

The Audience Response Tool (ART)

developed by

Dr Renee Glass, Associate Professor Kate Stevens & Dr Stephen Malloch
MARCS Auditory Laboratories, University of Western Sydney
<http://marcs.uws.edu.au>; kj.stevens@uws.edu.au
September 2007

Background

The Audience Response Tool (ART) measures cognitive, emotional, and affective responses to contemporary dance using a combination of open-ended and closed questions to access qualitative and quantitative data (Glass, 2005, 2006). The ART was developed and refined using two highly evolved contemporary dance works (*Red Rain* by Anna Smith and *Fine Line Terrain* by Sue Healey). The ART was tested using a total of 472 participants (ranging in dance experience). Developed initially for dance, the scale is easily modified for use in music, theatre, cinema or multimedia contexts.

The ART contains three sections:

1. Qualitative Assessment of the Psychological Response to Contemporary Dance (QIPRCD);
2. Quantitative Assessment of the Psychological Response to Contemporary Dance (QnPRCD) and;
3. Background Information (BI).

1. Qualitative Assessment of the Psychological Response to Contemporary Dance (QIPRCD)

Description of the QIPRCD Section

This section of the ART asks observers three (counterbalanced) questions pertaining to cognitive (how would you interpret the dance piece?), emotional (did you respond emotionally to the dance piece?) and affective reactions (did you enjoy the dance piece? Please provide a reason for your response) to contemporary dance. A fourth question asks observers to reflect on any additional thoughts or feelings not captured by the initial three questions.

Each of the open-ended questions elicits a large amount of qualitative/written data and the results provide information not only about the presence of response but those cues and formal properties within the dance-work that elicited such a reaction. Responses can then be compared with a choreographer's broad or specific intention.

Advantages/Disadvantages of the QIPRCD Section

The advantage with the QIPRCD section is that it allows observers to express their thoughts and feelings in whatever manner they choose. However, the disadvantage with the QIPRCD section is that the section is both time-consuming for the participant who must answer four open-ended questions, and for the researcher who must code responses.

2. Quantitative Assessment of the Psychological Response to Contemporary Dance (QnPRCD)

Description of the QnPRCD Section

There are four scales in the QnPRCD section: The Attitudinal Rating Scale, the Enjoyment Rating Scale, the Emotion Rating Scale, and the Visceral Scale.

Attitudinal Rating Scale

This rating scale is composed of 9 items and uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This scale is divided into three subscales. The first subscale assesses the respondent's perceived *arousal* level (Cronbach's $\alpha = .84$, an index of reliability, Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). Five items make up the arousal subscale. Two of these items are reverse scored. The lowest possible score on the subscale is five and represents low negative arousal; the highest possible score is 35 and indicates high positive arousal.

The second subscale assesses observers' subjective assessment of their understanding ($\alpha = .79$). Two items make up the understanding sub-scale. The lowest possible score is 2 and indicates low levels of understanding (as reported by the observer) and the highest possible score is 14 and indicates high levels of understanding (as reported by the observer).

The third subscale assesses observers' level of intellectual stimulation ($\alpha = .78$). Two items make up the intellectual stimulation sub-scale, one item is reverse scored. The lowest possible score is 2 indicating low levels of intellectual stimulation, and the highest possible score is 14 indicating high levels of intellectual stimulation.

Enjoyment Rating Scale

The enjoyment rating scale is composed of 14 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not enjoyable) to 7 (highly enjoyable). There is an additional 'don't know/unsure' category for each item so that those observers who do not understand an item can indicate so.

The enjoyment rating scale has three sub-scales. Ten items make up the *dance* enjoyment subscale ($\alpha = .93$); this subscale measures enjoyment of different movement elements and dancer characteristics. Two items make up the aural enjoyment subscale ($\alpha = .91$) and two items make up the visual setting enjoyment subscale ($\alpha = .75$).

Emotion Rating Scale

The emotion rating scale assesses observers' subjective assessment of the emotions they experienced whilst watching a performance. There are 14 different emotions (a mixture of basic and secondary emotions). Responses are recorded on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (none) to 7 (extremely).

Visceral Rating Scale

The visceral rating scale measures observers' subjective assessment of the visceral responses (e.g. heart rate, shivers down the spine, tears, etc) they experienced whilst watching the performance. This scale was adapted from

Sloboda (1991). There are 10 items and respondents indicate their response using a nominal, yes/no rating scale.

Advantages/Disadvantages of the QnPRCD Section

In summary, the advantages of the QnPRCD section are that it comprises scales that are relatively quick to administer and produces data that are relatively quick to analyse. However, these scales may not deliver the richness of response that the QIPRCD section captures. Although the QnPRCD scales measure various dimensions of the aesthetic response and can be used to examine the impact of independent variables in experimental designs (such as experience or pre-performance information), they only measure response to the *global* stimulus. In other words, the scales do not capture precisely those stimulus properties within the dance-work that produced the particular response.

3. Background Information (BI)

This section collects demographic data including information about gender, age, education, and income. In addition, this section measures respondents experience with dance (including dance training and how frequently they attend different dance events) and other art forms including music, visual arts, and the performing arts.

Acknowledgments

Development of the ART was supported by an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant (Grant no. LP0211991) with industry partners The Australia Council for the Arts, Australian Dance Council – Ausdance, and The Australian Choreographic Centre. If you would like to obtain a copy of the ART please contact marcs@uws.edu.au or kj.stevens@uws.edu.au. Journal articles describing development of the ART, its administration and scoring, are forthcoming. For citation or acknowledgment of the ART in talks, publications, and theses, use:

Glass, R. (2006). The Audience Response Tool (ART) Testing and Scoring Procedure. MARCS Auditory Laboratories, University of Western Sydney, Australia. <http://marcs.uws.edu.au>.

References

- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing* (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Glass, R. (2005). Observer response to contemporary dance. In Grove, R., Stevens, C. & McKechnie, S (Eds.). *Thinking in four dimensions: Creativity and cognition in contemporary dance* (pp. 107-121). Carlton: Melbourne University Press.
- Glass, R. (2006). *The Audience Response Tool (A.R.T.): The impact of choreographic intention, information and dance expertise on psychological reactions to contemporary dance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MARCS Auditory Laboratories, University of Western Sydney.
- Sloboda, J. A. (1991). Music structure and emotional response: some empirical findings. *Psychology of Music*, 19, 110-120.