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## Executive Summary

The Inside Out event was seen as a breathtaking spectacle of the very highest quality by visitors who had an excellent time and would not hesitate to recommend it to others in the future.
$65 \%$ of visitors main or sole reason for visiting was an Inside Out event.
$81 \%$ of visitors to Arquiem, $79 \%$ of visitors to Carmen Funebre and $89 \%$ of visitors to Enclosure stated their sole or main reason for visiting was the Inside Out event.

More than $90 \%$ of respondents are likely or very likely, given the opportunity, to attend another Inside Out event, attend Inside Out again and recommend Inside Out.

In total some $71 \%$ of respondents used a word that meant spectacular and some $49 \%$ used a word that meant excellent when asked to describe Inside Out events.
$24 \%$ of respondents suggested future events would benefit from a higher level of advertising.

In terms of experience those directly relating to the event; venue, overall experience and performance quality received the highest average rating. Those relating to printed material, the website and festival food and drink received the lowest average ratings.

A quarter of all respondents received their information about Inside Out via word of mouth.

Hotels accommodation was used by $30 \%$ of staying visitors to Inside Out events.

A majority of visitors who stayed in hotels selected a full or half board basis for their stay.

Of respondents some $67 \%$ were socio-economic group $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ or C 1 .

## Total Visitor Numbers

| Event | Total Visitors |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arquiem, Wimborne | 1,370 |  |  |
| Peixos, Poole | 3,200 |  |  |
| Counter Currents, Bridport | 2,600 |  |  |
| Fire Gardens, Bournemouth | 22,100 |  |  |
| Carmen Funebre, Weymouth | 897 |  |  |
| Enclosure, Hambledon Hill | 668 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 0 , 8 3 5}$ |

Total Visitor Spend - £199,924
Total Effect of Visitor Spend - $£ 283,452$

Visitor Accommodation - £122,500
Total Effect of Visitor Accommodation - £204,404

Total Effect of Visitor Spend - £487,857

Organisers Spend - $£ 340,014$
Total Effect of Organisers Spend - $£ 420,700$

Total Economic Impact Inside Out Dorset $2007=£ 908,557$
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## Inside Out Dorset: 2007 Evaluation

## 1. Evaluation Overview

The Inside Out festival was a ten-day festival of international, high impact performance that took place during September 2007 in locations around the County of Dorset and the Boroughs of Bournemouth and Poole. The aim of this evaluation was to provide bench mark data in respect of visitor attendance and socio-economic impacts from which the future success of the festival can be tracked. This project therefore aimed:
a) To survey visitors attending the nine events during the ten-day festival in September 2007 and cover the following areas:

- To provide a profile of visitors to the event:
a) Estimates of visitor numbers to events
b) Age, gender and socio-economic group breakdown
- Attendance of cultural events both generally and within the Inside Out Festival.
- To assess visitor satisfaction and experience.
b) To model the data to produce a comprehensive economic model.
- To provide an indication of the events contribution to the economy of the area
- To estimate visitor expenditure.
- To assess the economic effect of the Inside Out Festival


## 2. The Market Research Group

The Market Research Group provides market research and intelligence services to organisations in the service sector and local government.

The Market Research Group, based within Bournemouth University, can offer a wealth of experience and expertise in the field of leisure, tourism, heritage, best value and economic impact research at a national, regional and local level.

Using external market research professionals to complete all or part of the consultation and research process can bring together greater legitimacy and independence to the results, expertise and research experience, less disruption to other in-house services, and greater resources.

## 3. Methodology

## Overall Methodology

## Stage 1 (Profile of the Events' Current Visitor Base)

To profile the festival's visitors a comprehensive survey, based on a short questionnaire format, was undertaken.
The survey was two sides of A4 and allowed a picture to be constructed of the whole 'population' of visitors. The questionnaire provided all data necessary to answer questions about types of visitors.

## Stage 2 (Economic Impact)

The economic effect and additional benefits will be determined by modelling the primary, secondary and tertiary impacts of the Events. This will be based on data yielded by Stage 1.

Outputs from the model include total visitor spend, secondary and tertiary spend.

## Survey Methodology

All visitors to the festival represented the target population. To obtain the most accurate data possible, a two stage data gathering process was utilised.

Stage One: 4,000 questionnaires with freepost envelopes were prepared and 3,945 distributed at the events with a brief explanation of the survey details. These were completed and returned to The Market Research Group, to be scanned, utilising optical character recognition software to ensure accuracy.

| Event | Date | Day | Time | Target <br> questionnaire per <br> night | questionnaires <br> per night |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arquiem, | $13^{\text {th }}$ | Thurs | 8-10pm | 175 | 175 |
| Wimborne | 14 th | Fri | $8-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 175 | 175 |
| Peixos, Poole | $15^{\text {th }}$ | Sat | $8-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 1000 | 1075 |
| Counter Currents, <br> Bridport | $16^{\text {th }}$ | Sun | $1-7 \mathrm{pm}$ | 650 | 650 |
| Fire Gardens, <br> Bournemouth | $19^{\text {th }}$ | Wed | $7-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 466 | 466 |
|  | $20^{\text {th }}$ | Thurs | $7-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 466 | 466 |
|  | $21^{\text {st }}$ | Fri | $7-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 466 | 466 |
| Carmen Funebre, <br> Weymouth | $21^{\text {st }}$ | Fri | $8-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 175 | 123 |
|  | $22^{\text {nd }}$ | Sat | $8-10 \mathrm{pm}$ | 175 | 197 |
| Enclosure, Hambledon <br> Hill | $23^{\text {rd }}$ | Sun | $5-8 p m$ | 200 | 152 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Stage Two: Face-to-face interviews, with randomly selected visitors, were undertaken during the Counter Currents and Fire Gardens events. These visitors were asked the same questions as posed by the questionnaire used in Stage One. This random sample was utilised as a control group against which Stage One was compared.

## Sample Data

## Stage One:

- Total self completion sample size 1159.
- Though statistical validity cannot be calculated for data collected via self completion, control group comparison demonstrated that the sample collected for the events is representative of the whole visitor population and the results are therefore accurate.

For a survey of this type the achieved $29 \%$ response rate is excellent and the data is considered robust.

## Stage Two:

A total of 82 face-to-face interviews were undertaken with randomly selected visitors. Statistical analysis of skewness, kurtosis, outliers and utilisation of QPlots provided a comparison of data from Stage One and Stage Two. The data was considered accurate and therefore data from Stage One was utilised to generate the tables within this report.

## Visitor Information

It was recorded that more than half of respondents to the survey attended the Fire Gardens event in Bournemouth, with a little more than a quarter attending the Peixos event in Poole.

| Table 1: Events Attended |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Fire Gardens, Bournemouth | 621 | 54.1 |
| Peixos, Poole | 299 | 26.1 |
| Arquiem, Wimborne | 216 | 18.8 |
| Counter Currents, West Bay, Bridport | 193 | 16.8 |
| Carmen Funebre, Weymouth | 138 | 12.0 |
| Enclosure, Hambledon Hill | 118 | 10.3 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 1160 | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A |

Figure 1.1: Events Attended


Table 1a shows the interlinking between events, it was seen that a high proportion of visitors to all other events also attended Fire Gardens.

| Table 1a: Events Attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem, Wimborne |  | Peixos, Poole |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (341) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Enclosure | 44 | 20.4 | 37 | 12.4 | 25 | 13.0 | 61 | 9.8 | 36 | 26.1 | 118 | 100.0 |
| Carmen Funebre | 30 | 13.9 | 24 | 8.0 | 32 | 16.6 | 38 | 6.1 | 138 | 100.0 | 36 | 30.5 |
| Fire Gardens | 84 | 38.9 | 114 | 38.1 | 43 | 22.3 | 621 | 100.0 | 38 | 27.5 | 61 | 51.7 |
| Counter Currents, West Bay | 43 | 19.9 | 50 | 16.7 | 193 | 100.0 | 43 | 6.9 | 32 | 23.2 | 25 | 21.2 |
| Peixos, Poole | 83 | 38.4 | 299 | 100.0 | 50 | 25.9 | 114 | 18.4 | 24 | 17.4 | 37 | 31.4 |
| Arquiem, Wimborne | 216 | 100.0 | 83 | 27.8 | 43 | 22.3 | 84 | 13.5 | 30 | 21.7 | 44 | 37.3 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |

With the exception of Peixos all other events saw a majority of visitors spending more than one hour at the event.

| Table 1.2: Events Attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peixos |  | Counter <br> Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  |  |
| Base: All (341) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |  |
| Under 15 mins | 6 | 1.8 | 9 | 4.6 | 3 | 0.5 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 6 - 3 0}$ mins | 39 | 11.6 | 4 | 2.0 | 43 | 7.1 |  |
| 31-60 mins | 129 | 38.5 | 21 | 10.7 | 176 | 29.0 |  |
| Over 60 mins | 161 | 48.1 | 163 | 82.7 | 384 | 63.4 |  |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 335 | N/A | 197 | N/A | 606 | N/A |  |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |  |
| Total (Base) | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |  |

Figure 1.2: Time spent at each event

$65 \%$ of visitors main or sole reason for visiting was an Inside Out event, though some $26 \%$ of visitors had never heard of Inside Out before their attendance at the event.

| Table 1.3: Decision to visit |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid <br> $\%$ |
| My sole reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 604 | 53.0 |
| I had never heard of Inside Out before my visit | 293 | 25.7 |
| My main reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 144 | 12.6 |
| I may not have visited if the Inside Out event was not happening | 56 | 4.9 |
| I intended to visit the Inside Out event, but it was not a significant factor | 25 | 2.2 |
| I knew of Inside Out, but it played no role in my decision | 18 | 1.6 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 1140 | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | 20 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A |

Fgure 1.3: Decision to Visit
I intended to visit the
Inside Out event, but it
w as not a significant I knew of Inside Out,

$76 \%$ of visitors to the Peixos event, $80 \%$ of visitors to the Counter Currents event and $65 \%$ of visitors to the Fire Gardens event who stayed more than one hour stated their sole or main reason for the visit was the Inside Out event. At the Fire Gardens some $29 \%$ of visitors who remained more than one hour heard not previously heard of Inside Out.

|  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | 1 | Valid \% | $t$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| My sole reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 95 | 59.0 | 97 | 59.5 | 216 | 56.5 |
| My main reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 28 | 17.4 | 33 | 20.2 | 33 | 8.6 |
| I may not have visited if the Inside Out event was not happening | 5 | 3.1 | 12 | 7.4 | 13 | 3.4 |
| I intended to visit the Inside Out event, but it was not a significant factor | 2 | 1.2 | 2 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.0 |
| I knew of Inside Out, but it played no role in my decision | 2 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.6 | 6 | 1.6 |
| I had never heard of Inside Out before my visit | 29 | 18.0 | 18 | 11.0 | 110 | 28.8 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 161 | 100.0 | 163 | 100.0 | 382 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Total (Base) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

$31 \%$ of all visitors to Fire Gardens had never heard of Inside Out before the event, though some $81 \%$ of visitors to Arquiem, $79 \%$ of visitors to Carmen Funebre and $89 \%$ of visitors to Enclosure stated their sole or main reason for visiting was the Inside Out event.

| Table 1.3c: Decision to visit by event attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem, Wimborne |  | Peixos, Poole |  | Counter Currents |  | FireGardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (341) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| My sole reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 150 | 69.8 | 166 | 55.9 | 110 | 57.0 | 313 | 50.6 | 94 | 69.1 | 94 | 80.3 |
| My main reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 24 | 11.2 | 50 | 16.8 | 39 | 20.2 | 71 | 11.5 | 14 | 10.3 | 10 | 8.5 |
| I may not have visited if the Inside Out event was not happening | 7 | 3.3 | 21 | 7.1 | 15 | 7.8 | 23 | 3.7 | 7 | 5.1 | 10 | 8.5 |
| I intended to visit the Inside Out event, but it was not a significant factor | 4 | 1.9 | 5 | 1.7 | 1 | 0.5 | 14 | 2.3 | 5 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| I knew of Inside Out, but it played no role in my decision | 2 | 0.9 | 4 | 1.3 | 2 | 1.0 | 6 | 1.0 | 4 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| I had never heard of Inside Out before my visit | 28 | 13.0 | 51 | 17.2 | 26 | 13.5 | 191 | 30.9 | 12 | 8.8 | 3 | 2.6 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 216 | 100.0 | 299 | 100.0 | 193 | 100.0 | 621 | 100.0 | 138 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

It was noted that level of interest in arts did not influence respondents reason for visiting, however, it was noted that those with an interest in the arts were more likely to have heard of Inside Out.

| Table 1.3d: Decision to visit by interest in the arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I've never seen an event like this before |  | I have a general interest in arts events |  | I am a regular arts attendee |  | I wouldn't describe myself as an arts attendee |  | I have seen events like this in other places |  |
| Base: All (341) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| My sole reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 369 | 48.6 | 280 | 64.5 | 166 | 68.9 | 54 | 42.5 | 99 | 61.9 |
| My main reason for visiting was to visit the Inside Out event | 81 | 10.7 | 54 | 12.4 | 40 | 16.6 | 13 | 10.2 | 25 | 15.6 |
| I may not have visited if the Inside Out event was not happening | 32 | 4.2 | 25 | 5.8 | 14 | 5.8 | 6 | 4.7 | 8 | 5.0 |
| I intended to visit the Inside Out event, but it was not a significant factor | 19 | 2.5 | 13 | 3.0 | 3 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.8 | 3 | 1.9 |
| I knew of Inside Out, but it played no role in my decision | 11 | 1.4 | 4 | 0.9 | 4 | 1.7 | 4 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| I had never heard of Inside Out before my visit | 248 | 32.6 | 58 | 13.4 | 14 | 5.8 | 49 | 38.6 | 25 | 15.6 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 760 | 100.0 | 434 | 100.0 | 241 | 100.0 | 127 | 100.0 | 160 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 5 | N/A | 3 | N/A | 4 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 765 | N/A | 437 | N/A | 245 | N/A | 127 | N/A | 160 | N/A |

A majority of respondents (67\%) noted that they had 'never seen an event like this before'. Although 38\% of respondents suggested that they had a general interest in arts events.

| Table 1.4: Interest in the Arts |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| I've never seen an event like this before | 765 | 66.8 |
| I have a general interest in arts events | 437 | 38.1 |
| I am a regular arts attendee | 245 | 21.4 |
| I have seen events like this in other places | 160 | 14.0 |
| I wouldn't describe myself as an arts attendee | 127 | 11.1 |
| Total (Valid: Multi Code) | N/A | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | N/A | N/A |
| Total (Base) | N/A | N/A |

Figure 1.4: Interest in the Arts


Visitors to Arquiem (57\%) and Enclosure (54\%) noted higher levels of general interest in arts events. With visitors to Carmen Funebre (46\%) and Enclosure (49\%) had a high level of regular arts attendees.

| Table 1.4b: Interest in the arts by event attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem, Wimborne |  | Peixos, Poole |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $t$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| l've never seen an event like this before | 112 | 51.9 | 176 | 58.9 | 79 | 41.1 | 498 | 80.3 | 57 | 41.6 | 55 | 46.6 |
| I have a general interest in arts events | 124 | 57.4 | 127 | 42.5 | 87 | 45.3 | 215 | 34.7 | 61 | 44.5 | 64 | 54.2 |
| 1 am a regular arts attendee | 67 | 31.0 | 66 | 22.1 | 72 | 37.5 | 95 | 15.3 | 63 | 46.0 | 58 | 49.2 |
| I wouldn't describe myself as an arts attendee | 18 | 8.3 | 36 | 12.0 | 22 | 11.5 | 69 | 11.1 | 14 | 10.2 | 9 | 7.6 |
| I have seen events like this in other places | 44 | 20.4 | 56 | 18.7 | 50 | 26.0 | 51 | 8.2 | 36 | 26.3 | 29 | 24.6 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Total (Base) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

More than $90 \%$ of respondents are likely or very likely, given the opportunity, to attend another Inside Out event, attend Inside Out again and recommend Inside Out.

| Table 1.5: Future Intentions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Attend another <br> Inside Out event | Attend Inside Out <br> again |  | Recommend <br> Inside Out |  |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Very likely | 722 | 66.8 | 618 | 62.9 | 699 | 69.4 |
| Likely | 255 | 23.6 | 256 | 26.0 | 239 | 23.7 |
| Not sure | 58 | 5.4 | 73 | 7.4 | 32 | 3.2 |
| Unlikely | 36 | 3.3 | 22 | 2.2 | 21 | 2.1 |
| Definitely not | 10 | 0.9 | 14 | 1.4 | 16 | 1.6 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | $\mathbf{1 0 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| (0) Missing Values | 79 | N/A | 177 | N/A | 153 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | $\mathbf{1 1 6 0}$ | N/A | $\mathbf{1 1 6 0}$ | N/A | $\mathbf{1 1 6 0}$ | N/A |

Figure 1.5: Future intentions


A very high proportion of respondents across all events are likely or very likely, given the opportunity, to attend another Inside Out event.

|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Very likely | 156 | 75.4 | 194 | 68.3 | 129 | 70.9 | 413 | 70.4 | 100 | 78.1 | 98 | 87.5 |
| Likely | 34 | 16.4 | 68 | 23.9 | 35 | 19.2 | 121 | 20.6 | 18 | 14.1 | 11 | 9.8 |
| Not sure | 6 | 2.9 | 10 | 3.5 | 10 | 5.5 | 29 | 4.9 | 4 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unlikely | 8 | 3.9 | 10 | 3.5 | 6 | 3.3 | 20 | 3.4 | 3 | 2.3 | 2 | 1.8 |
| Definitely not | 3 | 1.4 | 2 | 0.7 | 2 | 1.1 | 4 | 0.7 | 3 | 2.3 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 207 | 100.0 | 284 | 100.0 | 182 | 100.0 | 587 | 100.0 | 128 | 100.0 | 112 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 9 | 4.2 | 15 | 5.0 | 11 | 5.7 | 34 | 5.5 | 10 | 7.2 | 6 | 5.1 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

A very high proportion of respondents are likely or very likely, given the opportunity, to attend Inside Out again.

| Table 1.5b_2: Likelihood of attending Inside Out again by event attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Very likely | 142 | 74.3 | 171 | 64.0 | 112 | 70.9 | 353 | 65.5 | 86 | 72.9 | 91 | 85.8 |
| Likely | 28 | 14.7 | 69 | 25.8 | 31 | 19.6 | 129 | 23.9 | 22 | 18.6 | 13 | 12.3 |
| Not sure | 9 | 4.7 | 17 | 6.4 | 7 | 4.4 | 40 | 7.4 | 6 | 5.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unlikely | 6 | 3.1 | 4 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.5 | 10 | 1.9 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Definitely not | 6 | 3.1 | 6 | 2.2 | 4 | 2.5 | 7 | 1.3 | 3 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.9 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 191 | 100.0 | 267 | 100.0 | 158 | 100.0 | 539 | 100.0 | 118 | 100.0 | 106 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 25 | 11.6 | 32 | 10.7 | 35 | 18.1 | 82 | 13.2 | 20 | 14.5 | 12 | 10.2 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

A very high proportion of respondents are likely or very likely, given the opportunity, to recommend Inside Out.

| Table 1.5b_3: Likelihood of recommending Inside Out by event attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Very likely | 156 | 79.2 | 190 | 70.4 | 117 | 70.9 | 404 | 73.3 | 93 | 76.2 | 94 | 86.2 |
| Likely | 26 | 13.2 | 57 | 21.1 | 33 | 20.0 | 114 | 20.7 | 22 | 18.0 | 12 | 11.0 |
| Not sure | 4 | 2.0 | 9 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.4 | 16 | 2.9 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unlikely | 4 | 2.0 | 6 | 2.2 | 5 | 3.0 | 7 | 1.3 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Definitely not | 7 | 3.6 | 8 | 3.0 | 6 | 3.6 | 10 | 1.8 | 4 | 3.3 | 3 | 2.8 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 197 | 100.0 | 270 | 100.0 | 165 | 100.0 | 551 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 109 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 19 | 8.8 | 29 | 9.7 | 28 | 14.5 | 70 | 11.3 | 16 | 11.6 | 9 | 7.6 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

Relatively frequent attendance at the theatre, museums and galleries, cinema and outdoor events and festivals was recorded. However, this may be a function of availability rather than desire.

| Table 1.6: Involvement in the Arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 |  | 1-2 |  | 3-5 |  | 6-9 |  | 10+ |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Theatre | 123 | 11.5 | 474 | 44.1 | 280 | 26.1 | 112 | 10.4 | 85 | 7.9 |
| Classical music concerts | 445 | 45.1 | 348 | 35.3 | 110 | 11.2 | 34 | 3.4 | 49 | 5.0 |
| Dance | 395 | 41.1 | 338 | 35.2 | 116 | 12.1 | 37 | 3.9 | 74 | 7.7 |
| Museums / galleries | 80 | 7.7 | 368 | 35.6 | 326 | 31.6 | 137 | 13.3 | 122 | 11.8 |
| Jazz / folk / roots / world concerts | 337 | 34.7 | 318 | 32.7 | 156 | 16.0 | 74 | 7.6 | 87 | 9.0 |
| Cinema | 99 | 9.3 | 265 | 24.9 | 322 | 30.2 | 183 | 17.2 | 196 | 18.4 |
| Street theatre | 318 | 32.4 | 373 | 38.1 | 175 | 17.9 | 54 | 5.5 | 60 | 6.1 |
| Festivals / outdoor events | 62 | 5.8 | 457 | 42.6 | 371 | 34.6 | 84 | 7.8 | 99 | 9.2 |

In general there was little disparity between Inside Out events in terms of attendance at arts events; previous themes of low attendance at Classical music concerts, Dance, Jazz / folk / roots / world concerts and Street theatre continued. Specific reference can be made to the following tables for areas of particular interest.

| Table 1.6b_1: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Theatre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 15 | 7.3 | 30 | 10.8 | 20 | 11.2 | 65 | 11.1 | 5 | 3.9 | 12 | 10.6 |
| 1-2 | 75 | 36.4 | 114 | 41.0 | 73 | 40.8 | 272 | 46.5 | 44 | 34.4 | 37 | 32.7 |
| 3-5 | 64 | 31.1 | 79 | 28.4 | 52 | 29.1 | 154 | 26.3 | 36 | 28.1 | 31 | 27.4 |
| 6-9 | 28 | 13.6 | 31 | 11.2 | 18 | 10.1 | 55 | 9.4 | 23 | 18.0 | 17 | 15.0 |
| 10+ | 24 | 11.7 | 24 | 8.6 | 16 | 8.9 | 39 | 6.7 | 20 | 15.6 | 16 | 14.2 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 206 | 100.0 | 278 | 100.0 | 179 | 100.0 | 585 | 100.0 | 128 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 10 | 4.6 | 21 | 7.0 | 14 | 7.3 | 36 | 5.8 | 10 | 7.2 | 5 | 4.2 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |


|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 75 | 39.5 | 121 | 46.9 | 68 | 41.2 | 249 | 46.5 | 42 | 35.3 | 41 | 38.0 |
| 1-2 | 69 | 36.3 | 87 | 33.7 | 66 | 40.0 | 195 | 36.4 | 43 | 36.1 | 42 | 38.9 |
| 3-5 | 27 | 14.2 | 25 | 9.7 | 13 | 7.9 | 52 | 9.7 | 21 | 17.6 | 14 | 13.0 |
| 6-9 | 9 | 4.7 | 11 | 4.3 | 6 | 3.6 | 16 | 3.0 | 7 | 5.9 | 3 | 2.8 |
| 10+ | 10 | 5.3 | 14 | 5.4 | 12 | 7.3 | 24 | 4.5 | 6 | 5.0 | 8 | 7.4 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 190 | 100.0 | 258 | 100.0 | 165 | 100.0 | 536 | 100.0 | 119 | 100.0 | 108 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 26 | 12.0 | 41 | 13.7 | 28 | 14.5 | 85 | 13.7 | 19 | 13.8 | 10 | 8.5 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |


| Table 1.6b_3: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Dance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 61 | 33.5 | 109 | 42.6 | 52 | 31.7 | 235 | 45.2 | 35 | 30.2 | 28 | 26.4 |
| 1-2 | 69 | 37.9 | 89 | 34.8 | 68 | 41.5 | 167 | 32.1 | 41 | 35.3 | 46 | 43.4 |
| 3-5 | 31 | 17.0 | 31 | 12.1 | 21 | 12.8 | 59 | 11.3 | 26 | 22.4 | 19 | 17.9 |
| 6-9 | 7 | 3.8 | 7 | 2.7 | 8 | 4.9 | 18 | 3.5 | 6 | 5.2 | 3 | 2.8 |
| 10+ | 14 | 7.7 | 20 | 7.8 | 15 | 9.1 | 41 | 7.9 | 8 | 6.9 | 10 | 9.4 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 182 | 100.0 | 256 | 100.0 | 164 | 100.0 | 520 | 100.0 | 116 | 100.0 | 106 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 34 | 15.7 | 43 | 14.4 | 29 | 15.0 | 101 | 16.3 | 22 | 15.9 | 12 | 10.2 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |


| Table 1.6b_4: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Museums / galleries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 11 | 5.6 | 26 | 9.5 | 9 | 5.1 | 44 | 7.8 | 2 | 1.6 | 5 | 4.5 |
| 1-2 | 56 | 28.7 | 76 | 27.7 | 48 | 27.3 | 223 | 39.7 | 33 | 26.6 | 26 | 23.2 |
| 3-5 | 65 | 33.3 | 94 | 34.3 | 54 | 30.7 | 171 | 30.4 | 41 | 33.1 | 38 | 33.9 |
| 6-9 | 31 | 15.9 | 41 | 15.0 | 38 | 21.6 | 62 | 11.0 | 32 | 25.8 | 25 | 22.3 |
| 10+ | 32 | 16.4 | 37 | 13.5 | 27 | 15.3 | 62 | 11.0 | 16 | 12.9 | 18 | 16.1 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 195 | 100.0 | 274 | 100.0 | 176 | 100.0 | 562 | 100.0 | 124 | 100.0 | 112 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 21 | 9.7 | 25 | 8.4 | 17 | 8.8 | 59 | 9.5 | 14 | 10.1 | 6 | 5.1 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

Table 1.6b_5: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Jazz / folk / roots / world concerts

|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 46 | 24.6 | 93 | 35.5 | 32 | 18.8 | 206 | 39.5 | 20 | 16.7 | 16 | 14.7 |
| 1-2 | 61 | 32.6 | 81 | 30.9 | 62 | 36.5 | 161 | 30.8 | 43 | 35.8 | 36 | 33.0 |
| 3-5 | 41 | 21.9 | 41 | 15.6 | 41 | 24.1 | 72 | 13.8 | 28 | 23.3 | 31 | 28.4 |
| 6-9 | 14 | 7.5 | 20 | 7.6 | 11 | 6.5 | 44 | 8.4 | 12 | 10.0 | 10 | 9.2 |
| 10+ | 25 | 13.4 | 27 | 10.3 | 24 | 14.1 | 39 | 7.5 | 17 | 14.2 | 16 | 14.7 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 187 | 100.0 | 262 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 522 | 100.0 | 120 | 100.0 | 109 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 29 | 13.4 | 37 | 12.4 | 23 | 11.9 | 99 | 15.9 | 18 | 13.0 | 9 | 7.6 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |


| Table 1.6b_6: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Cinema |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 10 | 4.9 | 31 | 11.2 | 5 | 2.8 | 56 | 9.7 | 4 | 3.1 | 8 | 7.0 |
| 1-2 | 46 | 22.5 | 64 | 23.0 | 40 | 22.3 | 152 | 26.3 | 14 | 11.0 | 22 | 19.3 |
| 3-5 | 63 | 30.9 | 94 | 33.8 | 54 | 30.2 | 182 | 31.4 | 36 | 28.3 | 36 | 31.6 |
| 6-9 | 41 | 20.1 | 47 | 16.9 | 35 | 19.6 | 96 | 16.6 | 29 | 22.8 | 18 | 15.8 |
| 10+ | 44 | 21.6 | 42 | 15.1 | 45 | 25.1 | 93 | 16.1 | 44 | 34.6 | 30 | 26.3 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 204 | 100.0 | 278 | 100.0 | 179 | 100.0 | 579 | 100.0 | 127 | 100.0 | 114 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 12 | 5.6 | 21 | 7.0 | 14 | 7.3 | 42 | 6.8 | 11 | 8.0 | 4 | 3.4 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |


|  | Table 1.6b_7: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Street theatre |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 52 | 27.1 | 71 | 27.3 | 32 | 19.8 | 200 | 37.7 | 26 | 21.3 | 20 | 18.0 |
| 1-2 | 85 | 44.3 | 107 | 41.2 | 64 | 39.5 | 182 | 34.3 | 41 | 33.6 | 38 | 34.2 |
| 3-5 | 25 | 13.0 | 48 | 18.5 | 39 | 24.1 | 86 | 16.2 | 31 | 25.4 | 26 | 23.4 |
| 6-9 | 15 | 7.8 | 18 | 6.9 | 15 | 9.3 | 29 | 5.5 | 10 | 8.2 | 12 | 10.8 |
| 10+ | 15 | 7.8 | 16 | 6.2 | 12 | 7.4 | 34 | 6.4 | 14 | 11.5 | 15 | 13.5 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 192 | 100.0 | 260 | 100.0 | 162 | 100.0 | 531 | 100.0 | 122 | 100.0 | 111 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 24 | 11.1 | 39 | 13.0 | 31 | 16.1 | 90 | 14.5 | 16 | 11.6 | 7 | 5.9 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |


| Table 1.6b_8: Involvement in the Arts by interest in Festivals / outdoor events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 0 | 15 | 7.3 | 18 | 6.3 | 5 | 2.7 | 36 | 6.2 | 6 | 4.7 | 2 | 1.7 |
| 1-2 | 72 | 35.1 | 114 | 40.0 | 73 | 40.1 | 240 | 41.5 | 58 | 45.7 | 34 | 29.6 |
| 3-5 | 74 | 36.1 | 94 | 33.0 | 62 | 34.1 | 205 | 35.4 | 35 | 27.6 | 43 | 37.4 |
| 6-9 | 22 | 10.7 | 31 | 10.9 | 15 | 8.2 | 42 | 7.3 | 13 | 10.2 | 14 | 12.2 |
| 10+ | 22 | 10.7 | 28 | 9.8 | 27 | 14.8 | 56 | 9.7 | 15 | 11.8 | 22 | 19.1 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 205 | 100.0 | 285 | 100.0 | 182 | 100.0 | 579 | 100.0 | 127 | 100.0 | 115 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 11 | 5.1 | 14 | 4.7 | 11 | 5.7 | 42 | 6.8 | 11 | 8.0 | 3 | 2.5 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

Visitors were asked to describe the Inside Out events using five words that were not a sentence. These were analysed, grouped (words of similar meaning were grouped under a single summary word) and tabulated.
In total some $71 \%$ of respondents used a word that meant spectacular and some $49 \%$ used a word that meant excellent.

| Table 1.7: Description of the Inside Out events |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Spectacular (Breathe-taking, fantastic). | 832 | 71.7 |
| Excellent (quality of event, good, enjoyable, fun etc.) | 570 | 49.1 |
| Exciting (emotive qualities of event such as invigorating.) | 477 | 41.1 |
| Innovative (different/new/unique) | 400 | 34.5 |
| Fun (experience, good experience, fun etc) | 356 | 30.7 |
| Stunning (visual effects) | 208 | 17.9 |
| Interesting subject matter, contents, techniques) | 191 | 16.5 |
| Stimulating (verbatim) | 164 | 14.1 |
| Scary (scary, concerning) | 162 | 14.0 |
| Amazing (impressive, amazing) | 136 | 11.7 |
| Inspiring (thought provoking) | 135 | 11.6 |
| Relaxing (relaxing, calm, tranquil) | 109 | 9.4 |
| Surreal (verbatim) | 61 | 5.3 |
| Professional (performance quality) | 50 | 4.3 |
| Memorable (verbatim) | 24 | 2.1 |
| Total (Valid: multi Code) | 1160 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

Description of inside out


Suggested improvements was an open field in which respondents were not prompted at all. Therefore a response of $24 \%$ of respondents suggesting a higher level of advertising is a significant finding; respondents seeking improvements to events were commonly asking for more or longer events and suggested virtually no improvements to the events themselves.

| Table 1.8: Suggested improvements |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Advertising (More and better E.G.: starting times and exact locations) | 277 | 23.9 |
| Events (More events, increased duration and more details as to the nature of events) | 259 | 22.3 |
| Crowd (Control and manage crowd and crowd numbers more effectively) | 59 | 5.1 |
| Performances (Greater variance of performances) | 58 | 5.0 |
| Food (Cost and availability of food and drink) | 57 | 4.9 |
| Access (Parking, maps of locations and ensuring disabled access) | 40 | 3.4 |
| Music/sound (more and louder music at events, ensure dialogue is audible) | 48 | 4.1 |
| Visibility (Audience visibility was limited at some events (Wimborne)) | 33 | 2.8 |
| Safety (Concerns over safety of events (Fire Gardens)) | 30 | 2.6 |
| Weather | 26 | 2.2 |
| Child (Advice on appropriateness for children) | 17 | 1.5 |
| Seating (Make seating available for those unable to stand for long periods of time) | 16 | 1.4 |
| Don't know/Unsure | 38 | 3.3 |
| Total (Valid: multi Code) | 1160 | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A |

Suggested improvements


In terms of experience, those directly relating to the event; venue, overall experience and performance quality received the highest average rating (where 1 was very good and 5 was very poor). Those relating to printed material, the website and festival food and drink received the lowest average ratings.

| Table 1.9: Experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Overall experience |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Performance } \\ \text { quality } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Venue/locati } \\ \text { on } \end{gathered}$ |  | Environment/ comfort |  | Staff friendliness |  | Brochurel poster/ other print |  | Website |  | Festival food and drink |  | Using public money to fund events like this |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Very Good | 794 | 70.5 | 728 | 65.9 | 791 | 70.3 | 428 | 39.3 | 531 | 52.8 | 330 | 35.1 | 94 | 30.7 | 108 | 22.0 | 421 | 40.6 |
| Good | 258 | 22.9 | 295 | 26.7 | 274 | 24.4 | 382 | 35.0 | 324 | 32.2 | 295 | 31.3 | 115 | 37.6 | 141 | 28.8 | 321 | 31.0 |
| OK | 47 | 4.2 | 59 | 5.3 | 50 | 4.4 | 235 | 21.6 | 127 | 12.6 | 216 | 23.0 | 74 | 24.2 | 168 | 34.3 | 246 | 23.7 |
| Poor | 22 | 2.0 | 18 | 1.6 | 8 | 0.7 | 36 | 3.3 | 22 | 2.2 | 74 | 7.9 | 16 | 5.2 | 51 | 10.4 | 30 | 2.9 |
| Very Poor | 6 | 0.5 | 5 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.2 | 9 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.2 | 26 | 2.8 | 7 | 2.3 | 22 | 4.5 | 19 | 1.8 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 1127 | 100.0 | 1105 | 100.0 | 1125 | 100.0 | 1090 | 100.0 | 1006 | 100.0 | 941 | 100.0 | 306 | 100.0 | 490 | 100.0 | 1037 | 100.0 |
| N/A | 8 | 0.7 | 23 | 2.0 | 9 | 0.8 | 25 | 2.2 | 102 | 8.8 | 133 | 11.5 | 598 | 51.6 | 469 | 40.4 | 56 | 4.8 |
| (0) Missing Values | 25 | 2.2 | 32 | 2.8 | 26 | 2.2 | 45 | 3.9 | 52 | 4.5 | 86 | 7.4 | 256 | 22.1 | 201 | 17.3 | 67 | 5.8 |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A | 1160 | N/A |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |

Figure 1.9: Experience - Average Ratings


Uniquely Enclosure received above average ratings in all areas and was given the highest overall average rating, second was Arquiem. Though it should be noted that Fire Gardens and Carmen Funebre's overall rating was negatively affected by festival food and drink ratings.

Light blue equates to above average and pink to below average rating.

| Table 1.9b: Average ratings by event attended. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Arquiem | Peixos | Counter Currents | Fire Gardens | Carmen Funebre | Enclosure |
| Venue/ location | 1.36 | 1.38 | 1.40 | 1.56 | 1.28 | 1.30 | 1.19 |
| Overall experience | 1.39 | 1.45 | 1.38 | 1.52 | 1.27 | 1.44 | 1.28 |
| Performance quality | 1.44 | 1.42 | 1.45 | 1.47 | 1.40 | 1.28 | 1.34 |
| Staff friendliness | 1.60 | 1.50 | 1.59 | 1.63 | 1.59 | 1.65 | 1.36 |
| Environment/ comfort | 1.91 | 1.90 | 1.87 | 2.09 | 1.69 | 2.30 | 1.86 |
| Using public money to fund events | 1.94 | 1.80 | 1.89 | 1.78 | 1.95 | 1.50 | 1.45 |
| Website | 2.11 | 1.87 | 2.10 | 2.14 | 2.08 | 1.96 | 1.75 |
| Brochure/ poster/ other print | 2.12 | 1.74 | 2.16 | 1.96 | 2.14 | 1.76 | 1.59 |
| Festival food and drink | 2.47 | 2.18 | 2.30 | 2.31 | 2.43 | 2.60 | 2.38 |
| Event Average |  | 1.69 | 1.79 | 1.83 | 1.76 | 1.76 | 1.58 |

A quarter of all respondents received their information about Inside Out via word of mouth.

| Table 1.11: Information Sources |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Word of mouth | 277 | 25.3 |
| Local newspaper/magazine | 218 | 19.9 |
| Picked up brochure | 196 | 17.9 |
| Received brochure through the post | 113 | 10.3 |
| Poster | 66 | 6.0 |
| Website | 44 | 4.0 |
| National newspaper/magazine | 13 | 1.2 |
| Radio | 8 | 0.7 |
| Television | 4 | 0.4 |
| Other | 154 | 14.1 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 1093 | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | 20 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A |

Figure 1.11: Information Source


There was some disparity between receipt of brochures through the post by event, only 7\% of those attending the Fire Gardens received a brochure while $22 \%$ of those attending Carmen Funebre or Enclosure received one.

| Table 1.11b: Information Sources by event attended |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arguiem |  | Peixos |  | Counter Currents |  | Fire Gardens |  | Carmen Funebre |  | Enclosure |  |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Received brochure through the post | 35 | 16.8 | 32 | 11.3 | 36 | 19.4 | 38 | 6.5 | 30 | 22.1 | 25 | 22.1 |
| Local newspaper/magazine | 42 | 20.2 | 64 | 22.6 | 29 | 15.6 | 114 | 19.4 | 20 | 14.7 | 12 | 10.6 |
| National newspaper/magazine | 4 | 1.9 | 3 | 1.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 6 | 1.0 | 6 | 4.4 | 3 | 2.7 |
| Radio | 2 | 1.0 | 7 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Television | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 1.1 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Word of mouth | 41 | 19.7 | 65 | 23.0 | 38 | 20.4 | 162 | 27.6 | 34 | 25.0 | 26 | 23.0 |
| Picked up brochure | 42 | 20.2 | 41 | 14.5 | 45 | 24.2 | 105 | 17.9 | 25 | 18.4 | 25 | 22.1 |
| Poster | 9 | 4.3 | 6 | 2.1 | 4 | 2.2 | 51 | 8.7 | 2 | 1.5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Website | 5 | 2.4 | 26 | 9.2 | 3 | 1.6 | 15 | 2.6 | 3 | 2.2 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Other | 28 | 13.5 | 39 | 13.8 | 26 | 14.0 | 91 | 15.5 | 16 | 11.8 | 13 | 11.5 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 208 | 100.0 | 283 | 100.0 | 186 | 100.0 | 587 | 100.0 | 136 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 8 | 3.7 | 16 | 5.4 | 7 | 3.6 | 34 | 5.5 | 2 | 1.4 | 5 | 4.2 |
| Total (Base) | 216 | N/A | 299 | N/A | 193 | N/A | 621 | N/A | 138 | N/A | 118 | N/A |

## Expenditure

Expenditure records indicate that visitors spent approximately $£ 10$ per person. Data in this section is modelled in a later section of the report to allow it to be a per person per event figure which is utilised for modelling purposes.

| Average expenditure - per person |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Valid \% |
| Food and drink | $£ 6.25$ | 62.4 |
| Fares and petrol | $£ 2.81$ | 28.1 |
| Other costs | $£ 0.95$ | 9.5 |
| Total | $£ 10.02$ | 100.0 |

Figure 2.1: Average expenditure - per person


Expenditure records indicate that day visitors spent approximately $£ 8$ per person.

| Figure 2.2: Average expenditure - Day Visitor- per person |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Valid \% |
| Food and drink | $£ 5.01$ | 64.0 |
| Fares and petrol | $£ 2.19$ | 28.0 |
| Other costs | $£ 0.63$ | 8.0 |
| Total | $£ 7.82$ | 100.0 |

Figure 2.2: Average expenditure - Day Visitors


Staying visitors spent approximately $£ 39$ per person.

| Figure 2.3: Average expenditure - Staying Visitor - per person |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Valid \% |
| Accommodation | $£ 30.75$ | 79.7 |
| Food and drink | $£ 5.01$ | 13.0 |
| Fares and petrol | $£ 2.19$ | 5.7 |
| Other costs | $£ 0.63$ | 1.6 |
| Total | $£ 38.57$ | 100.0 |

Figure 2.3: Average expenditure - Staying Visitors


## Accommodation

Hotel accommodation was used by $30 \%$ of staying visitors to Inside Out events, with some $17 \%$ staying at the home of a friend or relative. The relatively high proportions of visitors staying in hotels drove a significant element of the accommodation spend within the economic model.

| Table 3.1: Accommodation Type |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Hotel | 79 | 29.9 |
| Home of a friend or relative | 45 | 17.0 |
| Self catering house, flat or cottage | 32 | 12.1 |
| Static caravan / Chalet | 23 | 8.7 |
| Second home | 15 | 5.7 |
| Touring caravan / tent | 15 | 5.7 |
| Guest House / Bed and Breakfast | 15 | 5.7 |
| Holiday park | 6 | 2.3 |
| Camper van / mobile home | 5 | 1.9 |
| Other | 29 | 11.0 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 264 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| (0) Missing Values | 0 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Total (Base) | 264 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

Figure 3.1: Accommodation Type


Many visitors 31\% selected an accommodation only basis for their stay, though some $25 \%$ selected half board.

| Table 3.2: Accommodation Basis |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| Accommodation only | 55 | 31.1 |
| Half Board | 45 | 25.4 |
| Bed and Breakfast | 42 | 23.7 |
| Full Board | 35 | 19.8 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 177 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 87 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 264 | N/A |

Figure 3.2: Accommodation Basis


A majority of visitors who stayed in hotels selected a full or half board basis for their stay, though $39 \%$ opted for bed and breakfast only. Of visitors who stayed with friends or relatives a majority ate all their meals with them.

|  | Full | oard | Half | oard |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { and } \\ & \text { kfast } \end{aligned}$ |  | modatio only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valid } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $f$ | Valid \% |
| Hotel | 11 | 13.9 | 35 | 44.3 | 31 | 39.2 | 2 | 2.5 |
| Guest House / Bed and Breakfast | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 7.7 | 10 | 76.9 | 2 | 15.4 |
| Self catering house, flat or cottage | 4 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 83.3 |
| Static caravan / Chalet | 1 | 8.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 75.0 |
| Camper van / mobile home | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Holiday park | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 83.3 |
| Touring caravan / tent | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 100.0 |
| Home of a friend or relative | 14 | 56.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 1 | 4.0 | 6 | 24.0 |
| Second home | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 50.0 |
| Other | 2 | 28.6 | 3 | 42.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 28.6 |

Expenditure on accommodation varied significantly from a minimum of $£ 0$ (where visitors stayed with friends or relatives) to $£ 250$.

| Table 3.4a: Accommodation Expenditure - Per person per night |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All | Minimum | Maximum | Average |
| Accommodation | $£ 0.00$ | $£ 250.00$ | $£ 34.16$ |

Accommodation expenditure varied significantly according to accommodation type utilised.

| Table 3.4b: Accommodation Expenditure by accommodation type- Per person per night |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | Minimum | Maximum | Average |
| Hotel | $£ 1.78$ | $£ 250.00$ | $£ 50.63$ |
| Guest House / Bed and Breakfast | $£ 10.71$ | $£ 56.25$ | $£ 29.69$ |
| Self catering house, flat or cottage | $£ 14.29$ | $£ 71.43$ | $£ 29.13$ |
| Static caravan / Chalet | $£ 0.00$ | $£ 33.33$ | $£ 17.05$ |
| Camper van / mobile home | $£ 7.92$ | $£ 9.17$ | $£ 8.54$ |
| Holiday park | $£ 8.57$ | $£ 50.00$ | $£ 23.34$ |
| Touring caravan / tent | $£ 4.91$ | $£ 23.33$ | $£ 10.18$ |
| Home of a friend or relative | $£ 0.00$ | $£ 62.50$ | $£ 18.05$ |
| Second home | $£ 9.52$ | $£ 9.52$ | $£ 9.52$ |
| Other | $£ 4.71$ | $£ 27.00$ | $£ 15.86$ |

Where data was available expenditure by accommodation type and basis was recorded.

| Table 3.4c: Accommodation Expenditure by accommodation type and basis - Per person per night |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (341) | Full Board | Half Board | Bed and Breakfast | Accommodation only |  |
| Hotel | $£ 40.00$ | $£ 49.10$ | $£ 55.50$ | $£ 18.50$ |  |
| Guest House / Bed and Breakfast | . | $£ 56.25$ | $£ 28.83$ | $£ 19.42$ |  |
| Self catering house, flat or cottage | . | . | . | $£ 26.11$ |  |
| Static caravan / Chalet | $£ 16.67$ | . | . | $£ 17.88$ |  |
| Camper van / mobile home | . | . | . | . |  |
| Holiday park | . | . | . | $£ 23.34$ |  |
| Touring caravan / tent | . | . | . | $£ 8.87$ |  |
| Home of a friend or relative | $£ 9.26$ | $£ 24.64$ | . | $£ 8.04$ |  |
| Second home | $£ 9.52$ | . | . | . |  |
| Other | . | . | . | $£ 27.00$ |  |

## Visitor Demographics

The overwhelming majority of visitors $99 \%$ were from the UK.

| Table 4.1: Visitor Origin | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | 1085 | 98.8 |
| UK | 13 | 1.2 |
| Overseas | 1098 | 100.0 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 62 | N/A |
| (0) Missing Values | 1160 | N/A |
| Total (Base) |  |  |

Figure 4.1: Visitor Origin


Of the total sample of 1160 only 170 respondents did not give a full occupation that allowed a socio-economic group to be generated. Commonly this was respondents indicating that they were retired without reference to their previous occupation.
Of respondents some 67\% were socio-economic group A, B or C1.

| Table 4.2: Socio-economic group |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $\boldsymbol{f}$ | Valid \% |
| A | 20 | 2.0 |
| B | 294 | 29.7 |
| C1 | 345 | 34.8 |
| C2 | 134 | 13.5 |
| D | 197 | 19.9 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 990 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 170 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A |

Figure 4.2: Socio-economic Group


Some disparity between socio-economic group by event was recorded, this was especially the case for the Fire Gardens where a reduced number of group B was recorded.

| Table 4.2a: Socio-economic group by event |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | A | B | C1 | C2 | D | Total |
| Arquiem, <br> Wimborne | Count | 4 | 68 | 68 | 24 | 31 | 216 |
|  | $\%$ | 1.9 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 11.1 | 14.4 | 100 |
| Peixos, <br> Poole | Count | 4 | 99 | 76 | 41 | 39 | 299 |
|  | $\%$ | 1.3 | 33.1 | 25.4 | 13.7 | 13.0 | 100 |
| Counter Currents, <br> West Bay, Bridport | Count | 6 | 56 | 54 | 35 | 22 | 193 |
|  | $\%$ | 3.1 | 29.0 | 28.0 | 18.1 | 11.4 | 100 |
| Fire Gardens, <br> Bournemouth | Count | 8 | 148 | 185 | 66 | 118 | 621 |
|  | \% | 1.3 | 23.8 | 29.8 | 10.6 | 19.0 | 100 |
| Carmen Funebre, <br> Weymouth | Count | 4 | 49 | 49 | 16 | 16 | 138 |
|  | $\%$ | 2.9 | 35.5 | 35.5 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 100 |
| Enclosure, Hambledon <br> Hill | Count | 1 | 42 | 47 | 12 | 8 | 118 |
|  | $\%$ | 0.8 | 35.6 | 39.8 | 10.2 | 6.8 | 100 |



Relatively high proportions of children and older people were recorded at events, it was also noted that there was a slightly higher proportion of women than men.

|  | Men |  | Women |  | All |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $f$ | Valid \% | $f$ | Valid \% | f | Valid \% |
| 0-15 years | 359 | 9.3 | 376 | 9.7 | 735 | 19.0 |
| 16-24 years | 105 | 2.7 | 177 | 4.6 | 282 | 7.3 |
| 25-34 years | 180 | 4.6 | 248 | 6.4 | 428 | 11.0 |
| 35-44 years | 228 | 5.9 | 297 | 7.7 | 525 | 13.6 |
| 45-54 years | 300 | 7.7 | 386 | 10.0 | 686 | 17.7 |
| 55-64 years | 354 | 9.1 | 426 | 11.0 | 780 | 20.1 |
| 65+ years | 206 | 5.3 | 232 | 6.0 | 438 | 11.3 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 1732 | 44.7 | 2142 | 55.3 | 3874 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 2142 | N/A | 1732 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 3874 | N/A | 3874 | N/A | 3874 | N/A |

Figure 4.3: Age and Gender


The majority of visitors $53 \%$ arrived at the event in groups of 1 or 2 , though a significant proportion 19\% came in groups of 4.

| Table 4.4: Group Size |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base: All (1160) | $f$ | Valid \% |
| 1 | 85 | 7.6 |
| 2 | 508 | 45.4 |
| 3 | 145 | 12.9 |
| 4 | 212 | 18.9 |
| 5 | 57 | 5.1 |
| 6 | 44 | 3.9 |
| 7 | 22 | 2.0 |
| 8 | 11 | 1.0 |
| 9 | 7 | 0.6 |
| 10 | 5 | 0.4 |
| 11 | 5 | 0.4 |
| 12 | 4 | 0.4 |
| 13 | 2 | 0.2 |
| 14 | 3 | 0.3 |
| 15 | 1 | 0.1 |
| 16 | 2 | 0.2 |
| 17 | 1 | 0.1 |
| 20+ | 6 | 0.5 |
| Total (Valid: Single Code) | 1120 | 100.0 |
| (0) Missing Values | 40 | N/A |
| Total (Base) | 1160 | N/A |

Figure 4.4: Group Size


Respondents' postcodes were recorded within the survey and a high proportion of visitors, as expected, came from the BH and DT postcode areas

|  | Frequency | Valid \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AL | 2 | 0.2 |
| B | 7 | 0.6 |
| BA | 14 | 1.3 |
| BH | 5 | 0.5 |
| BH1 | 34 | 3.1 |
| BH10 | 13 | 1.2 |
| BH11 | 14 | 1.3 |
| BH12 | 38 | 3.5 |
| BH13 | 8 | 0.7 |
| BH14 | 29 | 2.7 |
| BH15 | 55 | 5.0 |
| BH16 | 20 | 1.8 |
| BH17 | 22 | 2.0 |
| BH18 | 14 | 1.3 |
| BH19 | 2 | 0.2 |
| BH2 | 16 | 1.5 |
| BH2O | 9 | 0.8 |
| BH21 | 104 | 9.5 |
| BH22 | 26 | 2.4 |
| BH23 | 28 | 2.6 |
| BH24 | 8 | 0.7 |
| BH25 | 3 | 0.3 |
| BH3 | 11 | 1.0 |
| BH31 | 3 | 0.3 |
| BH4 | 18 | 1.6 |
| BH5 | 16 | 1.5 |
| BH6 | 30 | 2.7 |
| BH7 | 11 | 1.0 |
| BH8 | 40 | 3.7 |
| BH9 | 50 | 4.6 |
| BN | 5 | 0.5 |
| BS | 9 | 0.8 |
| CF | 1 | 0.1 |
| CM | 2 | 0.2 |
| CO | 4 | 0.4 |
| CR | 4 | 0.4 |
| CT | 4 | 0.4 |
| CV | 4 | 0.4 |
| CW | 1 | 0.1 |
| DD | 1 | 0.1 |
| DE | 4 | 0.4 |
| DH | 1 | 0.1 |
| DL | 1 | 0.1 |
| DN | 2 | 0.2 |
| DT1 | 16 | 1.5 |
| DT10 | 4 | 0.4 |
| DT11 | 28 | 2.6 |
| DT2 | 37 | 3.4 |
| DT3 | 19 | 1.7 |
| DT4 | 34 | 3.1 |
| DT5 | 8 | 0.7 |
| DT6 | 71 | 6.5 |
| DT8 | 8 | 0.7 |
| DT9 | 3 | 0.3 |
| E | 2 | 0.2 |
| EX | 7 | 0.6 |
| GL | 2 | 0.2 |
| GU | 3 | 0.3 |
| HA | 2 | 0.2 |
| HP | 3 | 0.3 |
| HU | 2 | 0.2 |
| L | 2 | 0.2 |


| LD | 1 | 0.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LE | 2 | 0.2 |
| LG | 1 | 0.1 |
| LL | 1 | 0.1 |
| M | 2 | 0.2 |
| ME | 2 | 0.2 |
| MK | 6 | 0.5 |
| N | 1 | 0.1 |
| NG | 2 | 0.2 |
| NN | 6 | 0.5 |
| NP | 1 | 0.1 |
| NR | 5 | 0.5 |
| NW | 1 | 0.1 |
| OL | 1 | 0.1 |
| OX | 5 | 0.5 |
| PE | 3 | 0.3 |
| PL | 2 | 0.2 |
| PO | 6 | 0.5 |
| RG | 4 | 0.4 |
| RH | 5 | 0.5 |
| RM | 2 | 0.2 |
| RM17 | 1 | 0.1 |
| S | 6 | 0.5 |
| SA | 1 | 0.1 |
| SE | 2 | 0.2 |
| SG | 2 | 0.2 |
| SK | 2 | 0.2 |
| SL | 5 | 0.5 |
| SN | 4 | 0.4 |
| SO | 6 | 0.5 |
| SP | 22 | 2.0 |
| SS | 2 | 0.2 |
| ST | 2 | 0.2 |
| SW | 2 | 0.2 |
| SY | 1 | 0.1 |
| TA | 11 | 1.0 |
| TF | 2 | 0.2 |
| TN | 8 | 0.7 |
| TQ | 1 | 0.1 |
| TW | 2 | 0.2 |
| UB | 2 | 0.2 |
| W | 2 | 0.2 |
| WF | 1 | 0.1 |
| WN | 1 | 0.1 |
| WV | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | 1092 | 100.0 |

Across all events some 57\% of visitors reported having a BH postcode with some $21 \%$ recording a DT postcode.

| Table 4.6: All Events |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Frequency | Valid \% |
| BH | 627 | 57.4 |
| DT | 228 | 20.9 |
| Other | 237 | 21.7 |
|  | 1092 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

At Arquiem some 70\% of respondents had a BH postcode.

| Table 4.7: Arquiem event |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| postcodes |  |  |$|$|  | Frequency |
| :--- | ---: |
| Valid \% |  |
| BH | 147 |
| DT | 39 |
| SP | 11 |
| Other | 13 |
|  | 210 |

At Peixos some 72\% of respondents had a BH postcode.

| Table 4.8: Peixos event |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| postcodes |  |  |$|$|  | Frequency | Valid \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| BH | 207 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 9}$ |
| DT | 40 | 13.9 |
| Other | 41 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 2}$ |
|  | 288 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

At Counter Currents some 65\% of respondents had a DT postcode.

| Table 4.9: Counter Currents <br> event postcodes |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Frequency | Valid \% |
| BH | 29 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6}$ |
| DT | 120 | $\mathbf{6 4 . 5}$ |
| EX | 7 | 3.8 |
| TA | 7 | 3.8 |
| Other | 23 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 4}$ |
|  | 186 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

At the Fire Gardens some $70 \%$ of respondents had a BH postcode.

| Table 4.10: Fire Gardens event postcodes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | Valid \% |
| BH | 412 | 70.2 |
| DT | 40 | 6.8 |
| Other | 135 | 23.0 |
|  | 587 | 100.0 |

At Carmen some 65\% of respondents had a DT postcode.

| Table 4.11: Carmen event |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| postcodes |  |  |

At Enclosure some 39\% of respondents had a BH postcode with some $38 \%$ of respondents recording a DT postcode.

| Table 4.12: Enclosure event <br> postcodes |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Frequency | Valid \% |
| BH | 45 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1}$ |
| DT | 44 | $\mathbf{3 8 . 3}$ |
| BA | 5 | $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ |
| SP | 8 | $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ |
| Other | 13 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 3}$ |
|  | 115 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

A broadly similar proportion of visitors from outside the DT or BH area was recorded at all events. Proximity to the conurbation influenced attendance by respondents with a BH postcode at events with the exception of Enclosure.

| Table 4.13: Postcode by Event |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Arquiem | Peixos | Counter Currents | Fire Gardens | Carmen | Enclosure |  |
| BH | 70.0 | 71.9 | 15.6 | 70.2 | 13.2 | 39.1 |  |
| DT | 18.6 | 13.9 | 64.5 | 6.8 | 65.4 | 38.3 |  |
| Other | 11.4 | 14.2 | 19.9 | 23.0 | 21.3 | 22.6 |  |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Postcode by Event


## Visitor Counts

The total numbers of visitors to events was surveyed by The Market Research Group. However, because of the nature of most events fully accurate counts could not be achieved, therefore an element of error is present within the results. However, all counts were conducted successfully and the results were considered, accepting the error outlined above, to be representative of visitor numbers.

## Arquiem

Promenade theatre show, through the streets of Wimborne.
This event was non-ticketed, mobile and took place in the dark using fire, smoke, flashing lights and other medium.

No standard technique for counting visitors would function correctly for this event; therefore a census methodology was used to make an assessment of visitor numbers. Counts were undertaken by a group of researchers unobtrusively sweeping through the event during the performance and using handheld counters to record the total number of visitors. Four full counts were undertaken per night to provide robust data.

Counts were undertaken when the performance and audience was in either Zone 1 or Zone 2.
Full count details are included within the table below.

| Arquiem - Wimborne |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thursday $13^{\text {th }}$ September |  |
| $19: 55$ | 454 |
| $20: 00$ | 606 |
| $20: 20$ | 632 |
| $20: 30$ | 642 |
| Estimated Visitor Numbers $\mathbf{- 6 5 0}$ |  |
|  |  |
| Friday $14^{\text {th }}$ September |  |
| $19: 55$ | 338 |
| $20: 00$ | 523 |
| $20: 20$ | 713 |
| $20: 30$ | 718 |
| Estimated Visitor Numbers $\mathbf{- 7 2 0}$ |  |
|  |  |
| Estimated total visitor numbers - 1,370 |  |



## Peixos

Parade style performance, moving back and forth in the Quay area of Poole.
This event was non-ticketed, mobile and took place in the dark among some overhanging buildings with people watching from both outside and inside pubs.

No standard technique for counting visitors would function correctly for this event; therefore a census methodology was used to make an assessment of visitor numbers. Count were undertaken by a group of researchers unobtrusively sweeping through the event during the performance and using handheld counters to record the total number of visitors. Two full sweeps were undertaken to provide robust data.

To achieve accurate results the route was zoned (see map) and zones were counted simultaneously by different researchers. Some minor flow between zones was accepted to have occurred though this is likely to have been fairly limited. During the event it was noted that visitors moved from the start of the parade to the end, not using the route of the parade but side streets. Simultaneous counting, prevented this causing any problems and allows a single 'total audience' figure to be generated.

| Peixos - Poole |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Saturday $15^{\text {th }}$ September |  |  |
| Count 1 | 2,440 |  |
| Count 2 | 2,715 |  |
| Estimated Visitor Numbers $\mathbf{- 3 , 2 0 0}$ |  |  |



## Counter Currents

Various performance art sites around West Bay with visitors drifting between experiences.

This event was non-ticketed and at multiple locations which were not enclosed.
As the budget would not allow aerial photography, a census count, where researchers flow through event audiences using handheld counters to record the total number of visitors, was utilised. The various events were then modelled together with dwell time to provide the total number of unique visitors.
The table below outlines the maximum number of visitors recorded at each event during the day.

| Counter currents - West Bay |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Sunday 16 |  |  |
| Maximum number of of visitors recorded |  |  |
| Loving IT | 648 |  |
| Osadia | 551 |  |
| Upswing aerial (voices) | 801 |  |
| Minbre 'the bridge' | 831 |  |
| Artizani | 324 |  |
| Music Bigtop | 245 |  |
| Estimated Visitor Numbers $\mathbf{- 2 , 6 0 0}$ |  |  |

## Fire Gardens

A night time event for visitors to promenade through Bournemouth Gardens and view fire and listen to music.

This event was non-ticketed and employed a blend of darkness and fire within the spectacle. As result of these factors and the dispersed nature of visitors and size of the event it was considered the most difficult to record visitor numbers for.

For several reasons counting visitors into or out of the gardens was impossible and therefore a census count, where researchers flowed through the event audience using handheld counters to record the total number of visitors, was utilised. The various elements were then modelled together with dwell time to provide the total number of unique visitors. Because of the large number of visitors and necessary complexity of this methodology an element of error was anticipated.



## Carmen Funebre

Fixed site theatrical experience.
This event was ticketed, therefore the event organisers provided the total number of unique visitors.

| Carmen Funebre - Weymouth |
| :--- |
| Friday $21^{\text {st }}$ September |
| Visitor Numbers -374 |
|  |
| Saturday $22^{\text {nd }}$ September |
| Visitor Numbers - 523 |
|  |
| Total visitor numbers $\mathbf{- 8 9 7}$ |

## Enclosure

A multifaceted theatrical event.
Visitors to this event flowed past a single location and therefore were counted by a researcher using a handheld counter.

| Enclosure - Hambledon Hill |
| :--- |
| Sunday $23^{\text {rd }}$ September |
| Visitor Numbers -668 |

Total Visitor Numbers

| Event | Date | Day | Time | Visitor numbers | Total Visitors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arquiem, | $13^{\text {th }}$ | Thurs | 8-10pm | 650 |  |
| Wimborne | 14th | Fri | 8-10pm | 720 | 1,370 |
| Peixos, Poole | $15^{\text {th }}$ | Sat | 8-10pm | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| Counter Currents, Bridport | $16^{\text {th }}$ | Sun | 1-7pm | 2,600 | 2,600 |
|  | $19^{\text {th }}$ | Wed | 7-10pm | 5,200 |  |
| Fire Gardens, | $20^{\text {th }}$ | Thurs | 7-10pm | 7,600 |  |
| Bournemouth | $21^{\text {st }}$ | Fri | 7-10pm | 9,300 | 22,100 |
| Carmen Funebre, | $21^{\text {st }}$ | Fri | 8-10pm | 374 |  |
| Weymouth | $22^{\text {nd }}$ | Sat | 8-10pm | 523 | 897 |
| Enclosure, Hambledon Hill | $23^{\text {rd }}$ | Sun | 5-8pm | 668 | 668 |
|  |  |  |  | 30,835 |  |

## Economic Impact

To evaluate the impact of the Inside Out Dorset Festival spend indicated within the visitor survey was modelled to allow the full impact of the event, as the money ripples through the economy, to be fully considered.
Visitor numbers at the events were recorded by The Market Research Group and are outlined in the previous section 'Visitor Numbers'.

## Modelling Summary

Initial spend figures are adjusted utilising multipliers to estimate indirect or "ripple" effects on business income. These multipliers were calculated by Bournemouth University as part of its ongoing event research programme. When a business receives income from the consumer, this in turn leads to an increase in, for example, stock, orders for supplies, raw material, transport expenditure etc. These supplier businesses in turn see an upturn in their own economic activity, and so on. As a result, initial spend by the consumer has a "ripple effect" throughout the economy.

Direct Spend refers to the money directly spend by visitors to the Inside Out Dorset Festival as recorded by the visitor survey. This figure is calculated utilising the length of stay, number of days visited and other factors to ensure accuracy. Figures are then factored to represent the total number of visitors to the Inside Out Dorset Festival.

Indirect refers to the ripple effect on businesses from direct spend. It takes into consideration the increase/decrease in, for example, stock, orders for supplies, raw material, transport expenditure etc. It is calculated by applying a multiplier to spend. The multiplier varies according to the category of goods purchased.

Induced refers to the additional impact resulting from expenditure on goods and services in the areas under consideration by recipients of both direct and indirect income. It is calculated by applying a multiplier to spend. The multiplier varies according to the category of goods purchased.

Total Visitor Spend

|  | Arquiem <br> Farmen | Counter <br> Currents | Fire <br> Gardens | Carmen <br> Funebre | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Food and drink - At the event pp | 3214 | 7507 | 6100 | 51846 | 2104 | 1567 |
| Food and drink - Dorset pp | 1834 | 4283 | 3480 | 29581 | 1201 | 894 |
| Food and drink - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 994 | Under $£ 5000$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - At the event pp | 1021 | 2385 | 1938 | 16469 | 668 | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - Dorset pp | 1392 | 3252 | 2642 | 22457 | 912 | 679 |
| Fares and Petrol - UK pp | 665 | 1553 | 1262 | 10726 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - At the event pp | Under $£ 500$ | 957 | 777 | 6607 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | 637 | 517 | 4398 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 8 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 7 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3 2 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 3 1}$ |

Total Indirect Effect

|  | Arquiem <br> Counter <br> Currents | Fire <br> Gardens | Carmen <br> Funebre | Enclosure |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Food and drink - At the event pp | 840 | 1962 | 1594 | 13547 | 550 | Under $£ 500$ |
| Food and drink - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | 1119 | 909 | 7730 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Food and drink - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 260 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - At the event pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 2474 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 3373 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 1611 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - At the event pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 587 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 6}$ |

Total Induced Effect

|  | Arquiem | Peixos | Counter <br> Currents | Fire <br> Gardens | Carmen <br> Funebre | Enclosure |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Food and drink - At the event pp | 670 | 1565 | 1272 | 10810 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Food and drink - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | 893 | 726 | 6168 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Food and drink - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 207 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - At the event pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 3434 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | 678 | 551 | 4682 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Fares and Petrol - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 2236 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - At the event pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 1378 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - Dorset pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | 917 | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Other Costs - UK pp | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ | Under $£ 500$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 6}$ |

Total Effect of Visitor Spend

|  | Arquiem | Peixos <br> Currents | Fire <br> Gardens | Carmen <br> Funebre | Enclosure |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Food and drink - At the event pp | 4724 | 11034 | 8965 | 76203 | 3093 | 2303 |  |
| Food and drink - Dorset pp | 2695 | 6296 | 5115 | 43479 | 1765 | 1314 |  |
| Food and drink - UK pp | 91 | 211 | 172 | 1461 | 59 | 44 |  |
| Fares and Petrol - At the event pp | 1387 | 3240 | 2633 | 22377 | 908 | 676 |  |
| Fares and Petrol - Dorset pp | 1892 | 4418 | 3590 | 30513 | 1238 | 922 |  |
| Fares and Petrol - UK pp | 903 | 2110 | 1715 | 14574 | 592 | 441 |  |
| Other Costs - At the event pp | 531 | 1241 | 1008 | 8571 | 348 | 259 |  |
| Other Costs - Dorset pp | 354 | 826 | 671 | 5705 | 232 | 172 |  |
| Other Costs - UK pp | 17 | 39 | 32 | 273 | 11 | 8 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 5 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 9 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 4 1}$ |  |

Visitor Accommodation

|  | Arquiem | Peixos | Counter Currents | Fire Gardens | Carmen Funebre | Enclosure | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accommodation Spend | 5443 | 12713 | 10329 | 87798 | 3564 | 2654 | 122500 |
| Accommodation Indirect | 2040 | 4765 | 3871 | 32907 | 1336 | 995 | 45913 |
| Accommodation Induced | 1599 | 3735 | 3035 | 25795 | 1047 | 780 | 35991 |
| Total Effect of Visitor Accommodation | 9082 | 21213 | 17235 | 146500 | 5946 | 4428 | £204,404 |

Total Visitor Spend

|  | Arquiem | PeixOS | Counter Currents | Fire Gardens | Carmen Funebre | Enclosure |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | Total (

Grand Total of Visitor Related Spend $£ 487,857$

## Expenditure Summary

Organisers spend is considered to be a significant factor in the total impact of an event, especially when the event is not funded primarily by tickets. Below is a summary of the total impact of the Inside Out Dorset Event.

| Effect of Organisers Spend |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Organisers Spend | $£ 340,014$ |
| Indirect | $£ 30,193$ |
| Induced | $£ 50,492$ |
| Total Effect of Organisers Spend | $£ 420,700$ |

## Total Visitor Spend - £199,924 <br> Total Effect of Visitor Spend - £283,452

Visitor Accommodation - £122,500
Total Effect of Visitor Accommodation - £204,404

## Total Effect of Visitor Spend - £487,857

Organisers Spend - $£ 340,014$
Total Effect of Organisers Spend - £420,700

## Total Economic Impact Inside Out Dorset $2007=£ 908,557$

It can be reasonably concluded that in excess of $£ 900,000$ was released into the economy as a result of the Inside Out Dorset events 2007.

