Public investment of jazz - a coherent policy for jazz, changing demographics, live music and coping with the increasing supply of jazz musicians.

Preface

Stuart Nicholson in his book “Jazz and Culture in a Global Age” (2014) stated “But if adequate remuneration had become one problem facing American jazz musicians, then falling audience numbers was another. Yet those who attempted to highlight issues such as these often found their words unwelcome, un- American even, and likely to be shouted down – ‘Jazz has more than its fair share of handwringers’, thundered the New York Times when concern was raised at the results of the 2009 National Endowment for the Arts survey on the audience participation for the arts, which revealed the audience for jazz, especially for younger fans, was in decline”. Britain too has its share of people who with think everything in the jazz garden is rosy. The music is of the highest order but the infrastructure is not there to sustain it and a young audience for jazz needs rebuilding.

Summary

This paper examines:

- A level playing field for jazz
- The paucity of public funding for jazz
- The lack of a coherent policy for jazz in the UK
- Changing demographics
- The education sector and the supply of jazz musicians and live music
- Keep music live

1 Arts Council funding of jazz and the second National Portfolio round 2015/16

1.1 Subsidy per attender for opera, classical music and jazz in 2011/16

Total funding for opera and jazz has risen and the total funding for classical music has fallen in the latest round. Funding for opera has risen by 17% despite the cut in funding to English National Opera and funding for Jazz has risen by 1.3%.

Arts Council England Funding for opera, classical and jazz	2011/12 £ millions	2012/13 £ millions	2015/16 £ millions	Audience as a percentage of population	Audience attending music events in millions	Subsidy per head 2011/12 £	Subsidy per head 2012/13 £	Subsidy per head 2015/16 £
Total funding for opera	50.02	50.5	59.2	3.9%	1.67	31.26	31.56	35.34
Total funding for classical music	18.3	18.9	16.9	7.7%	3.29	5.55	5.72	5.13
Total funding for jazz	1.42	1.25	1.67	5.6%	2.38	0.57	0.50	0.70

Table 1 Source: Taking Part 2011/12 Kantar Media/ Arts Council England

1.2 Jazz as a percentage of the totals of Arts Council England regularly funded music organisations 1991/92, 2011/12 and National Portfolio Organisations for 2015/2016

The total funding for jazz had risen from 0.5% in 1991/92 to 1.8% of the total funding of regularly funded organisations in 2015/16.

Arts Council England Regularly Funded Music Organisations (RFOs)	1991/92 £ million	As a percentage of total funding of RFOs 1991/92	2011/12 £ million	2012/13 £ million	2015/16 £ million	As a percentage of total funding of RFOs 2011/12	As a percentage of total funding of NPOs 2012/13	As a percentage of total funding of NPOs 2015/16
Total funding of music RFOs	48.5	100%	83.5	82.5	92.3	100%	100%	100%
Total funding for opera RFOs	37.8	77.9%	50.02	50.5	59.2	60%	61%	64%
Total funding for classical RFOs	8.6	17.7%	18.3	18.9	16.9	22%	22.9%	18.3%
Total funding for jazz RFOs	0.24	0.5%	1.42	1.25	1.67	1.7%	1.52%	1.8%
Funding of other music's and projects	1.8	3.9%	13.76	11.85	14.53	16.5%	14.58%	15.7

Table 2 Source: Arts Council England

1.3 A level playing field?

English National Opera received a cut of £5 million from £17 million to £12 million. However it would appear from an article in the Guardian on the 2nd July 2014 (ENO forced to tighten its reins while 58 groups lose all funding from Arts Council) that the funding of English National Opera (ENO) was a done deal as ENO was given an inducement of £7.6 million to "help in the transition of its business plan". Did the Arts Council of England offer this kind of help to the organisations who lost their funding? The opera companies, the orchestras, the national companies like the Royal Shakespeare Company, like the banks, are too big to fail. The brunt of the cuts has fallen on the smaller companies.

Even with a cut in ENO funding opera funding increased from £50.5 million in 2012/13 to £59.2 million in 2015/16. Jazz increased its overall funding from £1.25 million in 2012/13 to £1.67 million in 2015/16 but Jazz Services the national organisation for jazz was cut. Classical music funding was reduced from £18.9 million in 2012/13 to £16.9 million in 2015/16. The audience for opera is 1.67 million attenders, for classical music 3.29 million and for jazz 2.67 million.

1.4 Arts Council funding for jazz 2013 to 2016

Arts Council funding for Jazz	2012/13 £ millions	2013/14 £ millions	2014/15 £ millions	2015/16 £ millions
Percentage cut	-	2.09%	3.06%	5%
Funding	**£1.345**	**£1.41**	**£1.37**	**£1.30**

Table 3 Source Jazz Services

Note: Jazz North Arts Council England grant of £95k has been added for 2012/13 and 190k each year for 2013/14 and 2104/15.These figures assume that the Arts Council will award the same level of funding for 2015-2018

2. A policy for jazz

The Arts Council has nailed its colours to the mast on National Portfolio Organisations and has set goals and asked organisations to set quantified objectives for the foreseeable future.

The Arts Council's goals and priorities.

Mission: Great Art for Everyone

Goal 1: Talent and artistic excellence are thriving and celebrated

Goal 2: More people experience and are inspired by the arts

Goal 3: The arts are sustainable, resilient and innovative

Goal 4: The Arts leadership and workforce are diverse and highly skilled

Goal 5: Every child and young person has the opportunity to experience the richness of the Arts

In 1996 the Arts Council of England published "A policy for the support of jazz in England". When Hilary Boulding became Music director in 1999 and then Director Music Strategy, ironically the Jazz Policy was dropped.

The Arts Council had a real opportunity in 2012/15 to shape the funding of jazz in the UK and provide proper levels of support. The Arts Council failed to deliver then and failed again this time.

Arts Council England before any thought of formulating a flawed funding framework should have asked and provided the answers to these fundamental questions for the arts in England. Where are we now? Where do we want to be? The failure to answer these questions in the 2015/18 funding round; to address the flaws in equitable provision for music and jazz in particular, the Arts Council has again regrettably missed another chance to ensure that music provision in England was balanced equitably, with a coherent communal direction.

The fundamental problem is there is no policy for the arts in England. Arts funding is now run like a dodgy hedge fund that every three years selects a National Portfolio of arts organisations and then three years later un-bundles them. This rag bag "portfolio" of arts organisations, replete with the slogan "Great Art for Everyone" is tortuously brought into existence without any coherent art form policy. Whatever next? Anne Summers – "Great Sex for Everyone", or the Cooperative Funeral Care – "Great Funerals for Everyone". Even more risible is the fact that they have dumped the notion of specialist art form administrators and lumbered the staff with the title "relationship managers", a term adopted from the high street banks.

Is the Arts Council competent enough to deliver coherent arts funding system, with art form policies? For example, the Arts Council set strict criteria for awarding National Portfolio funding status, two of which are a competent business plan and sound governance. The Arts Council has blown the whistle on its own incompetence. The Arts Council awarded English National Opera National Port Folio status and a few months down the line tells English National Opera to get its house in order, citing business planning and corporate governance. Furthermore in an age of austerity the Royal Opera House and English National Opera exist cheek by jowl and in 2015 will receive public funding of circa £37 million. If two Accident and Emergency units existed side by side, one would be closed or relocated immediately. A national policy for the arts would ensure equitable distribution of funding across art forms and regions.

How many more times is the Arts Council going to be allowed to fail jazz and the wider music constituency?

3 Changing demographics

Appendix I shows that in 1986 the profile of the audience for jazz among young people aged between 15 and 24 years of age was 38% of the total audience for jazz. By 2008/2009 this was 17%; a fall of 55 percentage points. By 2010 - 2011 this had slumped to 11%. There has been a corresponding rise in the 65+ year old audiences from 5% in 1986 to 15% in 2010/2011. Clearly jazz in the UK needs to investigate ways in which more young people can be persuaded to attend jazz events. An increased attendance would then feed in time into the older age groups and eventually replenish the 55+ age group.

4 Supply and demand

Appendix II illustrates the number of students on conservatoire jazz courses. The supply of musicians coming into jazz is greater than the current number of venues can cope with. The potential demand is there but more venues are required to satisfy the potential demand

5 Keep music live

It is self-evident that for people to purchase music they need to hear it. However with streaming there is a real problem with the level of artists royalties that are paid. A physical product such as a CD will earn the performer around 12% of the published price to dealers. However as recently reported in the New York Times, Zoe Keating a Californian musician provided a detailed case study of her earnings. “Even for an “under-the-radar artist like Ms Keating who describes her style as avant garde cello the numbers painted a stark picture”. Over 6 months her songs were played 1.5 million times on Pandora earning her 1,652.74 dollars and on Spotify in the year 2012 131,000 plays earned her 547.71 dollars or an average of 0.42 cents a play. As Ms Keating summed up, “in certain types of music like classical or jazz, we are condemning them to poverty if this is going to be the only way people consume music”.

The underlying malaise is that new media distribution has allowed a scale of mass consumption of music hitherto unknown and in the process lowered people’s expectations of the price they should pay. It is crucial that the music industry re-establishes the value of music in today’s digital world; to do this it is vital that there is an increase in outlets for live music.

In The Guardian Friday 22nd February 2013 there was excellent article by John Harris “Can the UK's 'toilet circuit' of small music venues survive?”. The article was about the “tiny, grimy pubs and clubs fighting to stay open”. Although the piece was about rock and pop bands the predicament is faced by just about every music that is not opera or classical music. The crucial fact is that bands playing in these venues - whatever their genre – are in the argot of business – “new product development”. These are the bands that will eventually fill the O2 stadiums and medium to large scale venues of tomorrow, although many may well fall by the wayside. Another factor is the economic impact of these small venues. For example Wakefield Jazz Club generates £6.99 every £1 of public investment and Scarborough Jazz Club £4.99. The UK cannot rely on market forces or the “bulbous nosed beer barons” to ensure a constant stream of music innovation there needs to be public investment to create a chain of small scale venues that are funded in the same way as are the concert halls and theatres for opera and classical music. This will ensure the UK has an infrastructure that creates value tomorrow for all music, both financially and artistically.

Chris Hodgkins
9th May 2015

APPENDIX I

1 Changes in the attendance of young adults at jazz events

1.1 Introduction

This paper discusses the changes in the demographics of young people attending jazz events. Since 1986 there has been a fall in attendances of young people in the 15-24 age groups which in 1986 accounted for 36% of the audience for jazz. In 2009-2010 the audience for jazz in the 16-24 age groups was 11%.

1.2 Arts participation in the USA

A survey of arts participation in the arts in America by the National Endowment for the Arts (Arts Participation 2008 produced some interesting findings. http://www.nea.gov/research/2008-SPPA.pdf . Since 1982, young adult (18 – 24) attendance rates have declined significantly for jazz, classical music, opera, ballet and non- musical plays. In jazz the decline has been a 58% change.

Table 1. Percentage of adults Ages 18 – 24 attending Arts Events in 1982 and 2008 in the USA

	1982	2008	Percentage change
Jazz	17.5%	7.3%	-58%
Classical music	11.0%	6.9%	-37%
Opera	2.0%	1.2%	-40%
Musicals	16.6%	14.5%	-13%
Non-musical plays	10.7%	8.2%	-23%
Ballet	3.9%	2.5%	-36%
Art museums	22.7%	22.9%	+1%

Table 1. Source: National Endowment for the Arts2009

The crucial question is, will this problem be replicated in the UK along assuming that events in the USA are eventually mirrored in the UK (for example sub-prime mortgages and toxic debt) – or is jazz holding its own in the UK?

1.3 Arts participation in the UK

Table 2. Percentage of all adults who attend each type of music event in England 2005 – 2011

Music	2005/06 %	2006/07 %	2007/08 %	2008/09 %	2009/10 %	2010/11 %	Percentage change 2005/11 %
Jazz	5.6	5.6	5.4	5.7	5.4	5.4	-3.7
Opera	4.4	3.8	3.9	4	4.3	4.1	-6.8
Classical	8.3	7.7	7.6	8.1	7.6	7.7	-7.7

Table 2 Source: Kantar Media Taking Part survey 2005/11

Table 2 shows that jazz has suffered less than opera and classical music in the overall decline of its audiences from 2005/06 to 2010/11

Table 3. Percentage of adults aged 16 – 24 attending Arts Events in 2005 and 2011 in England

	2005 %	2011 %	Percentage change %
Jazz	4.5	4	-11
Classical	3.3	4	+21
Opera	1.7	1.8	+6

Table 3 Source: Kantar Media Taking Part survey 2005/11

Table three however shows that when compared to opera and classical music the audience for jazz among the 16-24 year olds has declined by 11%. The audience for opera and classical music among 16-24 year olds has increased.

Table 4. Percentage of adults who attend each type of jazz event by age in England from 2005 - 2011

	Total %	16-24 %	25-44 %	45-64 %	65-74 %	75+ %
2005/06	5.6	4.5	4.7	7.4	7.2	2.6
2006/07	5.6	5.1	5.1	7.2	6.3	2.4
2007/08	5.4	4.5	4.6	6.8	7.9	2.8
2008/09	5.7	4.8	4.6	7.0	8.8	3.5
2009/10	5.4	5.0	4.9	6.7	6.1	2.7
2010/11	5.4	4.0	4.6	6	8.1	5.0
Percentage change 2005/11	-3.7	-11	-2.1	-19	+12.5	+92

Table 4 Source: Kantar Media Taking Part survey 2005/11

In Table 4 there is a change of 3.7% in audience figures, from 5.6% in 2005/06 to 5.5% in 2010/11. However in the age range 16-24 there is an overall decrease of 11% attendance from 4.5% in 2005/06 to 4% in 2010/11.The age ranges 65-74 and 75+ both show increases of 12.5% 93% in audience figures.

The figures in Table 4 all reflect the fact that the UK has an 'ageing' population with an increasing number of people reaching old age and the increase in the average age of the population. Karen Dunnell from the Office for National Statistics in "Ageing and Mortality" in the UK, National Statisticians' Annual Article on the Population (Winter 2008), noted that
"Over the last 25 years the number of people aged 65 and over in the UK has increased by 16%, from 8.5 million to 9.8 million. The number of children under 16 has declined by nearly 800,000 over the same period, from 12.23 million to 11.5 million. In 1982 the population aged 65 and over accounted for 15% of the population; by 2007 the figure had reached 16%. There are far more old people in the population than ever before. In addition the older population is ageing.

2 Changes to the distribution jazz attenders in the UK by age

When you examine the distribution of jazz attenders by age and compare this to the distribution of the UK population at large, a different picture emerges.

Table 5. Age distribution of the population in Great Britain compared to the age distribution people attending jazz events 1986 – 2009

Age	0-14 %	15-24 %	25-34 %	35-44 %	45-64 %	65+ %	Total %
Age distribution of population of GB 1986	19	16	14	14	22	15	100
Age distribution of people who attend jazz 1986	-	**38**	**20**	**14**	**23**	**5**	100
Age distribution of population of GB 2002/03	19	12	14	15	24	16	100
Age distribution of people who attend jazz 2002	-	**7**	**13**	**20**	**42**	**18**	100
Age distribution of population of GB 2005	18	13	13	15	25	16	100
Age distribution of people who attend jazz 2005/06	-	**15**	**14**	**16**	**35**	**20**	100
Age distribution of population of GB 2007	18	13	13	15	25	16	100
Age distribution of people who attend jazz 2008/09	-	**17**	**18**	**16**	**34**	**15**	100
Percentage change	-	**-55%**	**-20%**	**+14.2%**	**+47.8%**	**+200**	

Table 5 Source: BMRB Target Group Index 1986/2009 and National Statistics Office Mid-Year Population for the UK

Between 1986 and 2009 the Arts Council subscribed to the Target Group Index (TGI). TGI GB is a continuous survey of consumer usage habits, lifestyles, media exposure and attitudes. Established in 1969, the survey provides accurate and independent marketing information on adults aged 15+.

In 1986, 38% of the audience for jazz was aged between 15-24 years as compared to the overall proportion of population in the same age group was 16%. The population aged 65+ was 15% and the audience for jazz in the same group was 5%.

By 2008/09 this had changed dramatically. 17% of the audience for jazz is aged 15-24 whereas the audience for jazz in people aged 65+ had risen to 15%. The demographic shift illustrates the decline among the 15-34 year olds that are crucial to ensuring that jazz continues to build its audiences.

3 Changes to the distribution of jazz attenders in England by age

Taking Part is a major continuous survey of cultural and sport participation in England commissioned by the Department for Media Culture and Sport in partnership with Arts Council England, Sport England and English Heritage. Every year it collects information from a nationally representative sample from children and adults about their attendance at a wide variety of arts events. The data is collected by TNS-BMRB and has been conducted since 2005. Set out below in table 6 are the distribution figures for jazz, from the Taking Part survey, compared to the general population distribution figures.

Table 6. Age distribution of the population in England compared to the age distribution of people attending jazz events 2005 - 2011

Age	0-14 %	16-24 %	25-44 %	45-64 %	65-74 %	75+ %	Total %
Age distribution of population of England 2005/06	19	12	29	24	8	8	100
Age distribution of people in England who attend jazz 2005/06	-	11	30	41	14	4	100
Age distribution of population of England 2006/7	19	12	29	24	8	8	100
Age distribution of people in England who attend jazz 2006/07	-	**13**	**32**	**39**	**12**	**4**	100
Age distribution of population of England 2007/08	19	12	28	24	9	8	100
Age distribution of people in England who attend jazz 2007/08	-	**12**	**30**	**38**	**15**	**5**	100
Age distribution of population of England 2008/09	19	12	28	25	8	8	100
Age distribution of people in England who attend jazz 2008/09	-	**12**	**29**	**37**	**16**	**6**	100
Age distribution of population of England 2009/10	19	12	28	25	8	8	100
Age distribution of people who attend jazz 2009/10	**-**	**14**	**31**	**38**	**12**	**5**	100
Age distribution of population of GB 2010/11	19	12	28	25	8	8	100
Age distribution of people in England who attend jazz 2010/11	-	**11**	**29**	**35**	**16**	**9**	100
Percentage change	-	**0**	**0**	**-17.1**	**+100**	**+12.5**	-

Table 6 Source: Kantar Media Taking Part survey 2005/11 and National Statistics Office mid-Year Population for England

The figures show that the audience in England for jazz among the 16-24 year old has stabilised and is commensurate with the general population at large. However it is important to note that the percentage of 16-24 year olds in 2005-2006 is the same as 2010-2011 at 11%, the percentage of 16-24 year olds attending jazz events 2009-2010 fell 3 percentage points to 11% in 2010-2011.The participation rate for the 45 to 65 year olds is decreasing and is down by 6 percentage points. The attendance rates for 65-74 year olds has doubled and that for the 75+ is up by 5 percentage points.

At the present rate audiences for jazz are getting older and are not being replaced by younger audiences at the same rate therefor the crucial question is how can jazz rebuild its audience aged 16-24?

When times get tough, the marketing of jazz is awash with arguments for dumping the name jazz. For market place against subsidy; that jazz should be part of a contemporary music lexicon along with folk," world music" and contemporary classical music; the egregious and fatally flawed economics of scale arguments of erasing diversity in favour of *"a strong corporate identity … a suite of discreet brands. An entity that would provide a strong operational platform and the benefits of economy of scale for support services … such an organisation would benefit from entrepreneurial leadership, a clear mission and market position."* (Boulding 2005)

Simon Frith argues for a blurring of boundaries:

"The key to jazz success is not getting records into the shops but listeners into the venues. And the issue here is not how to get the mainstream jazz audience to attend avant-garde gigs but how to get the audience for avant-garde rock and dance and contemporary music to attend avant-garde jazz shows too. Jamie Cullum fans are unlikely to enjoy a Polar Bear gig (their jazz interests are quite different); Bloc Party fans might. The way forward, in other words, is to blur the boundaries between

jazz and other kinds of music rather than to try to mark them out more clearly. This is happening already in some venues and festivals (such as the Arches in Glasgow and Scotland's Tryptic Festival), on some labels (such as Babel) and for some musicians (such as Acoustic Ladyland, Soweto Kinch and Spring Heeled Jack). (Frith 2007)

Stuart Nicholson argues for subsidy as a bulwark against the homogenization of the market place for jazz:

"We are, then, at a key moment in jazz history. The music is being reshaped and reimagined beyond the borders of the United States through the process of glocalisation and transculturation with increasing authority by voices asserting their own cultural identity on the music. Non-American musicians want to connect with their own surroundings and want to give the music life and vitality that is relevant to their own socio-musical situation, so they are broadening the expressive base of the music in ways over which American jazz has no control. Key to these developments in Europe is that they are not a response to commercial logic. Sheltered by subsidy from the homogenizing effect of this marketplace, the music has been able to grow and develop in ways musicians want, rather than conforming to the expectations of the marketplace or shaped by the conventions of previous practice". (Nicholson 2005)

On the other hand, Eric Hobsbawm in Uncommon People takes a different angle:

"Is jazz becoming terminally fossilized? It is not impossible. If this should be the fate of jazz, it will not be much consolation that Clint Eastwood has buried Bird in a celluloid mausoleum and that every hairdresser and cosmetics store plays tapes of Billie Holiday. However, jazz has shown extraordinary powers of survival and self-renewal inside a society not designed for it and which it does not deserve. It is too early to think that its potential is exhausted. Besides, what is wrong with just listening and letting the future take care of itself". (Hobsbawm 1998)

Many people wrestle with the word jazz; Peter Ind; jazz musician, environmentalist, painter and author says people *"like the word but hate the music".* However, if jazz is that bad why do cosmetic companies, car dealers and car manufacturers fall over themselves to exploit the word jazz? A rhetorical question and best answered by the simple fact that there is a market out there with definable characteristics and with people who may only like one genre of jazz or a number of genres; or the 'early adopter' who attends the innovative variety. Jazz is a broad church and when there is an altercation in the choir stall or the vestry, someone is busily adding an extension to the chancel.

Hobsbawm is right to let the music take care of itself but we should use every tool available to market jazz from the classroom to old and new media.

The answer to the question 'how can you rebuild the audience aged 15-24 is inextricably bound up with access to hearing jazz. When you go to see a film you buy the ticket first "but music is different – and radio proves that whether it is a pop tune, a heavily political punk album or an experimental avant garde suite the key is very simple: people have to hear it – repeatedly if possible – and for free. After a while if you're lucky people get to know and like the music. Sooner or later they are going to have to own it". (Dubber 2007)

Exposure has always been – for jazz – a defining component that affects the eventual buying decision. For example, *thejazz*, the UK's first 24 hours-a-day digital national radio station launched at Easter 2007, had 334,000 listeners in the RAJAR survey period ending in June 2007.By the period ending 16th September 2007 the listenership had increased to 388,000 or an increase of 16%. In addition to the 338k 15+ listeners to *thejazz*, there were 53,000 children under the age of 15 listening in each week. (Byrnes 2007) *thejazz* came off the air in March 2008 due to a proposed takeover bid.

To rebuild attendance at jazz events by the 16-24 year age group, the use of radio and new media is crucial and tactics need to be researched, developed and refined in a way that will enable promoters and musicians to gain access to the ears of young people and 16+ listeners.

Chris Hodgkins
Jazz Services
30th June 2013

References

Boulding. H. (2005). Letter from Hilary Boulding Music Director, Arts Council England. 7th February 2005.

Byrnes.S. (2007) Jazz, jazz everywhere – but not on television. The Independent Monday 30th April 2007

Dubber. A. (2007). 20 Things you must know about music on line. Digital Central 2007 p6.

Dunnell.K. (2008) Office of National Statistics. Aging and Mortality. National Statisticians' Annual article on the Population. Winter 2008.

Frith.S (2007). Is Jazz Popular Music. Equinox Publishing Ltd 2007 p20.Hobsbawm. E (1998) Uncommon People, Resistance, Rebellion and Jazz. Liedenfield and Nicholson.1998. P291-292.National Endowment for the Arts. (2008) 2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts Research

Nicholson.S. (2005) Is Jazz Dead (or has it moved to another address) Routledge 2005 P239-240

Appendix II

Applicants and acceptances by specialism, 2011-2012

- Birmingham Conservatoire
- Guildhall School of Music & Drama (12/13 intake of students)
- Leeds College of Music
- Royal Academy of Music
- Royal College of Music
- Royal Northern College of Music
- Royal Conservatoire of Scotland
- Royal Welsh College of Music & Drama
- Trinity Laban Conservatoire Of Music and Dance

Specialism	UG				PG		
	Applicants		Acceptances		Applicants		Acceptances
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011
Clarinet (Jazz)	4	3	0	0	0	0	0
Composition (Jazz)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Double Bass (Jazz)	9	6	3	3	4	3	1
Drum kit (Jazz)	39	25	8	4	7	15	3
Flute (Jazz)	3	1	0	0	0	1	0
Guitar (Jazz Acoustic)	2	0	0	0	2	1	1
Guitar (Jazz Electric Bass)	13	12	3	2	3	2	0
Guitar (Jazz Electric Bass)/Jazz Double Bass	5	3	1	0	0	1	0
Guitar (Jazz Electric Lead)	36	20	3	3	14	9	3
Guitar (Jazz)	5	6	1	2	0	1	0
*Percussion (Jazz)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Piano (Jazz)	35	29	10	6	8	8	3
Saxophone (Alto) Jazz	24	22	4	2	5	5	2
*Saxophone (Baritone) Jazz	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Saxophone (Jazz)	33	25	4	5	4	6	1
Saxophone (Tenor) Jazz	19	13	3	4	1	9	1
Trombone (Jazz)	7	4	3	2	3	4	0
Trumpet (Jazz)	19	12	7	5	4	4	1
Vibraphone (Jazz)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
*Violin (Jazz)	0	1	0	0	1	2	0
Voice (Jazz)	27	31	5	2	10	10	0
Jazz Total	**281**	**215**	**55**	**40**	**67**	**82**	**16**
Grand Total	**2,575**	**4,551**	**766**	**858**	**1,897**	**2,223**	**561**