniture, and make fewer comments about the appropriateness of the exhibition to Cooper-Hewitt in comparison to first time visitors.

Table 6

Did anything about the exhibition surprise you?

Percent	Response
29.0	No
<u>71.0</u>	Yes
100.0	

If YES: What Surprised you?

<u>Total</u>	<u>First Visit</u>	<u>Repeat Visit</u>	
28.7	28.3	29.3	Exhibition itself, including content/presentation (e.g., thought it would be larger, more comprehensive than expected, short, how much work went into displays, no paintings).
27.0	20.8	35.4	Lack of familiarity with Cubism movement (e.g., not aware of it, wasn't aware of genre, never seen it before).
21.0	18.6	24.3	Furniture and specific objects (e.g., design, color, massiveness, use of wood to design was remarkable).
2.8	1.7	4.1	Positive comments about Czech Cubism (e.g., drawings are good, quality of pieces is very good).
1.4	0.5	2.6	Negative comments about Czech Cubism (e.g., how ugly it is, not crazy about Cubism, it was so angular, - I didn't like it).
2.6	2.9	2.2	Comparative comments (e.g., similar to Cubism in US, like Art Deco). Applications to the present and to other art forms (i.e. architecture).
16.1	26.4	2.0	All comments about the exhibition's appropriateness to Cooper-Hewitt (almost all positive), and a few comments about the mansion or building.
<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.0</u>	Everything!
100.0	100.0	100.0	

General Exhibition Components. In addition to asking visitors about exhibition-specific components, they were also asked to rate a series of components and exhibition-related activities which are part of most Cooper-Hewitt exhibitions. These include written materials, public programs, and museum personnel. These questions were also asked of visitors who had not seen the exhibition. In this question, as shown

in Table 7 below, the focus was on "usefulness" to the respondent in "any exhibition." Our experience has shown, however, that while many respondents can think in general terms; some relate the questions to the exhibition just visited. In the table, the items have been ordered from "most useful" to "least useful" using the high rating (number 4).

Table 7

Visitor Reactions to General Exhibition Components

Components	Rating Scale					Percent
	1 Not Useful	2	3	4 Useful	DK/No Experience	
Object identifying labels*	1.0	12.4	24.9	58.6	3.1	100
Descriptive text panels	4.5	9.0	27.4	56.4	2.7	100
Pamphlets to read	6.2	13.5	32.1	45.1	3.1	100
Catalogues in exhibition	11.0	15.8	29.9	41.3	1.9	100
Lectures/Public programs	7.5	14.1	24.8	39.7	13.9	100
Museum staff to talk to	11.8	15.2	23.0	34.9	15.1	100
Catalogues for sale	19.2	19.2	23.3	33.2	5.0	100
Guided tours	20.6	18.9	11.8	27.3	21.5	100
Computer/interactive displays	29.9	18.2	20.6	18.3	13.0	100

* The data in this table are row percentages, rather than column percentages, as used in the other tables. Reading across the page, for example, we see "Descriptive text panels" were rated as 1 (Not Useful) by 4.5% of visitors, 9.0% as 2, 27.4% as 3, 56.4% as 4 (Useful) and 2.7% indicated that they "didn't know." The column percentages allow for comparison across rating categories; e.g., "not useful" ratings range from 1.0% (Object identifying labels) to 29.9% (Computer/interactive displays).

As expected, object identifying labels and descriptive text panels are ranked as useful by over half of the visitors, with pamphlets by almost half. If we combine "somewhat useful" and "useful," i.e. codes 3 and 4 in the table, these three items reach 75% or more. Catalogues placed in the exhibition are also welcomed by many visitors, with 25% giving them a "somewhat useful" rating and 41.3% a "useful" rating. "Museum staff to talk to" and "Lectures/Public Programs," are rated positively by half or more of the visitors. For the remaining items, the negative ratings are relatively high. The percent of visitors who indicate lack of familiarity or experience is highest for the "people," items -- lectures, staff, and guided tours. Not surprisingly, computer/interactive displays are rated lowest by this audience. There is evidence to suggest that use of modern technology is age related, with older people being less enthusiastic than younger people. It may also be that this generally traditional audience is reluctant to embrace this technology in a museum setting.

Finally, visitors were asked to estimate how much time they spent in the exhibition. Table 8 shows the distribution of time, for those who came specifically to see *Czech Cubism* or had heard of the show and for those who were unfamiliar with the exhibition. The table clearly shows that those who came specifically to see the exhibition or had heard of it previously spent more time in it than visitors who came for a more general visit to Cooper-Hewitt. Overall, about one-fourth (26.2%) of visitors spent less than 10 minutes in the exhibition, another third (31.6%) spent between 10-20 minutes and the remainder over 20 minutes.

Table 8

Time Spent in the Czech Cubism Exhibition

Time (Minutes)	Came to see Exhibition/Heard about Exhibition	Had not Heard of Exhibition	Total
Less than 10	15.7	37.1	26.2
10 - 20	25.7	37.7	31.6
20 - 30	23.2	9.5	16.4
30 - 60	28.8	14.0	21.5
Over 60	6.6	1.6	4.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0

A. Questionnaire and Survey Schedule

SESSION #:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

SHIFT:

1	2	3	4	5	6

COUNT:

DATE:

Summer 1993 Cooper-Hewitt Visitor Study

Hello, my name is . I am a Cooper-Hewitt volunteer and would like to speak with you about your visit.

1. Is TODAY your first visit to the Cooper-Hewitt?

Yes: GO TO Q.2 Work at C-H:
 No: GO TO Q.1A GO TO ADMIN BOX

1A. When was the last time you were here?

Since April 6, 1993 3 years ago
 In the last year 4 years ago
 1-2 years ago More than 4 years ago

+*2. Who are you here with today?

Alone More than one other adult
 One other adult Friends/Peers (Teens)
 Children School group
 Adult(s) & child(ren) Tour group
 Other:

3. Are you or your household a member of the Cooper-Hewitt or the Smithsonian?

No Yes, C-H Yes, Smithsonian

4. What is the MAIN reason you visited the Cooper-Hewitt today?

To see Czech Cubism: GO TO: Q.6 To see film/participate in museum program
 To see other C-H exhib.: General interest/ No particular reason
 Visit museum shop School or teacher related
 See mansion/Bldg Garden visit
 Free admission (Tues nights)

5. Before today, had you heard about the CZECH, CUBISM exhibition? Yes No: GO TO Q.7

6. How did you hear about this exhibition? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

Repeat visit to Czech Cubism: ASK: How did you FIRST hear about it? THAT APPLY

Newspaper:
 Magazine:
 TV/Radio Word of mouth (friends/family/work)
 School related Exterior banner/poster 1 3
 C-H Calendar Previous visit to C-H 2 4

7. How much time did you spend in the Czech Cubism exhibition? minutes.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Did not see exh.: GO TO Q.10

8. In thinking about the Czech Cubism exhibition, on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 means DETRACTED/ SUBTRACTED FROM your visit to the exhibition and 4 means ENHANCED/ ADDED TO your visit to the exhibition, how would you rate the following... [Show Card]

[READ OUT]	1	2	3	4	DK/NA
The introductory slides	<input type="checkbox"/>				
The music	<input type="checkbox"/>				
The large Poetic Quotes	<input type="checkbox"/>				
The definitions	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Display technique of the objects?	<input type="checkbox"/>				

9. Did anything about the exhibition surprise you?

Yes Ask: What No

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

10. On average, how often do you visit art museums?

Once a week Once a year
 Once a month Every few years
 Every few months Never

11. How about private art galleries?

Once a week Once a year
 Once a month Every few years
 Every few months Never

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

12. Thinking about museum visits in general, on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 means NOT USEFUL AND 4 means VERY USEFUL, how would you rate the following... [SHOW CARD]

[READ OUT]	1	2	3	4	DK/NA
Descriptive text panels					
Object identifying labels					
Pamphlets to read					
Guided tours					
Museum staff to talk to					
Computer/interactive displays					
Lectures/Public programs					
Catalogues in the exhibition					
Catalogues for sale?					

NOW, JUST A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU...

13. Would you please look at this and tell me which of the following MOST ACCURATELY describes your Cooper-Hewitt related background or experience? [MARK ALL THAT APPLY]

- 1 I am a design/dec. arts professional
- 2 I am a professional in the arts
- 3 I studied decorative arts/design in...[Highest level]
 - High school Graduate/Prof. school
 - College Museum/gallery courses
- 4 I studied art appreciation/studio arts in...[Highest level]
 - High school Graduate/Prof. school
 - College Museum/gallery courses
- 5 I create art...not a professional
- 6 I collect dec. arts...own enjoyment
- 7 Read books/mags. about DEC. ARTS/DESIGN
- 8 Read books/mags. about ART
- 9 General interest
- 10 None

14. What is your occupation?

- Arts professional (e.g. Painter, artist, photographer, c. graph.)
- Design professional (e.g. Architect, interior designer)
- Science professional (e.g. Physicians, engineers, comp. related)
- Non-science/business professional (e.g. Banker, lawyer, self-employed, etc.)
- Clerical/Sales/Labor (e.g. Secretary, clerk, salesperson, carpenter)
- Teacher/Educator: Art related
- Teacher/Educator: Non-Art related
- Professional writer (e.g. journalist, poets)
- Student
- Retired

Other: _____

1	2	3	4	5	6

+15. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Pre/grade school
- Some HS
- HS graduate
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Some graduate study
- MA/Ph.D./Professional

+*16. What is your age?

- 0-11 25-34 55-64
- 12-19 35-44 65+
- 20-24 45-54

+*17. Where do you live?

- New York City: SHOW CARD: In what area?
 - Above 96th St. in Man. Brooklyn
 - Upper West side Bronx
 - Upper East side Queens
 - Midtown Staten Island
 - Lower Manhattan
- New York City suburbs in NY/NJ/Conn.
- Other U.S. state: _____
- Outside the U.S.: _____

For office use only:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

+*18. What is your cultural/racial/ethnic identity?

- Afr. Amer./Black Hispanic/Latino
- Asian/Pac. Islander Nat. Amer./AK native
- Caucasian Other: _____

+*19. Gender: MARK. [DO NOT ASK!!]

- Female Male

Status: C-H employee/contractor

- Interview: Adult Refusal: Lang.
- Interview: Child Refusal: Other

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION									
CURRENT Segment Count									
Segment #:									
PREVIOUS Segment Count									
INTERCEPTS in Segment									

Czech Cubism Schedule

	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY	SUNDAY
	8-Jun	9-Jun	10-Jun	11-Jun	12-Jun	13-Jun
WEEK 1						
10:30-12:00	TRAINING	Exit		Exit	Exit	
12:30-2:00		Exit	Exit		Exit	Exit
2:30-4:00			Exit	Exit	Exit	Exit
5:30-7:00						
7:15-8:45						
	15-Jun	16-Jun	17-Jun	18-Jun	19-Jun	20-Jun
WEEK 2						
10:30-12:00	Exit		Exit	Exit	Exit	
12:30-2:00	Exit	Exit		Exit	Exit	Exit
2:30-4:00		Exit	Exit		Exit	Exit
5:30-7:00						
7:15-8:45	Exit					
	22-Jun					
WEEK 3						
10:30-12:00	Exit					
12:30-2:00						
2:30-4:00	Exit					
5:30-7:00	Exit					
7:15-8:45						

B. Supplementary Tables

Table B.1 Composition of Sample and Disposition: 1993 Czech Cubism Study

	Number	Percent
<u>I. Composition</u>		
SI staff/contractors*	7	1.4
Visitors	476	98.6
Total	483	100.0
<u>II. Disposition, All Eligible Visitors</u>		
Interviews	391	82.1
Non-Interviews	85	17.9
Total	476	100.0
<u>III. Reasons for Non-Participation, Eligible Visitors</u>		
Refusal, Language difficulty	20	23.5
Refusal, Other	65	76.5
Total, Non-interviews	85	100.0
<u>IV. Response Rates</u>		
All eligible visitors**		82.1
Excluding Language difficulty		85.7

* Includes C-H staff, other SI staff, and contractors

** From II. above

Table B.2 Comparison of Survey Participants and Non-Participants-Czech Cubism

<u>Characteristic</u>	No	Yes	Total
<u>Gender</u>			
Female	60.1	56.9	57.5
Male	39.9	43.1	42.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Age</u>			
Less than 12	0.0	0.9	0.7
12-19	0.7	1.8	1.6
20-34	23.2	40.1	37.3
35-54	60.0	38.2	41.8
55 and over	16.1	19.1	18.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Identification</u>			
African American/Black	10.7	2.8	4.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.7	7.6	6.9
Hispanic/Latino	8.4	2.8	3.8
Native American	1.6	1.1	1.2
Caucasian	75.6	85.7	83.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Residence</u>			
Foreign	14.2	13.0	13.2
United States	85.8	87.0	86.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Group</u>			
Alone	24.5	37.5	35.2
Two adults	53.8	50.1	50.7
Adults w/ Children	16.7	4.2	6.4
Other Groups	5.0	8.2	7.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	85	391	476
Percentage	17.9	82.1	100.0