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About the survey

Nonprofit blogger Beth Kanter recently highlighted two new research studies about nonprofits and the adoption of social media released by Weber Shandwick and Philanthropy Action. These studies yielded some interesting results.

The Weber Shandwick study of 200 nonprofit executives revealed that an overwhelming majority (85%) will use more social media in the next two years. There is extensive experimentation with social media in the nonprofit sector, but only half (51%) are active users. Most nonprofits (52%) do not currently have the infrastructure, staff and expertise necessary to take full advantage of social media’s potential, and ultimately, for most nonprofit executives (79%), the true value of social media has yet to be determined for their organizations.

The Philanthropy Action study questioned the use of social networking for mid-size nonprofits and concluded that “in terms of fundraising and attracting volunteers, metrics that most nonprofit boards and executive directors highly value, the available evidence suggests that social media is not very effective.”

How do orchestras stack up in this environment? What kind of resources do managers commit and how active are orchestras in social media? Do orchestra managers share the opinion that fundraising and attracting volunteers are highly valuable metrics, or do they have different goals and objectives?

There has never been a comprehensive, industry-wide look at if and how orchestras are using social media. In order to get a clear and complete picture of what is happening with orchestras and social media around the country, I sent around a survey to 53 orchestra marketing, communications and web managers in October and November, 2009.

The survey was designed to collect details about the state of social media, ranging from budget size and time allotment to attitudes and goals. It was not meant to single out organizations, or show what is good or what is bad. All responses have been tallied to provide a comprehensive, collective report that aims to aid orchestra managers in years to come.

My gratitude goes out to each of the orchestra managers that responded.

Quick methodology facts

Dates of survey: October 27, 2009 – November 13, 2009
Survey mode: Online questionnaire (see appendix B).
Sample: 81 orchestras in Group 1-3; 53 surveys sent out (see appendix A); 15 respondents
Who took the survey?

The survey was sent to 53 orchestras across the country, which represents 10 percent of the total count of orchestras (Group 1-8) in the United States. See appendix A for a list of orchestras that received the survey. I received 15 responses before the deadline.

Those orchestra managers that responded were generally in marketing, communications or web functions at their respective orchestras, and most were either directors or managers. In these findings, they are commonly referred to as “orchestra managers.”

Out of the 15 orchestras, seven came from Group 1 (budget more than $13.6 million), four came from Group 2 ($5.2 - $13.6 million), and four came from Group 3 ($2.5 - $5.2 million). This means that 27% of the Group 1 orchestras are represented in this study, versus 13% of Group 2 and 16% of Group 3. In total, 18.5% of the orchestras in Group 1-3 are represented.

With responses limited to Group 1-3, we’re only looking at orchestras with a budget of more than $2.5 million. And so, this survey is not representative of all orchestras across the country. Additionally, it is perhaps reasonable to expect a certain bias toward orchestras that are already engaged in social media. How much do the institutions that responded look like the ones that did not?

The small sample of 15 orchestras also means that one orchestra can significantly impact results, as one orchestra represents 6.67% of the results.

Seeing the small sample, I would therefore advise readers to see this document as informative, rather than authoritative.

Perhaps this study can serve as a call for more research into the use of social media at orchestras around the country. It would sure be a project suited for the League of American Orchestras, or foundations including the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and The Wallace Foundation.
**Key findings**

Social media activities, familiarity and usage seem to be widespread among orchestras. Managers find social media important and organizations are generally enthusiastic. However, the efforts are far from organized and strategic. It seems many orchestras are dipping their feet in the social media pool, but do not have the policies, budgets, and metrics in place to effectively use the tools at their disposal, even if they do recognize the need for checks and balances.

**Budgets and responsibilities**

- Half of the orchestras (53%) do not have a budget for social media; a little more than a quarter (27%) spends more than $1,000 annually on social media;
- Two-thirds of the orchestras (67%) divide social media responsibilities among multiple staff members;
- Marketing departments are involved, either jointly or solely, with managing social media efforts at a large majority (87%) of the orchestras.

**Social media mind-set**

- Managers find social media a moderately important element in marketing and communications strategy. On a scale of one to five (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important), orchestra managers rated the importance of social media in marketing or communications strategy at an average of 3.53. Twenty percent of the managers gave importance the highest rating;
- Measuring results is rated more important. The importance of measuring results from social media was rated at an average of 3.87. Two-thirds (67%) of the managers rated it at least a four;
- The attitude toward social media among orchestra managers is generally enthusiastic. On a scale of one to five (1 = hostile, 5 = enthusiastic), orchestra managers rated the attitude at an average of 3.8. None of the managers scored the attitude two or lower;
- Knowledge of social media is fair to average. On a scale of one to five (1 = elementary, 5 = expert), orchestra managers rated the knowledge of social media at an average of 3.13. No manager scored knowledge a five;
Social media activities

- All orchestras have a Facebook presence, with 93% managing a Facebook Fan Page
- A large majority of orchestras has a Twitter account (80%), while only 40% have a MySpace page;
- Nearly half of the orchestras produce a podcast (47%) and one-third of the orchestras maintain a blog;
- Eighty percent of the orchestras have responded to questions and comments on social networking sites and 40% actively pitch bloggers;
- Forty-seven percent of the orchestras did not respond externally when faced with negative comments in social media; 27% posted a public rebuttal;
- A large majority of the orchestras (87%) does not have an internal policy regarding social media usage by employees and 40% does not find a need for one.

Social media goals and measurement

- Driving Web traffic and increasing awareness of programming and the organization are the most important social media goals;
- The survey seems to suggest that the larger budget orchestras are using more tools to monitor social media;
- None of the orchestras indicated they have implemented or established metrics for measuring social media activities. However, the majority of the orchestras (73%) recognize the need to measure social media activities and the remaining 27% are currently planning metrics for measuring social media.
**Annual budget for social media**

Eight out of 15 orchestras (53%) do not have a budget for social media efforts. The other seven orchestras spend at least $500 annually on social media and a little more than a quarter (27%) of the orchestras spends more than $1,000 every year.

Only one of the orchestras, a Group 1 orchestra, budgets more than $10,000 for social media. One Group 2 orchestra has a $5,000-$9,999 budget and two orchestras (13%) are spending $1,000-$4,999 on social media, one of which is a Group 3 orchestra. Three orchestras (20%) budget $500-$999 for social media. As you can see, no clear pattern emerges of spending according to group or orchestra budget size.

Setting a budget for social media was not an indicator of social media being part of the marketing or communications strategy; only two of the seven orchestras with budgets indicated they had implemented social media in the strategy, the others were currently planning and writing social media into the strategy.

Compared to their non-budget counterparts, orchestras with budgets for social media rated the importance of social media higher (3.25 vs. 3.85); rated the importance of measuring results higher (3.63 vs. 4.14); and rated the organization’s attitude toward social media more positively (3.63 vs. 4). Perhaps surprisingly, orchestras with social media budgets rated knowledge lower than their non-budget counterparts (3.25 vs. 3). (Also see “Social media mind-set” below.)

Keep in mind, budgets exclude employee salary and wages, but other than that, there are no particular guidelines to what exactly is or should be included in these budgets. Differences between each orchestra’s take on what goes in to a social media budget should be expected and is not accounted for in this survey.

### Who manages social media?

A majority of orchestras (67%) divide social media responsibilities among multiple staff members. More than a quarter (27%) of the orchestras list social media responsibilities as part of an existing staff member’s duties. No orchestra has a dedicated social media or digital media employee or has hired an external agency or freelancer. One orchestra puts their intern in charge to manage social media.
Marketing departments are involved in managing social media at an overwhelming majority (87%) of the orchestras, but at slightly less than half (47%) of the orchestras it was the marketing department that was solely in charge.

Social media was managed by multiple departments at seven of the 15 orchestras (47%), with public relations and marketing being the most common combination. One orchestra indicated that the Web/IT department managed social media along with marketing and public relations; and two orchestras indicated that the development department jointly managed social media with other departments.

**Time commitment to social media**

All orchestras spend at least some time on social media per work week. A large majority of the orchestras (80%) spends between 1 and 5 hours per work week on social media. One orchestra spends between 5 and 10 hours and two orchestras (13%) spend between 10 and 20 hours per week.

The two orchestras that spend most time on social media are both in Group 1 and both rated the importance of social media in marketing or communications strategy at the highest mark (5), as well as the importance of measuring social media efforts.

**Social media mind-set**

The graph below demonstrates how orchestra managers rated the importance of social media in marketing or communications strategy; the importance of measuring social media; the organization’s overall attitude toward social media; and the organization’s overall knowledge of social media. On average, managers from Group 1 orchestras (orchestras with larger budgets) ranked all aspects higher than the combined average of all orchestras.

As mentioned previously, orchestras with budgets for social media rated the importance of social media higher (3.85); rated the importance of measuring results higher (4.14); and rated the organization’s attitude toward social media more positively (4). And again, orchestras with budgets rated knowledge lower (3).
The two orchestras that spend most time on social media rated the importance of social media in marketing or communications strategy at the highest mark (5), as well as the importance of measuring social media efforts.

**Importance of social media in marketing or communications strategy**

Ranging from not at all important (1) to very important (5), the average rating was 3.53. None of the managers rated importance at one. Thirteen percent rated importance at two; 40% at three; 27% at four; and 20% gave importance the highest rating of five. Managers from Group 1 were the only managers that gave importance the highest rating.

**Organization’s attitude toward social media**

Ranging from hostile (1) to enthusiastic (5), the average attitude toward social media leaned more toward enthusiastic with an average score of 3.8. None of the managers scored the attitude two or lower. Forty percent scored the attitude a neutral three, another 40% scored it a four and 20% scored it a five.

**Organization’s knowledge of social media**

Ranging from elementary (1) to expert (5), the average organizational knowledge of social media was rated 3.13. None of the managers scored knowledge a five, yet one manager (7%) scored it a one and two managers (13%) scored it a two. Forty percent scored it a three, while another 40% scored it a four.

**Social media activities**

The survey showed that all orchestras have an institutional Facebook presence. Fourteen out of 15 orchestras (93%) maintain a Facebook Fan Page, while the one orchestra that does not have a Facebook Fan Page instead maintains a Facebook Group. Five orchestras maintain a Fan Page as well as a Group.

More surprising is that only six orchestras (40%) have a MySpace page, even though MySpace places more emphasis on music. Perhaps this can be explained by MySpace’s declining popularity and a late entry-point in social media endeavors by orchestras.
Twelve orchestras (80%) maintain a Twitter account; nine orchestras (60%) maintain a YouTube account; and six orchestras (40%) have a Flickr account. Seven orchestras (47%) produce a podcast, while five orchestras (33%) maintain an organizational blog.

The three activities mentioned in the “other” category relate to live streaming, social networking and a local arts and entertainment community site.

Group 1 orchestras are involved in more social media activities than their smaller budget counterparts. Group 1 orchestras use an average of 5.14 tools (out of the 8 given suggestions and an open-ended “other” category), whereas Group 2 and 3 orchestras use an average of 4 tools.

A majority of orchestras (67%) has placed an ad on a social network, while one-third of the orchestras have not. Six out of seven orchestras with a budget for social media have placed advertising on a social network.

**Social media engagement**

**Social media engagement. Do you, or the person responsible for social media:**

*Check all that apply*

- [ ] Maintain a separate mailing or pitch list for new media outlets and authors?
- [ ] Actively pitch bloggers with story ideas?
- [ ] Adapt press or marketing materials for social media purposes?
- [ ] Respond to questions and comments on social networking sites?
- [ ] None of the above

Having a Facebook page or Twitter account is one thing, engaging with your audience is another. In an attempt to look at some of the engagement efforts of orchestras, I asked the four questions above. While I understand the limitations of such narrow framing, I believe it does display some valuable information.

Eighty percent of the orchestras respond to questions and comments on social networking sites. This likely happens on places like Facebook and Twitter. A little more than half (53%) of the orchestras adapt press and marketing materials for social media and 40% actively pitch bloggers, yet 20% maintain a separate mailing or pitch list for new media outlets and authors.

One orchestra did none of the above. This orchestra did not have many social media activities and rated enthusiasm for and knowledge of social media lower than the average.

When asked if orchestras had responded to negative comments in social media (including, but not limited to, blogs, forums, Twitter, social networks), nearly half (47%) of the orchestras did not respond externally. Twenty-seven percent attempted to contact the writer and another 27% posted a public rebuttal. None of the managers indicated that they don’t monitor social media commentary.

**Internal policy**

Do orchestras have an internal policy regarding social media usage by employees? An overwhelming 87% of the orchestras do not. And forty percent do not find a need for one, while 47% recognize the need, but do not currently have a policy.
One orchestra is currently planning and writing a policy, while another orchestra has already written and implemented a policy. Both are Group 1 orchestras.

**Social media in the marketing or communications strategy**

Nearly three-quarters of the orchestras (73%) indicated that they are currently planning and writing social media into the communications or marketing strategy. Four orchestras (27%) have already added and implemented social media as part of the strategy, and of these four, three are Group 1 orchestras.

However, the survey did not indicate a correlation between implementation of social media in the strategy and a larger budget for social media, time commitment or measurement of results.

Ranging from not at all important (1) to very important (5), the average rating for importance of social media in strategy was 3.53. None of the managers rated importance at one.

Managers from orchestras with budgets for social media rated the importance of social media higher (3.85) and managers from Group 1 rated importance at 3.86. Managers from Group 1 were the only managers to give importance the highest rating.

The two orchestras that spend most time on social media rated the importance of social media in marketing or communications strategy at the highest mark (5).

**Social media goals and objectives**

What are the goals and objectives in social media efforts? Let’s attempt to answer the question posed in the introduction: “Do orchestra managers share the opinion that fundraising and attracting volunteers are highly valuable metrics, or do they have different goals and objectives?”

Managers rated the importance of different goals and objectives from a list of eight different aspects with the familiar rating system of not at all important (1) to very important (5). The table below demonstrates the average rating from the 15 respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social media goals and objectives</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Web traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing awareness of...</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing brand awareness</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving customer service</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation management</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing ticket sales</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving SEO</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing fund raising</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Importance of goals and objectives (1=low, 5=high)*
To answer the question: fund raising is not important, as it is rated below the median threshold of three points. Increasing Web traffic, awareness of programming and brand awareness are the most important goals for orchestra managers.

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, increasing ticket sales is ranked sixth out of the eight options. But further investigation shows that the answers on this question were split. Nearly half of the managers (47%) rated increasing ticket sales four or higher, whereas one-third of the managers rated increasing ticket sales two or lower.

Attracting volunteers was not one of the eight given options, but it was not mentioned in the open-ended suggestion. Two orchestras answered the open-ended question on suggestions for other goals and objectives they find important. Those two answers are:

“We think the social media component of the organization is an important way to create and develop relationships with our community. We try to use it to sell tickets, but that is a secondary element.”

“Learning more about our audience and our prospective audience, and becoming more able to respond to what they want and need.”

Social media monitoring

Do managers in charge of social media monitor the scene? And if so, how do they do it? The survey looked at social media monitoring and measuring. The first question pertained to specific tools managers are using to do the monitoring. A large majority (87%) of the managers use Google Alerts to stay on top of what is being written about the organization. A slightly smaller majority (73%) use social networking services including Facebook and MySpace to monitor social media and two-thirds of the managers use Twitter or a third-party Twitter search tool to monitor.

Forty percent of the managers use blog search engines including Technorati and Google to monitor and an equal amount of managers use an RSS aggregator to monitor. Interesting to note that 5 out of 7 Group 1 orchestra managers use RSS aggregators and 5 out of 6 managers that are using RSS aggregators are at Group 1 orchestras.

None of the managers indicated that they are not monitoring social media. At the other end of the spectrum, none of the managers indicated that they are using professional services such as Vocus or Radian 6 to monitor social media.

The survey seems to suggest that the larger budget (Group 1) orchestras are using more tools to monitor social media. Four out of 15 orchestra managers are using all five free tools listed in the options and three of the four were at Group 1 orchestras and one at a Group 2 orchestra.

A similar pattern emerges from the survey question on what key words managers are tracking online. Four managers (27%) state they do not track key words. Three of the four come from Group 3 orchestras and one from a Group 2 orchestra. Only one orchestra out of 15 monitors all five key word categories. Managers that are tracking key words (73%) all monitor the organization’s name. The organization’s artistic leadership is the second most monitored category, with 40% of the managers monitoring it.
tracking it. Twenty-seven percent track the organization’s administrative leadership, while 20% track competitors and 20% track key words about the industry in general.

**Monitoring by key words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Word</th>
<th>Percentage of Orchestras Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Leadership</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Leadership</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tracking</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the orchestras indicated they have implemented or established metrics for measuring social media activities. However, the majority of the orchestras (73%) recognized the need to measure social media activities and the remaining 27% were currently planning metrics for measuring social media.

Managers do find measuring important. On the familiar scale of one to five, the importance of measuring results was rated at an average of 3.87. Two-thirds (67%) of the managers rated it at least four and one-third of the managers gave it the highest rating. Group 1 orchestra managers rated the importance slightly higher on average at four.

Orchestras with budgets for social media rated the importance of measuring results higher (4.14) on average and the two orchestras that spend most time on social media rated the importance of measuring at the highest mark (5).

**What do orchestras measure?**

Just over half the orchestras (53%) measure ticket sales numbers from social media campaigns and the same number measure incoming traffic from blogs and social networking sites. Sixty percent of the orchestras track comments underneath blogs and on social networking sites.

Twenty-seven percent of the orchestras indicated that they were measuring changes in search engine rankings. One orchestra indicated they measured changes in online brand reputation and changes in brand awareness. Earlier in the survey, this orchestra rated the importance of brand awareness and reputation management goals 4 and 5 respectively.

One orchestra specifically mentioned tracking “Facebook fan growth and effectiveness of various activities to drive that growth; effectiveness of Facebook ads campaigns and ticket sales.”

Two out of 15 orchestras (13%) indicated they were not measuring or tracking results. A large majority (80%) report possible findings to department heads or senior management.
Conclusions and recommendations

Once again, seeing the small sample, I would advise readers to see this document as informative, rather than authoritative. My interest for social media and how it is used by orchestras led me to create this survey. Now, after gathering and analyzing the results, I noticed I could have perhaps framed questions differently and clarified definitions to get more accurate results. For example, two managers might have different opinions on what it exactly means to “adapt press or marketing materials for social media purposes.”

That is not to say there is no value in my effort. I believe it offers valuable information, albeit primitive and preliminary. But it offers information where there was no information before. This survey is the first of its kind for orchestras. From that alone, lessons can be learned.

Clearly, a larger, more in-depth study is needed to really get a better picture. Perhaps this study can serve as a call for more research into the use of social media at orchestras around the country. It would sure be a project suited for the League of American Orchestras, or foundations including the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and The Wallace Foundation.

Having said that, I would like to make recommendations based on the findings from this survey, for the betterment of the strategic use of social media at orchestras.

Social media activities, familiarity and usage seem to be widespread among orchestras. Managers find social media important and organizations are generally enthusiastic. However, the efforts are far from organized and strategic. It seems many orchestras are dipping their feet in the social media pool, but do not have the policies, budgets, and metrics in place to effectively use the tools at their disposal, even if they do recognize the need for checks and balances.

It seems, in other words, that orchestras are at the brink of a strategic approach to social media, but have yet to jump. Here is what they can do:

Formalize your goal

What are you trying to achieve? As we have seen in the findings, the most important goals for orchestra managers are increasing Web traffic, awareness of programming and brand awareness. Keep in mind, social media can help you in your core mission: bringing art and music to your community. And that’s a goal too.

Whatever your goal might be, in setting up your social media efforts, keep these goals in front of mind, and make them measurable.

Formalize your plan

The time for blindly dipping your feet into the social media pool is over. Think strategically and plan your efforts. Nearly three-quarters of the orchestras indicated that they are currently planning and writing social media into the communications or marketing strategy. Make it a complete plan: from scoping the environment to setting your goals, from creating your strategy to planning tactics, and from measuring results to using that data to inform your next steps.
Classical music organizations are uniquely primed to do well in social media—even if not many are terribly good yet. Why do they have so much potential? Because they have strength in interesting content, interesting people, a dedicated and involved fan base, and established relationships with the community. Now go out and use those strengths as cornerstones for your strategy.

**Formalize your policy**

The majority of the orchestras do not have an internal social media policy and 40% does not find a need for one. Perhaps managers are scared off by the word policy. Don’t think that it means limiting an employee’s freedom to participate in social media. Rather, it means mutual understanding. Make sure they understand your rules and basic legal issues (defamation, trade secrets, privacy etc.), and certainly, make sure they know who to reach for any social media questions they, or others, might have.

As an employee, make sure you understand there are legal and ethical limitations to what you can or should say about your employer and understand your employer’s policy. Know that, even though you do not speak for them, you are always connected to your employer, willingly or not, and do not hide your identity. Always participate in full transparency and under your real name.

**Formalize your team**

As the survey indicates, at most organizations, responsibilities for social media are scattered among different employees and multiple departments. Social media touches many parts of the organization: artistic (content), Web and IT (technology), marketing (ticket sales), communications (branding and public relations), ticketing (customer service), development (fund raising), and volunteer (recruiting).

It’s important to formalize the role of social media in the organization. Outside of the implausible hiring of new staff or freelancers, you can update staff positions and job descriptions to incorporate social media. Make it official. Bring these people together, under the auspices of a senior manager who has the strategic oversight and organizational knowledge.

**Formalize your budget**

If you’re going to make the most of the tools, in a strategic manner, you have to give them the resources they require.

Budget for human resources (even if it is only a part of an employee’s staff time); budget for staff development (classes, webinars on social media); budget for technological needs (software, hardware); budget for marketing and promotion efforts (ticket and recording give-aways); and budget for analysis and measurement.

Sure, many of these things can be free, low-cost, or shared with other budgets, but if you’re going to effectively measure your performance, you need to know what your efforts cost.

Set a budget that aligns with your goals. Setting a budget does not mean bankrupting your organization. Start small and expand according to your results; put your money where the results are.
Formalize your performance measures

Managers indicated they find measuring results important. And they’re right. How can you justify your efforts and your budget if you can’t show results? But just as you have to set a budget that aligns with your goals, you have to work with metrics that accurately measure your performance.

If you’re tracking ticket sales, set up a funnel in Google Analytics to track conversions from social media efforts. That’s one example; there’s an appropriate metric for any goal. Page views, fan and follower numbers don’t tell you much. You might have thousands of fans on Facebook or hundreds of followers on Twitter; if they don’t help you reach your goal, they are worthless.

Do what search engine marketers have done for years; analyze your performance and use that data to inform and optimize your next steps.

Quality vs. quantity

This survey did intentionally not look at the quality of social media activities by orchestras, yet quality is an important factor in the effectiveness of your social media efforts. So if you don’t find social media to be effective, keep in mind that in measuring social media efforts, it is important to determine whether social media is not working because social media an sich is not working, or because managers are not implementing their social media strategy and tactics correctly.
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by Amber Naslund
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### Appendix A

**List of orchestras that received survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alabama Symphony</th>
<th>Milwaukee Symphony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Symphony</td>
<td>Minnesota Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Symphony</td>
<td>Nashville Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Symphony</td>
<td>National Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Symphony</td>
<td>New Jersey Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Philharmonic</td>
<td>New York Philharmonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Symphony</td>
<td>North Carolina Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Symphony</td>
<td>Oregon Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Orchestra</td>
<td>Philadelphia Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Orchestra</td>
<td>Phoenix Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Symphony</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Symphony</td>
<td>Portland Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Symphony</td>
<td>Richmond Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Philharmonic</td>
<td>Rochester Philharmonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Symphony</td>
<td>Saint Paul Chamber Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Symphony</td>
<td>San Diego Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Symphony</td>
<td>San Francisco Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne Philharmonic</td>
<td>Seattle Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Symphony</td>
<td>St. Louis Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Symphony</td>
<td>Syracuse Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Symphony</td>
<td>Toledo Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Symphony</td>
<td>Tucson Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville Symphony</td>
<td>Utah Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Symphony</td>
<td>Virginia Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Philharmonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Symphony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis Symphony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Orchestras and Social Media Survey

* Required

1. Basic information

The report will tally collective results only. The basic information is for tracking and verification purposes only.

Name of the orchestra * (verification only)

Your name * (verification only)

Your title * (verification only)

Your e-mail address * (verification only)

2. Budgets, responsibilities and time

Annual budget of the orchestra *
(Groups by League of American Orchestras)

- Group 1: more than $13,600,000
- Group 2: between $5,200,000 - $13,600,000
- Group 3: between $2,500,000 - $5,200,000
- Group 4: between $1,650,000 - $2,500,000
- Group 5: between $870,000 - $1,650,000
- Group 6: between $420,000 - $870,000
- Other:

Estimated annual budget for social media *
(Excluding employee salary and wages)

- More than $10,000
- Between $5,000 and $9,999
- Between $1,000 and $4,999
- Between $500 and $999
- Between $250 and $499
- Less than $250
- No budget

Who manages social media activities? *

- Dedicated social or digital media staff member
- It is part of an existing staff member’s job description
- Divided among multiple staff members
- An intern
- An external agency or freelancer
- Not applicable
- Other:
What department manages social media activities? * (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Public Relations
- [ ] Marketing
- [ ] Web/IT
- [ ] An external agency or freelancer
- [ ] Not applicable
- [ ] Other: 

How much time, on average, is committed to social media per work week? *

- [ ] More than 20 hours
- [ ] Between 10 and 20 hours
- [ ] Between 5 and 10 hours
- [ ] Between 1 and 5 hours
- [ ] Less than 1 hour
- [ ] Not applicable

3. Social media activities

Your social media presence *
Check all that apply. Only active accounts operated by your organization. Multiple entries in "others"

- [ ] Facebook Fan Page
- [ ] Facebook Group
- [ ] Twitter
- [ ] Myspace

- [ ] YouTube
- [ ] Flickr
- [ ] Blogging (organization maintains a blog)
- [ ] Podcasting (organization produces a podcast)
- [ ] Other: 

Has your organization ever placed an advertisement on a social networking site? *

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Social media engagement. Do you, or the person responsible for social media: * (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Maintain a separate mailing or pitch list for new media outlets and authors?
- [ ] Actively pitch bloggers with story ideas?
- [ ] Adapt press or marketing materials for social media purposes?
- [ ] Respond to questions and comments on social networking sites?
- [ ] None of the above

Have you responded to negative comments about your organization in social media? *
Including, but not limited to, blogs, forums, Twitter, social networks

- [ ] We don't monitor social media commentary
- [ ] We monitor but didn't respond externally
- [ ] We attempted to contact the writer
- [ ] We posted a public rebuttal
4. Social media attitude, strategy and policy

How would you describe the organization's overall attitude towards social media? *

1 2 3 4 5

Hostile ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Enthusiastic ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

How would you describe the organization's overall knowledge of social media? *

1 2 3 4 5

Elementary ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Expert ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Does your organization have an internal policy regarding social media usage by employees? *

- ☐ There is no need for an internal policy
- ☐ We recognize the need, but we currently do not have a policy
- ☐ We are currently planning and writing a policy
- ☐ We have written and implemented a policy

Is social media part of your communications or marketing strategy? *

- ☐ We recognize the need, but it is not part of the strategy
- ☐ We are currently planning and writing social media into the strategy
- ☐ We have written and implemented a policy
- ☐ We have added and implemented social media as part of the strategy

How do you rate the importance of social media in a communications or marketing strategy? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

5. Social media goals and objectives

How important do you feel each of the following goals and objectives are in a social media strategy?

Increasing brand awareness? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Increasing awareness of your programming? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

(Online) reputation management? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Increasing ticket sales of performances? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Increasing fund raising? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Improving Search Engine Optimization (SEO)? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very important ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Increasing Web site visitor traffic? *  

Not at all important  1  2  3  4  5  Very important

Improving customer service? *  

Not at all important  1  2  3  4  5  Very important

Other important goals and objectives (If needed, please list other goals and objectives you feel are important)

---

6. Social media monitoring and measuring

Social media monitoring. Are you, or the person responsible for social media, using: * (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Google Alerts?
- [ ] An RSS aggregator (such as Bloglines, Google Reader)?
- [ ] Blog search engines (such as Google Blogs, Technorati)?
- [ ] Twitter Search or a third-party Twitter search tool?
- [ ] Social networks such as Facebook and MySpace to monitor social media?
- [ ] Professional services such as Vocus or Radian6 to monitor social media?
- [ ] We are not monitoring social media
- [ ] Other: [ ]

Social media monitoring. Are you, or the person responsible for social media, tracking key words online about the following subjects: * (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Your organization's artistic leadership
- [ ] Your organization's administrative leadership
- [ ] Your organization's name
- [ ] Your competitors
- [ ] Your industry
- [ ] We are not tracking key words
- [ ] Other: [ ]

Social media measurement. Does your organization have established metrics for measuring social media activities? *

- [ ] No, we do not find a need to measure our social media activities
- [ ] No, but we recognize the need to measure our social media activities
- [ ] No, but we are currently planning our metrics for measuring social media
- [ ] Yes, we have implemented metrics for measuring social media activities

How do you rate the importance of measuring social media activities? *  

Not at all important  1  2  3  4  5  Very important
Social media measurement. Are you, or the person responsible for social media, tracking? *
(Check all that apply)

- [ ] Changes in online brand reputation
- [ ] Changes in brand awareness
- [ ] Changes in search engine rankings
- [ ] Ticket sales numbers from social media campaigns
- [ ] Incoming traffic from blogs and social networking sites
- [ ] Comments underneath blogs and on social networking sites
- [ ] We are not tracking or measuring results
- [ ] Other: ___________

Do you report your possible findings to department heads or senior management? *

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not applicable

8. Comments, suggestions and remarks

Anything you would like to mention?
Want to tell us about any specific detail or experience? Please use the box below.

Other comments
If you have any additional comments, suggestions or remarks, please use the box below.