



Metropolitan Group

the power of voice

From Nicety to Necessity
Building Public Will for Lifelong Arts Learning

Remarks by:
Kevin T. Kirkpatrick
Senior Executive Vice President/Principal
Metropolitan Group

National Guild for Community Arts Education
November 21, 2014

I want to thank Jonathan Herman and everyone at the National Guild for Community Arts Education for inviting me to be here today.

And not just because it's November and I live in Chicago, and not just because the polar vortex has already come to the Windy City ... our temperatures are 20 degrees below normal ...

I'm pleased to be here because any time I can be with a group of folks who care about and promote the arts and culture – especially among young people – that's somewhere I want to be.

There are a couple of things I'd like to accomplish during our time together this morning.

First, I want to inspire you. I know you all work hard. You believe in what you do. And you've been fighting some really tough battles for many years. So, one of my jobs is to provide you with some extra "juice" to keep at it once you go back home.

I also want to provide you with some specific things you can try in your own communities across the country. Things you might not have tried before. Maybe some things you've never even thought about.

And lastly, I want to be provocative. Push the envelope a little bit.

I can tell you right off the bat that I don't have all the answers. A few years ago, I saw former President Bill Clinton speak, and after responding to a couple of the moderator's questions with 10-15 minute answers, he responded to one question with a simple "I don't know." After the shock of that answer had subsided – he said, "I try to say 'I don't know' at least once an hour." I think that's a good lesson in humility from someone who's not necessarily known for that particular attribute.

So, I don't have all the answers. You might agree or disagree with me on any number of things. It's not our job this morning to come to consensus. I just want to give you some things to think about.

I should also point out that I consider myself to be an advocate for lifelong arts learning,

both in my personal and professional life. What you're selling, I'm buying. And since I have worked for several years to promote the arts and arts education, I will take the liberty of talking about what I think "WE" should be doing. What "WE'RE" doing right. And what "WE'RE" doing wrong.

So, if I say something that sounds like I'm telling you that you're thinning on top or you've put on a few pounds, it's because I love you. And because I'M thinning on top and I'VE put on a few pounds. I hope you'll take it in the spirit in which it's intended.

So, let's get started (slide #3).

In talking with you all today, I'm really happy to be in a position to share some new research with you. The company I work for, Metropolitan Group, is part of a national planning team to develop and pilot test an initiative to build public will for the arts as a recognized, valued, and expected part of everyday life.

The project is being led by Arts Midwest with lead funding from the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation. We've been working on pilots in four locations: Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon and here in California. Specifically, San Jose, which is being led by Kerry Adams-Hapner, Director of Cultural Affairs for the City of San Jose, in partnership with the California Arts Council.

We've just completed a national survey with oversampling in our four pilot states about public attitudes and understanding about arts and culture, trying to fill some of the gaps from previous research on this subject. And we're about to go into focus group testing, which is happening in the first two weeks of December.

We're going to release our findings and recommendations early next year, and we're obviously not yet done with our research, so there's a limit to how much I can tell you right now.

But, I'm going to share some of what we've learned thus far ... both to whet your appetite for what's to come in January, and to provide you with some ideas to start thinking about in your communities.

As I mentioned, our purpose ultimately is to develop and implement a plan to build public will for the arts and culture as a recognized, valued, and expected part of everyday life.

Because right now, that public will just doesn't exist. You just don't see many signs like this out there (slide #4). As my partner and colleague Eric Friedenwald-Fishman is fond of saying, for most people the arts are a nicety, rather than a necessity.

That doesn't mean that people don't care about the arts and about arts education, in particular. They do. Research has shown that for years. And our research confirms it.

It's just not the top priority for most people. Oh, it's on the list. But, it tends to be pretty far down the list of things people value in their lives and their communities. At the top of the list are things like family and well-being, faith and spirituality. That kind of thing.

Now, that's not terribly surprising. When you think of the hierarchy of needs for most people in their own lives and communities, it's no surprise they care about their families, safety, jobs, good schools, health and well-being.

Our task is not to try to unseat any of those things in people's minds, but to connect the arts and culture to the things they care about. That's the trick. We don't need them to care less about their families or about their health and well-being. We just need them to understand how arts and culture connect to those things.

That understanding will not come about, however, by giving people more data. More facts.

People already believe that exposure to arts and culture in their lives is good for them. Good for their health and well-being. Good for reducing their stress and helping them connect with other people and learn something new. They also believe it's really good for kids, that it provides them with a more well-rounded education, and better prepares them for college and career.

All the data we put out there about the impact of the arts on our lives, our education, our communities, and our economy ... people get it.

And as a result of believing this, people are generally in favor of support for the arts, particularly when it comes to arts education for all kids. And one of the takeaways from our national survey is that Americans overwhelmingly believe that opportunities to experience arts and culture should be affordable by everyone.

So, if the facts are already on our side, and the majority of people already understand that and agree with us, then why are we having such a hard time?

Part of the reason is that there's a **big, big difference between public opinion and public will** (slide #5).

People have opinions on all sorts of things. And it's really not all that tough to get people to believe something, at least for a little while. But, that doesn't mean what they believe today will still be something they believe tomorrow, and it sure doesn't mean they care enough to get off their butts and do something about it.

What we need is not public opinion, but public will. The kind of public will that translates beliefs and attitudes into behaviors, policies and cultural norms.

About 10 years ago, we published our **framework for building public will**, which has five phases (slide #6). We don't really have time today to walk through the entire model. So, I'm going to focus on the first phase. Framing the problem.

In our experience, that's where a lot of social purpose advocates make their first and most fundamental mistake. Because, if you're not starting with an effective frame, then nothing else will work for you.

So, let's talk about what I mean about framing (slide #7).

Framing theory tells us that when presented with new information, what we believe and the choices we make (or don't make) are directly tied to our core values, and to our views and assumptions about how the world works.

Framing theory draws on extensive research in how our brains function and how we process information. **And there are six fundamental ideas behind it** (slide #8).

1. We use mental shortcuts to make sense of the world around us and to process the vast amount of information and data to which we're exposed to everyday. Researchers I've worked with have called us "frugal cognators", which is a really just a nice way of saying that we're "intellectually lazy."
2. We look and listen for clues in that information, to help us decide whether to pay attention to the information or not. We can't possibly pay attention to everything, so we filter really well, deciding very quickly whether we should pay attention or not.
3. Those clues connect the information to certain stories or narratives we already have in our heads. The Cinderella story. The local kid made good story. The prodigal son story. The hooker with a heart of gold story. Narratives, too, that are dominant in our culture. The undeserving poor supported by hard-working, tax-paying middle class folks. The "illegal aliens" taking our jobs. The nanny state telling us how to raise our kids.
4. These stories trigger values that we hold very deeply, and which we share, again across generations and cultures. Values like freedom, privacy, my home is my castle, community, family, fairness.
5. These values and the stories associated with them help us to assign responsibility for resolving problems. We've become really adept at deciding who needs to solve our problems. It's seldom us, of course. It's always someone else's responsibility.
6. And finally, all of this works together to suggest to us that certain solutions are relevant and other solutions are not.

What's interesting about the power of frames, is that information that contradicts our frame—no matter how solid the data behind it might be—is disregarded. In other words (slide #9), **values trump facts**.

Facts really work best in reinforcing a belief, choice or decision that's already been made. Reinforcing the purchase decision, if you will.

But, facts and information seldom—and I mean SELDOM—change anyone's mind about anything unless their mind really wasn't all that set to begin with. I mean, look at the continuing debate about global climate change. Are we really still having a conversation about whether the science is real or not ...?

But, to get back to framing ...

Here's a little test for you.

(slide #10) Suppose I show you **this picture of these two houses**.

Suppose I now tell you that the man who lives in the white house on the right has developed a rare form of cancer. He doesn't smoke or drink. Never worked in a hazardous environment, but he's sick. And he's probably going to die. Suppose I then ask you why he might be sick? Who's fault is it? Who's responsible for doing something about it? And what kinds of solutions might make sense?

Now, let me alter the picture a bit.

Then, suppose I ask you the same questions: Why might this man be sick? Who's fault is it? Who's responsible for doing something about it? And what kinds of solutions might be appropriate?

I suspect your answers to the second set of questions would be very different than your answers to the first set. If I had suggested during your consideration of the first picture that the community had some responsibility to address the fact that these girls are sick, or that some policy solutions might be relevant, you probably would have thought I was over-reaching.

Here's an example of all of this in the real world (slide #11) ... These are **two photocaptions** that crossed the wires in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. The photo at left shows two Caucasians and the caption describes them as residents who waded through the water in search of supplies. The photo at right shows a young African American male who is described as a looter. The photos here and the words used reflect two very different frames and generate two very different results.

The frame at left triggers the values of community and rugged individualism. The problem is defined as innocent people facing tragic circumstances beyond their control, and the logical solution is to send food. Send money. They need our help.

The frame at right triggers the values of authority and justice. The problem is that bad people are taking advantage of a tragic situation and actually making things worse. And the solution is to send in the National Guard, which is—of course—exactly what happened.

Let's apply framing theory to another issue that we've worked on at Metropolitan Group that I think will strike some familiar chords with you: **historic preservation** (slide #12).

A couple of years ago, we were hired by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. After fifty years, the historic preservation movement in this country—and the organization representing it—have gotten older. Its core constituency is literally dying off. And while that might be good news for fundraisers trying to build a planned giving program, it's not very good news for anybody else in the preservation movement.

So, we were hired to develop a new brand platform and message framework to help engage a broader and younger audience. Basically, they were looking for folks we called "latent preservationists." People who buy and fix up old houses. They shop at local mom and pop stores instead of big box stores. They take their kids to historic sites on vacation

and watch a documentary on television if the subject interests them. But, they would never describe themselves as “preservationists.”

We did a lot of research on these folks, including 12 focus groups in four communities across the country.

And we found that this audience had a very unhelpful frame on historic preservation that **looked something like this...**(slide #13).

They didn't see any relevance to historic preservation in their own lives. To them, preservation is about Mount Vernon and Monticello. It's not about places they care about—the diner where they ate with their parents as kids, the church their grandparents were married in, the old house on the corner they were convinced was haunted every Halloween. To them, historic preservation was determined by other people who were deciding what is and what is not worth preserving. And it turned them off.

The good news is that we found we could engage them pretty effectively by reframing and **redefining historic preservation** as being about the protection, enhancement and enjoyment of **places that matter to people**. Suddenly, the target audience was a lot more interested. Suddenly there was relevance to them. And it connected with their core values, their connection to their own heritage and to the legacy they want to leave behind for their own kids.

And the reframing to “this place matters” (slide #14) totally reinvigorated the historic preservation movement across the country. Suddenly, thousands of people were printing out “This place matters” on their home printers and taking and posting pictures of themselves on Flickr in front of the places that mattered to them.

I think the lesson from that experience is really relevant here. Another issue that ordinary people find hard to connect to their own lives. Where there's an assumption about some things being important and worthy and other things not. Where it's associated with East Coast or at least urban elitists.

So, framing matters. And before we can change the frame on the arts and arts education, we have to understand the current frame and how it helps and hurts us.

And for that, I'd like to start with a book by **George Lakoff**, called Moral Politics (slide #15). I highly recommend it to you, if you haven't already read it.

In the book, Lakoff writes that the country is not divided between red states and blue states, or even between liberals and conservatives, (slide #16) but between those with a “**strict father**” mentality and those with a “**nurturant parent**” mentality. I don't think I need to describe in detail what each of those mean; I think you can probably guess.

And in the book, Lakoff talks about their very different perspectives on a whole host of issues, including the arts and education. And I think you'll find his observations on these perspectives to be very interesting.

First, let's look at education (slide #17).

According to Lakoff, strict fathers look on education from the perspectives of authority and discipline, standards and accountability. Education should teach kids the basics and prepare them to be productive and successful in the world.

Nurturant parents, on the other hand, look on the self-actualizing aspect of education. The search for truth. Asking tough questions. Yes, there are standards and accountability, but we're accountable to and responsible for each other, and standards help ensure that. And part of the job of education is to help kids develop their creativity and imaginations.

That's a pretty big disconnect. And there's not a whole lot of room for common ground there.

What about the arts? (slide #18)

According to Lakoff, those with a strict father mentality think art should serve a higher purpose. It should be something beautiful to be appreciated and admired. It should be a source of pleasure. It should uplift and inspire us, and it should be a solid economic investment.

What about nurturant parents? Well, something interesting happens here. Because the pretty straightforward dichotomy we saw in perspectives on education is largely missing here.

Turns out that nurturant parents share a lot of these same perspectives, according to Lakoff. They might not REQUIRE them of the arts like strict fathers do, but they certainly understand that perspective and in some respects, EXPECT the arts to fulfill them.

At the same time, nurturant parents also think art should help us search for truth and ask tough questions. It should increase our understanding and empathy. It can be healing.

The overlap here between strict fathers and nurturant parents is really important. It explains why you don't find many people beyond the quote/unquote "arts community" who are willing to stand up and defend the arts when something controversial sparks public outrage. Lakoff suggests that's because a lot of so-called liberals don't really understand art enough to appreciate and respect it for pushing boundaries and buttons. Most of them really would prefer to be looking at Monet rather than Mapplethorpe (slide #19). Even though they think art should be provocative, they get nervous sometimes at how far some artists are willing to push, and it's easy for them to sit on the sidelines and let the controversy play itself out. And since strict fathers seldom sit quietly on the sidelines for anything, it's no great surprise when arts take a hit. Exhibitions are closed. Artists are demonized. Public funding is revoked.

In considering all of this, I think there are some **obvious implications in promoting lifelong arts learning** (slide #20).

It should be relatively easy to engage and motivate nurturant parents, because they are likely to believe that the arts should be integrated into our educational experiences because they improve overall achievement. And as a stand-alone, they enlighten and enrich our kids.

But, strict fathers are more likely to see arts as OK if it helps students to achieve more in the basics of their education. As a stand-alone part of the curriculum, it had better serve some high moral purpose. And even then, it's probably a luxury at best. Something easy to cut, especially now with budgets being cut to the bone—and beyond.

But, you know what? Here's the good news. We don't have to win over every strict father.

You don't need everyone on board to effectively build public will, to change cultural norms and to make policy change happen. Anti-smoking behaviors, policies, laws and cultural norms have become dominant in the last generation or so even though a sizable minority of Americans still smoke—or make and sell products to these Americans—and have opposed these changes every step of the way.

You don't need to convince everybody (slide #21).

You need just enough people to tip the balance in your favor. Today every politician knows that elections are determined by so-called undecided voters.

That's what I'm suggesting we do in trying to build public will for arts and culture as a recognized, valued, and expected part of everyday life. Accept that there are already a core group of folks on our side (slide #22). So-called arts enthusiasts. People who already get it. We need to energize this group and get them riled up once in a while. And we certainly don't want to do anything to alienate them.

We know what this group tends to look like. The data is pretty clear. They're liberal or independents leaning liberal. They're teachers, or well-educated college grads. They're professionals and they're considered to be active in the arts. And they make more than \$75,000 a year. And many of them are white. And our research suggests it's about one-third of the population who say that opportunities to experience arts and culture in their everyday lives is very important.

And on the flip side, we need to accept that there is also a core group of folks —our research suggests it's only about 10 percent of the country — that don't get it and don't want to. They just don't see being artistic or creative — or expressing their culture — as terribly important. They live in more rural areas. They're more conservative politically, socially, and spiritually. More of them are men. And many of them are white.

They're not going to buy what we're selling at any price. So, you know what? We need to stop trying.

Instead, we need to focus our attention on some of the folks in the middle. The folks who see value in being artistic or creative — or expressing their culture — but they don't necessarily label it that way. In fact, they would probably say they're not terribly artistic or creative people, although they're doing things every day that fit that description.

They're taking pictures with their smart phones, playing around with different filters, and sharing them. They're mixing their own music on their laptops, and posting videos on YouTube. They're making jewelry at home and selling it to friends and neighbors. They're taking pride in their gardens, or their cooking. They're making stuff out of found

objects, and going to cultural festivals. They're salsa dancing at block parties and finally taking up the piano.

But, they would never call themselves artists.

They just know that what they're doing makes a difference in their lives. It helps them express themselves as individuals and share their unique voice. It helps them connect with who they are and where they come from. It gives them a chance to do something with their kids. It helps them relax and reduces their stress.

In short, what they're doing directly connects back to the things our survey shows they care most about ... their children and their family. Their health and well-being.

And what do these folks look like? Well, for one thing they tend to be much more diverse. Many more people of color than the groups at either end of the spectrum that we talked about a few minutes ago. They tend to be younger ... millennials, for example. They've got kids under 18, and they like to do things as a family. They would consider themselves spiritual, but not necessarily religious. They're actively engaged outside the home. And more of them are women.

The trick for us is to find a way to engage this diverse audience in a way that helps them more overtly and consciously connect what they're already doing with what they care about, and showing them that these creative ways of expressing or enjoying themselves are actually part of something bigger that's important in all our lives. Something that connects them to their communities. To the local community theater. To the art program at their kid's school. To the little art gallery on the corner. To the cultural festivals held each summer. To the art museum downtown.

Something that should be valued. And protected. And supported.

Now that we know what this audience is doing, and how it connects to what they care about ... we need to find a way to frame arts and culture in a way that builds on that. And find a message that resonates with them and motivates them.

That's a big part of what we're going to be exploring in the focus groups in December ... so let me tell you a bit about what we're thinking right now.

First (slide #23), we need to recognize and appreciate that the words "arts" and "culture" might not be the best way to describe what people are doing and valuing in their own lives. For one thing, our research tells us they define arts and culture very differently. The arts are about something you create. A painting. A photograph. A sculpture. Culture is more amorphous. Something you experience, part of your lifestyle, something connected to your heritage, perhaps.

When they hear the word "arts" most people tend to think of it in terms of a capital-A. So-called "fine arts." Institutional art represented by theater and dance companies, art museums and galleries.

And while there is definitely a segment of society for whom engagement with this kind of capital-A art is very important, it just doesn't register as important to most people.

There is one exception to this that is directly relevant to this audience ... When it comes to an explicit conversation about arts and culture, people are all for it in terms of their children's education. It's the one place where explicitly talking about arts and culture works for people. I'll come back to that in a few moments ...

But "arts and culture" resonates less powerfully with adults in the context of their own lives. It's just not something that most of them rank very highly.

What resonates higher with people and is more motivating to them is when we frame what they're doing and valuing in their own lives in terms of self-expression (slide #24).

In fact when we ask people whether it's important to them to be creative, artistic, or to have opportunities to express their culture in their everyday lives, 63 percent said yes. Which was impressive in and of itself. Thirty-four percent of folks said it was very important. And about one-third of people – 36% – said it wasn't important.

In a split sample, we asked another set of people how important it is to be able to express who you are. And on this question, 82 percent said it was important. A jump of almost 20 points.

What's interesting is that the percentage of folks who think this is very important is exactly the same as think it's very important to be creative or artistic or have opportunities to express their culture in their everyday lives: 34 percent. What we picked up was another 20 percent who think it's somewhat important to be able to express who they are.

This 20-point jump when we reframe in terms of opportunities to express yourself is very interesting ... and it seems to connect to the values of health and well-being. Which we're going to explore more in-depth in our focus groups in a couple of weeks.

I mentioned a few moments ago that people seem to embrace arts and culture most explicitly in the context of their kids ... In fact, the strongest message of all the messages we tested in our national survey was this (slide #25):

"Every child deserves a well-rounded education that teaches them not just to read and write, but to think creatively and solve problems, to work together, and to express their unique talent and ideas. And one of the best ways to learn these skills is to experience arts and culture in the classroom."

81 percent of people said that was an effective message in motivating them to want to put more arts in culture in their lives, or to do more of the creative things they enjoy. In fact, 40 percent of men found that message to be very effective and 59 percent of women. It was by far the strongest message we tested. It alone occupies the top tier of effective messaging.

The next tier is occupied by two messages that tested very close to each other in terms of effectiveness ... (slide #26)

The first of these messages conveys the unique human experience reflected in arts and cultural experiences and how these experiences help us find meaning in our lives and

our world. One third of men and 40 percent of women found this message to be very effective.

And the second of these tier-two messages talks about how arts and cultural experiences help us reconnect with our selves, release our stress, and provide outlets for our creative energy in today's fast-paced and stressful world. 28 percent of men and 42 percent of women found this message to be very effective.

Another message that talked about the importance of creativity and imagination in our changing world and how arts and cultural experiences better equip us to solve problems and find new ways of doing things actually didn't test very well compared to these others. Only 28 percent of people found that to be a very effective message.

Since our effort is focused on building public will for arts and culture as part of our everyday lives for everyone, I don't think we'll gravitate toward the well-rounded education message as our lead message.

But, what we learn about the arts education message will certainly be among the findings we share with the field early next year, and I hope you'll all feel free to take what we learn and make use of it in any way that helps advance your work.

In the meantime, here are some suggestions for what you might want to consider as you go back to your own communities next week.

First, beware of the perils associated with being a true believer (slide #27).

I have the great pleasure of working at an agency that only works with clients that are working to build a just and sustainable world. They're all doing amazing things. And like you, they wouldn't be doing what they're doing if they didn't believe in what they're doing with every fiber of their being.

The problem we often encounter, however, is with clients who assume that everyone else shares that commitment, those same values, or even the same worldview.

The fact is, everyone else doesn't necessarily share that commitment, those values or that same worldview. So, what do you do with that? Do you recognize that everyone doesn't need to believe the same things in order to find common ground? Or do you stake a claim to the moral high ground and insist that everyone play by your rules?

I'm not saying you should sell your soul and **come over the dark side** (slide #28). I AM saying that we need to recognize that people can come from very different places (slide #29), and take very different routes, and still arrive at the same destination. But if we insist that everyone start at the same place and take the same route, then we're liable to lose a lot more people along the way than we can afford.

I think we also need to stop spending so much of our time and energy **preaching to the choir** (slide #30).

This is something we and our clients wrestle with every day.

It's a tough one because we definitely need to work our base. We need them to be on our side, and we need them to stand up when it counts and demand certain things.

But, just because we can stir up the folks who already agree with us, doesn't mean we can rile up anyone else. Heck, it doesn't even mean we can hold their interest or keep them from getting up and walking out on us.

The same arguments that might generate hallelulahs from the faithful are not necessarily the same arguments we need to motivate other folks. And if we're not careful, we end up with campaigns like this one (slide #31) that actually have the potential to do damage to our cause.

So, we need to get out of our own way (slide #32). We can't design arguments to rile ourselves up. In fact, we need to try to remember that it's not about us at all.

What works for us...what motivates us...what gets us all up in arms and ready to go to battle, will probably only work for people who already think and feel exactly like us. And how many of them can there actually be? Not enough.

I think we should also reconsider our champions (slide #33).

Think about the people we put out there most often as spokespersons and champions for lifelong arts learning. School principals. Arts teachers. Involved parents. Working artists. Yawn.

I mean, come on! Frankly, when people hear arts educators or school principals talk about the importance of arts education, they're not really very surprised, let alone motivated. What kind of arts educator would NOT support arts education in the schools?

Let's hear from some "unusual suspects" ... public policy leaders, community and business leaders, psychologists, criminologists. There's really compelling data showing that kids exposed to the arts in their schools are less likely to commit crimes. What a great case to make to the law and order conservatives.

And I think this ties in to one of the themes of this conference ... about forming new partnerships and collaborations that extend your reach and your influence. Adopting more of a collective impact approach.

Settle in for the long haul (slide #34). This is the last one, and perhaps the toughest.

Public will isn't built in a year. It takes time. It takes patience. And it takes a clear, consistent strategy that is sustained over the long haul. And frankly, it takes money.

There are two—unfortunately, contradictory—implications of settling in for the long haul.

The good news is that history tells us that American society is constantly evolving in a progressive direction. At least, that's good news for progressives.

Sure, there are setbacks along the way and entire generations where we seem to be falling back to what might be perceived by some to be the safe harbor of conservatism. But, over time we're moving in a progressive direction.

The bad news is that too many children are losing opportunities to participate in the arts every year. That's particularly true of children in underserved communities. We're

moving toward a time when the only kids exposed to the arts on any meaningful level will be those kids whose parents care and can afford it. In many respects, that day is already here. And what does that mean for the future of arts education if the next generation has no idea what real arts education is all about? If they don't know it when they see it, they didn't really know they missed it, and they couldn't tell you what it looks like, then how will they ever be motivated to demand it? And it will only get worse unless we do something about it.

I'm confident that we can. But to do it, we have to be bold.

We have to stop allowing the institutions we've built – both literal and figurative – to be the center of our world (slide #35), and the dominant image the public associates with us and our work. This “Field of Dreams” fantasy where we think “if we build it, they will come.”

That strategy will work with some people some of the time. There's no question that there is a core of arts enthusiasts and advocates for whom that kind of strategy will always be effective.

But, they're not the majority. Not even close. At least, not yet!

Of course, our hope is to grow that group over time so eventually they do become the majority. But, that's going to take time.

And we won't win over more people by taking for granted that they already appreciate art for its own sake and just need to be encouraged to demand more of it. This art-centric – “well of course you must want it, who wouldn't?” – framing is painfully close to patronizing.

To reach and effectively engage the rest of the folks, we need to find and meet them where they are. Instead of trying to entice them to want what we have to offer, we need to offer them something they value. Something they might not even know they need.

We need to understand what they're doing and what they value in their own lives (slide #36), and then show them how much more of that stuff exists out there in the world. In their schools. In their communities.

Then we have to give them the motivation to seek it out.

In effect, we need to help them make the leap by themselves.

We're hoping and intending that the research we're doing here in California and across the country will provide advocates like you with new understanding to help people of all ages to take this leap ... to embrace lifelong arts learning. And to make the arts and culture – whether they call it that or not! – a recognized, valued, and expected part of everyday life.

Thank you (slide #37).

###