

Perspectives of Theatre for Young Audiences Companies' Leaders by Budget, Region, and Longevity: A Survey

[MATT OMASTA](#)

[AUBREY FELTY](#)

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

This report offers extensive data from a survey project that invited the artistic, business, and education leaders of every professional Theatre for Young Audiences company affiliated with TYA/USA to share information regarding a wide range of topics including season selection, finances, education programming, staff demographics, leader perceptions of quality TYA, and others. The focus of this piece is a comparison of data from theatres of different types.

Specifically, it considers how three influential circumstances—theatres' budget sizes, their geographic locations, and their longevity—intersect with, and perhaps affect, other circumstances as well as the perspectives and beliefs of their theatre leaders. This article provides copious descriptive data and invites readers to draw insights from their personal analyses of the data most relevant to their own practice and/or research.

TYA scholars have long called for empirical studies in the field related to a wide range of research questions (e.g., Cornelison, 1975; Davis, 1961; Klein, 1989; Saldaña, 1988; Ward, 1950). In recent years, many researchers have explored the field through survey research, primarily seeking to better understand aspects of young spectators' engagement with, interpretation of, or understanding of a performance, or how plays might affect young audiences' attitudes, values, and beliefs. The projects usually survey young spectators themselves (e.g., Betzien, 2007; Johari 2018; Omasta, 2011; Pretorious, 2008; and Queponds, 2016) or primary and secondary level educators (e.g., Adamson, 2011; Klein, 1997; Swallow, 2012).

Only three studies have attempted to assess the state of the US TYA field more broadly through survey research. The first (van Tassel, 1969) collected survey responses from 104 "individuals or producing organizations practicing in the field of theatre for children in the United States" (p. 414). The second (Blackwell, 2008), collected responses from 36 "directors, playwrights, university faculty, and educational theatre artists" (p. 12). Omasta (2019) conducted the most recent project, surveying the artistic, business, and educational leaders of TYA theatres affiliated with TYA/USA, the U.S. center of ASSITEJ; leaders from 97% of the 61 eligible theatres participated—an exceptionally high response rate in survey research.

This report shares extensive data from the most recent project, with a focus on comparing data from theatres of different types. Specifically, it considers how three influential circumstances—theatres' budget sizes, their geographic locations, and their longevity¹—intersect with, and perhaps affect, other circumstances as well as the perspectives and beliefs of their theatre leaders.

Given the wide range of topics the survey covered, the value of

¹ We use this term to refer to the length of time a theatre has been in operation.

the data in this report will vary to a large extent based on the particular interests of each individual reader. We present brief overviews of responses related to each topic along with tables detailing the findings, but it is not possible to discuss the nuances of all data in a report of this nature.

As such, in this report we provide copious descriptive data and invite readers to draw insights from their personal analyses most relevant to their own practice and/or research. Separately, we have published an article (the piece can be accessed here: [Omasta & Felty, 2021](#)) that demonstrates how readers can analyze the information presented here. The article analyzes data relevant to a particularly significant and timely topic: the state of inclusivity and equity in our field.

METHODOLOGY

Omasta (2019) invited the artistic, business, and education leaders of each professional TYA company affiliated with TYA/USA to participate in the survey, employing a cross-sectional (Barr, 2004) census design (Fricker Jr, 2008; Groves et al., 2009). As Cantwell (2008) observes, among quantitative approaches, a census can be the only design that “can produce useful information for rare populations” (p. 4). The census approach and theatre-level response rate of 97% suggest minimal likelihood of non-sampling bias or non-response bias.

The research team sent questionnaires designed specifically for the artistic, business, and education leaders of each company, with an additional questionnaire for participants who led in more than one of these areas. We drafted most of the questions in collaboration with TYA/USA and based additional questions on those posed in previous surveys of the field (vanTassel, 1969; Blackwell, 2008). To promote validity, we employed expert review (Groves et al., 2009), cognitive verbal prompting (Hoffmeyer, Sheingold, & Taylor, 2015), and readability analysis (Kincaid, Fishburne, Rogers, & Chissom, 1975).

We collected data using Qualtrics and analyzed it using SPSS

statistical software. Two research assistants coded qualitative data, achieving intercoder reliability greater than 96%, with discrepant codes analyzed by a third coder. When possible, we quantitized qualitative data for reporting. For further technical details regarding methodology, see Omasta (2019).

We note that the global COVID-19 pandemic that began the season following the one during which this data was collected radically altered the ways in which TYA companies operated, with many transitioning primarily to virtual operations. As of the publication of this report, many companies have begun to offer live, in-person programming once again. It is uncertain at this time to what degree companies may return to previous practices, retain those from the pandemic era, and/or innovate moving forward. Future research similar to that of this study may provide insights into the evolving landscape of the field in terms of responses to the pandemic and other factors.

Comparison Groups

In this report we compare data from theatres in three ways. We first compare theatres with regard to their financial resources as measured by their total annual operating budgets during their 2017-18 seasons. The four budget categories are:

Category A: Budgets Under \$250,000

Category B: Budgets Between \$250,000 — \$999,999

Category C: Budgets Between \$1 million — \$2.99 million

Category D: Budgets of \$3 million and above

We next compare theatres based on their geographical region, using the four primary regions established by the US Census Bureau: Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. Finally, we compare theatres in three groups based on longevity: those founded in 1979 or earlier; between 1980-1999, and in 2000 or later. The percentage of respondents within each group is indicated in Table 1.

Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
23%	22%	32%	23%	15%	29%	41%	15%	36%	30%	34%

Table 1. Percentages of participating theatres by budget size, region, and year founded. *N* = 59.

There are some correlations between theatres which can be inferred throughout the data, including data between larger-budget theatres and theatres with greater longevity. In general, theatres with greater longevity tended to have larger budgets than those founded more recently. As such, observations about differences between, for example, theatres in budget Category A and theatres in budget Category D, also often appear between theatres founded before 1980 and theatres founded in 2000 or later. This is not always the case, however; there are instances in which a theatre's budget or longevity may be more telling than the combined weight of those two factors. Additionally, theatres in the Northeast often reported smaller budgets¹ and were founded more recently² than theatres in other regions.

DATA AND ANALYSIS

In this section we briefly summarize the data and what we perceive as salient trends related to each topic the survey considered. To allow for more detailed analysis, we supplement these summaries with more comprehensive data presented in tables. Each table

¹ Only 38% of theatres in the Northeast reported budgets of \$1 million or greater, compared to 53-64% of theatres in other regions.

² 100% of the participating theatres in the Northeast were founded in 1980 or later, while only 56-59% of theatres in other regions were founded this recently.

indicates the overall mean (average) response from all participating theatres, followed by responses from theatres categorized by budget size, region, and longevity.

Programming

Season Selection

The survey asked theatres' artistic leaders to indicate the importance of eight potentially relevant season selection criteria. Leaders rated the importance of each criterion on a scale of 1 ("not at all important") to 4 ("very important"). Their responses appear in Tables 2-4. To help understand the data, several indicators of importance are included: the eight criteria are presented in order from greatest to lowest mean importance for each theatre type; the mean rating of each criterion is indicated; and the color scheme helps visually compare mean ratings.³

As the tables suggest, respondents from different types of theatres often prioritized various criteria differently; in fact, no criterion was rated at least 3.0 ("Important") by leaders from *all*

³ These multiple ways of viewing the data can be helpful given the fact that criteria received different mean ratings even in cases when they were ranked similarly. For example, while both category C & D theatre leaders collectively rated "including a certain number of productions each year for specific age groups" as the most important criterion, category D leaders collectively rated this criterion as more important than category C leaders did.

theatre types. There were some noticeable trends, however.

Criteria that leaders ranked highly (mean score of 3.0 or greater) at theatres of nearly all budget types, regions, and longevity were:

- “Plays that provide opportunities for artistic experimentation” (all theatres except those in the West)
- “Titles that tell the stories of marginalized people” (all theatres except Category A)
- “Including a certain number of productions each year for specific age groups” (all theatres except Category A and those founded since 2000)

While no criteria consistently received very low scores, some received scores of less than 3.0 at theatres of nearly all budget types, regions, and years. These were:

- “Plays appropriate for the talent of actors available in the theatre’s ensemble or region” (all theatres except Category A theatres and those founded since 2000).
- “Plays that are wholly original; not adaptations from existing material” (all theatres except Category A and those in the Northeast).

Ratings of other criteria varied more widely. For example, selecting plays “expected to generate high revenue/sales” was relatively unimportant to leaders of smaller-budget theatres, but quite important to larger-budget theatre leaders (especially Category D theatres). Similarly, while selecting plays with “recognizable titles” was the least important criteria for Category A & B theatre leaders, it was much more important to Category C & D theatre leaders.

In general, leaders of Category D theatres were more likely to rate various criteria as “very important.” While *none* of the leaders of Category A, B, or C theatre provided on average rated any criteria as 3.5 or above, leaders of Category D theatres collectively rated *five* of

the eight criteria this highly. Leaders of the largest-budget theatres feel may greater pressure to meet numerous criteria in general than their colleagues at theatres with smaller budgets.

Leaders of theatres in the Northeast collectively rated “including plays that provide opportunities for artistic experimentation and innovation” as especially important, collectively rating this criterion as more important than leaders of any other type of theatre. While leaders in the Northeast rated including wholly original plays in their seasons to be important, this was the least important criterion to leaders of theatres in all other regions.

Tables 2-4 use summary terms. Since the exact wording of the criteria matter, they are indicated here in full:

- “Including plays expected to generate high revenue/sales” (HIGH REVENUE)
- “Including plays with recognizable titles” (RECOGNIZABLE TITLES)
- “Including a certain number of productions each year for specific age groups” (VARIOUS AGE GROUPS)
- “Including plays that provide opportunities for artistic experimentation and innovation” (ARTISTIC EXPERIMENTATION)
- “Including plays that respond to current issues and events” (CURRENT ISSUES)
- “Including titles that tell the stories of marginalized people” (STORIES OF MARGINALIZED)
- “Including plays that are appropriate for the talent of actors available in the theatre’s ensemble or region” (AVAILABLE TALENT)
- “Including plays that are wholly original; not adaptations from existing material” (ORIGINAL MATERIAL).

CATEGORY A	CATEGORY B	CATEGORY C	CATEGORY D		Color Key
Artistic Experimentation (3.38)	Current Issues (3.30)	Various Age Groups (3.38)	Various Age Groups (3.69)		
Available Talent (3.33)	TIE: Various Age Groups;	Stories of Marginalized (3.31)	TIE: High Revenue;		Score 3.50-4.00
Original Material (3.08)	Artistic Experimentation; Stories of Marginalized (3.10)	TIE: High Revenue;	Stories of Marginalized (3.62)		Score 3.00-3.49
Stories of Marginalized (2.92)		Recognizable Titles;	TIE: Recognizable Titles;		Score 2.50-2.99
Various Age Groups (2.83)	Available Talent (2.80)	Artistic Experimentation (3.19)	Current Issues (3.54)		Score 2.00-2.49
Current Issues (2.42)	TIE: High Revenue;	Current Issues (3.00)	Artistic Experimentation (3.46)		Score 1.00-1.99
High Revenue (2.38)	Original Material (2.70)	Original Material (2.31)	Available Talent (2.77)		
Recognizable Titles (1.92)	Recognizable Titles (2.60)	Available Talent (2.25)	Original Material (2.62)		

Table 2. Mean importance of various season selection criteria, by theatre budget size. *N* = 55.

NORTHEAST	MIDWEST	SOUTH	WEST
Artistic Experimentation (3.75)	TIE: Various Age Groups; Artistic Experimentation (3.29)	TIE: Artistic Experimentation; Stories of Marginalized (3.38)	Various Age Groups (3.56)
Stories of Marginalized (3.43)			TIE: Recognizable Titles; Stories of Marginalized (3.33)
TIE: Various Age Groups; Current Issues (3.14)	TIE: High Revenue; Stories of Marginalized (3.06)	TIE: Various Age Groups; Current Issues (3.19)	High Revenue (3.22)
Original Material (3.13)	Current Issues (2.94)	TIE: High Revenue; Recognizable Titles (3.00)	Current Issues (3.11)
Available Talent (2.57)	Available Talent (2.88)		Artistic Experimentation (2.78)
High Revenue (2.50)	TIE: Recognizable Titles; Original Material (2.82)	Available Talent (2.95)	Available Talent (2.33)
Recognizable Titles (1.86)		Original Material (2.62)	Original Material (2.00)

Table 3. Mean importance of various season selection criteria, by theatre region. *N* = 55.

BEFORE 1980	1980-1999	2000 AND LATER
Stories of Marginalized (3.45)	Various Age Groups (3.56)	Artistic Experimentation (3.21)
TIE: High Revenue; Various Age Groups; Artistic Experimentation; Current Issues (3.35)	Artistic Experimentation (3.38)	TIE: Stories of Marginalized; Available Talent (3.06)
	Stories of Marginalized (3.31)	
	Current Issues (3.19)	Various Age Groups (2.94)
	High Revenue (3.13)	Original Material (2.74)
Recognizable Titles (3.25)	Recognizable Titles (3.00)	Current Issues (2.72)
Available Talent (2.75)	Original Material (2.62)	High Revenue (2.47)
Original Material (2.60)	Available Talent (2.5)	Recognizable Titles (2.28)

Table 4. Mean importance of various season selection criteria, by theatre founding. *N* = 55.

Productions for Various Ages

Table 5 reports the percentages of shows participating theatres produced/presented intended for audiences of different ages. Except for the smallest-budget theatres (Category A), most performances were targeted for children,¹ followed by those intended primarily for the very young or tweens, with few productions for teens and even fewer for adults.

Theatre for the Very Young (TVY) thrived at smaller-budget theatres. TVY constituted the majority of productions at Category A theatres and was also much more common in the Northeast than other regions and at theatres founded since 2000.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Primary Audience	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
TVY	22%	38%	23%	17%	18%	44%	11%	24%	17%	15%	14%	36%
Children	58%	36%	52%	56%	61%	47%	60%	60%	57%	58%	60%	56%
Tweens	14%	13%	19%	20%	15%	4%	23%	12%	13%	22%	14%	6%
Teens	5%	7%	3%	6%	6%	4%	6%	4%	7%	5%	9%	1%
Adults	1%	6%	3%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	6%	0%	3%	1%

Table 5. Mean percentages of productions primarily for audiences of various ages, by theatre budget size, region, and year founded. Overall N = 57.

¹ The survey used the following age groups: TVY (approximately ages 0-5), children (approximately ages 5-10), tweens (approximately ages 11-13), teens (approximately ages 14-17), and adults (ages 18+).

Adaptations, Musicals, and Premieres

As indicated in Table 6, there was a positive correlation between theatre budget size and percentage of adaptations offered: the larger the budget, the greater the percentage of adaptations produced. Larger-budget theatres also produced greater percentages of musicals than smaller-budget theatres. Interestingly, world premieres constituted a considerably greater percentage of work at Category A theatres than at larger-budget theatres.

Corresponding trends emerge when considering theatres by longevity: the most-established theatres produced the greatest percentages of adaptations and musicals while the newest theatres produced greater percentages of world premieres. Regionally, the theatres in the Northeast varied from the rest of the country: adaptations, musicals, and world premieres constituted much lower percentages of their total plays produced.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Show Type	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Adaptations	39%	20%	41%	46%	50%	19%	39%	42%	48%	55%	37%	25%
Musicals	30%	11%	24%	42%	38%	16%	39%	30%	26%	37%	40%	14%
World Premieres	27%	39%	23%	23%	20%	12%	32%	27%	30%	20%	23%	37%

Table 6. Mean percentages of productions of different types, by theatre budget size, region, and year founded. Overall N = 57.

Commissioning and Fees

Most participating theatres commissioned or produced new work, including 100% theatres in several categories, as indicated in Table 7. While still prevalent, commissioning was slightly less common at Category A theatres, theatres in the West, and theatres founded between 1980-1999.

	Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
93%	85%	100%	94%	92%	100%	94%	91%	89%	100%	81%	95%

Table 7. Percentages of theatres that commission / produce new work. Overall N = 52.

While nearly all theatres that commissioned plays paid a commissioning fee to playwrights, there was considerable variation among theatres of all types with regard to average fees paid, as illustrated in Table 8. Most theatres paid fees between \$2,000 – \$4,999. Larger-budget theatres were more likely to pay higher fees (but did not always do so), and the most-recently founded theatres generally paid the lowest fees.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Average Fee	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
\$0	3%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	7%
\$1 – \$1,999	19%	67%	0%	14%	0%	0%	29%	23%	0%	12%	0%	43%
\$2,000 - \$4,999	43%	22%	83%	36%	46%	75%	29%	41%	58%	29%	82%	29%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	21%	11%	0%	29%	27%	25%	28%	18%	14%	24%	18%	21%
\$10,000+	14%	0%	0%	21%	27%	0%	14%	18%	14%	35%	0%	0%

Table 8. Percentages of theatres paying average fees of various amounts to playwrights whose work they commissioned during the 2017-18 season. Overall N = 42.

Performance Types

All theatres except those with the smallest budgets reported that they offered most of their performances in residence at their own venues, split roughly equally between public performances and school performances. However, as Table 9 reveals, nearly half of performances at Category A theatres were touring performances. Touring was most common at recently-founded theatres and those in the Northeast.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Performance Type	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Public	40%	36%	46%	40%	41%	34%	45%	39%	41%	40%	45%	37%
School (Resident)	35%	16%	46%	40%	39%	33%	32%	35%	41%	39%	40%	27%
Tour	25%	48%	8%	20%	20%	33%	23%	26%	18%	21%	15%	36%

Table 9. Mean percentages of performances for various types of audiences, by theatre budget size, region, and year founded. Overall N = 57

Audiences with Special Needs

Most theatres of all types offered *performances* specifically for audience members with special needs (e.g., one or more sensory-friendly performances during the run of a production), as indicated in Table 10. The likelihood of offering these performances was positively correlated with budget size; that is, larger-budget theatres

were more likely to offer performances for audiences with special needs. All participating theatres in the Northeast indicated that they offered these performances, while they were least common in the West.

	Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
73%	54%	60%	88%	85%	100%	65%	76%	56%	85%	81%	53%

Table 10. Percentages of theatres offering special performances specifically for audience members with special needs (e.g., sensory-friendly performances). Overall $N = 55$

Overall, few theatres offered entire *productions* intended specifically for audience members with special needs (i.e., all performances throughout the run were designed for members of this population). As Table 11 illustrates, these productions were most common in the Northeast and especially uncommon in the South. Interestingly, although theatres founded since 2000 were the least likely to offer *performances* specifically for audience members with special needs, they were the most likely to offer *productions* for this population.

	Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
12%	7%	10%	19%	8%	25%	12%	5%	11%	10%	6%	16%

Table 11. Percentages of theatres offering special productions specifically for audience members with special needs (i.e., the complete run of the entire production was designed for audience members with special needs.) Overall $N = 55$.

Leader Perspectives

Programming Priorities

To get another perspective on the relative importance TYA theatre leaders placed on potential priorities related to shows (beyond the season selection criteria discussed above), the survey asked all theatre leaders (artistic, business, and education) to rate their level of agreement with several statements. They were:

- “In general, it is important that the shows my theatre presents and/or produces...”
 - “...demonstrate aesthetic excellence.”
 - “...are highly entertaining.”
 - “...align with school curricula.”
 - “...address social issues and diversity.”

Leaders rated their agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), and results are reported in Table 12.

Leaders from theatres of all budget sizes, regions, and years founded responded similarly. The highest-rated priority among all groups was “aesthetic excellence,” and the lowest among all groups was “alignment with school curricula.” In most cases, leaders rated “social issues and diversity” second-most important, followed by “highly entertaining”; the import of these middle values was reversed at Category A theatres and those founded since 2000.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Aesthetic Excellence	3.83	3.72	3.81	3.81	3.90	3.94	3.92	3.74	3.75	3.80	3.85	3.83
Highly Entertaining	3.40	3.39	3.46	3.48	3.26	3.56	3.33	3.40	3.35	3.22	3.50	3.56
Align School Curricula	2.75	2.50	2.77	2.88	2.71	2.39	2.86	2.83	2.70	2.90	2.71	2.58
Social Issues & Diversity	3.55	3.28	3.50	3.57	3.68	3.61	3.58	3.47	3.60	3.61	3.59	3.42

Table 12. Leader ratings of the importance of various aspects of shows produced. *N* = 121.

Qualities of Quality

To understand theatre leaders' perceptions of what constitutes "quality" work, the survey posed the open-ended question, "How would you define 'quality' as in 'quality TYA'?" We then coded the responses to identify recurring patterns. We identified 18 "qualities of quality" mentioned by the 122 leaders who responded to this question, and present them in Table 13 in order from the most to least frequently mentioned (overall).¹ There was relatively minor variance between leaders from theatres of various types; the only two qualities mentioned by at least a quarter of respondents were that work should be artistically excellent and respectful of the young people who view it.

¹ It is important to note that, given the way the data were collected, the fact that a leader did not mention any particular quality does not necessarily imply that they did not value it. The survey asked an open-ended question and did not present leaders with a comprehensive list of qualities to respond to.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Artistically Excellent	49%	33%	42%	62%	44%	59%	50%	59%	47%	56%	63%	42%
Respects Young People	25%	24%	42%	14%	38%	41%	29%	20%	32%	29%	27%	27%
Relevant	13%	12%	17%	16%	14%	18%	12%	17%	11%	6%	17%	24%
Engaging	16%	24%	13%	27%	7%	12%	21%	20%	11%	15%	20%	18%
Created by Trained Prof.	11%	12%	17%	14%	7%	6%	15%	17%	0%	10%	13%	12%
Inclusive / Accessible	19%	18%	21%	16%	31%	18%	35%	10%	21%	21%	33%	9%
Challenging	8%	24%	0%	5%	14%	18%	12%	7%	0%	6%	13%	9%
Innovative	7%	12%	4%	5%	7%	12%	12%	5%	5%	4%	13%	9%
Imaginative	7%	12%	4%	11%	0%	6%	6%	10%	5%	6%	7%	9%
Inspiring	6%	0%	4%	11%	7%	12%	9%	5%	0%	6%	3%	9%
Pedagogically Excellent	7%	12%	0%	11%	7%	18%	12%	5%	0%	8%	10%	6%
Thought Provoking	4%	6%	4%	2%	3%	12%	3%	5%	0%	2%	7%	6%
Age Appropriate	7%	6%	4%	8%	10%	0%	12%	5%	11%	10%	3%	6%
Original	2%	0%	4%	0%	0%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%
Appealing to All Ages	6%	0%	0%	10%	9%	6%	12%	2%	5%	8%	10%	0%

Table 13 – Part 1 of 2. Percentages of leaders mentioning various “qualities of quality.” N = 122.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Empathy-Promoting	9%	0%	4%	14%	13%	0%	15%	7%	16%	19%	7%	0%
Empowering	4%	0%	8%	5%	3%	0%	6%	5%	5%	8%	3%	0%
Enjoyable	2%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	2%	5%	2%	3%	0%

Table 13 – Part 2 of 2. Percentages of leaders mentioning various “qualities of quality.” N = 122.

Education

Education Programming and Production Season

The artistic, business, and education leaders of participating theatres rated the degree to which their theatres' education programs related to the shows they produced/presented in their seasons on a scale of 1 ("few or none" of the education programs related to productions) to 4 ("all" programs related). As Table 14 indicates, leaders indicated that some, but not most, education programs related to productions. Leaders reported somewhat higher alignment at lower-budget theatres and theatres founded since 2000.

	Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
2.28	2.44	2.62	2.10	2.23	2.35	2.28	2.28	2.25	2.22	2.15	2.50

Table 14. Theatre leaders' mean ratings of the degree to which their theatres' education programs relate to the shows produced/presented in their season on a scale where 1 indicates that "few or none" of the programs relate to productions, 2 indicates "some, but not most" programs relate, 3 indicates "most" programs relate, and 4 indicates "all" programs relate. Overall $N = 120$.

Education Resources Offered

Table 15 indicates the mean frequencies at which theatres of various types offered four types of resources/offerings on a scale from 1 (“almost never”) to 4 (“almost always”). Teacher resource guides were very common at all theatres, especially larger-budget theatres and those founded before 1980. Student study/activity guides were

offered “often” and were more common at theatres with annual budgets under \$1 million, theatres in the Northeast, and theatres founded since 1980. In-school visits, both pre- and post-show, were infrequent overall and especially rare at Category A theatres.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Education Resource	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Teacher Resource Guides	3.78	3.25	3.83	3.81	4.00	3.71	3.79	3.75	3.87	4.00	3.69	3.60
Student Study Guides	2.99	3.13	3.38	2.63	2.92	3.57	3.21	2.75	2.69	2.83	3.16	3.00
In-School Pre-Show Visits	2.00	1.38	2.08	2.00	2.27	2.29	2.07	1.79	2.13	1.78	2.27	2.00
In-School Post-Show Visits	2.10	1.50	2.17	2.00	2.64	2.00	2.14	1.89	2.63	2.06	2.27	2.00

Table 14. Mean frequencies at which theatres offer various educational resources on a scale where 1 indicates "almost never," 2 indicates "infrequently," 3 indicates "often," and 4 indicates "almost always." Overall N = 48-49.

Education Program Script Usage

Theatres also reported the percentage of original scripts used in their education programs (as opposed to licensed scripts). As Table 16 reveals, original scripts were most common in Category A (smaller budget) theatres, theatres in the Northeast, and theatres founded since 1980. Category D (larger budget) theatres and those founded before 1980 were most likely to produce licensed scripts.

	Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
56%	100%	41%	68%	24%	89%	46%	52%	55%	35%	70%	78%

Table 15. Mean percentages of original scripts used in theatres' education programs (as opposed to licensed scripts). Overall $N = 28$.

Theatre Leadership and Staff

Leader Demographics

The survey illuminated one of the greatest challenges facing the field in the US: the demographics of those working in professional TYA. While it revealed some differences between theatres of different types, in general, the data indicate that the field's leadership is fairly homogenous, as revealed in Table 17. By and large, the artistic, business, and education leaders of U.S. TYA companies identified as white (93%) women (64%), the majority of whom held graduate degrees (59%), with a mean age of 47.

Leaders of Category A theatres and those founded since 2000 were generally younger than those at other theatres. At theatres of all types, education leaders were younger than artistic and business leaders. Mean ages did not vary considerably by region.

There was a positive correlation between theatres' budget sizes

and their likelihood of employing male artistic leaders; that is, larger-budget theatres were more likely to have male artistic leaders. However, there was also a positive correlation between theatres' budget sizes and their likelihood of employing female business leaders. Education leaders were especially likely to identify as female at theatres of all budgets, particularly at Category A theatres. Only one leader indicated that they identified as non-binary.

In total, only 7% of participating leaders identified as people of color. These individuals were most likely to serve as education leaders or artistic leaders. They were also much more likely to work with Category C theatres and those founded between 1980-1999, as well as theatres in the Northeast.

Most leaders at all theatres, especially larger-budget theatres

and those in the Northeast and South, held graduate degrees. There was a positive correlation between theatres' longevity and the likelihood that their leaders held graduate degrees.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Mean Leader Age	47	39	48	49	48	47	49	46	48	48	51	42
% Female Leaders	64%	78%	54%	60%	66%	65%	68%	63%	63%	58%	68%	69%
% POC Leaders	7%	0%	4%	15%	4%	19%	0%	7%	11%	6%	13%	3%
% Leaders w/ Grad. Degrees	59%	50%	52%	64%	58%	67%	51%	65%	50%	79%	58%	55%

Table 16. Theatre leader demographics. Overall N (Age) = 118; Overall N (Gender) = 114; Overall N (POC) = 111; Overall N (Degrees) = 11.

Staff Benefits

The most common staff benefit TYA theatres offered was paid vacation time and/or paid holidays, as indicated in Table 18. The likelihood of a theatre offering its full-time employees paid vacation time and/or holidays was positively correlated with its budget size and longevity. Theatres in the Northeast were markedly less likely to offer paid time off than those in other regions.

Retirement plans were less common at theatres of all types. While the likelihood of theatres offering retirement plans was positively correlated with their budget size and age, even many large-budget theatres did not offer plans. Nearly one-third of professional TYA companies with annual operating budgets of \$3

million or greater did not offer their full-time employees any retirement benefits.

Most participating theatres did not offer paid maternity leave, and even fewer offered paid paternity leave. Although there was a positive correlation between theatres' longevity and their likelihood of offering parental leave, there was no correlation between theatres' budget sizes and their likelihood of offering these benefits. Only among Category C theatres did a majority offer parental leave and, notably, it was the smallest-budget theatres (Category A) that were next most likely to offer these benefits.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Paid Vacation / Holidays	83%	39%	90%	100%	100%	50%	88%	91%	89%	100%	93%	58%
Retirement Plan (Any)	46%	8%	30%	65%	69%	25%	50%	52%	44%	76%	43%	16%
Paid Maternity Leave	40%	40%	10%	71%	25%	43%	47%	47%	11%	43%	39%	38%
Paid Paternity Leave	28%	30%	0%	59%	8%	43%	33%	36%	11%	38%	23%	19%

Table 17. Percentages of theatres offering various benefits to full-time staff. Overall N = 54 (Vacation/Retirement); Overall N = 50 (Parental Leave)

Leadership Development Opportunities

Most participating theatres offered leadership development opportunities in the field, such as internship and/or apprenticeship programs; hiring assistant directors, assistant designers, and assistant stage managers; and/or offering training programs and classes for aspiring TYA practitioners, as indicated in Table 19. Such offerings were generally less common at Category A theatres, those founded since 2000, and those in the Northeast.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
Opportunity	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Internships / Apprentices	85%	46%	92%	94%	100%	89%	82%	83%	89%	95%	100%	60%
Assistants & Entry-Level Hiring	73%	54%	83%	83%	77%	56%	94%	67%	67%	81%	72%	65%
Training / Classes	63%	62%	50%	67%	69%	44%	65%	63%	78%	71%	56%	60%

Table 18. Percentages of theatres of various types offering leadership development opportunities. Overall *N* = 59.

Relationships with Unions

Most theatres of all types indicated they never hire union actors, directors, designers, or technicians, or do so only in rare exceptions, as revealed by Table 20. Although there was a positive correlation between theatres' budget sizes and their likelihood of hiring at least 30% union employees of all types, this was uncommon even among the largest-budget theatres.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
≥ 30% Equity	19%	0%	20%	24%	36%	14%	19%	20%	22%	29%	17%	11%
≥ 30% SDC	15%	8%	10%	18%	27%	14%	6%	20%	22%	24%	8%	11%
≥ 30% USA	21%	0%	20%	24%	46%	29%	13%	20%	33%	29%	17%	16%
≥ 30% IATSE	12%	0%	0%	6%	46%	0%	19%	10%	11%	19%	17%	0%

Table 19. Percentages of theatres reporting that at least 30% of the artists and technicians of various types that they hire in a typical season are members of their respective labor unions, including the Actors' Equity Association (Equity), the Stage Directors and Choreographers Association (SDC), United Scenic Artists (USA), and the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE). Overall N = 52

Finances and Property

Income and Expenses

On average, among theatres of all types, salaries consisted of just over half of each organization's expenses, as Table 21 indicates. The only notable difference was at theatres in the Northeast, which had higher salary expenses than those in other regions. There was also little variation in the balance of income sources among different types of theatres, with earned income generally constituting just over half of revenue. Category B theatres and those located in the West tended to report somewhat higher proportions of contributed income.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Salary Expenses	54%	54%	55%	55%	51%	67%	52%	52%	51%	55%	53%	53%
Non-Salary Expenses	46%	46%	45%	45%	49%	33%	48%	48%	49%	45%	47%	47%
Contributed Income	44%	45%	39%	45%	44%	42%	47%	47%	30%	43%	45%	43%
Earned Income	56%	55%	61%	55%	56%	58%	53%	53%	70%	57%	55%	57%

Table 20. Mean percentages salary/non-salary expenses and earned/contributed income. Overall $N = 53$.

Venues

As Table 22 illustrates, most theatres of all types rented at least one of their performance venues. While the majority of theatres did not own any of their performance venues, there was a positive correlation between theatres' budget sizes as well as longevity and their likelihood of owning at least one of their venues. Regionally, ownership was highest in the Midwest and much lower in the Northeast.

There was a negative correlation between theatre's budgets and

their likelihood of indicating they were at least partly itinerant (the larger a theatre's budget, the less likely it was to be partly itinerant), and there was a corresponding negative correlation between theatres' longevity and the likelihood of being at least partly itinerant. Theatres in the Northeast were more than three times as likely to indicate they were at least partly itinerant when compared to other regions.

		Budget Size				Region				Year Founded		
	Overall	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category D	North-east	Midwest	South	West	Before 1980	1980-1999	2000 & Later
Own	30%	8%	30%	35%	42%	14%	38%	29%	33%	43%	23%	21%
Rent	68%	69%	70%	65%	75%	57%	69%	67%	78%	67%	77%	63%
Itinerant	25%	62%	20%	12%	8%	71%	19%	19%	11%	5%	15%	53%

Table 21. Percentages of theatres indicating they owned and/or rented at least one of their performance venues and/or were at least partly itinerant, performing in a variety of spaces. Overall $N = 53$.

CLOSURE

As discussed at the beginning of this report, the true utility of the data presented here is reliant on the analysis of individual readers. We have identified some of the trends that interested us in the summaries above, we recognize that what constitutes the most relevant information will vary based on the questions raised by readers' particular work. We offer one example of the way this data can be analyzed in our piece regarding equity in the field (see Omasta & Felty, 2021), and encourage others to similarly use the data here to explore issues of pertinent to their own research and practice.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Omasta, M., & Felty, A. (2021). Perspectives of theatre for young audiences companies' leaders by budget, region, and longevity: A survey. *ArtsPraxis*, 8 (2), Appendix A, 1-26.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, L. (2011). *Why bring students to the theatre? An exploration of the value of professional theatre for children* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Toronto.
- Barr, R. (2004). [Census](#). In *The SAGE encyclopedia of social science research methods*.
- Betzien, A. (2007). *Hoods: Creating political theatre for young audiences: A play and accompanying exegesis* (Unpublished master's thesis). Queensland University of Technology.
- Blackwell, C. 2008. TYA then and now: 40 years of change. *TYA Today*, 22 (2): 12-15.
- Cantwell, P. J. (2008). Census. In *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (2nd ed., pp. 90–93). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cornelison, G. L. (1975). *Death and childhood: Attitudes and approaches in society, children's literature, and children's theatre and drama*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kansas.
- Davis, J. (1961). Prospectus for research in children's theatre. *Educational Theatre Journal*, 14 (4), 274-277.
- Fricker Jr., R. D. & Schonlau Rand, M. (2002). Advantages and disadvantages of internet research surveys: Evidence from the literature. *Field Methods*, 14 (4), 347–367.
- Groves, R. M., Fowler Jr., F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2009). *Survey methodology* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Hofmeyer, A., Sheingold, B. H., & Taylor, R. (2015). Do you understand what I mean? How cognitive interviewing can strengthen valid, reliable study instruments and dissemination products. *Journal of International Education Research*, 11 (4), 261–268.
- Johari, R. K. (2018). Making theatre and communicating meaning for young audiences: Director's choices. Paper presented at 3rd International Music and Performing Arts Conference, Tanjung Malim, Perak, Malaysia.
- Kincaid, J.P., Fishburne, R.P., Rogers, R. L., & Chissom, B. S. (1975). *Derivation of new readability formulas (automated reliability index, fog count and Flesch Reading Ease formula) for Navy enlisted personnel* (Research Branch Report 8–75). Naval Technical Training Command.
- Klein, J. (1989). "K-12 drama/theatre research for the 1990s: An agenda for dramatic action." *Design for Arts in Education*, 91 (2), 27-34.
- Klein, J. (1997). Elementary teachers' evaluations of university performances for young audiences. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 11 (1), 1-14.

- Omasta, M. (2011). Artist intention and audience reception in theatre for young audiences. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 25 (1), 32-50.
- Omasta, M. & Felty, A. (2021). Data-based analysis of diversity and equity in theatre for young audience companies. *ArtsPraxis*, 8 (2), 46-70.
- Pretorius, L. (2008). *An analysis and proposed expansion of the market for theatre for young people in the Western Cape* (Unpublished master's thesis). Stellenbosch University.
- Queponds, M.C. (2016). *Latina theatre for young audiences: Mariachi Girl* (Unpublished honors thesis). University of California, Riverside.
- Saldaña, J. (1988). Jed H. Davis' 'prospectus for research in children's theatre': Twenty-five years later. In J. Klein, (Ed.), *Theatre for Young Audiences: Principles and Strategies for the Future*, 55-86. University of Kansas.
- Swallow, C. (2012). *'Faces of Captives': Aesthetic distance and emotional absorption in young children's engagement with theatre* (Unpublished master's thesis). Victoria University of Wellington.
- Van Tassel, W. (1969). Differences in contemporary views of theatre for children. *Educational Theatre Journal*, 21 (4): 414-425.
- Ward, Winifred. (1950). "Sixth annual Children's Theatre Conference." *Educational Theatre Journal*, 2 (3), 199-207.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Matt Omasta is Professor of Theatre Arts and Associate Dean of the Caine College of the Arts at Utah State University. His publications include co-author/editorship of *Playwriting and Young Audiences* (Intellect), *Impacting Theatre Audiences: Methods for Studying Change* (Routledge), *Qualitative Research: Analyzing Life* (SAGE), and *Play, Performance, and Identity* (Routledge). His articles appear in *Youth Theatre Journal*, *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *Theatre Topics*, *TYA Today*, *the International Journal of Education and the Arts*, *Arts Education Policy Review*, *Performance Matters*, *Journal for Learning through the Arts*, and others.

Aubrey Felty is a senior from Dallas, Texas pursuing a B.F.A. in Theatre Education and a minor in Family and Human Development at Utah State University. She has presented her work at the American Alliance for Theatre and Education and International Theatre for Young Audiences Research Network conferences. She is a member of the Honors Program and was recognized as the Caine College of the Arts Scholar of the Year in 2020.