Race, Ethnicity and Participation in the Arts

Patterns of Participation by Hispanics, Whites, and African-Americans in Selected Activities from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts

Paul DiMaggio
Francie Ostrower

Research Division Report #25

Race, Ethnicity, and Participation in the Arts

Race, Ethnicity, and Participation in the Arts

Patterns of Participation by Hispanics, Whites, and African-Americans in Selected Activities from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts

Paul DiMaggio
Princeton University

Francie Ostrower
Harvard University

Research Division Report # 25
National Endowment for the Arts

Seven Locks Press
Washington, D.C.

Race, Ethnicity, and Participation in the Arts is Report #25 in a series on matters of interest to the arts community commissioned by the Research Division of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

DiMaggio, Paul.

Race, ethnicity, and participation in the arts : patterns of participation by Hispanics, Whites, and African-Americans in selected activities from the 1982 and 1985 surveys of public participation in the arts / Paul DiMaggio, Francie Ostrower.

p. cm. — (Research Division report / National Endowment for the Arts ; #25)

ISBN 0–929765–03–6

1. Arts surveys—United States. 2. Arts audiences—United States. 3. Ethnic arts—United States. 4. Minorities in art. I. Ostrower, Francie. II. Title. III. Series: Research Division report (National Endowment for the Arts. Research Division) ; 25.

NX220.D56 1992

700' .973' 09048—dc20 92–31145

CIP

Manufactured in the United States of America

Seven Locks Press
Washington, D.C.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report uses data from the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) to describe and explain differences in patterns of participation in selected artistic activities by African-American, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic white respondents. The surveys permit generalization to national populations of whites and African-Americans because the SPPAs were designed to be nationally representative of the U.S. population with respect to age, gender, and race. Because the sample was not designed to be representative with respect to Hispanic origin or other ethnic categories, conclusions about the participation of Hispanic-Americans must be more tentative. Asian-Americans were identifiable only in the 1985 data, but too few were included in the sample to permit generalization about this group. Native Americans were not identified separately, thus making analysis of their participation impossible.

Data on socioeconomic and demographic background and on participation in ten "core" activities were collected from all respondents in both years. The core activities were: attending jazz, classical music, opera, musical theater, theater, and ballet performances; visiting art museums or exhibits; reading works of imaginative literature; playing a musical instrument in public; and dancing or singing or acting on stage. The SPPAs also asked subsamples of respondents each year about: (1) participation in "other" activities, including visiting historical or science museums or monuments, reading poetry, taking art lessons, painting or drawing, engaging in various craft activities, and working backstage in the performing arts; (2) consumption of arts programming on television, radio, or sound recording; (3) desire for additional participation in the core activities and reasons for not participating more; (4) socialization into the arts as children and specific kinds of art lessons taken throughout the respondent's life; (5) and attitudes towards 13 kinds of music.

Descriptive statistics on the core questions were derived from analyses of the full samples for both years; descriptive statistics on the other questions were derived from analyses of subsamples of whom these questions were

asked for both years; and multivariate analyses employing data from two or more of the intermittently asked questions are based on data from November and December 1982, the only months during which the same respondents were asked all of the questions.

Differences in Participation

SPPA Core Activities. With the exception of attendance at jazz concerts, for which African-American rates of participation exceeded those of whites or Hispanics, white respondents participated more in all of the core activities than did African-American or Hispanic respondents. Most absolute differences between groups with respect to core activities were relatively small, with spreads ranging from one-tenth of 1 percent (Hispanic ballet attendance in 1982) to, at most, almost 24 percent (Hispanic fiction reading in 1982) between minority groups and the non-Hispanic white majority. Most absolute percentage differences were low in large part because, except for reading literature, relatively few members of any group participated in core activities.

If one looks not at gross differences between the percentages of groups participating, but rather at the ratio of percentages participating for different groups (odds ratios), for some activities the differences in rates of participation for whites, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanics, on the other, were sizable. For example, in both years whites were more than twice as likely as African-Americans to report attending a classical music concert, an opera performance, a musical theater performance, a play, or a ballet. Non-Hispanic whites were also more than twice as likely as Americans of Hispanic origin to report attending a play (in both years) and in 1985 attending a classical music concert or an opera performance.[1]

Rates of public *performance* on musical instruments or by singing, dancing, or acting were lower than those for *attendance* at arts events for members of all groups. Differences between whites and other groups were smaller for these art-producing activities than for most core art-consuming activities.

Other activities. Whites were substantially more likely to visit museums or exhibits than Hispanics, who were somewhat more likely to do so than African-Americans. Differences between African-Americans' and whites' rates were substantial for visiting history or science museums, historical monuments, and arts or craft fairs. White respondents were also substantially more likely than others to engage in needlework crafts, and much more likely

than African-Americans to participate in other crafts activities. By contrast, whites were only somewhat more likely than others to have read or listened to poetry, taken art lessons, or engaged in printing and drawing, photography, or filmmaking. Some of these participation rates for African-Americans and Hispanics fluctuated between 1982 and 1985. (For example, Hispanics in 1982 were more likely to report creative writing than whites, whereas they were less likely than African-Americans or whites to indicate participating in this activity in 1985.)

Evidence from the core and other activities indicates that minority group members were less likely to attend cultural institutions, relative to whites, than to be found among amateur creative artists. Nonetheless, the tendency of white Americans to participate at higher rates than others manifested itself in responses to most of these questions. The exception of jazz, for which African-American attendance rates were well above those of whites or Hispanics, indicates that these differences are genre specific, and that intergroup patterns of difference should not be generalized beyond the activities about which the SPPA asked.

Use of the Media for Arts Consumption. More people encountered the arts covered in the SPPA through the media than in live settings. The proportionate gap between white and minority attendance was smaller in consumption of the arts through the media than in live attendance. In other words, although members of all groups were more likely to watch the arts covered by the core questions than to attend them, this tendency was more pronounced in the case of minority group members than in the case of whites.

People who watched an arts program on television were more likely than others to attend comparable live events. Viewing and attending tended to be more closely associated for African-Americans and Hispanics than for non-Hispanic whites. Smaller intergroup differences for viewers than for nonviewers were evident in both 1982 and 1985 for Hispanic respondents with respect to classical music, musical theater, ballet, and art, and for African-American respondents with respect to opera and musical theater.

Musical Preference. Respondents were asked if they enjoyed listening to each of 13 musical genres: classical, opera, jazz, show tunes, big band, soul/rhythm and blues, rock, country western, easy listening, folk, bluegrass, hymns/gospels, and barbershop. Their responses indicated significant differences associated with race or ethnicity within the context of a national musical culture dominated by commercially produced genres. African-Americans were particularly likely to report enjoying such forms as jazz,

blues, and gospel, which have deep roots in the African-American experience, whereas white and Hispanic respondents were more likely to choose country western, easy listening, and rock. But even commercial genres like rhythm and blues or country western, which are associated historically with specific racial or ethnic groups, appear to have become part of a national musical culture. Thus, approximately one in four whites liked jazz and blues, and an equal proportion of African-Americans enjoyed country western. Preferences were neither sharply segmented by race nor indicative of an undifferentiated mass culture in which racial and ethnic differences have atrophied.

Few respondents in any group reported enjoying opera, although substantial minorities liked classical music, jazz, and show tunes. Although whites were considerably more likely than African-Americans to report enjoying classical music, Hispanics were almost as favorable in 1982 and more likely to report enjoying classical music than whites in 1985.

Parental guidance. White respondents were considerably more likely than either African-American or Hispanic respondents to report that their parents took them to art museums or listened to classical music when they were children. Whites were only somewhat more likely than African-Americans, who were more likely than Hispanics, to report that their parents took them to plays, dance performances, or classical music concerts, or that parents encouraged them to read when they were young.

Lessons and classes. African-Americans and whites were almost equally likely to report having taken many kinds of classes in the arts during the high school years, whereas whites were more likely to report taking classes before and/or after high school. By contrast, Hispanic-Americans were less likely than whites or African-Americans to report taking many kinds of arts classes when they were young. Differences were particularly marked with respect to music lessons and music appreciation courses.[2]

Net Differences Between African-Americans, Hispanics, and Whites. To what extent were differences in participation rates in the core activities the result of differences in the socioeconomic standing and demographic characteristics of African-Americans, Hispanics, and non-Hispanic whites? Logistic regression analyses were used to predict participation in core activities, with attention to the effects of group membership (African-American and Hispanic as compared to white), controlling for age, gender, educational attainment, occupation, family income, marital status, and SMSA residence.[3]

Even with these controls for sociodemographic factors, whites were significantly more likely than African-Americans to participate in most of the core consumption activities, but not in attending jazz concerts (for which African-Americans were significantly more likely to participate). Whites were also significantly more likely to participate by performing on a musical instrument or as actors, singers, or dancers.

With respect to the consumption activities, a substantial portion (but, with one exception, less than half) of the gross difference (*i.e.*, without controls) in participation rates between African-American and white Americans stemmed from sociodemographic, especially socioeconomic, differences between the races. When one looks not at probabilities of participation in specific activities but at a measure of the range of performing arts attendance (excluding jazz) in which respondents participated, more of the gross difference between African-Americans and whites is explained by sociodemographic factors.

Although these interracial differences survived the inclusion of numerous controls, they are small relative to differences associated with other determinants of participation. With respect to all of the activities for which being African-American was associated with significantly lower participation (relative to whites), the direct effect of race is dwarfed by the impact of educational attainment and (except for reading in 1982) exceeded by the effect of family income. Similarly, once other sociodemographic factors are taken into account, participation rates of African-Americans and whites are more similar than are rates for men and women for all such activities except visiting art exhibitions.

Although gross rates of participation in the core activities were similar for Hispanic and African-American respondents, larger proportions of the differences between Hispanics and whites than between African-Americans and whites stemmed from intergroup differences in sociodemographic attributes. Controlling for socioeconomic and demographic factors left significant differences between whites and Hispanics in both years only for reading and attendance at musical and dramatic theatrical performances — the only ones of the 10 core activities for which command of the English language is often essential.

Demand for More Participation

Some respondents in each year were shown a card listing the core arts attendance activities and told:

"Few people can do everything they would like to do. But if you could do any of the things listed on this card as often as you wanted, which ones would you do more often than you have during the last 12 months?"

Those respondents who said they would like to have attended a given kind of performance or exhibition more than they had in the past year were then asked to indicate what prevented them from participating more.

The percentage of respondents in each group who had not participated in each activity but who reported that they wanted to do so was added to the percentage who reported having participated to estimate a potential participation rate. These potential participation rates were much greater than actual participation rates for all groups. Except for white attendance (in 1982 and 1985) and Hispanic attendance (in 1985) at classical music concerts, and white and Hispanic visits to art museums and galleries (in both years), potential rates were at least twice the actual rates of attendance and, in many cases, were much greater.

Demand for participation in the seven core consumption activities appeared to be cultivated by attendance. People who already attended were much more likely to want to attend more than were people who had not. Thus, although there was much apparent unsated demand for these activities, most of it came from attenders rather than nonattenders. Because, with the exception of jazz performances, whites were more likely to attend than African-Americans or Hispanics, unsated demand appeared to be greater among whites. Moreover, nonattenders from groups that had the highest attendance rates (African-Americans for jazz, whites for everything else) were more likely than nonattenders from other groups to want to attend. Consequently, if everyone had done what they said they wanted to do, the absolute margins in participation rates between whites and everyone else would have been wider. (For the exceptional activity, jazz, the gap between African-Americans and others would have widened.) For most activities, however, the ratios of white to both African-American and Hispanic rates would have declined.

This could be interpreted as meaning that eliminating barriers to attendance would exacerbate intergroup differences in participation in the SPPA core activities (if one focuses on gross differences) or at best moderate only some differences, and these only slightly (if one focuses on ratios). This conclusion is questionable, however, on at least two grounds. First, the most important barriers to participation may be those that influence demand, not those that influence the ability of persons to satisfy demand they already have. Second, respondents to the SPPA "want-more" questions may have

responded on the basis of taken-for-granted understandings about the costs associated with getting more of what they wanted, thus artificially suppressing demand among groups facing greater barriers.

For members of all groups, cost and lack of time were the most important reasons given for nonparticipation. With respect to most activities, white respondents were more likely to give time as a reason than cost, and Hispanic respondents were more likely to cite cost than time. In 1982, African-American respondents were somewhat more likely to mention cost than time for most activities, whereas in 1985 they were somewhat more likely to cite time than cost. Lack of availability was frequently cited by whites and lack of accessibility was often mentioned by Hispanics. African-American respondents frequently mentioned these and also cited inadequate transportation as an impediment to attendance more than whites and, for most activities, more than Hispanics. For most activities, Hispanics were more likely than African-Americans or whites to cite child care problems as reasons for not attending. Fear of crime, being handicapped or having health problems, poor quality of available activities, inadequate publicity, work-related reasons, or inconvenient times of performance were rarely cited as reasons for not participating by respondents in any group.

Additional Findings from November/December 1982

Because all respondents to whom the SPPA was administered in November and December 1982 were asked all the questions, this subsample is useful for investigating a broader range of questions than could be addressed using data from the total 1982 or 1985 samples.

Net differences in parental guidance/lessons. Two scales were created: one to count the number of kinds of parental arts socialization each respondent reported receiving as a child, and one to count the number of kinds of arts lessons or classes taken by age 17. (Because the survey failed to distinguish between lessons at home and those at school, these are treated separately from parental guidance.) Although African-American and Hispanic respondents received fewer parental-guidance experiences and took fewer arts-related classes or lessons in their youth than whites, these differences were entirely a result of the fact that African-American and Hispanic respondents had parents who had received fewer years of formal education than did the parents of white respondents. Controlling for parental education, African-American and Hispanic parents gave their children *more* kinds of home

guidance experiences than did comparable white parents, and no differences remained in the number of kinds of lessons.

Taste for art music and related genres. Factor analysis isolated a cluster of musical genres (classical and chamber music, opera, show tunes, big band, and easy listening music) which were summed into an additive scale. White respondents scored significantly higher than African-Americans and Hispanics on this scale. Controls for sociodemographic factors reduced the sizable African-American/white difference by almost half, but a modest significant difference remained. Sociodemographic controls eliminated all of the differences between Hispanics and whites.

Viewing arts programs on television. A scale was created as a simple count of the number of kinds of arts programs that each respondent reported having watched on television. White respondents reported viewing slightly but significantly more kinds of televised arts programs than African-Americans or Hispanics, but these small differences were entirely the result of sociodemographic differences between whites and the other groups.

Participation scales. Factor analysis of combined responses to the SPPA's core and other participation questions generated five scales consisting of participation items reflecting, respectively: performing-arts attendance (including and excluding jazz); visual and literary consumption activities; performing-arts production activities; and visual and literary production activities. Regression analysis was used to examine the effects of race and ethnicity on these scales, controlling for sociodemographic characteristics, parental guidance and lessons, and artistic taste and interest as reflected by the art-music and television-viewing scales. The results added further evidence that one cannot generalize about the effects of race or ethnicity on cultural participation *per se*. Hispanic-Americans attend fewer public arts consumption activities than whites (both performing and visually oriented), but this difference was almost entirely the result of the fact that white Americans had more years of education, higher incomes, and higher status occupations. Hispanic respondents participated in no fewer art-producing activities (either performing or visual) than white respondents and, with both sociodemographic factors and guidance/lessons controlled, they participated in these art-producing activities significantly more than did comparable whites.

There is no statistically significant difference between African-Ameri-

can and white respondents with respect to participating onstage or backstage in performing-arts events, but African-Americans scored significantly lower than whites on the other scales. Sociodemographic differences, however, accounted for approximately 80 percent of the significant difference between African-Americans and white Americans in the number of kinds of performing-arts events attended with jazz excluded, and all of the difference with jazz included. The remaining gaps were not statistically significant.

Controlling for sociodemographic differences eliminated approximately 40 percent of the differences between white and African-American respondents in the visual/literary consumption and production scales, although small, but statistically significant differences remained. The remaining significant difference in production was attributable to differences between African-Americans and whites in childhood socialization in the arts (both at home and through lessons and classes); whereas the differences in consumption remained significant even after including the full range of controls.

Separate predictive models for African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites. Data on each group were separated in order to see if the factors predicting outcome measures were similar or different for the three groups. For the most part, artistic socialization, taste, and participation measures were predicted by the same variables for African-Americans and Hispanics as for whites. Two exceptions were notable, however.

First, the effects of age on parental socialization, taste for art music and related genres, and arts television watching were greater for whites than for African-Americans. With parental education controlled, white parents of young respondents offered fewer arts socialization experiences than comparably educated white parents of older respondents, whereas African-American parents of younger respondents offered more than comparable African-American parents of older respondents, suggesting that a convergence is occurring. Similarly, controlling for other sociodemographic factors, tastes for art music and viewing arts programs on television increased with age for whites, but not for African-Americans and Hispanics. (These differences were significant except for white/Hispanic viewing of arts programs on television.) Although these results might mean that white Americans' tastes change more with age than those of African-Americans or Hispanics, they may also indicate a convergence of all groups over time with respect to tastes for art music, and convergence between African-Americans and white Americans in watching arts programs on television. These findings are consistent with inspection of means by race and age: intergroup

differences in socialization and lessons, taste for art music, and arts television watching were smaller among younger respondents than for older respondents.

Second, education had a significantly stronger effect on viewing arts on television and on all of the participation scales except for performing-arts production activities for whites than for African-Americans, although in most cases education was a significantly positive predictor for both groups. Moreover, the effects of taking lessons or classes in the arts were less pronounced for African-Americans than for other groups, although these differences were not statistically significant. Watching the arts on television was also less strongly predictive of attendance for African-Americans, and the differences between African-Americans and Hispanics were significant with respect to visual-arts consumption and production activities. In other words, the analyses provided tentative evidence that formal education, both general and arts-specific, was less strongly related to interest and participation in the arts for African-Americans than for other groups.

Change over time. For most participation activities, gaps between white and minority populations were greater for older than for younger respondents. Most of the decline in intergroup differences appeared to be the result of changes in the sociodemographic profiles of African-American, Hispanic, and white Americans. Sharp increases in the educational attainment of African-Americans and Hispanics have narrowed the gap in participation in the arts by younger men and women.

Chapter 1

RACE, ETHNICITY, AND PARTICIPATION IN THE ARTS

Since the creation of the first modern museums and orchestras after the Civil War, many Americans have regarded the arts as a public good. Even during the Great Depression, a number of institutions, including the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Works Progress Administration of the federal government, supported the extension of the visual arts and "good" music to communities that had little access to them.[1] After World War II, especially from the 1960s on, attention turned specifically to making the arts available to groups believed to have been culturally isolated.

With the emergence of government and the large foundations as patrons of the arts, attention to minority participation became widespread. The shift of concern from the amount of artistic activity to the *distribution of opportunity* to participate in such activity stemmed from at least three separate factors.

First, due largely to the civil rights movement, the 1960s witnessed increased attention to the problems of the least well-off Americans and to the equitable distribution of such public goods as educational opportunity. Second, the traditionally dominant role of individual patrons in financing the arts was complemented by support from large institutions, especially private foundations and federal and state government agencies, which were compelled by their charter purposes to take a broad view of the public good. Third, with the expansion in the number and activity of arts organizations nationally in the 1970s, inequality of access to the arts came to be perceived less as a matter of regional disparity (at least among metropolitan areas) than of differences among groups within regions.

It is the purpose of this report to examine the participation of racial and ethnic minorities in certain arts activities, primarily as audience members and to a lesser degree as amateur producers of art. With the completion of the 1982 and 1985 Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPAs), more reliable data became available. Previous studies of attendance of racial and ethnic minorities in the arts were either narrow in scope or of dubious

technical quality. The SPPAs were undertaken by the U.S. Bureau of the Census as part of the National Crime Survey at the request of the National Endowment for the Arts. Responses from 17,254 persons in 1982 and 13,675 in 1985 were weighted (by age, gender, and race) to be representative of all noninstitutionalized Americans 18 years of age or older. The advantages of the SPPA data over data from earlier surveys include its national scope and representativeness, careful question design and pretesting, closely supervised survey administration (usually in person rather than over the telephone), the broad scope of the questions asked, and the large number of respondents. Consequently, the SPPAs permit researchers and policy makers to pose more interesting questions and to generalize more confidently than we have been able to do in the past.[2]

The SPPA included eight kinds of questions about cultural participation. The first set of questions (*core activities*) asked respondents to report on whether or not they had engaged in each of 10 kinds of activities during the previous year and, if so, how often they had done so during the previous month.[3] The second set of questions (*barriers*) asked respondents which of the core activities they would like to participate in more than they do now, and what factors prevent them from doing so. The third set of questions (*socialization*) asked respondents about the extent to which their parents encouraged certain kinds of participation in the arts and whether (and if so, when) they had taken several kinds of classes or lessons in the arts. The fourth set (not analyzed in this report) asked respondents about their participation in a range of non-arts activities. The fifth set (*location*) asked those who responded affirmatively to one or more of the core questions where their participation had taken place. The sixth set of questions (*musical preference*) asked respondents whether or not they liked each of several genres of music, and which they liked best. The seventh (*other participation*) asked whether or not respondents had participated in several cultural activities that were not included among the core questions. The last set (*media*) asked respondents whether they had watched or listened to several kinds of arts presentations on television, radio, records, or tapes. All respondents in both years were asked the core-activities questions, whereas only a portion (approximately one third in 1982 and one sixth in 1985) were asked the others.[4]

Defining Our Terms

The task of this report is less straightforward than it may appear. To explore the extent to which members of racial and ethnic minority groups are underrepresented as participants in the arts, it is necessary to define such

terms as "racial and ethnic minority," "underrepresentation," and "participation in the arts."

Different definitions of the terms entail different definitions of the problem and, in some cases, different implicit values as to what is desirable. Different definitions may also yield different conclusions. In the sections that follow, we explain how and why we define our terms as we do, and speculate about the possible consequences of our choices. These explanations provide warnings that may help the reader interpret our results.

Racial or ethnic minorities. The categories "race" and "ethnicity" are socially constructed, not scientifically given. The ways and the extent to which differences associated with racial or national origin are perceived as important bases for social cohesion, exclusion, and individual identity vary considerably among societies and across historical eras.[5] In the United States, race is treated as a social fact, and most respondents to surveys have little trouble designating themselves as African-American (or Black), white, Asian or Pacific Islander, or American Indian (or Native American).[6] These distinctions are reflected in relatively low rates of intermarriage among members of different racial groups, so defined. Because the SPPA sample was designed to be nationally representative as to race, we began with the racial categories available to us in that survey: in 1982, White, African-American, and Other; and, in 1985, White, African-American, Asian, and Other.[7]

With respect to ethnicity, the situation is more complicated. The SPPA data provide a single ethnic code for each respondent, but many Americans are of mixed national origin. When asked to designate their ethnicity, they may have difficulty doing so, and if they are compelled to do so, their responses may be only partially accurate. Moreover, the SPPAs were not designed to be representative with respect to ethnicity, as they were with respect to race. Therefore, we do not know whether patterns of participation in the arts found among respondents to the SPPA surveys are typical of (or generalizable to) members of their ethnic groups. These considerations, and a comparison of SPPA responses with those on the 1980 decennial census, which allowed for multiple national origins, led us to conclude that the ethnicity data in the SPPA were generally not suitable for our analyses.

At the same time, however, we concluded that the SPPA data *would* be useful for examining arts participation among Hispanic-Americans, including those respondents whose ethnicity was coded as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or Other Spanish. The proportions of respondents who reported their ethnic origin as Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban are comparable to those reported in the United States census, and few

Table 1–1
Comparison of National Origin Estimates from 1980 Census and 1982 and 1985 SPPAs

Origin	SPPA82	SPPA85	Census	Single	Multiple
German	8.9	8.0	26.1	36.5	63.5
Italian	3.7	3.8	6.5	56.5	43.5
Irish	5.0	4.6	21.3	25.7	74.3
French	1.6	1.9	6.9	23.8	76.2
Polish	1.9	1.8	4.5	46.3	53.7
Russian	1.0	0.8	1.5	49.6	50.4
English	5.5	5.4	26.3	47.9	52.1
Scottish	0.9	0.9	5.3	11.7	88.3
Welsh	0.3	0.2	0.9	18.5	81.5
Mexican	3.5	4.4	4.1	90.9	9.1
Puerto Rican	0.7	0.6	0.8	88.0	12.0
Cuban	0.4	0.2	0.3	83.7	16.3
Central/South American	0.5	0.8	NA	NA	NA
Other Spanish	0.6	0.6	NA	NA	NA
Afro-American	10.3	10.3	11.1	97.9	2.1
Other	55.3	55.7	NA	NA	NA

Note: Rightmost two columns report percentage of respondents to 1980 census in each national origin group who reported single and multiple national origins, respectively. Only those national origins coded in SPPA are included. Because respondents to the 1980 census could give multiple responses, the census columns sum to more than 100 percent. All percentages from SPPA are weighted by race, age, and gender, and missing data (1.95 percent for 1982, 2.55 percent for 1985) are omitted from base. Source for census data is Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, *Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980.* Supplementary Report PC80–S1–10, April, 1983 (Table 2).

census respondents in these categories reported multiple ethnic origins. Given these findings, and the fact that Hispanic-Americans represent an important set of ethnic minority groups in the United States, we felt warranted in distinguishing between Americans of Hispanic descent and other Americans in our analyses.[8]

Almost all Hispanic respondents to the 1982 and 1985 SPPA (99 and 97 percent, respectively) reported their race as white, and the absolute numbers of those who did not were far too small to permit separate analysis.[9] Therefore, we did not divide the Hispanic respondents by race.

On the basis of these decisions, we concentrate in this report on comparing the responses to the SPPAs of four groups, three racial and one ethnic: White Americans (not of Hispanic descent), African-Americans (not of Hispanic descent), Asian-Americans (not of Hispanic descent), and Hispanic-Americans. (Data permitting the separation of responses from Asian-Americans were available for 1985 only.) Although the SPPA surveys were designed and weighted to be representative of the racial composition of the American population, no such representativeness is guaranteed for the Hispanic ethnic category.

Finally, it should be recognized that although we focus on "Hispanic-Americans," this category includes members of ethnic groups that differ from one another in many respects.[10] Similarly, the African-American and white racial categories include members of diverse ethnic backgrounds. Indeed, it is possible that variations in behavior within these groups are greater than those between them. Our use of broad categories, despite the potential differences they may obscure, is based on the coding categories and numbers of respondents available to us in these data. We hope that in the future, surveys with a larger number of respondents will be conducted so that more refined ethnic categories can be employed, allowing researchers to discover differences and similarities in arts participation that cannot be identified using the categorization scheme currently available.

Table 1-2
Comparison of Estimates for Race and Hispanic Origin Between 1982 and 1985 SPPAs and 1980 Census

	SPPA82	SPPA85	1980 Census
White	87.1	87.2	85.0
Black	10.6	10.8	10.5
American Indian	NA	0.2	0.5
Asian	NA	1.6	1.5
Other	2.3	0.1	2.5
Hispanic Origin	5.6	6.7	5.5

Note: Individuals 18 and over only. SPPA figures based on data weighted for race, age, and gender. Census figures from Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, *General Population Characteristics: U.S. Summary*, PC80-1-B1 (tables 43 and 44). Census figures for "Other" calculated by subtracting sum of other racial categories from 100 percent.

Underrepresentation. The term "underrepresentation" is pejorative, indicating a state of affairs that is unjust. Because the term is value-laden and because it has several meanings, we shall avoid it in the narrative of this report. Nonetheless, because a concern with "underrepresentation" underlies the analyses we undertake, it is necessary to discuss the issue.

In one sense, members of a racial or ethnic group can be described as underrepresented relative to some other group if they participate less frequently in some activity. We can assess the degree of underrepresentation, thus defined, by comparing the *rates of participation* by different groups. If 24 percent of Group A reports attending arts and crafts fairs, for example, but just 12 percent of Group B, the members of Group B are underrepresented. We investigate underrepresentation by race and ethnicity in this sense in Chapter 2. If one is concerned with *equality of result — i.e.*, if one feels that equalizing participation in the arts is itself a legitimate goal of public policy — then such differences among groups are a concern in their own right.

By contrast, public policy in the United States has often been concerned not with equality of result but with *equality of opportunity*. From the perspective of equality of opportunity, it is less important that members of different groups all participate to the same degree than that persons are not disadvantaged, *by virtue of their racial or ethnic origin*, in attempting to share a public good. American society tolerates all sorts of inequality, so this argument goes, opposing as odious only inequality that results directly from statuses such as race or gender into which one is born. Thus what are important are not differences in rates of participation by members of different groups, but rather differences in opportunities to participate that are *a consequence of*, rather than simply associated with, membership in a racial or ethnic minority group.

In this view, the appropriate measure of underrepresentation is the existence of a negative effect of racial or ethnic group membership on rates of artistic participation, *net* the influence of people's other characteristics. To return to our previous example, imagine that members of Group A attend arts and crafts fairs less than members of Group B not because they are excluded on the basis of race but because they have less of other characteristics (*e.g.*, education or money) that are associated with participation. If we *control for* these other characteristics, we can estimate the net effect of racial or ethnic origin. This we do, using logistic regression analysis, in Chapter 3.

There is another reason one might wish to look at the "net effect" of race or ethnicity on artistic participation rather than the simple association of the

two. Measures of association, like those in the tables presented in Chapter 2, tell us what degree of inequality exists, but they do not tell us *why* it exists. Inspecting the factors that account for such variation in participation, as we do in Chapter 3, enables us to assess what would have to change to reduce the inequality we see. For example, if differences in the artistic participation of different racial or ethnic groups were simply a result of differences in the length of time members of different groups stay in school, then equalizing educational opportunity would suffice to equalize artistic participation. If not, then other programs would be required.

The factors that lead to participation in the arts may not be the same for all groups. If one is concerned with increasing racial or ethnic minority participation, then it is important to understand the factors that account for participation by members of these groups, and how these factors may differ from those predicting participation by members of the majority. In Chapter 3, we present results of separate analyses for white, African-American, and Hispanic respondents to the SPPAs, to explore the possibility that participation in the arts stems from different origins in each group.

The notion of "underrepresentation" implies that participation in the arts is a public good that, like education or political influence, almost anyone would find attractive. By contrast, most of us think of our artistic participation (or lack thereof) in individualistic, voluntaristic terms. Differences in artistic participation, either gross or net, may result from the exclusion of some groups from artistic opportunities (either through active discrimination, of the kind commonly exercised against African-Americans in the past, or through more subtle, perhaps unintended, social pressures that make members of minority groups feel unwelcome or uncomfortable at certain artistic events). Or they may simply reflect intergroup differences in taste or preferences. The SPPA data do not provide such clear accounts of the extent to which racial or ethnic differences in participation represent exclusion or differences in taste as they do of the extent to which such differences exist. But they do permit us to hazard some guesses, which we shall do in Chapter 4. Note, however, that many arts advocates may not regard such evidence as relevant to public policy. In their view, participation in the arts is a good thing, and people who do not want more of it may simply have been deprived of opportunities that would have awakened them to its virtues.

Finally, to the extent that underrepresentation (however defined) is a concern, it is important to know what subgroups are most underrepresented and whether underrepresentation is increasing or decreasing. In Chapter 5, we shall present the results of analyses comparing the extent of racial and ethnic differences in artistic participation among men and women and

among Americans of different ages and educational levels. In that chapter, we shall also use a special subsample of the 1982 SPPA that enables us to explore the impact of childhood experiences and indices of musical taste and artistic interest on several kinds of participation, controlling for socio-economic factors.

In summary, "underrepresentation" may mean at least three different things: 1) differences in the extent to which members of different groups participate; 2) differences in the extent of participation of members of some groups *compared with members of other groups who are in other respects similar to them*; or 3) differences in the extent of participation by members of different groups *attributable to differences in access rather than to differences in taste.* Each definition entails a different view of art and of the nature of a just society, and assessing underrepresentation according to each definition requires a different methodological approach. Rather than choose one, we address each definition, investigating the first two rather thoroughly and the third as much as limited data permit.

Artistic participation. No two people define "art" in exactly the same way. Some emphasize the most prestigious expressions of "high culture," others include such modern forms as jazz or film and "folk arts" or "crafts," and still others admit the full range of "the popular arts" distributed by the commercial media. People also differ in their estimation of the kinds of participation that are most important: some believe that any exposure to art is desirable, others value personal encounters more highly than exposure to the arts through broadcast or reproduction, and still others maintain that the best measure of our cultural well-being is the extent to which people create and perform art themselves.

We call attention to these issues because the extent to which we find intergroup differences in participation will depend on where we look, on the kinds of art forms and participation about which measures are available in our data. Fortunately the 1982 and 1985 SPPAs took a relatively inclusive view both of the arts and of participation. The core questions, for example, asked respondents about jazz, as well as classical music and opera; and asked respondents whether they played a musical instrument (in any kind of musical presentation) or acted, sang, or danced onstage, as well as whether they watched others do so. Respondents were asked whether they had taken classes in photography as well as in painting; and in crafts as well as fine arts and art or music appreciation. And one question asked respondents whether they enjoyed each of a wide range of musical genres, from country western to chamber music. Moreover, people were asked about the arts they watched

on television or listened to on radio or recordings, as well as those they witnessed live.

Nonetheless, the SPPA questions tend to reflect both its sponsorship by the National Endowment for the Arts, and what is probably a loose consensus among educated Americans as to what forms of artistic participation matter most. Thus the survey focuses predominantly upon the arts that are within the domain of the Arts Endowment. These include the kinds of performances or presentations that are sponsored by nonprofit cultural organizations or public television stations rather than those that are produced by commercial media conglomerates. They also focus on the kinds of performances that are more likely to take place on a public stage than in one's living room or on the street.

Notwithstanding the legitimacy of these emphases, the choice of activities and the way in which questions are worded may have influenced the patterns that emerged from the data. For one thing, the SPPA simply did not ask specifically about certain activities: *e.g.*, break dancing, graffiti art, clog dancing, mariachi music, many kinds of ethnic dance and song, or televised soap operas. Consequently, we cannot know if racial and ethnic patterns of participation in such activities are different from patterns in the activities about which the respondents were asked. It follows that the data cannot yield grand generalizations about racial and ethnic differences in "artistic participation," in the broadest definition of that term. To the extent that the SPPA focuses upon activities that are favored by white college graduates, it probably overestimates the extent of the difference between the artistic participation of white Americans and of everyone else.

On the other hand, certain questions were phrased so broadly that the absense of racial and ethnic differences in response would not permit us to infer that the practices of white, Hispanic-, Asian-, and African-Americans were the same. For example, the fact that similar proportions of two groups attend live plays does not mean that they are attending the same kinds of dramatic productions. It is important, therefore, to remember that our findings pertain to a circumscribed, although relatively broad, set of artistic practices.

Chapter 2

RATES OF PARTICIPATION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

In reporting the rates at which members of three racial and one ethnic group participate in several artistic activities, we shall compare responses to questions about different *kinds* of artistic activities to see if the pattern of intergroup differences can give us hints as to the sources of racial and ethnic variation. These comparisons allow us to document differences in participation, but not to explain them. Differences may result

- from patterns of racial or ethnic exclusion,
- from differences in taste that are associated with race or ethnicity, or
- from factors such as educational attainment or occupational status that are associated with both race and participation in the arts.

The Core Activities

We begin by looking at responses to questions about participation in 10 core activities about which respondents were asked each month in which the surveys were administered. Responses to these questions, weighted by age, race, and gender, appear in Table 2-1.

Respondents were asked whether they had participated in each activity during the previous year, and how many times they had participated during the previous month. Because participation rates during the previous month were low for all groups, we focus here on whether or not respondents reported engaging in each activity during the *year* before the survey was administered.[1] The way in which this question was phrased means that we do not know whether members of different groups who answered affirmatively differed in their frequency of participation over the course of the year. The respondent who attended a single play during the previous year, for example, is treated no differently than one who attended 20.

We report the percentage of the members of different groups who participate. This is very different from the percentage of visits or attendance for which members of each group account. Previous research indicates that a relatively few people account for a large proportion of visits to museums and attendance at performing-arts events because they go very frequently.[2] If one's primary interest is in these high attenders, the data reviewed here are of limited value. On the other hand, earlier studies and SPPA evidence on participation during the previous month suggest that high attenders represent only a small minority of the American population. Thus the data are suitable for comparing rates of attendance of groups within that population.

We can make several generalizations about responses to core questions for 1982 and 1985. First, the absolute differences between groups with respect to core activities are relatively small, with spreads of from one-tenth of 1 percent (Hispanic ballet attendance in 1982) to, at most, almost 24 percent (Hispanic fiction reading in 1982) between minority groups and the white majority. For the most part, absolute percentage differences are low because relatively few members of any group participate in the core activities (aside from reading literature). For example, the largest percentage of any group that attended opera was the 4.58 percent of Asian-Americans in 1985. The highest rate of visiting art galleries and museums was 26.02 percent (again for Asian-Americans in 1985). Participation rates for other activities were intermediate.

Taking just those groups for which data are available for both years (whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics), we see that participation rates were higher for whites in both years for all but attendance at jazz concerts. Taking not the absolute differences but rather the odds ratios, we see that for some activities these differences were sizable. For example, in both years, whites were more than twice as likely as African-Americans to report attending a classical music concert, an opera performance, a musical theater performance, a play, or a ballet. In 1985, they were more than twice as likely to report visiting an art gallery or museum. Non-Hispanic whites were also more than twice as likely as Americans of Hispanic origin to report attending a play (in both years) and in 1985 attending a classical music concert or an opera performance.[3] Hispanic respondents reported rates of attendance comparable to those of whites at jazz concerts, operas, and ballet in 1982, although the gap widened slightly in 1985.

Inspecting ratios of the probability of participation in many core activities for white respondents to the probability of participation for minority respondents makes the differences between groups look large. We can turn the measure around and look, instead, at the ratio of the probability that

Table 2–1
Participation in Core Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity

	Attend jazz concert		Attend classical concert	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	9.13	9.48	14.42	14.31
	13,890	10,861	13,909	10,875
African-American	15.64	13.08	6.67	6.39
	1,654	1,384	1,656	1,384
Hispanic	8.27	6.55	7.87	6.77
	940	788	941	789
Asian	—	7.81	—	16.50
	—	232	—	232

	Attend Ballet		Visit Art Exhibit	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	4.64	4.72	23.94	24.14
	13,913	10,878	13,905	10,872
African-American	1.78	2.14	12.47	10.71
	1,657	1,385	1,656	1,385
Hispanic	4.54	3.21	16.22	18.18
	941	790	941	790
Asian	—	6.22	—	26.02
	—	232	—	232

Table 2–1 (Continued)
Participation in Core Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity

	Attend opera performance		Attend musical		Attend play	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	3.33	2.97	20.67	18.60	13.44	13.10
	13,901	10,861	13,908	10,873	13,899	10,869
African-American	1.36	1.43	10.10	8.45	5.82	6.09
	1,654	1,384	1,656	1,384	1,655	1,383
Hispanic	2.52	0.78	10.96	9.52	5.47	6.41
	940	788	940	789	941	788
Asian	—	4.58	—	13.89	—	8.87
	—	232	—	231	—	232

	Perform on musical instrument		Perform: act/sing/ dance		Read fiction	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	4.01	2.98	4.68	4.27	60.19	59.66
	13,916	10,879	13,916	10,879	13,868	10,852
African-American	3.35	1.72	4.87	3.49	42.41	43.34
	1,658	1,385	1,658	1,385	1,651	1,381
Hispanic	3.11	2.03	2.85	2.63	36.45	41.46
	941	790	941	790	938	788
Asian	—	3.82	—	4.00	—	53.73
	—	232	—	232	—	230

Note: First line to right of racial ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during 12 months preceding survey. Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, Asian-Americans were included in an "Other" racial category.

minority respondents do *not* participate in an activity to the probability that whites do *not* participate. Viewed this way, the same intergroup differences seem much smaller. For example, in 1982 whites were well over twice as likely as African-Americans (a big difference) to have attended an opera, but African-Americans were only 2 percent more likely than whites (a tiny difference) to have abstained from opera attendance. Similarly, in 1985, white respondents were twice as likely as Hispanic respondents to have attended a classical music performance, but Hispanics were only 9 percent more likely than whites *not* to have attended.

Responses of Asian-Americans (available only in 1985) resemble those of white Americans. (So few Asian respondents were included in the survey that we cannot be as confident that the percentages reflect actual population distributions.) Asian respondents were somewhat more likely than whites to attend classical music concerts, operas, and ballet performances, and to visit art galleries and museums. They were less likely than whites to attend jazz concerts, musical theater, and stage plays, but white rates of attendance were in all cases less than 50 percent greater than those of Asians.

Rates of public performance were lower than those for attendance at arts events for members of all groups, and these rates varied less among the groups than those for attendance. African-Americans were more likely than others to report singing, acting, or dancing onstage in 1982 (but not in 1985), and Asian-Americans were more likely to report performing publicly on musical instruments than any other group in 1985. Hispanics were somewhat less likely than others to report performing onstage, but the absolute margin of difference is very small.

We may infer from this that artistic participation is more equal among ethnic groups with respect to performing than with respect to watching other people perform. We would also note, however, that the wording of the performance questions was somewhat broader than that of the attendance questions, covering any kind of public performance in any musical, dramatic, or dance style. Respondents who answered the music performance question affirmatively were then asked if they performed classical music and if they performed jazz. One-fourth of the white musical performers and one-fifth of the Hispanic reported that they had played classical music, compared to one in ten of the African-American musical performers in 1982. (In 1985, the comparable figures were 71 percent for Asians, 32 percent for whites, 24 percent for Hispanics and 19 percent for African-Americans.) In 1982, more than one-fourth of the Hispanics and more than one-fifth of the whites who reported performing on an instrument in public said that they had played jazz, compared to just 16 percent of the African-American instrumentalists.

(In 1985, the comparable proportions were 36 percent for Hispanics, 26 percent for whites, 17 percent for African-Americans, with no Asian reporting a public performance of jazz.)

Instrumentalists who performed in public but played neither classical music nor jazz presumably were playing either folk or ethnic music or some form of commercial popular music. Thus we can infer that in 1982, 77 percent of African-American instrumentalists, compared to 63 percent of whites and 70 percent of Hispanics, played exclusively commercial popular or folk/ethnic music. (In 1985, the figures were 71 percent for African-Americans, 55 percent for whites, 57 percent for Hispanics, and 29 percent for Asians.) Had the question been restricted to classical music and jazz, as were many questions in the SPPA, ratios of white to African-American participation rates would have been higher, and Hispanic participation rates would have exceeded those of African-Americans. These results serve well to illustrate how the size and direction of intergroup differences are influenced by the ways in which "the arts" are defined.

Although the music performance question is unusual in permitting inference about participation in popular commercial art forms, other options do vary in the extent to which they focus upon conventionally prestigious "high culture" activities. Are racial and ethnic differences greater with respect to well-established forms of high culture and smaller for more contemporary or commercial forms? The gaps between whites and Asians, on the one hand, and Hispanics and African-Americans, on the other, are striking with respect to classical music and, to a lesser extent, opera and art exhibits. But the gap between whites, on one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanics on the other, is also sizable with respect to stage plays and musical theater presentations, often seen as more popular events; and differences between whites and Hispanics in ballet are relatively modest. Thus responses to the core questions defy generalization on this issue.

Although African-Americans report the lowest participation levels with respect to most of the attendance activities, they report the highest rates of attendance at jazz concerts. Jazz is notable because it is the single art form included in the core questions that has emerged out of the African-American experience; and, although jazz attendance is a minority pursuit among African-Americans and jazz has established itself within American music more broadly, African-Americans artists are still especially prominent as composers and musicians. (The jazz audience is predominantly white, but only because there are so many more white Americans than African-Americans.[4]) African-Americans were more than 60 percent more likely than whites to report attending a jazz concert in 1982, and more than 35 percent

more likely to do so in 1985. This anomalous finding is important, for it shows that the gap between African-Americans and whites with respect to other kinds of attendance does not reflect a generalized indisposition towards attendance at the performing arts within the African-American subsample.

Differences in Core Participation Among Hispanic Ethnic Groups

The Hispanic subgroups vary with respect to demographic attributes such as age and formal educational attainment. These subgroups also vary substantially in their participation in core activities of the SPPA. The 1982 SPPA included data from 425 Mexican-Americans, but only 98 Puerto Ricans, 47 Cuban-Americans, and 143 Hispanics with other national backgrounds. Evidence from the 1985 survey is even more limited, with 382 Mexican-American respondents, but just 62 Puerto Ricans, only 22 Cuban-Americans, and 131 in the "other Hispanic" category.

In both 1982 and 1985, respondents in the "other" category participated in most activities more than members of the named Hispanic ethnic groups, and, especially in 1985, their pattern of participation was similar to that of non-Hispanic whites. Puerto Rican and Mexican-American respondents tended to report lower levels of participation, although the former were relatively more active in 1985 than in 1982. (See Table 2-2.)

These differences are both suggestive and consistent with what we know about differences in age and educational attainment among these segments of the heterogeneous Hispanic-American community. But without systematic sampling of larger numbers of Hispanic respondents, we can treat these findings only as bases for hypotheses to be explored in future research.

Participation in Other Artistic Activities

An additional set of questions was asked of approximately one-third of the respondents in 1982 and one-sixth in 1985. Several of these questions focused on visual and craft arts, and on activities that involved "making" art rather than "consuming" it. This set of questions also asked respondents if they had read or listened to poetry, visited historical or science museums or visited historical monuments.

Weighted participation rates by race/ethnicity are reported in Table 2-3.

Table 2–2
Participation in Core Activities by Hispanic-Origin Ethnic Groups, 1982 and 1985

	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Other	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Jazz	6.40	6.45	2.02	11.04	5.74	4.41	8.78	8.27
Classical	7.57	5.03	2.89	6.41	8.36	0.00	9.65	11.46
Opera	1.44	0.24	2.40	2.03	8.86	3.85	5.95	0.91
Musical	10.91	6.53	5.84	17.53	12.46	6.23	12.62	21.05
Play	3.62	4.83	3.80	6.57	7.35	3.85	11.97	13.29
Ballet	4.35	2.08	1.79	1.27	7.27	0.00	7.75	7.22
Art Ex.	13.44	15.43	16.84	18.35	18.40	12.07	19.82	29.49
Perform: Music	2.09	2.50	2.05	0.00	8.97	0.00	0.65	2.55
Perform: Sing, etc.	2.23	2.12	3.99	0.00	4.42	0.00	0.82	1.46
Read	29.22	37.70	34.72	39.63	29.31	42.65	48.93	57.42
N	425	382	98	62	47	22	143	131

Note: N for Mexican-Americans in 1982 is 424 for attending operas and musicals. N for Mexican-Americans in 1985 is 380 for jazz and opera, 381 for plays. N for Other in 1985 is 130 for plays. Ns are unweighted, percentages are weighted.

Whites were substantially more likely to participate in the attendance activities and creative writing than Hispanics, who were somewhat more likely to do so than African-Americans. For visiting history or science museums and historical monuments, differences in African-American and white rates were substantial. In 1985, for example, 26 percent of white respondents, but just 11 percent of African-Americans, attended a science or history museum. More than 40 percent of the white Americans, but just 18 percent of the African-Americans, visited a historical monument.

White respondents were more likely than African-Americans or Hispanics to report attending arts or craft fairs in the previous year: 43 percent of whites in 1982 and 45 percent in 1985, compared to 27 and 26 percent for

Table 2–3
Participation in Other Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity

	Visit non-art musem		Visit hist. monument	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	24.06	26.08	40.19	40.09
	3,461	1,860	3,462	1,858
African-American	13.20	11.23	21.68	17.50
	416	249	417	248
Hispanic	21.09	16.26	26.99	23.95
	186	144	185	144
Asian	—	16.57	—	31.06
	—	37	—	37

	Work with pottery		Weave, crochet	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	13.29	12.68	33.58	30.67
	3,463	1,857	3,463	1,857
African-American	6.93	5.42	22.97	15.58
	417	249	417	249
Hispanic	8.82	8.95	22.20	16.48
	186	144	186	144
Asian	—	4.14	—	38.74
	—	37	—	37

Table 2–3 (Continued)
Participation in Other Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity

	Read/listen poetry		Arts/craft fair		Take art lessons	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	20.66	20.37	43.18	44.56	11.12	10.98
	3,461	1,854	3,462	1,857	3,462	1,859
African-American	15.12	14.16	17.14	15.41	8.08	7.03
	417	248	417	249	417	249
Hispanic	16.83	14.83	26.50	26.03	10.60	6.92
	186	142	186	142	186	143
Asian	—	20.17	—	43.71	—	15.56
	—	37	—	37	—	37

	Creative writing		Photography, film		Paint or draw	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	6.70	6.73	11.05	10.67	10.34	9.54
	3,463	1,857	3,461	1,856	3,463	1,859
African-American	5.72	4.56	8.01	8.54	7.59	5.04
	416	249	417	248	417	249
Hispanic	6.97	4.00	7.91	5.23	8.80	9.01
	186	144	185	144	186	143
Asian	—	3.02	—	7.71	—	7.70
	—	37	—	37	—	37

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during 12 months preceding survey. Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. Asian-Americans who were included in an "Other" racial category are not included here for 1982.

Hispanics and just 17 and 15 percent for African-Americans. By contrast, whites were only somewhat more likely to have read or listened to poetry.

Data were available from only 37 Asian-Americans, too few for confident statistical inference, so participation rates for this group are suggestive at best. Asian respondents attended art and craft fairs and read or listened to poetry at roughly the same rates as whites. Their attendance at science and history museums was comparable to that of Hispanics, whereas their rate of visiting historical monuments fell between the white and Hispanic levels.

The percentages of the African-American, white, and Hispanic groups that attended science or history museums — and the differences in those rates — were similar to patterns for attendance at art galleries and museums. This suggests that the latter differences have as much to do with museum visiting *per se* as with the content or exhibits of art museums.

Other activities covered in this section of the SPPA were creative pastimes that individuals could pursue in private: taking lessons in writing, music, arts, dance, or crafts; working with pottery, ceramics, jewelry, leather, or metal; practicing a needlecraft (weaving, sewing, or others); creative writing; photography, film, or video "as an artistic activity"; and painting, drawing, sculpting, or printmaking. (Respondents were also asked if they had worked backstage at musical or other kinds of performances, but so few had that we do not report the results here.)

Most intergroup differences with respect to these creative activities were strikingly small. In 1985, for example, 11 percent of the white respondents, compared to 7 percent of both African-Americans and Hispanics, reported taking art lessons; 7 percent of the whites, 5 percent of the African-Americans, and 4 percent of the Hispanics engaged in creative writing; 10 percent of the whites, 5 percent of the African-Americans, and 9 percent of the Hispanics created in the visual and plastic arts. In 1982 Hispanics were somewhat more likely to report creative writing than whites. Whites were twice as likely as Hispanics to report art lessons, photography, and film making in 1985, but not in 1982. Asian-American responses were high to moderate compared to those of other groups.

Differences were greater for creative activity in the craft arts, both needlecrafts and other crafts. Whites were 50 percent more likely than both African-Americans and Hispanics in 1982, and almost twice as likely in 1985, to report sewing, weaving, or similar activities. They were almost twice as likely in 1982 and more than twice as likely in 1985 as African-Americans, and about 50 percent more likely than Hispanics in both years to report working with pottery, ceramics, or comparable materials. This pattern suggests that with respect to *making* the visual arts, rates of minority

participation relative to those of the white majority are no higher, and in fact may be lower, for the craft arts than for more prestigious creative activities like drawing, photography, or painting. The data as a whole indicate that minority group members are less likely to attend cultural institutions, relative to whites, than to be found in the ranks of amateur creative artists. Nonetheless, the tendency of white Americans to participate at higher rates than others manifests itself in responses to most of these questions.

Use of the Media for Exposure to the Arts

A subset of respondents to the SPPAs (approximately one-fourth in 1982 and approximately one-sixth in 1985) were asked if they had, during the past year, seen or heard a jazz performance, a classical music performance, an opera, a musical theater production, a stage play, a ballet performance, or a visual arts program on television and, where appropriate, radio or sound recording. These questions are of particular interest for two reasons. First, policy makers have viewed the media, especially television, as an important means of increasing exposure to art forms that have benefitted from public subsidy. To the extent that participation by minorities in consuming the arts via the media is greater relative to the non-Hispanic white majority than their attendance at live performances, many would regard such an apparent equalization of one kind of artistic opportunity as another benefit of programs that promote the arts on television and radio.

Second, a comparison of differences in the use of media arts programs by different groups with those intergroup differences that emerge when we look at attendance at live events and exhibitions may provide clues as to the origins of the latter differences. Nearly all American families own television sets, and nearly all television sets receive one or more public television stations, which tend to broadcast fine arts programming. As such, consumption of the arts on television or radio is costless, except in time. Roughly speaking, if intergroup differences are simply a matter of taste, we should not expect them to be much reduced when we compare viewing a kind of art on television to attending the same activity in person. If they are reduced, this suggests that lower levels of live attendance may reflect not simply differences in taste, but differences in the resources necessary to attend or in the comfort felt in the places where live performances and exhibitions are held.

The results (Table 2-4) are striking in two respects. First, more people encountered the arts about which the SPPA asked through the media than in

Table 2–4
Use of Media for Arts Consumption by Race/Ethnicity

	Watch jazz on TV		Listen jazz on radio	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	16.91 3,288	14.97 1,705	15.78 3,281	15.47 1,699
African-American	27.95 366	37.94 186	36.01 366	32.42 186
Hispanic	16.06 203	15.05 123	17.45 201	19.43 124
Asian	— —	24.85 37	— —	35.90 36

	Classical records		Opera on TV	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	23.54 3,264	22.49 1,698	12.45 3,288	12.78 1,710
African-American	13.24 362	15.48 186	9.32 366	9.97 187
Hispanic	15.58 200	11.03 123	9.71 203	12.70 123
Asian	— —	46.63 36	— —	25.16 37

	Musical theater on TV		Musical theater on radio	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	21.04 3,279	17.43 1,707	4.22 3,275	4.92 1,700
African-American	17.21 366	17.82 186	4.44 366	2.80 186
Hispanic	17.83 203	17.67 124	4.09 201	6.50 124
Asian	— —	40.12 37	— —	14.10 37

Table 2–4 (Continued)
Use of Media for Arts Consumption by Race/Ethnicity

	Listen jazz records		Classical music on TV		Classical radio	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	18.42	17.03	26.04	24.89	20.49	22.01
	3,260	1,695	3,287	1,709	3,276	1,703
African-American	36.62	36.45	15.68	21.88	15.40	17.49
	361	186	366	187	364	187
Hispanic	18.76	16.18	21.66	18.59	19.90	18.05
	201	124	203	124	201	124
Asian	—	19.71	—	41.86	—	38.51
	—	36	—	37	—	36

	Opera on radio		Opera records	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	7.35	7.03	8.23	8.19
	3,269	1,702	3,281	1,709
African-American	5.32	4.36	3.94	4.31
	363	187	366	186
Hispanic	5.26	6.17	3.18	3.03
	201	124	202	124
Asian	—	11.04	—	14.10
	—	36	—	37

	Musical theater records		Stage play on TV		Stage play on radio	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	9.53	8.24	27.86	22.91	3.90	3.93
	3,271	1,697	3,284	1,707	3,272	1,695
African-American	1.89	5.07	18.21	18.60	2.67	3.90
	365	185	366	186	361	183
Hispanic	3.40	3.00	14.58	15.38	6.54	3.34
	200	124	203	124	199	123
Asian	—	19.39	—	25.45	—	0.00
	—	37	—	37	—	37

Table 2–4 (Continued)
Use of Media for Arts Consumption by Race/Ethnicity

	Ballet on TV		Art on TV	
	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	16.98	15.00	23.74	26.75
	3,278	1,707	3,275	1,706
African-American	10.34	15.66	19.48	23.62
	365	187	366	187
Hispanic	15.09	16.58	16.37	18.40
	203	123	202	124
Asian	—	40.92	—	38.02
	—	37	—	37

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during 12 months preceding survey. Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, the "Other" category included Asian-Americans, whereas in 1985 it did not. For the media questions, which were asked only two months of 1985, only two respondents were in the "Other" category, too few to warrant reporting results.

live settings. Persons in every racial or ethnic group in each year were more likely to see a jazz concert, a classical music performance, an opera, a stage play, or a ballet on television (and in the case of the first three, to hear such an event on radio or recording) than to attend a live event. This tendency was less pronounced for musical theater (which, in 1985, a slightly larger proportion of the white sample reported seeing live than on television) and for the visual arts. (For the visual arts, white and Hispanic, but not African-American, television viewing were roughly comparable to attendance at galleries or museums.)

Second, the proportionate gap between white and minority attendance was smaller in consuming the arts through the media than in live attendance. The only exceptions were jazz, where African-Americans were even more likely than whites to report hearing jazz on television, radio, and record than in live performances; and the substantial gaps between Asians and all other groups in media-linked consumption of classical music, opera, musical theater, ballet, and the visual arts. (The evidence on Asian-Americans is intriguing, but inconclusive because the number of respondents [37] is so small.) In other words, although members of all groups were more likely to

watch these art forms than to attend, this tendency was more pronounced for minority groups than for whites.

Consider a few examples from 1985. That year, 24 percent of white respondents, compared to 6 percent of African-Americans and 7 percent of Hispanics, reported attending classical music concerts. By contrast, 25 percent of the whites, compared to 22 percent of the African-Americans and 19 percent of the Hispanics, reported watching classical music on television. In other words, in 1985 whites were twice as likely as Hispanics and more than twice as likely as African-Americans to attend a classical concert; but only 14 percent more apt than African-Americans and only 32 percent more likely than Hispanics to watch one on television. That same year, whites were more than twice as likely as African-Americans, and about 50 percent more likely than Hispanics to attend a ballet performance. By contrast, slightly larger proportions of the latter groups watched ballet on television than did whites.

These findings are notable for two reasons. First, they tell us that the media, especially television, have done much to ensure that African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans are nearly as likely as whites to expose themselves to classical music, opera, musical theater, drama, ballet, and the visual arts. Second, they indicate that a substantial proportion of African-Americans and Hispanics who do not attend such events in person are sufficiently interested to watch them on television. This finding suggests the potential for developing minority audiences, and leads one to ask why African-American and Hispanic-Americans who view the arts on television do not attend them live. Do intergroup differences in attendance reflect differences in opportunity as well as taste?

The implications of these data are inconclusive for four reasons. First, attending a live event requires more commitment than watching a similar program on television. To do the former one must spend time in transit, usually pay some money, and face embarrassment if one wishes to leave. By contrast, one can view the arts on television free of charge and without preparation, and leave a performance by changing the channel. We do not know how many respondents who reported watching opera on television, for example, did so intently or repeatedly and how many simply spent a few minutes watching an opera in between action adventure shows. People who watch fine arts events on television but not in person may have less interest than those who see them live, albeit more interest than persons who neither watch nor attend such activities.

Second, it is necessary to disentangle watching televised arts programs from television viewing generally. African-Americans and Hispanics, on

average, watch more television than whites; however, analyses described in Chapter 5 (Appendix Tables 5-7 and 5-14) indicate that their relatively high consumption of televised arts programming does not simply reflect a greater propensity to watch television. For the full sample, overall television watching has a small, significant positive effect on the number of kinds of arts programs a respondents watched. But even with that measure controlled, African-Americans and Hispanics watch as much arts programming as comparable whites. Separate analyses on African-American, Hispanic, and white subsamples indicate that within each group, general television watching has no significant impact on viewing arts television, with appropriate controls.

Third, we do not know if the musical performances, plays, or dance presentations that people watch on television are similar to the ones they attend live. It may be that some African-Americans and Hispanics are more likely to watch arts events on television than to attend them because they prefer the specific programs on television to those available in their communities.

Finally, these data tell us nothing about the quality of the televised arts experience. Many would argue that television simply cannot capture the sound of a symphony hall or the texture and color of a work of art. Others would contend that attending an arts event represents a statement of social membership that solitary consumption cannot duplicate. We have no data that bear on these issues, which are matters of value rather than social science research. Nonetheless, if one holds to either of these views, a world in which African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans disproportionately experience the arts via media and white Americans experience them disproportionately in person does not seem equitable. By contrast, if one believes that it is good to have contact with the arts forms about which the media questions asked, and that they are as rewarding televised as live, or that watching such events on television will lead to attendance, these findings are encouraging.[5]

We explored these issues further by comparing the percentage of respondents in each group who watched a given kind of arts program on TV and who also attended comparable live events to the percentage of those who did not see such events on television but did attend in person. For all groups, people who watched an arts program on television were more likely than others to attend comparable live events (see Appendix Tables 2-2 and 2-3). In some cases the tendency was slight: for example, in 1982, Hispanic respondents who watched jazz programs on television were only 6 percent more likely than those who did not to go to live events. By contrast, Hispanic respondents in 1982 who watched classical music programs were more than

10 times as likely to attend live classical music performances than were those who did not.

A tendency for arts viewing and attending to be more closely associated for African-Americans and Hispanics than for whites (with smaller intergroup differences for viewers than for nonviewers) was evident in both 1982 and 1985 for Hispanic respondents with respect to classical music, musical theater, ballet, and art, and for African-American respondents with respect to opera and musical theater. These findings may indicate that for these art forms television has served to develop an appetite for live attendance among new minority audiences. On the other hand, they could mean that African-American and Hispanic audiences of these events are more likely than whites to pursue their interest by watching them on television; or that watching these arts on television is more closely associated with other characteristics that lead to live attendance among African-Americans and Hispanics than among whites. Therefore, caution demands that these findings be regarded as no more than the basis for hypotheses to be pursued in future studies.

Musical Preferences

We have hypothesized that more specific definitions of art forms or genres vary more markedly with race and ethnicity than categories that are broadly defined. During certain months, the SPPA asked respondents if they liked to listen to any of a range of musical genres: classical music, opera, show tunes, jazz, soul/blues, big band, country western, bluegrass, rock, easy listening, folk, barbershop and hymns or gospel. The question did not include such genres as rap, salsa, mariachi, cajun, reggae, or polka, for which even greater racial or ethnic variation in taste might be expected. Although the question is not, strictly speaking, about participation, it provides an opportunity to investigate intergroup differences in taste for a wider range of musical genres than that about which the core or other participation questions ask.

Responses are described in Table 2-5. Intergroup differences are summarized by the correlations at the bottom of that table. Correlations between groups for 1982 are below the diagonal, for 1985 above it. Correlations on the diagonal describe the relationship between each group's own responses for 1982 and 1985. A correlation is a measure of association, in this case between the percentages of each group who reported liking each kind of music, that ranges from −1.0 to +1.0. If tastes were perfectly coincident, the correlation would be 1.0. If they were totally opposed, it would be −1.0.

Table 2–5
Percentage Reporting That They Enjoy Specific Musical Genres, by Race/Ethnicity, 1982 and 1985

	Whites		African-Americans		Hispanics	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Classical	29.45	27.13	15.74	12.61	25.68	31.32
Opera	10.41	11.52	5.74	7.05	5.51	10.29
Show tunes	25.60	26.77	12.25	12.32	15.51	23.23
Jazz	24.52	30.19	43.23	57.82	26.67	41.57
Soul/blues	23.07	28.87	61.14	72.45	28.74	34.80
Big band	35.69	35.28	18.53	20.94	23.91	21.52
Country	63.68	57.46	24.65	27.10	49.26	52.95
Bluegrass	28.27	27.59	5.07	3.02	9.51	15.85
Rock	36.71	43.17	29.59	32.29	37.49	51.01
Easy listening	52.39	54.85	24.93	43.17	40.30	46.29
Folk	28.00	27.43	8.72	13.66	18.01	19.93
Barbershop	16.70	17.53	4.60	2.88	5.18	7.67
Hymns/gospel	34.30	38.30	64.49	65.05	16.40	26.61
N	4,518	1,758	532	156	277	113

Correlations	White	African-American	Hispanic
White	.97	.41	.84
African-American	.18	.97	.56
Hispanic	.86	.37	.96

Note: Pearson correlations. 1985 above diagonal, 1982 below. Diagonal=correlation between 1982 and 1985 for each group. Correlations subject to rounding error. Z-scores presented in Appendix Table 2–1.

The diagonal correlations indicate that the musical tastes of each group were highly stable between 1982 and 1985. Correlations between the tastes of white and Hispanic respondents were also very high in both years. (Both whites and Hispanics favored country western music above any other genre, both liked easy listening music, and few in either group enjoyed opera.)

In 1982, the correlation between African-American and white tastes was .18, positive but nonetheless considerably weaker than any other association in the table. African-Americans were less likely than whites to report enjoying classical or chamber music, and whites were less likely than African-Americans to report enjoying jazz. The largest differences between the groups, however, were for soul/blues, country western, easy listening and hymns or gospel music. For example, more than 60 percent of African-American respondents, but fewer than one in four of the whites, reported liking soul or blues music. Less than one-fourth of the African-Americans but almost two-thirds of the whites enjoyed country western. More than half the whites but fewer than one in four African-Americans liked easy listening music. About one-third of the white respondents, but almost two-thirds of the African-American respondents, enjoyed hymns or gospel music. Sizable minorities of white respondents, but very few African-American respondents, reported enjoying folk or bluegrass music. Although whites were 80 percent more likely than African-Americans to report that they liked opera, the two groups were similar in that few respondents, African-American or white, reported enjoying this form. In 1985, the African-American/white correlation (based on a smaller sample than in 1982) rose substantially to .41. Most of the increase resulted from a marked rise in the proportion of African-American respondents who reported that they enjoyed easy listening music, although there was some slight convergence in taste for opera, big band, country western, folk, and hymns or gospel music as well.

Correlations between Hispanic and African-American tastes were midway between those between African-Americans and white preference, .37 in 1982 and .56 in 1985. Like whites, Hispanics tended to enjoy country western and easy listening music and were less likely than African-Americans to report enjoying soul music or blues. Like African-Americans, they were less likely than whites to like big band music or, in 1982, show tunes and bluegrass. Hispanic respondents reported liking hymns or gospel music less than either African-Americans or whites.

These results indicate notable differences associated with race or ethnicity in a national musical culture dominated by commercially produced genres. On the one hand, African-Americans are particularly supportive of forms like jazz, soul or blues, and gospel, all of which have deep roots in the

African-American experience; and relatively uninvolved in such forms as bluegrass, barbershop, or, relative to others, country western music, associated with white subcultures. But even genres associated with specific racial or ethnic communities appear to have permeated a national musical culture. Thus approximately one in four whites liked jazz and soul/blues, and an equal proportion of African-Americans enjoyed country western music. The findings lend support to images neither of racially segmented cultures nor of a homogeneous mass society where racial and ethnic differences have atrophied. Instead, we find differentiation without segmentation.

African-Americans were less likely to report liking classical music than white or Hispanic respondents, and opera was enjoyed by only small minorities in any group. In 1985, Hispanics were more likely than whites to report enjoying classical music, ranking it sixth among the thirteen genres, higher than whites, who ranked it tenth, or African-Americans, for whom it ranked ninth. It is thus striking that in 1985 Hispanics were only one half as likely as whites to have reported attending classical music concerts.

Childhood Experience in the Arts

Advocates of arts education sometimes assert that appreciation of the arts must be cultivated from childhood if one is to understand and care about them as an adult. Sociologists sometimes refer to the familiarity with the fine arts with which educated parents endow their children as "cultural capital," analogous to bequests of financial capital as a means to ensure that one's children get ahead in life.[6] If this emphasis on early artistic experiences is justified, then it is possible that intergroup differences in participation reflect differences in the way that children of these groups were socialized.

Fortunately, the SPPAs asked a portion of the respondents (about one-third in 1982 and approximately one-sixth in 1985) about their childhood experiences with respect to a variety of art forms. Four questions concerned socialization by parents "when you were growing up." Respondents were asked if their parents "often, occasionally, or never" listened to classical music, took them to art museums or galleries, took them to plays, dance or classical music performances, or encouraged them to read books "which were not required for school or religious studies." Responses to these questions are presented in Table 2-6.

People often have difficulty recalling events that happened in their distant past, and we all have some tendency to reconstruct our childhoods so as to make them consistent with our subsequent experience. We do not know

Table 2–6
Cultural Socialization in Family by Race/Ethnicity

	Parents listened classical music		Parents took art museums/ galleries		Parents took plays/dance/ classical		Parents encouraged reading	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	32.64	34.19	35.33	36.64	33.05	33.59	40.36	39.08
	4,563	1,913	4,567	1,912	4,561	1,910	4,567	1,915
African-American	18.84	22.17	26.86	26.07	26.31	29.13	32.82	37.91
	507	197	508	198	511	194	511	199
Hispanic	16.56	25.05	22.76	27.09	20.36	23.16	22.26	20.06
	302	140	304	141	302	141	305	141
Asian	—	48.70	—	43.30	—	32.86	—	46.66
	—	39	—	39	—	39	—	39

Note: First line to right of racial/ethnic category refers to weighted percentage of group reporting parents engaged in activity "occasionally or often" (for first three columns) or "often" (for "encouraged reading"). Second line refers to unweighted number of respondents. In 1982, Asian-Americans were in an "Other"category (not included).

whether such distortions bias the responses affirmatively or negatively, or whether, by contrast, individual distortions more or less balance one another out. To the extent we are interested in comparisons between groups, we need be concerned less by absolute bias than by the possibility that responses from different racial or ethnic categories are flawed by different degrees (or directions) of biased recall. John Robinson and his colleagues have suggested that question ordering in the SPPA may have made childhood arts experiences more salient to respondents who had reported engaging in related arts activities. If this were the case, we would expect such tendencies to yield exaggerated differences between whites and members of other groups in the tables that follow.[7]

White respondents were most likely to report that their parents at least occasionally listened to classical music. In 1982, 33 percent of whites compared to 19 percent of African-Americans and 17 percent of Hispanics

answered in this way. (In 1985, the figures were 34 percent for whites, 22 percent for African-Americans, 25 percent for Hispanics, and 49 percent for Asians. Regrettably, the small number of Asian-American respondents prevents us from placing much stock in the latter arresting figure.[8]) These differences are comparable to those for attending classical music concerts and greater than those for viewing or listening to classical music programs on television or radio.[9]

In 1982, white respondents were 32 percent more likely than African-Americans to report that their parents took them occasionally or often to art museums or galleries when they were young.[10] (1985 results were similar.) In 1982, they were 55 percent more apt to report such experiences than were Hispanic respondents, whereas in 1985 Hispanics were more similar to African-American respondents. (More than 40 percent of the Asian respondents — compared to 37 percent of the whites — reported such early experience in 1985.) If we compare these results to reports of visits to art museums in the past year (Table 2-1), we see that the gap between white and African-American respondents is somewhat greater than we would expect on the basis of these early socialization experiences, whereas the difference between white and Hispanic respondents is approximately the same. By contrast, the difference in the proportion of whites and African-Americans who report watching visual arts programming on television is somewhat less than we would expect on the basis of parental socialization.

Because the question about going to performing arts events with one's parents was worded to include attendance at plays, dance, or classical music performances, it does not admit to straightforward comparison with any of the core participation questions. The responses are comparable to those for visits with parents to art museums and art galleries, with approximately one-third of the whites in both years, compared to 26 and 29 percent of the African-American respondents (1982 and 1985, respectively) and 20 and 23 percent of the Hispanic group reporting that their parents at least occasionally took them to concerts and plays when they were young.[11]

In 1982, 40 percent of the white respondents, compared to 33 percent of the African-American respondents and 22 percent of the Hispanics reported that their parents often encouraged them to do reading that was not required as part of school or religious instruction. (In 1985, with smaller samples, the figures were 39 percent, 38 percent, and 20 percent. Of the few Asian respondents, 47 percent reported such parental encouragement.) If we compare these responses to those for the core question on whether respondents had read novels, short stories, poetry, or plays during the previous year, we see that the proportionate gaps between African-American and white respon-

dents are somewhat greater than one might expect on the basis of responses to the parental socialization question, whereas the differences between whites and Hispanics are somewhat less.

The SPPAs also asked respondents if they had taken classes or lessons in voice or an instrument, art, acting, ballet, creative writing, craft arts, art appreciation, or music appreciation at various periods in their lives. Table 2-7 reports the proportion that *never* took each kind of class, as well as the percentage of respondents who took their first class of each kind when they were under the age of 12, between the ages of 12 and 17, and older than 17.

White respondents were more likely each year to report taking each kind of art class or lesson than were African-American or Hispanic respondents. Similarly, with just one exception, African-Americans were more apt to report having taken classes in each area in each year than Hispanics.[12] As was the case for other questions asked in only one month of 1985, the number of Asian respondents was too small to yield conclusive results.

Focusing upon 1982, for which the number of African-American and Hispanic respondents to these questions was substantially higher than in 1985, the absolute gap between whites and African-Americans ranged from 10 percent (50 percent of the whites compared with 40 percent of the African-Americans) for vocal or instrumental lessons, to less than 1 percent (22 percent of the whites and 21 percent of the African-Americans) for music appreciation courses. The ratio of white to African-American participation ranged from two to one (for ballet lessons, taken by 8 percent of the whites and just 4 percent of the African-Americans), to 1.03:1, for music appreciation courses. Among class types taken by substantial minorities of all respondents, whites were 38 percent more likely than African-Americans to report classes in the visual arts, 33 percent more apt to report taking creative writing classes, 40 percent more likely to report classes in the craft arts, and 31 percent more likely to report art appreciation classes.

The proportion of Hispanic-Americans who indicated that they had taken classes or lessons was comparable to, although slightly lower than, the African-American percentage for the visual arts, acting, and ballet classes. Hispanics were just 62 percent as likely as whites and 82 percent as apt as African-Americans to report taking creative writing courses. For craft art courses the comparable figures were 59 percent and 83 percent. For art appreciation courses, they were 53 and 70 percent, respectively. Hispanics were especially unlikely to have taken music lessons or music appreciation courses. Only 22 percent of the Hispanics, compared to 40 percent of the African-American and 50 percent of the white respondents, reported taking vocal or instrumental classes or lessons. And only 9 percent, as compared

Table 2–7
Age at First Class or Lesson in Selected Arts Subjects by Race/Ethnicity, 1982 and 1985

	Age at first class	Music class		Art class		Acting class		Ballet class	
		1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	Never	49.51	48.92	74.55	72.16	90.05	89.16	92.00	90.81
	<12	26.30	28.68	3.00	3.93	1.07	1.00	5.57	7.05
	12-17	19.93	18.61	11.41	12.16	6.03	6.73	0.92	0.89
	>17	4.27	3.78	11.04	11.75	2.84	2.56	1.51	1.25
African-American	Never	59.55	62.96	81.60	82.77	93.08	91.53	96.17	97.04
	<12	13.81	14.23	2.44	0.89	1.02	0.75	1.73	1.14
	12-17	21.23	17.31	11.14	11.98	3.80	6.85	1.04	1.40
	>17	5.41	5.51	4.82	4.36	2.09	0.88	1.05	0.43
Hispanic	Never	77.65	76.07	82.97	88.71	92.69	95.27	96.56	97.28
	<12	6.38	7.37	2.48	0.00	0.60	0.00	1.85	0.44
	12-17	14.20	11.24	9.97	7.74	4.60	3.79	0.00	1.41
	>17	1.77	5.32	4.59	3.55	2.11	0.94	1.60	0.87
Asian	Never	—	59.88	—	70.88	—	88.04	—	94.59
	<12	—	15.04	—	6.44	—	0.00	—	0.00
	12-17	—	8.53	—	11.76	—	7.37	—	2.75
	>17	—	16.55	—	10.91	—	4.59	—	2.66

with 21 percent of the African-American respondents and 22 percent of the whites, reported ever taking a course in music appreciation.

The age at which persons first took classes or lessons varied by kind of lesson, with music and ballet lessons often taken during the elementary school years, and music and art appreciation often taken after the age of 17. Such patterns differed somewhat by race and ethnicity, however. For example, 26 percent of the white respondents, but just 14 percent of the African-American respondents, reported taking voice or instrumental lessons before the age of 12. By contrast, African-Americans were slightly more likely than whites to take such lessons during the high school years and after the age of 17. Similarly, African-Americans were somewhat more likely than whites to take music appreciation courses during the high school years, and somewhat less likely to take them before or after. This pattern of relatively equal African-American/white participation during the high school years, and less equal participation before and/or after high school tended also to be the case for

Table 2–7 (Continued)
Age at First Class or Lesson in Selected Arts Subjects by Race/Ethnicity, 1982 and 1985

	Creative writing class		Craft art class		Art appreciation class		Music appreciation class		Number of respondents	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
White	80.78	78.94	66.51	62.44	79.31	78.50	78.47	78.27	4,590	1,923
	0.75	1.07	3.47	4.25	0.81	0.76	2.32	1.95		
	7.51	9.21	15.37	17.95	6.16	6.50	9.02	9.39		
	10.96	10.78	14.66	15.36	13.71	14.24	10.18	10.39		
African-American	85.60	87.90	76.04	71.79	84.22	83.17	79.10	83.03	515	199
	1.05	0.78	3.57	0.93	0.68	0.30	1.73	1.11		
	6.21	4.37	13.00	15.79	6.02	11.17	11.01	6.73		
	7.14	6.96	7.38	11.49	9.08	5.36	8.16	9.13		
Hispanic	88.17	95.91	80.08	84.31	88.99	93.06	91.02	93.02	305	143
	0.98	0.00	2.14	2.22	1.09	0.00	1.07	0.44		
	4.71	1.64	12.17	8.99	4.59	4.00	3.54	3.22		
	6.14	2.45	5.61	4.49	5.32	2.94	4.37	3.32		
Asian	—	89.78	—	81.39	—	88.89	—	87.32	—	39
	—	0.00	—	0.00	—	0.00	—	4.56		
	—	5.96	—	6.45	—	5.96	—	8.13		
	—	4.26	—	12.15	—	5.15	—	0.00		

Note: Figures under class names refer to weighted percentage of group first engaging in activity at age indicated. Last two columns indicate unweighted number of respondents. (Ns for each group for each year were the same for all classes, except that N=4,589 for white respondents with respect to writing classes and craft art classes in 1982.) In 1982, Asian-Americans were coded in "Other" category (not included).

other kinds of classes. Although the data are ambiguous because respondents were not asked where they took lessons or classes, the findings do suggest that U.S. secondary schools have tended to equalize access to arts training between white and African-American students. They do not seem to have done this for Hispanic-Americans, however.[13]

Whether such classes have had a long-term effect is another issue. If we assume that music appreciation courses focused on classical music, then the gaps between white and African-Americans in attending classical concerts and watching televised classical music programs are larger, and the differ-

ences between African-Americans and Hispanics smaller (or in the opposite direction), than what one would predict on the basis of these responses. This could be the case if African-American students took different kinds of courses than whites, or if whites and Hispanics had more opportunities to develop a taste for classical music without taking classes. African-Americans are less likely than whites to visit art museums or galleries but more likely to watch visual-arts programs on television than we would expect from the rate at which they have taken art appreciation courses, whereas the white/Hispanic gap in the rate of visiting art exhibits is lower than the art-appreciation data would lead one to predict. The difference between the percentage of whites, on the one hand, and both African-Americans and Hispanics on the other, who report that they currently practice creative writing and painting or drawing is less than one would expect on the basis of differences in the proportion of these groups who have taken art or creative writing courses.[14]

Summary

The data reported above are too complex to summarize facilely, but one fact emerges clearly. African-Americans and Hispanics are statistically underrepresented, relative to whites, among those who attend fine-arts events, both performances and exhibitions. They also tend to be less likely than whites to participate in the fine arts by watching them on television and by engaging in amateur practice, but the differences are proportionately smaller than for most kinds of live attendance. White Americans are also more likely than African-Americans and much more likely than Hispanics to report that they have been socialized into the fine arts (and reading) by parents and by classes or lessons. With respect to core participation, the only set of questions for which there were a sizable number of Asian respondents, Asian-Americans were notable for their rates of attendance at classical concerts, art exhibits, and ballet and opera performances, all of which exceeded the white rate.

Despite their superficial similarity in comparison to those of whites, the response patterns of African-Americans and Hispanics are distinct. Fewer Hispanics than African-Americans reported benefiting from most of the socialization experiences about which respondents were asked. Yet their rates of participation through watching the arts on media were similar to those of African-Americans (but higher for classical music and ballet), as was their participation in creative practice (with somewhat higher rates for

most visual arts or crafts activities). Hispanics were also more likely than African-Americans to visit art exhibits.

These patterns point to relatively low participation of African-Americans as fine-arts attenders (except for jazz concerts) and art exhibition visitors that cannot be explained by artistic socialization alone. Moreover, the fact that African-Americans attend jazz concerts at higher rates than whites (or Hispanics or Asians) indicates that they are not uninterested in performing-arts events *per se*. It is likely that had the SPPA questions emphasized artistic genres with closer historical links to the African-American and Hispanic communities, artistic participation for these groups would have been as high or higher than that of whites.

Nonetheless, we cannot assume that relatively low rates of African-American and Hispanic participation among attenders of fine-arts events simply reflect lower interest in or liking for such activities. The fact that the proportionate gap between white respondents, on the one hand, and African-American and (to a somewhat lesser extent) Hispanic respondents on the other, was greater for live attendance than for media participation indicates that there is interest in both the African-American and Hispanic populations in the fine arts that is not being manifested in attendance. Moreover, given the relatively small differences in the proportion of African-Americans and whites who take art and, especially, music appreciation courses, the low rates at which African-Americans attend classical music concerts, opera and ballet performances, and art exhibits are surprising. Add to this the greater statistical overrepresentation of African-Americans relative to whites for watching jazz on television and listening to it on radio and recordings than for attendance at live concerts, and it appears that some factors other than taste may inhibit the attendance of African-Americans at live performing-arts events and art exhibits.

If one believes that the kinds of arts participation about which the SPPA asked are so important that intergroup differences, of whatever origin, are unacceptable, then these findings are of grave concern. If one believes that such intergroup differences are unacceptable only if they reflect differences in opportunity, rather than differences in preferences, then these patterns raise cause for concern, but do not demonstrate conclusively that such concern is warranted.

The reader should be aware, however, that almost all of the activities about which respondents were asked (except for reading novels, short stories, poetry, or plays) are ones in which only a minority of all respondents participated during the year prior to the survey. With respect to many activities (for example, attending opera or ballet performances or performing

onstage), these minorities were very small ones. If one believes that the goal of policy should be to increase the number of minority Americans engaging in these activities rather than to make participation rates equal, this could be accomplished more effectively for most activities by doubling the current rates of participation of *all* groups than by bringing African-American and Hispanic rates up to white levels.

These findings tell us that whites, African-Americans, Hispanics, and Asian-Americans participate in a wide range of artistic activities at unequal rates, but they do not tell us why these differences exist. If one believes that racial or ethnic differences of the sort identified here are only problematic if they seem to be *explained* by race or ethnicity, as opposed to being just *associated* with race or ethnicity, then these findings are not sufficient. In Chapter 3, we investigate the *net* effects of African-American and Hispanic origin on SPPA core participation rates among otherwise similar respondents, and address certain questions this chapter has posed but not answered.

Chapter 3

NET EFFECTS OF RACE AND ETHNICITY ON PARTICIPATION IN SPPA CORE ACTIVITIES

In Chapter 2, we observed persistent differences between the rates of participation of African-Americans, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, and whites in the artistic activities about which the SPPAs asked. Comparison of patterns of responses to different questions suggested that, with certain exceptions, differences by race were stronger for live attendance than for arts consumption through the media, stronger for live attendance than for art-producing activities, and stronger for performing "high culture" music than jazz or popular music.

It is one thing to establish that racial or ethnic groups vary in the rates at which they participate in certain cultural activities. It is quite another to demonstrate that these differences result from race or ethnicity, rather than being by-products of other differences between such groups. The major goal of this chapter is to determine the extent to which differences among whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics stem from group membership itself, or originate in sociodemographic differences among these groups.[1] In other words, we shall ask whether members of these groups would participate at different rates were they identical with respect to sociodemographic position as measured by the SPPA.

These analyses are both of intrinsic interest and of interest for their relevance to public policy towards the arts. If one believes that racial or ethnic differences in participation are objectionable only if they flow directly from race or ethnicity, the results of this chapter will permit one to see to what extent this is the case. If one regards intergroup differences as lamentable whatever their origin, the analyses in this chapter will provide clues as to how they might be modified.

We cannot assume, however, that the factors that lead people to participate in the arts are the same for members of different racial or ethnic groups.

After exploring the net effects of race and ethnicity on participation, we analyze the sociodemographic determinants of participation in the "core" activities separately for each group. These separate analyses permit us to judge the extent to which the same factors account for variation *within* each group. The results, should they differ, may suggest that different kinds of programs are necessary to extend opportunities for participation to members of different groups.

We restrict our analyses to the core participation questions because these activities are of particular interest and because they were asked throughout the survey periods, thus yielding large African-American and Hispanic subsamples.[2] Because these questions cover only a limited range of activities, the findings should not be generalized to other forms of participation in the arts.

Explaining Racial and Ethnic Differences

In this section, we predict participation in each of the core activities as a function of race, ethnicity, and sociodemographic characteristics.[3] For each core activity, we executed two predictive models: one including only racial or ethnic origin, and one including racial/ethnic origin and sociodemographic measures. By comparing the size of coefficients estimating the influence of racial or ethnic group membership on participation with and without controls, we can estimate the percentage of intergroup differences for which sociodemographic differences account.

Because the dependent variables — the participation measures — are binary, taking the value of "1" if the respondent did participate and "0" if he or she did not, we use a method designed for such variables, called *logit* or *logistic regression analysis*.[4] Race and ethnicity are included in the models as a series of dichotomous or "dummy" variables, taking the value of "1" when the respondent is a member of the group in question and "0" when he or she is not. To use dummy variables in this way, it is necessary to exclude a category. In these analyses, whites are the excluded category. Coefficients for other groups represent the impact of group membership on the probability of participation (net the effects of other independent variables in the model) *compared to* the participation rates of comparable white respondents. For the 1982 data, we included "African-American," "Hispanic," and "Other" as racial/ethnic categories. (Because we do not know who is in the "Other" category, we do not report results for this group.) In models for 1985, we excluded the very few "Other" respondents from the analyses and

included "African-American," "Hispanic," and "Asian" as racial/ethnic variables.

In interpreting these results, we focus upon the coefficients comparing the net participation of each racial or ethnic group in the activity in question. By way of illustration, consider the section of Table 3-1 reporting the effect of being African-American on attending classical music concerts in 1982. (These results are reported under 1982 to the right of the rows labeled "A" under the column headed "attends classical concerts.") Column 1 reports the results of the model including only the racial/ethnic dummy variables. Column 2 reports the results of the model including the racial/ethnic dummy variables with sociodemographic controls. Under each column, the row labeled "b" reports the logistic regression coefficient indicating the net influence of being African-American on attending classical music concerts. The coefficient in column 1, for example, is –.845. Because there are no controls in the model reported in column 1, this figure is comparable to the descriptive percentage results reported in Table 2-1. (Its negative sign means that African-Americans are less likely to attend than the omitted group, *i.e.*, whites.) Column 2 reports the effect of being African-American on attending classical music concerts, controlling for a wide range of sociodemographic differences between the white and African-American respondents. Because the coefficient is less than that in column 1 but nonetheless remains negative, it indicates that part, but not all, of the difference between African-Americans and whites is attributable to sociodemographic differences between the two groups. By dividing the coefficient in column 2 (–.566) by the coefficient in column 1 and subtracting the result from unity, we can conclude that roughly 33 percent of the difference in rates of participation between African-Americans and whites resulted from measured sociodemographic differences between the two groups, whereas the remainder stems from other sources.

We shall not discuss the standard error (the figure immediately under the logistic regression coefficient), which is of interest only to statistically sophisticated readers. Of more general interest is the alphabetical notation below that (in the row labeled "*sig*"). Probability theory tells us that when one uses a sample from a larger population, one gets some positive or negative coefficients simply by chance. The letters in the significance rows of Table 3-1 (keyed to an explanation at the end of the table) tell us how likely it is that a coefficient of a given magnitude would occur by chance. The letter "c" in the significance row of column 2 under classical music (for African-Americans in 1982) tells us that such an effect (–.566) would be estimated by chance fewer than 5 times out of 100,000. This is a very high

Table 3–1
Coefficients Representing Effects of African-American (A) and Hispanic (H) on Core Participation Items (1) with Race/Ethnicity Only and (2) with Demographic Controls

	Jazz		Classical	
1982	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	.631	.683	−.845	−.566
se	.071	.084	.097	.110
sig	c	c	c	c
H b	−.090	.075	−.667	−.071
se	.121	.133	.123	.137
sig	NS	NS	c	NS
1985	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	.381	.453	−.868	−.557
se	.084	.101	.111	.128
sig	c	c	c	d
H b	−.382	−.272	−.805	−.261
se	.140	.156	.137	.153
sig	a	NS	c	NS

	Ballet		Art	
1982	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	−.967	−.781	−.774	−.617
se	.182	.202	.074	.086
sig	c	b	c	c
H b	−.000	.511	−.486	−.039
se	.161	.179	.090	.104
sig	NS	a	c	NS
1985	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	−.799	−.536	−.948	−.790
se	.187	.205	.088	.102
sig	c	a	c	c
H b	−.384	.094	−.332	.101
se	.196	.211	.090	.105
sig	a	NS	b	NS

Table 3–1 (Continued)
Coefficients Representing Effects of African-American (A) and Hispanic (H) on Core Participation Items (1) with Race/Ethnicity Only and (2) with Demographic Controls

	Opera		Musical		Play	
1982	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	−.900	−.582	−.825	−.567	−.903	−.674
se	.208	.240	.081	.093	.103	.118
sig	c	a	c	c	c	c
H b	−.275	.356	−.734	−.314	−.970	−.505
se	.212	.233	.106	.119	.145	.160
sig	NS	NS	c	a	c	a
1985	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	−.715	−.306	−.884	−.562	−.815	−.603
se	.228	.249	.098	.111	.113	.133
sig	a	NS	c	c	c	c
H b	−1.334	−.832	−.753	−.339	−.761	−.359
se	.388	.428	.117	.131	.140	.159
sig	b	NS	c	a	c	a

	Instrument		Act, sing		Read	
1982	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	−.194	−.191	.040	.042	−.701	−.501
se	.137	.147	.116	.127	.051	.062
sig	NS	NS	NS	NS	c	c
H b	−.271	−.352	−.518	−.466	−.951	−.579
se	.191	.217	.199	.212	.070	.084
sig	NS	NS	a	a	c	c
1985	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
A b	−.547	−.317	−.195	−.043	−.629	−.456
se	.209	.221	.151	.169	.056	.069
sig	a	NS	NS	NS	c	c
H b	−.381	−.103	−.489	−.293	−.705	−.284
se	.245	.254	.215	.228	.071	.086
sig	NS	NS	a	NS	c	b

Note: b is the logistic regression coefficient; se is the standard error; sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant.

level of statistical significance and enables us to conclude that African-Americans really were less likely to attend classical music concerts than whites, as the negative regression coefficient indicates.

Racial/Ethnic Effects Net of Sociodemographic Differences

In chapter 2 we raised the possibility that differences in participation between whites, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans, on the other, might result simply from the fact that whites as a group are economically better-off. Because educational attainment and occupational status are associated with patterns of leisure activity and interest in the arts, it seemed reasonable to expect that at least some of the differences we observed stemmed from sociodemographic differences between whites and members of other groups.

We explored this possibility by including race/ethnicity in a predictive model that controlled for a wide range of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. These characteristics included: gender, three categories of residence (central city, other SMSA, and outside an SMSA), age, education, income, seven broad categories of occupation (1982: professional and technical; managerial and administrative; sales and clerical; craft, operative, service, farm, transport, laborers, private household, and armed forces; unknown; unemployed and retired; keeping house; and student; 1985: executive, administrative, managerial; professional; technical, sales, and administrative support; craft, operative, service, farm, armed forces; unknown; unemployed and retired; keeping house; and student); and five categories of marital status (married, widowed, divorced, separated, and single).[5]

To what extent are differences in participation in the core activities attributable to differences among groups in the sociodemographic controls? No single generalization applies to African-American, Hispanic, and Asian respondents.

Variation between African-Americans and whites. Differences in participation between African-Americans and whites were partially attributable to sociodemographic differences between these two groups; but significant differences tended to persist even in the presence of sociodemographic controls. In both 1982 and 1985, African-Americans were significantly less likely than whites, even after controlling for sociodemographic factors, to

attend classical music concerts, musical theater performances, plays, ballet performances, and art exhibitions, and significantly less likely to report reading novels, plays, poems, or short stories. In 1982, but not 1985, significant differences in opera attendance between African-Americans and whites remained after controls, as well. For reading and for attendance at classical music concerts, musical theater performances, plays, and art exhibits, the differences, net sociodemographic factors, were highly significant. For these activities, there are small but persistent differences between African-Americans and whites that cannot be attributed to the different sociodemographic characteristics of these two groups.

Nonetheless, introducing sociodemographic controls did diminish the differences in both 1982 and 1985 with respect to each of the activities mentioned above. In 1982, between 20 percent (for ballet) and 36 percent (for opera) of the African-American/white differences were attributable to sociodemographic variation between African-Americans and whites. In 1985, similar proportions of the African-American/white differential were attributable to sociodemographic variation (from 18 percent for art exhibitions to 37 percent for musical theater), with the exception that 57 percent of the variation in opera attendance was of sociodemographic origin. In other words, except for opera attendance, less than one-half, and in most cases closer to one-fourth, of the differences between African-American and white probabilities of participation in these activities stem from differences in the sociodemographic characteristics of these groups.

It is instructive to consider the core activities — jazz concert attendance, public performance on a musical instrument, and acting, singing, or dancing in public — to which this generalization does not apply. In both years, African-Americans were significantly more likely than whites to report attending live jazz concerts, and controlling for sociodemographic characteristics merely increased their advantage, although modestly. In both years, whites were slightly more likely to report performing on a musical instrument in public. In 1982, adding sociodemographic controls yielded only a trivial reduction in the small and statistically insignificant difference. In 1985, the gross difference was modestly significant; whereas, with sociodemographic controls, it was not significant at all. For acting, singing, and dancing, neither the gross nor net difference between African-Americans and whites was significant in either year.

The pattern that emerges is one of significant differences between African-American and white participation in the consumption of most high-cultural arts activities, both in gross terms and with sociodemographic characteristics controlled. With respect to these activities, a substantial

portion, but (with one exception) less than half, of the difference results from variation between African-American and white Americans in sociodemographic factors. By contrast, the greater propensity of African-Americans to attend jazz concerts — the one activity with historical ties to the African-American community — is actually accentuated when sociodemographic differences are controlled. Gross differences between African-Americans and whites with respect to acting or singing (including popular or commercial as well as fine-arts forms) are slight; in the one case in which such a difference is modestly significant, it becomes insignificant when sociodemographic factors are taken into account.

This pattern reinforces our conviction that one cannot generalize about racial differences in artistic participation, *per se*. We suspect that if more art forms with origins in the African-American experience had been included among the core activities, the results would reveal, as was the case for jazz, statistical underrepresentation of white Americans.

It is with respect to attendance at live, noncommercial, high-cultural events, as well as attendance at musical theater and reading imaginative literature, that whites participate at significantly higher rates than African-Americans, even controlling for demographic differences between the two groups. In other words, African-Americans are less likely than whites of similar socioeconomic standing to engage in the public consumption of Euro-American "high culture" and related genres.

Although these interracial differences are persistent and appear with respect to most of the forms of participation examined here, they are not large in magnitude relative to differences associated with other determinants of participation.[6] With respect to all of the activities for which being African-American significantly lessens participation (relative to whites), the direct effect of race is dwarfed by the impact of educational attainment and (except for reading in 1982) exceeded by the effect of family income. Similarly, once other sociodemographic factors are taken into account, participation rates of African-Americans and whites are more similar than are rates for men and women for all such activities but visiting art exhibitions. They are also more similar than rates for inner-city dwellers and persons living outside of SMSAs for all such activities but attending classical music performances and reading imaginative literature. Thus race is a far less important net predictor of participation in all activities in which African-Americans participate significantly less than whites than educational attainment. In most cases, race is also a weaker predictor than income, gender, or urban residence. Note, however, that African-Americans earn less money and have historically received fewer years of formal education than compa-

rable whites.[7] Therefore, in addition to its direct negative effect, being African-American exerts a small *indirect* negative effect on probability of participation in the core activities because African-Americans have, on average, lower incomes and fewer years of formal education than whites.

Variation between whites and Hispanics. The results for Americans of Hispanic origin lend themselves less easily to generalization. For one thing, no single pattern characterized Hispanic participation in the core consumption activities. For another, the influence of Hispanic origin on participation in specific activities varied from year to year. Although the latter differences were not statistically significant, the relatively small size of the Hispanic subsamples and, more important, the fact that the survey was not designed to represent statistically the Hispanic population, make the differences between the 1982 and 1985 results difficult to interpret.

In 1982, Hispanics were significantly less likely than whites to report reading novels and other imaginative works, attending classical music concerts, art exhibits, plays, musical theater performances; or acting, singing, or dancing on stage. In 1985, they were significantly less likely than whites to report every activity but performing on an instrument in public.

For most of these activities, however, large portions of the Hispanic/white difference stem from differences in the sociodemographic composition of the two groups. Entering sociodemographic controls into the 1982 models, for example, eliminates 89 percent of the differential between whites and Hispanics in classical music attendance, 91 percent of the variation in attending art exhibits, 57 percent in attending musical theater performances, 48 percent in attending stage plays and 39 percent in reading imaginative literature. Indeed, after controlling for these characteristics, rates of Hispanic participation are significantly lower than those of whites for no activities but attending musical theater performances and plays, and reading imaginative literature (in both years); performing on stage (in 1982); and attending opera (in 1985). In other words, these analyses demonstrate that Americans of Hispanic origin are about as likely as white Americans with similar sociodemographic characteristics to attend ballet, classical music, and jazz performances, to visit art exhibitions, and to perform on a musical instrument. Indeed, in 1982, Hispanic respondents were significantly more likely to attend ballet performances than sociodemographically comparable whites.

Two differences are notable between patterns for Hispanic and African-American respondents. First, although participation rates are roughly comparable for these two groups for most activities, larger proportions of the

differences between Hispanics and whites than between African-Americans and whites stem from intergroup differences in sociodemographic attributes. By contrast, more of the differences between African-Americans and whites reflect differences between the races in tastes, access, or unmeasured characteristics not associated with the sociodemographic controls. What this means is that public policies or historical processes that made Hispanics more similar to whites with respect to such resources as educational attainment, occupation, or earnings would, as a by-product, minimize many differences in artistic participation as well. So would policies that increased the artistic participation of people with fewer educational, occupational, and financial resources, even if those policies were not directed specifically at Hispanic Americans. By contrast, even if African-Americans became more similar to white Americans in their sociodemographic characteristics and even if the link between such characteristics and participation were lessened, African-Americans could still be expected to participate slightly but significantly less than whites in several of the core activities.

Hispanics and African-Americans also differ with respect to the activities for which these generalizations do not hold. As we have seen, the statistical overrepresentation of whites relative to African-Americans applies only to predominantly Euro-American consumption activities and not to jazz or public performance. By contrast, Hispanic Americans participated at lower rates than whites in both years, net sociodemographic differences, only in reading and in attendance at musical and dramatic theatrical performances. Note that these three activities are the only core activities for which command of the English language is ordinarily essential. Whereas almost all African-Americans and white Americans are native English speakers, a substantial proportion of Hispanic Americans are not. Thus we surmise (although, lacking data on language we cannot be sure) that lower net rates of Hispanic participation in activities involving the printed and spoken word reflect the linguistic characteristics of the Hispanic population and the relatively low availability of performances and imaginative literature in Spanish. Were the availability of such materials increased, we would expect to see Hispanics participate in them at rates comparable to those of whites with similar sociodemographic attributes.

Variation between Asian and white Americans. The 1985 SPPA (unlike its 1982 counterpart) made it possible to distinguish between Asian-American and other respondents. Nonetheless, because there were so few Asian respondents (well under 2 percent of the total sample), we cannot report their behavior with much statistical confidence. In models with only race and

ethnicity included, Asians were more likely than whites to participate in all the activities that do not rely on the spoken or printed word except attending jazz concerts, and less likely than whites to participate in those that do. Nonetheless, these differences were small and never statistically significant.

Because Asian-Americans tend on average to have sociodemographic characteristics that are associated with participation in the core activities, entering sociodemographic controls actually decreased net Asian participation relative to white participation. Thus Asian-Americans were significantly less likely than whites in similar sociodemographic circumstances to attend musical or dramatic stage presentations. Differences with respect to other core activities remained statistically insignificant.

Differences in Predictors of Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Built into the preceding analyses is the assumption that the same sociodemographic factors influence the participation of African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites in the same ways and to the same extent. This is a useful simplifying assumption because it enables us to estimate net differences in participation. But if we are interested in understanding the factors that lead members of racial and ethnic minorities to participate in the arts activities about which the surveys asked, we must consider the possibility that different groups arrive at participation by different routes. After much analysis, we conclude that the sociodemographic predictors of artistic participation (as defined by the core variables) are not systematically different for African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites.[8]

Differences in predictors of participation for whites and African-Americans. For both African-Americans and whites, educational attainment tended to be the variable that most effectively distinguished participants from nonparticipants for most of the core participation measures. Each of the other independent variables was significant, although less so than education, in predicting most of the participation measures for whites. For African-Americans, SMSA residence, income, and, in 1982, occupation, were also significantly related to many core variables. Although they were less likely to be significant for African-Americans than for whites (in part because significance is a function of the number of cases and there were many more whites than African-Americans among the respondents to the survey), most predic-

Table 3–2
Significant Differences in Models Predicting Responses to Core Participation Questions for African-American, Hispanic, and White Subsamples

ACTIVITY	PREDICTOR	
Jazz	WOMEN	Significantly negative for African-Americans (1982 and 1985). Not significant for whites in 1982 and significantly positive in 1985.
	MARITAL	Significantly positive for whites but not for African-Americans or Hispanics in 1982.
	EDUCATION	Significantly positive for whites but not for Hispanics in 1982.
Classical music	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for Hispanics in 1982.
	OCCUPATION	Significantly positive for whites but not for Hispanics in 1985.
Opera	SMSA	Extremely positive for African-Americans and Hispanics but not for whites in 1985.
	OCCUPATION	Extremely positive for Hispanics but not for African-Americans or whites in 1985.
Musical theater	WOMEN	Significantly positive for whites but not for African-Americans in 1982.
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for Hispanics than for whites in 1985.
Plays	WOMEN	Significantly positive for whites but not for African-Americans or Hispanics in 1982.
	SMSA	More significantly positive for African-Americans than for whites in 1982.
Ballet	SMSA	Extremely significantly positive for Hispanics but less so for whites and not significant for African-Americans in 1982. Extremely significant (positive) for African-Americans but not for whites or Hispanics in 1985.

Table 3–2 (Continued)
Significant Differences in Models Predicting Responses to Core Participation Questions for African-American, Hispanic, and White Subsamples

ACTIVITY	PREDICTOR	
Art museums	WOMEN	Significantly positive for whites but not for African-Americans in 1982.
	SMSA	Significantly positive for African-Americans but less so for whites and not significant for Hispanics in 1982.
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for Hispanics in 1985.
Perform: instrument	SMSA	Extremely significantly positive for Hispanics but not for African-Americans or whites in 1982.
Perform: act, sing, dance	SMSA	Extremely significantly positive for Hispanics but not for African-Americans or whites in 1982 and 1985. (Significantly negative for whites in 1985.)
	EDUCATION	Significantly positive for whites but not for Hispanics in 1982.
Literature reading	WOMEN	More significantly positive for whites than for African-Americans and Hispanics in 1982 and African-Americans in 1985.
	SMSA	More significantly positive for African-Americans than for whites in 1985.
	AGE	Significantly negative for African-Americans but not for whites in 1982.
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for African-Americans in 1982.
	OCCUPATION	More significantly positive for African-Americans than for whites in 1982.

Note: Descriptive statements provided only for differences that are statistically significant. Similar differences that do not reach statistical significance are not noted in this table.

tors took the same sign and, in many cases, were of the same order of magnitude for African-Americans and whites.

In only a few cases were there significant differences in models predicting core participation activities for the two races. In 1982, most such differences reflected an apparently stronger sexual division of labor in the consumption of the arts among whites than among African-Americans. That year, white women were significantly more likely than white men to report having participated in all of the core activities except playing a musical instrument in public and attending jazz concerts.[9] By contrast, African-American women were significantly more likely than African-American men only to read works of imaginative literature and attend ballet performances. Differences between African-Americans and whites in the impact of gender were statistically significant in 1982 with respect to attending jazz concerts, attending musicals, attending plays, visiting art museums and art galleries, and reading literature. In each of the first four cases, white women were more likely to engage in the activity than white men, but African-American men were more likely to do so than African-American women. Women of both races were more likely to read literature than men, but the differences were significantly greater for whites.

For 1982, these differences were notable and persistent across different kinds of artistic participation. But in 1985, the effects of gender varied less markedly by race, except for attending jazz concerts and reading literature, for which the gap widened. With respect to attending musicals and plays and visiting art exhibitions, however, African-American women joined white women in being more likely than men to participate, and the effects of gender became similar for the two groups. In summary, the pattern for the two years indicates that there may be more marked gender differences in artistic participation among whites than among African-Americans; but, except for reading literature and attending jazz concerts, the differences are not large or persistent. Nonetheless, the interaction of gender and race deserves further investigation.

For some activities in each year, the positive impact of living in an SMSA was greater for African-Americans than for whites. In 1982, although both African-Americans and whites were significantly more likely to attend plays and visit art galleries and museums if they lived in SMSAs, the advantage of SMSA dwellers was significantly greater for African-Americans. In 1985, the same was true for reading literature. Also in 1985, SMSA residence was not significantly related to attending operas or ballet performances for whites, but was overwhelmingly so for African-Americans. That year, all 20 African-Americans who reported going to opera performances,

and 32 of 33 who attended ballet performances, lived in SMSAs. These differences between African-Americans and whites are notable, but because they were discernible for no activity in both 1982 and 1985, they must be regarded with caution.

In 1982, although single and divorced whites and African-Americans were more likely to attend jazz performances than others, the advantage of single and divorced people was significantly greater for whites than for African-Americans. Although the pattern held in 1985, the difference was not significant.

In 1982, although education and occupation were both very significantly associated with reading works of imaginative literature among both African-Americans and whites, the effects of education were significantly greater for whites and the effects of occupation were stronger for African-Americans. Moreover, whereas age was positively, but not quite significantly, associated with reading for whites, it was negatively and significantly related to reading for African-Americans. In 1985, these patterns held but none of the differences were significant, although the difference for age was nearly so. The pattern suggests, but does not confirm, the hypothesis that there may be increasing interest in reading literature among younger cohorts of African-Americans that cannot be explained solely by reference to increases in African-American educational attainment.

Taken together, the separate models for African-Americans and whites suggest that the same sociodemographic characteristics are related to most of the core participation measures in approximately the same way for members of each group. There is a greater tendency for white women to outparticipate white men than for African-American women to outparticipate African-American men, and a stronger tendency for residence outside an SMSA to depress African-American attendance at arts events more than it depresses white attendance. Few specific differences, however, were significant in both 1982 and 1985, leading us to offer these observations as hypotheses for further study rather than as conclusions.

Differences in predictors of participation for whites and Hispanics. As was the case for African-Americans and whites, education was by far the strongest predictor of participation in most of the core activities for Hispanics in both 1982 and 1985. As was the case for African-Americans, most of the predictors took the same sign and many were of roughly the same magnitude for Hispanics as for whites, but, because of the far smaller number of Hispanic than of non-Hispanic white respondents, fewer were statistically significant. Given these relatively few, relatively weak, and very inconsistent

results, we can only conclude that the factors accounting for participation in the core activities were similar for whites and Hispanics.

Differences in predictors of participation for African-Americans and Hispanics. There were no statistically significant differences in the models predicting participation in the core activities for African-Americans and Hispanics.

Differences in predictors of participation for each group between 1982 and 1985. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the brief time between the two surveys, no statistically significant differences in predictors for African-Americans and Hispanics were observed. For whites, residence in an SMSA had a significantly stronger positive impact on visiting art galleries and museums, and a significantly stronger negative impact on playing an instrument in public in 1985 than in 1982. The positive impact of educational attainment on reading imaginative literature was slightly, but significantly, weaker in 1985 than in 1982. Given the large size of the white subsample and the large number of coefficients, we place little stock in these differences.

Summary. It was important to test whether the models for African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites indicated that the factors influencing participation for these groups differed. If they had, such evidence might have suggested, first, that the social meaning of participation differed, on average, for members of these groups and, second, that public policies or sociodemographic change would influence African-American, Hispanic, and white participation in systematically different ways. Moreover, if the differences were substantial, they might lead us to question our interpretations of the aggregated models described in the first part of this chapter.

The findings of these analyses provide no compelling evidence of systematic differences in factors leading African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites to participate in the core activities about which the SPPA asked. Significant differences were few, usually small in magnitude, and rarely persisted from one year to the other. It is possible that more differences would have been found had the selection of activities about which respondents were asked been broader. Note, however, that the variation present among the different core activities was sufficient to permit us to note systematic patterns of racial differences in *rates* of participation, whereas no such systematic differences were observed with respect to the *predictors* of participation. It is also possible that a different set of predictor variables might have revealed significant differences not noted here. It is not obvious

to us, however, what such additional predictors might be. Finally, were the African-American and Hispanic sample sizes larger, it is likely that more differences would have emerged as statistically significant. We believe there are important reasons to include more African-American and Hispanic (and Asian and Native American) respondents in the SPPA. But we regard the African-American and Hispanic sample sizes as adequate for detecting substantively meaningful differences in models predicting core participation items. In short, these analyses convince us that the sociodemographic characteristics accounting for most kinds of artistic participation are basically similar for African-American, Hispanic, and white Americans. In Chapter 5, we construct more detailed models predicting several additional dimensions of artistic participation.

Chapter 4

RACIAL/ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN UNSATED DEMAND FOR PARTICIPATION

In chapter 2, we noted persistent differences in rates at which Asian, African-American, Hispanics, and white Americans participate in the core activities about which the SPPAs asked all respondents. In chapter 3, we asked to what extent these differences could be accounted for by sociodemographic attributes with respect to which Asians, African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites also differ. In this chapter, we focus on the extent to which such differences reflect intergroup differences in *demand* for the arts as opposed to differential exposure to barriers to participation. We consider this question with respect to the seven core activities that involve attendance at arts events.[1]

Approximately one-fourth of the 1982 respondents and one-sixth of the 1985 respondents were shown a card listing the activities and told:

> "Few people can do everything they would like to do. But if you could do any of the things listed on this card as often as you wanted, which ones would you do more often than you have during the last 12 months?"

Those respondents who said they would like to have done a given activity more than they had in the past year were then asked to indicate which of several reasons were responsible for the fact that they had not participated more.

Demand for Greater Participation

Members of a group may participate in a given activity at a lower rate than members of another group for either of two reasons. They may do so because they enjoy or otherwise value the activity less. Or they may want to

engage in the activity as much as do members of the other group, but face obstacles to participation that the others do not.

These two explanations have very different implications for public policy. If low participation results not from low demand but from barriers to participation, policy might equalize participation by eliminating the barriers. If low participation results not from barriers but from low demand, policies aimed at eliminating inequality must serve to increase demand and not simply to level barriers.

We hesitate to interpret people's responses to questions about their desire for increased participation, for we are not sure what people mean when they say they "want" to attend arts events more than they do. Some people may deeply desire to attend more, but be unable to do so for well defined reasons. Others may wish to attend more, but lack the willingness to pay the cost in foregone opportunities to do things they value even more highly. Still others may mean that they wish they were the kind of person who liked the arts more than they do. We do not believe that everyone who reported wanting to participate in an activity more cared passionately about doing so. As long as the different meanings of "want" were not distributed by race and ethnicity in dramatically different ways, however, responses to this question may provide clues as to the extent that intergroup variation in attendance represents differences in demand or differences in opportunity. Nonetheless, without knowing more than we do about the subjective meaning of these responses, we are reluctant to regard them as any more than clues.

Responses to the "want more" question are reported in Table 4-1 for each activity and for African-Americans, Hispanics, whites, and (in 1985) Asian-Americans. We assume that "wanting to do more" means something different for a person who already participates than it does for someone who does not. Consequently, we report results separately for attenders (respondents who engaged in the activity at least once during the previous 12 months) and nonattenders. Consistent with our focus on *rates* of participation (rather than *levels* of participation), we look more closely at the latter.

Findings. It has been suggested that the arts are addictive. That is, whereas demand for most goods precedes and is sated by consumption, consumption of the arts is said to beget demand for more.[2] If this is the case, it explains what John Robinson, in a report on the 1982 SPPA, has called the "more-more principle": the more activities in which respondents participate, the more likely they are to participate in still others.[3]

Our findings on unsated demand for the core attendance activities are

Table 4–1
Percentage of Attenders and Nonattenders Wanting to Do Each Activity More Than They Had in the Previous 12 Months, by Race/Ethnicity

	Jazz		Classical		Opera		Musical	
Attenders	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**
Whites	53.77	59.89	53.15	46.56	44.50	40.41	69.77	64.69
	394	168	568	279	111	48	882	380
African-Americans	67.74	50.12	42.79	41.62	26.95	25.18	50.03	56.85
	80	42	31	17	4	9	44	30
Hispanics	51.41	42.23	61.89	44.99	24.87	NA	68.91	45.24
	28	10	17	8	4	0	34	11
Asian-Americans		NA		42.41		0.00		30.61
		0		4		2		4
Non-attenders	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**
Whites	13.34	14.60	14.28	13.36	7.17	8.50	27.33	24.82
	3,995	1,643	3,824	1,534	4,278	1,762	3,510	1,430
African-Americans	24.08	22.30	10.34	7.82	4.88	3.42	16.35	14.87
	457	245	506	269	531	278	493	256
Hispanics	14.13	19.28	12.65	5.61	4.82	4.80	16.24	10.29
	273	138	284	140	297	148	267	137
Asian-Americans		6.77		5.29		1.98		14.01
		47		43		45		42

consistent with Robinson's "more-more" dictum and with the addiction model of arts consumption. With only four exceptions (all cases in which only two or fewer respondents participated in the given activity), for every activity and every racial/ethnic group, attenders were more than twice as likely (and in most cases three or four times as likely) to want to participate more than were nonattenders. For example, in 1982, 54 percent of white jazz attenders, but just 13 percent of white nonattenders, reported wanting to attend jazz concerts more. That year, 43 percent of African-Americans who attended classical music concerts wanted to attend more, compared with just

TABLE 4–1 (Continued)
Percentage of Attenders and Nonattenders Wanting to Do Each Activity More Than They Had in the Previous 12 Months, by Race/Ethnicity

	Plays		Ballet		Art	
Attenders	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**
Whites	62.42	59.95	54.29	55.09	57.18	57.91
	575	245	182	80	1,057	475
African-Americans	55.38	48.06	31.83	44.33	50.48	57.26
	27	23	5	11	49	33
Hispanics	57.45	20.44	57.92	65.01	78.86	63.59
	18	4	9	3	52	28
Asian-Americans		NA		0.00		43.23
		0		2		6
Non-attenders	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**	**1982**	**1985**
Whites	22.48	22.10	11.01	11.42	24.40	24.07
	3,816	1,565	4,211	1,733	3,334	1,337
African-Americans	9.45	8.31	6.20	5.74	17.80	20.20
	510	263	532	276	488	254
Hispanics	9.54	8.43	7.26	10.75	19.25	17.66
	283	144	292	145	249	120
Asian-Americans		6.43		6.04		11.60
		47		45		41

Note: Percentages are weighted. Ns are unweighted.

10 percent of African-American nonattenders. Almost 80 percent of Hispanics who visited art museums or galleries, but less than 20 percent of those who did not, wanted to go more often.

The "more-more principle" also applied at the group level among nonattenders. That is, for each activity, except for Asian-Americans, nonattending members of the racial or ethnic group that attended most were also more likely than members of other groups to want to attend. For example, more

than 20 percent of African-Americans who did not attend jazz concerts wanted to do so in both survey years. By contrast, fewer than 15 percent of nonattending whites wished to attend. With respect to the other activities, which whites were more likely to attend, white nonattenders were more likely than other nonattenders to report wanting to participate.

For some activities, the differences were small. For example, in 1982, 14 percent of whites who had not attended classical music concerts wanted to do so, compared with 10 percent of such African-Americans and 13 percent of Hispanic nonattenders. In other cases, the differences were more sizable. In 1982, 22 percent of nonattending whites, but fewer than 10 percent of nonattending African-Americans and Hispanics wished to go to stage plays or "the theater."

Asian-Americans were the exception to the more-more principle. Although they participated in most activities at rates either higher or only slightly lower than those of white Americans, the percentages reporting a desire to attend each activity more were lower than those for all or most other groups. Whatever the reason, the gap between self-reported aspiration and actual participation was smaller for Asian-American respondents than for members of other groups.

The tendency of nonattenders from groups with relatively high rates of attendance to want to attend more than those from groups with lower attendance rates can be interpreted in either of two ways. To the extent that members of these groups tend to socialize disproportionately with others from those groups, nonattenders in groups with high attendance rates may come into more frequent contact with attenders than do members of other groups. On the one hand, this contact may engender a greater desire to try the activity in question. On the other, it may engender guilt about nonparticipation, and consequently inflate what survey analysts refer to as "social-desirability bias" in their responses. The latter possibility is one more reason to interpret these data with caution.

How would rates of participation change if everyone did what he or she wanted? Let us take the responses at face value and treat them as indicators of genuine unsated demand for the activities about which respondents were asked. If each nonattender who said that he or she wanted to participate were to do so, how would differences in participation by race and ethnicity be affected?

The answers are presented in Table 4-2. For each activity, each survey year, and each racial/ethnic group, data are presented on the percentage reporting participation in the prior year; the percentage who did not partici-

Table 4–2
Real Attendance Rates, Potential Increments, and Total Potential Attendance by Race and Ethnicity

	1982 Jazz			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	9.13	15.64	8.27	9.48	13.08	6.55	7.81
Increment	12.30	20.31	12.13	13.22	19.38	18.02	6.24
Potential	21.43	35.95	20.40	22.70	32.46	24.57	14.05
	1982 Classical			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	14.42	6.67	7.87	14.31	6.39	6.77	16.50
Increment	12.22	9.65	11.65	11.45	7.32	5.23	4.42
Potential	26.64	16.32	19.52	25.76	13.71	12.00	20.92
	1982 Opera			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	3.33	1.36	2.52	2.97	1.43	0.78	4.58
Increment	6.93	4.81	4.70	8.25	3.37	4.76	1.89
Potential	10.26	6.17	7.22	11.22	4.80	5.54	5.47
	1982 Musical			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	20.67	10.10	10.96	18.60	8.45	9.52	13.89
Increment	21.68	14.70	14.46	20.20	13.61	9.31	12.06
Potential	42.35	24.80	25.42	38.80	22.06	18.53	25.95
	1982 Plays			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	13.44	5.82	5.47	13.10	6.09	6.41	8.87
Increment	19.46	8.90	9.02	19.20	7.80	7.89	5.86
Potential	32.90	14.72	14.49	32.30	13.89	14.30	14.73
	1982 Ballet			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	4.64	1.78	4.54	4.72	2.14	3.21	6.22
Increment	10.50	6.09	6.93	10.88	5.62	10.40	5.66
Potential	15.14	7.87	11.47	15.60	7.76	13.61	11.88
	1982 Art			1985			
	W	A	H	W	A	H	S
Base	23.94	12.47	16.22	24.14	10.71	18.18	26.02
Increment	18.56	15.58	16.12	18.26	18.04	14.45	8.58
Potential	42.50	28.05	32.34	42.40	28.75	32.63	34.60

Note: Base rates from Table 2–1. Increment=percentage of nonattenders who reported wanting to participate times complement of base. A=African-American; S=Asian-American; H=Hispanic-American.

pate but reported they wanted to; and the total "potential audience" comprising both groups.

Potential participation rates, defined in this way, are much greater than the actual participation rates for all groups but Asian-Americans. Indeed, except for white attendance (in 1982 and 1985) and Hispanic attendance (in 1985) at classical music concerts and white and Hispanic visits to art museums and galleries (in both years), potential rates are at least twice the actual rates of attendance. In many cases, the differences are much greater than that. In other words, fewer people participated in these activities than did not but said they would like to do so.

Because nonattending members of groups with high participation rates are more likely to report wanting to attend than are nonattending members of other groups, the first effect of everyone doing what he or she reports wanting to would be to widen the absolute intergroup percentage difference in participation rates. In the case of jazz, the absolute difference between African-American participation rates and those of whites and Hispanics would double. In the case of the other six activities, the absolute difference between white rates and those of African-Americans and Hispanics would increase. (Again, Asian-Americans are the exception to the rule. Although their real participation rates in classical music concerts, opera, ballet, and art exhibits were higher than those for other groups, their potential participation rates were actually lower than those of whites for all of these and of Hispanics for opera attendance.) In other words, if all respondents did what they said they wanted to do, the absolute gap in participation rates between whites and everyone else would become wider. (The exceptional activity is jazz, for which the gap between African-Americans and everyone else would widen.)

In chapter 2, we focused not on absolute differences in rates but on the *ratio* of the white rate to rates for other groups. In other words, we asked how much more likely whites were than African-Americans or Hispanics to participate in these activities. When we put the question this way, our results are mixed. For most activities — and in 1982 for all activities but jazz and ballet — the ratios of white to other potential attendance rates are lower than the ratios of white to other *real* attendance rates. For example, whites were more than twice as likely as African-Americans to attend musicals in 1982. If everyone who wanted had attended, they would have been only 1.71 times as likely. Similarly, whites were nearly 50 percent more likely to visit art galleries or museums than Hispanic-Americans in 1982. If everyone who wanted had attended, their advantage would have declined to approximately 30 percent.

With respect to several activities, however, ratios between white and other groups' potential participation rates are even higher than for real participation rates. This is true of the white/African-American ratios for opera attendance and theater-going in 1985 and of white/Hispanic ratios for opera and ballet attendance in 1982 and for classical music, musical theater, and straight theater attendance in 1985. For example, in 1985 white Americans were 2.04 times as likely as Hispanic-Americans to report theater attendance, whereas they were 2.26 times as likely to appear in the potential audience for stage plays.

These results indicate that differences in participation in core activities do not result from barriers that disproportionately affect the ability of members of different groups from satisfying perceived demand. Instead they seem to reflect differences in the extent to which members of different racial and ethnic groups believe that they want to attend such arts events. For each of the seven activities about which they were asked (and with the notable exception of Asian-Americans), nonattenders of the groups whose members already participated at the highest rates were more likely than others to want to become participants.

If African-American and Hispanic nonattenders had wanted to participate more than white nonattenders, this would have constituted strong evidence that intergroup differences reflected barriers to minority attendance and not differences in demand. Clearly these data do not point in that direction. It would be simplistic, however, to take these results as strong evidence that intergroup differences do *not* reflect differences in opportunity.

First, the most effective barriers to participation may be those that influence demand, not those that influence the ability of persons to satisfy demand they already have. If, as the addiction theory mentioned at the beginning of this section suggests, taste for the arts is acquired through participation in the arts, then any barriers that prevent persons from participating in the arts are likely to be reflected in lower demand from the persons excluded.[4]

Second, respondents to the SPPA "want-more" questions may have answered on the basis of pre-conscious understandings about the costs associated with getting more of what they wanted. If there are perceived higher costs to participation for minorities than for whites, differences in demand may reflect these costs.

Third, it is possible, for the reasons discussed above, that social-desirability bias inflated the "want-more" responses of whites relative to those of African-Americans and Hispanics for those activities in which white Americans have the highest rates of participation.

These are all hypotheses that should lead us to avoid hasty conclusions on the basis of these findings, but should not lead us to dismiss them either. The results of these analyses indicate that it would be simple-minded to think about intergroup differences in arts attendance in the same way we think about intergroup differences in education. In the case of education, we have much evidence that demand is similar among racial and ethnic groups, with everyone viewing education as a good thing that helps people get ahead.[5] In the case of the arts, the evidence presented here indicates that attendance at the live events about which people were asked is *not* desired equally by members of all groups. The evidence indicates that demand varies by group and that if there are barriers, they work in large part by influencing demand for live attendance.

Why People Don't Attend More

Respondents who said they wanted to attend one of the seven core activities were given a list of possible reasons for not attending more than they did and were asked to check all those that applied. The reasons among which respondents could choose included: Tickets sold out, Cost, Not available, Feel uncomfortable, Don't have anyone to go with, Babysitter problems/Must care for children, Problem related to a handicap, Problem related to age/health, Too far to go, Transportation/Traffic/Parking problems, Crime or fear of crime, Poor quality/Not very good, Prefer to watch TV, Don't have time, Procrastination/Lack of motivation, and Other.[6] To simplify the analyses we coded together "Problem related to a handicap" and "Problem related to age/health." Similarly, we coded together "Procrastination/Lack of motivation" and "Prefer to watch TV" because we regarded each of these as indicating exceptionally low levels of demand, so low as to suggest some inconsistency with the respondent's professed desire to attend more.

We present the results in two forms. Appendix Tables 4-1 through 4-7 list, for African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites for 1982 and 1985, the weighted percentage of "want-more" attenders and "want-more" nonattenders in each group in each year giving each reason, along with the unweighted numbers of respondents upon which results for each group are based.[7] Table 4-3 summarizes the information for nonattenders who reported wanting to attend — the group of most immediate interest here — by listing for whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics in each year the three reasons given by the largest numbers of respondents and the percentages (of the nonattenders

who wished to attend) giving each response. (In the two cases in which more than 20 percent of such respondents marked a fourth reason, that one is reported as well.)

These findings are suggestive at best. The results for African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans are based on very small numbers of respondents because these questions were asked during only some of the survey months and because relatively few nonattenders wished to become attenders.[8] Moreover, we find responses to these questions difficult to interpret. We can be reasonably certain that some of the reasons provided were hastily selected excuses offered under duress by respondents who may have expressed a casual wish to do something they had not done. We are certain that others reflect real barriers to attendance. There is no obvious way to tell the two apart. For example, some people who said they did not attend stage plays because they were given at sites too far away may have made no effort to find out whether plays were presented nearby. Others may have been suburbanites who think nothing of going downtown to visit a museum, but value stage plays less than other forms of recreation. Still others may live in rural areas of prairie states where the nearest theater is three hours away. Some respondents who gave "cost" or "don't have enough time" as reasons may be destitute or work 70-hour weeks to support large families: that is, they may be people with little or no discretionary money or time. Others may have more discretionary income or time, but choose to spend it on other things. For the latter, "cost" or "time" responses tell us not just about barriers but about the value that respondents place on the arts relative to other uses of their time and money. Without either direct or plausible indirect measures of value that respondents place on attendance at the core activities, responses to the barrier questions are virtually uninterpretable.

Nonetheless, if we assume that the underlying valuation of arts attendance is the same for all three groups and if we remember to treat the data as merely suggestive, the results are interesting.[9] For members of all groups, cost and lack of time were the most important reasons given for nonparticipation. With respect to most activities, white respondents were more likely to give time as a reason than cost, and Hispanic respondents were more likely to cite cost than time. In 1982, African-American respondents were somewhat more likely to mention cost than time for most activities, whereas in 1985 they were somewhat more likely to cite time than cost. Lack of availability was frequently cited by whites, and a similar reason, that events were too far away, was often mentioned by Hispanics. African-American respondents frequently mentioned these and also cited transportation problems as impediments to attendance more than whites and, for most activities,

Table 4–3
Leading Reasons Given for Nonattendance by Nonattenders Who Wished to Attend

Jazz, 1982
- W Time (41), Cost (26), Not available (22)
- A Cost (45), Time (24), Transportation (14)
- H Cost (40), Time (37), Not available (14)

Jazz, 1985
- W Time (45), Cost (29), Not available (23)
- A Time (41), Cost (39), Not available (13)
- H Cost (55), Lack motivation (31), Time (31), Child care (21)

Classical, 1982
- W Time (39), Cost (28), Not available (23)
- A Cost (44), Time (35), Transportation (21)
- H Cost (48), Time (33), Too far to go (20)

Classical, 1985
- W Time (35), Cost (30), Too far to go (25), Not available (24)
- A Time (48), Cost (24), Transportation (17)
- H Insufficient number of respondents

Opera, 1982
- W Cost (35), Time (30), Not available (26)
- A Cost (39), Time (30), Too far to go (12)
- H Cost (68), Too far to go (36), Time (15)

Opera, 1985
- W Cost (37), Time (33), Too far to go (26)
- A Time (61), Transportation (30), Too far to go (14)
- H Insufficient number of respondents

Musical theater, 1982
- W Time (37), Cost (31), Not available (21)
- A Cost (47), Time (29), Lack motivation (12)
- H Cost (37), Time (33), Too far to go (29)

Musical theater, 1985
- W Time (34), Cost (32), Too far to go (19)
- A Cost (43), Time (26), Too far to go (15)
- H Cost (53), Time (37), Child care (17)

Table 4–3 (Continued)
Leading Reasons Given for Nonattendance by Nonattenders Who Wished to Attend

Plays, 1982

W	Time (39), Cost (31), Too far to go (15)
A	Cost (24), Not available (20), Time (15)
H	Cost (44), Time (41), Lack motivation (12)

Plays, 1985

W	Time (39), Cost (25), Not available (21)
A	Time (39), Cost (38), Transportation (14)
H	Cost (60), Time (51), Lack motivation (25)

Ballet, 1982

W	Time (32), Cost (29), Not available (27)
A	Cost (43), Time (33), Not available (14)
H	Cost (46), Time (26), Too far to go (20)

Ballet, 1985

W	Time (35), Cost (33), Too far to go (22)
A	Time (51), Cost (37), Fear of crime (12)
H	Cost (44), Time (28), Too far to go (16)

Art museums and galleries, 1982

W	Time (40), Not available (25), Too far to go (20)
A	Time (31), Cost (23), Lack motivation (18)
H	Time (47), Child care (15), Transportation (13)

Art museums and galleries, 1985

W	Time (39), Not available (24), Too far to go (21)
A	Time (53), Transportation (19), Cost (17)
H	Time (74), Lack motivation (34), Cost (30)

Note: Figures in parentheses are weighted percentages of those nonattending respondents who wanted to attend who reported a given reason for not attending. Data summarized from Appendix Tables 4–1 through 4–7.

more than Hispanics. For most activities, Hispanics were more likely than African-Americans or whites to cite child care problems as reasons for not attending. Fear of crime, handicap or health problems, poor quality, publicity, work related reasons, or performance time did not loom large as reasons for many respondents in any group.

In other words, whites tended to cite reasons indicative of an inadequate supply of activities more than members of other groups. By contrast, African-Americans and Hispanics were more likely than whites to mention problems like cost, transportation, and child care that are associated with insufficient financial resources. It follows from this that programs aimed at improving geographical access to the arts may disproportionately aid white Americans, whereas programs focused on financial access may be more likely to assist African-Americans and Hispanics.

At the same time, however, most of these differences were either relatively weak or somewhat inconsistent from activity to activity or year to year. Overall, the reasons given by African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites who did not attend the core activities but would like to do so, were rather similar, and focused on cost, time, and availability.

Conclusions

Demand for participation in the seven core attendance activities appears to be cultivated by attendance. People who already attend are much more likely to want to attend more than are people who do not. Thus, although there is much apparent unsated demand for these activities, most of it comes from attenders rather than nonattenders. Because, with the exception of jazz performances, whites are more likely to attend than are African-Americans or Hispanics, unsated demand appears to be greater among whites than among members of these other two groups.

If we look only at nonattenders, members of groups with higher attendance rates (African-Americans for jazz performance, whites for the other attendance activities) are more likely than others to say they want to attend. If we take professed desire for attendance at face value, then if all barriers to attendance were removed, the absolute differences in percentage participation rates between the groups that participate most and those that participate least would increase. Because intergroup differences in desired participation among nonattenders are less, in most but not all cases, than are intergroup differences in actual participation, the ratios of white attendance to African-American and Hispanic attendance, respectively, would decline somewhat

for most, but not all, activities if everyone did what he or she said they wanted to do.

Data on people's reasons for not attending are difficult to interpret and the numbers of African-American and Hispanic respondents are small. This weak evidence suggests that white, African-American, and Hispanic would-be attenders are all deterred most frequently by cost, lack of time, and limited availability. At the same time, whites are somewhat more likely to mention reasons related to limited availability than are members of other groups, whereas African-American and Hispanic respondents are more likely to mention reasons related to cost. Because, except for jazz, white nonattenders were more likely to report wanting to attend the events about which they were asked than were African-Americans or Hispanic nonattenders, and because most intergroup differences were relatively small or inconsistent, the evidence does not indicate that eliminating income-related barriers would quickly or markedly erode intergroup differences in participation.

These findings may seem inconsistent with some of the results presented in earlier chapters. For example, we noted earlier that the differences in rates of participation between whites, on the one hand, and Hispanics and African-Americans, on the other, were less for watching the arts on television than for live attendance. This led us to suggest that African-Americans and Hispanics might be deterred from live attendance at the core activities (other than jazz) by something other than taste. Yet the "want-more" questions failed to uncover greater unsated demand for live attendance (except for jazz) among these groups than among white Americans.

One reason for this may be that live attendance at an arts event requires a greater degree of commitment than watching a similar event on television. A second reason may be that demand for live attendance is influenced more by attributes of the attendance experience than by attributes of a program itself. A third reason is that people may consciously or unconsciously take account of barriers that raise their cost of attendance in responding to questions about unsated demand. The SPPA data do not permit us to determine which, if any, of these explanations is correct.

Our results may also seem at odds with the logistic regression analyses that showed that the difference in participation rates between Hispanic-Americans and (non-Hispanic) white Americans was reduced to insignificance when differences among groups in sociodemographic factors were taken into account. If this were the case, would we not expect to see high levels of unsated demand, explained by economic barriers, among Hispanic Americans?

Not necessarily. Our regression analyses indicated only that Hispanic-

Americans were similar in their participation in the core activities to white Americans with similar sociodemographic characteristics. It seems likely, on the basis of the data we have analyzed, that sociodemographic barriers work not just by making it more difficult for people who want to participate to do so, but also by influencing the extent to which people want to participate.

Our conclusions in this chapter have been general and laced with qualifications. We have relatively little confidence in the usefulness of the SPPA questions on the extent of and reasons for unsated demand for understanding intergroup differences in participation. Some of our reservations have to do with the small number of African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American respondents upon which our analyses, especially of reasons for nonattendance, are based. We hope that future SPPAs will oversample African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American respondents so that more detailed analysis will be possible.

Most of our reservations, however, have to do with the questions themselves, which seem to us to embody an unsophisticated view of human motivation. Although responses to these questions may be applicable to short-term marketing issues, we suspect that they tell us little about the complex processes that culminate in demand for attendance at arts events or about the long-term potential for increases in participation.

Chapter 5

EVIDENCE ON RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATION FROM THE NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 1982 SUBSAMPLE

Most of the analyses reported in Chapters 2 and 3 drew on data from all respondents to the 1982 and 1985 SPPAs. Because there were so many respondents, these analyses were statistically powerful, and permitted confident generalization.

At the same time, because most of the SPPA questions were asked only in certain months, reliance on these prevented us from exploring relationships among answers to the full range of questions the surveys included. In this chapter, we take advantage of the survey's breadth by using data collected in November and December 1982. In these months alone, respondents were asked all of the questions that appeared on the SPPA survey.

There are two advantages to focusing on this subsample. First, we can go beyond the core items to examine participation in a broader range of artistic activities. We have already noted that intergroup differences vary for different kinds of arts participation. In this chapter we investigate such differences more thoroughly.

Second, the November/December 1982 subsample permits us to explore the combined effects on participation of a broader range of explanatory variables by including them in the same models. In addition to the sociodemographic factors investigated in Chapter 3, in this chapter we consider the influence on participation of childhood experience (including both parental guidance and classes or lessons), musical taste, and viewing arts programs on television.

These advantages bear a cost: the decline of statistical power associated

with the number of respondents being reduced from more than 15,000 to 2,255. In particular, some of the following results are based on small numbers of African-American or Hispanic respondents. Thus, the effects of race or ethnicity must be larger than in analyses reported in earlier chapters if they are to reach statistical significance. Nonetheless, the sample size is sufficient to reveal intergroup differences that are substantively important.

The November/December sample contained data on 2,255 respondents, of whom 1,908 were white, 230 were African-American, and 117 were of Hispanic origin.[1] (Respondents classified as "Other" were not included in these analyses.) Table 5-1 compares probabilities of participation by race for November and December in the 10 core activities to those for the year as a whole. The Hispanic-Americans included in the November/December sample were much less likely to report attending classical music concerts, much more likely to report acting, singing, or dancing on stage, and somewhat more likely to report reading imaginative literature than the Hispanic sample for the year as a whole. African-American respondents for November/December were somewhat less likely to report having visited art exhibits or having read imaginative literature than their counterparts during the rest of the year. Attendance rates at classical music concerts, opera performances, plays, ballet performances, and art exhibits were lower for all groups in November/December than in all of 1982. For the most part, however, differences in participation between African-Americans, whites, and Hispanics are similar for the full and for the November/December samples.

Measures

The SPPA gathered many measures of artistic socialization and current participation. In Chapter 3, we focused exclusively on the core participation items. Because this chapter explores the full range of data available, economy of presentation dictates that we use scales — omnibus measures comprising several similar items in a single variable.

As we have seen, different kinds of participation are associated with race and ethnicity in different ways. To develop scales of arts participation, we applied a statistical method called factor analysis to the core participation and other participation variables described in Chapter 2.

Factor analysis permits one to identify families of variables that are strongly associated with one another. In the case of the participation measures, it revealed the existence of four such clusters. (See Appendix Table 5-1.)

Table 5–1
Percentage Participating in Core and Other Arts Activities by Race/Ethnicity, November/December and Full 1982 Samples

	Attend jazz concert		Attend classical concert		Attend opera performance		Attend musical		Attend play	
	Full	N/D	Full	N/D	Full	N/D	Full	N/D	Full	N/D
White	9.1	8.8	14.4	11.7	3.3	1.5	20.7	19.7	13.4	11.6
Afr.-Am.	15.6	16.9	6.7	5.0	1.4	0.5	10.1	8.6	5.8	4.9
Hispanic	8.2	9.0	7.9	2.2	2.5	0.8	11.0	11.8	5.5	3.9

	Attend ballet		Visit art exhibit		Perform on musical instrument		Perform: act/sing/ dance		Read fiction	
	Full	N/D	Full	N/D	Full	N/D	Full	N/D	Full	N/D
White	4.6	3.8	23.9	23.3	4.0	3.8	4.7	4.2	60.2	60.1
Afr.-Am.	1.8	0.7	12.5	9.8	3.4	3.7	4.9	4.4	42.4	38.4
Hispanic	4.5	2.8	16.2	15.9	3.1	4.6	2.9	7.8	36.5	42.5

Note: Weighted percentage of group engaging in activity at least once during 12 months preceding survey.

- *Performing-Arts Attendance*: The first six core participation measures, all involving attendance at performing-arts presentations, loaded together on a single factor. These included (in descending order of the strength of the relationship of each to the others) attending plays, attending ballet, attending musical theater, attending classical music performances, attending opera, and attending jazz performances. The resulting variable is an additive scale of the activities, ranging from 0 to 6.
- *Exhibit Visiting*: The core activity, visiting an art gallery or museum, combined with items on the "other participation" list, forms a second factor. The first four activities in this scale — in descending order, visiting historic monuments, visiting art or craft fairs, visiting science or history museums, and visiting art exhibits — all involved attendance at exhibitions. The fifth and sixth items, reading novels and other imaginative literature and doing needlecrafts, were anomalous,

having in common only that they do not involve the performing arts. This additive scale ranges from 0 to 6.

- *Performing-Arts Activities*: A third factor consists of four activities, two from the core list and two from the "other participation" items, each of which involves producing, rather than consuming, performing-arts events. In descending order these activities, summed to an additive scale ranging from 0 to 4, are acting, singing or dancing on stage, playing a musical instrument in public or on stage, working on a theatrical set, and working on a musical set.
- *Non-Performance Activities*: A fourth factor comprises six activities involving the visual or literary arts, each oriented towards production rather than consumption. In descending order, these are painting or drawing; creative writing; taking art, writing, or music lessons; photography; crafts (other than needlecrafts); and reading or listening to poetry. The additive scale ranges from 0 to 6.

These four scales represent four kinds of cultural participation, varying along two dimensions: performing arts versus visually oriented arts (visual and plastic arts, historical exhibits, literature), and arts consumption versus arts production.

The first scale includes jazz, which African-Americans attended more frequently than whites, along with five other activities that white respondents are more likely to attend than African-Americans. Because race thus affects different parts of the scale in different ways, cancelling one another out to a degree, we created a fifth scale by eliminating jazz from the performing-arts attendance activities. Results for the attendance scales including and excluding jazz, respectively, are reported separately throughout.

A focus of this chapter is on how participation in the arts during childhood (*i.e.*, before age 18) may affect participation in the arts as an adult. We subjected the measures of parental guidance and childhood classes (see Chapter 2 for a description of these variables) to factor analysis (Appendix Table 5-2), from which emerged two scales:

- *Parental Guidance*: A scale ranging from 0 to 4, consisting of the following items, in descending order: parents took child to plays or concerts; parents listened to classical music; parents took child to art museums; and parents encouraged child to read.
- *Childhood Lessons*: A scale ranging from 0 to 8, consisting of items reporting lessons or classes before age 18 in the following areas, in descending order: visual-art production, art appreciation, writing,

Table 5–2
Means for Artistic Socialization, Musical Taste, TV Art Viewing, and Artistic Participation Scales by Race

	N	Parental	Lessons	Art music	TV arts	
White	1,908	1.134	1.240	1.509	1.404	
Afr.-Am.	230	0.860	0.864	0.720	1.082	
Hispanic	117	0.800	0.667	1.084	1.027	
	N	**Attend**	**Attend***	**Exhibits**	**Perform**	**Do other**
White	1,908	0.571	0.483	2.288	0.116	0.762
Afr.-Am.	230	0.365	0.197	1.203	0.094	0.449
Hispanic	117	0.305	0.214	1.597	0.166	0.708

*Excluding attendance at jazz performances. Means are weighted, Ns are unweighted.

music appreciation, crafts, acting, playing an instrument or singing, and ballet.

Throughout this report, we have speculated about the extent to which differences in participation reflect, on the one hand, barriers to participation and, on the other, differences in taste. In this chapter, we use two rough proxies for taste or interest in "high culture." The first is based on the question that asked respondents which of the following kinds of music they like to listen to: classical/chamber, opera, operetta/Broadway/musical/ show tunes, jazz, soul/blues/rhythm and blues, big band, country western, bluegrass, rock, mood/easy listening, folk, barbershop, and hymns/gospel. Factor analysis (Appendix Table 5-3) yielded three factors, of which classical/ chamber, operetta/show tunes, and opera were associated strongly with the first, along with (at lower levels) big band and mood/easy listening music. (Jazz appeared on a distinct factor with soul/blues and rock; and a third factor included bluegrass, country western, folk, barbershop, and hymns/gospel music.) From the components of the first factor, we constructed an additive scale, ranging in value from 0 to 5, which we call *art music.*

A final additive scale is *TV arts,* ranging from 0 to 7, with 1 point for

Table 5–3: Regression Analyses Predicting Scores on Parental Guidance Scale

I.V.	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a
African-American	−.073 b	−.092 d	−.073 b	−.099 d	.044 a
Hispanic	−.071 b	−.078 c	−.076 b	−.085 d	.044 a
Female			.119 d	.099 d	.116 d
Age			−.114 d	−.156 d	.131 d
Father's education					.336 d
Mother's education					.276 d
d.f.	1,750	2,254	1,750	2,254	1,750
R Squared	.008	.012	.033	.044	.271

Note: Additive scale of number of kinds of family-based childhood artistic socialization activities respondents reported. Models labeled "a" are based on only those respondents for whom data on mother's and father's education were available. I.V.=Independent variable.

each kind of arts programming the respondent reported watching on television. Because such programs are available to most Americans free of charge, we regard this as a rough measure of interest in the arts, unaffected by barriers that may reduce attendance at live events or exhibitions.

In addition to the measures described above, we use the same control variables introduced in Chapter 3, as well as three new ones. The latter include father's educational attainment in years; mother's educational attainment; and the number of hours the respondent reported watching television on an average day (Hours TV). Because data on father's or mother's education are missing for many cases, these variables are used only for analyses based on a special subsample. Hours of television is included as a control variable for analysis with TV arts.

Intergroup Differences in Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales

Let us begin by considering intergroup differences in mean scores on the scales described above. (See Table 5-2.) Not surprisingly, the patterns mirror those noted in Chapter 2 with respect to the items of which these scales consist. White respondents reported more parental guidance experiences (1.13 compared to .86 and .80) than African-American or Hispanic respondents, respectively, as well as more kinds of classes or lessons (1.24) than African-Americans (.86) or, especially, Hispanic-Americans (.67). Whites reported liking more of the musical genres on the art music scale (1.51) than Hispanic (1.08) or, especially, African-American (.72) respondents. They also reported watching more kinds of televised arts programs (1.40) than African-American or Hispanic respondents (1.08 and 1.02).

Whites also had higher scores than African-Americans and Hispanics on all the participation measures but performance activities. The differences were greatest with respect to the visually oriented consumption scale, for which the average for white respondents was 2.29, compared to 1.60 for Hispanic and 1.20 for African-Americans. Intergroup differences in other areas were more modest. Indeed, Hispanics participated in slightly more performance activities and almost as many nonperformance activities as whites.

Although differences among groups are notable, especially with respect to consuming, rather than producing, art, even more striking is the modest degree of participation evident among any of these groups. Fewer than half the respondents from any group, for example, attended a performing-arts activity other than jazz, or participated in a performance, either onstage or backstage. Variation by race or ethnicity is limited, then, because whites, African-Americans, and Hispanic-Americans all reported low rates of participation.

Race, Ethnicity, and Parental Guidance

African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans report fewer parental-guidance experiences than do white Americans. Do these differences reflect differences in the degree to which African-American, Hispanic, and white parents value the arts? Or do they, instead, stem from differences in socioeconomic opportunity related to race or ethnicity?

To answer this question, we used multiple regression analysis, a method that lets one estimate net effects of race and ethnicity while holding other potential causal factors constant. In other words, the resulting coefficients describe differences between African-Americans and whites and between Hispanics and whites who are similar with respect to the variables for which we have controlled. Table 5-3 reports results of analyses predicting scores on the parental guidance scale, and Table 5-4 reports results of the analyses for lessons taken during childhood. Independent variables are arrayed vertically to the left of the page. Their statistical effects appear on the right, expressed as standardized coefficients, enabling us to compare the impacts of different predictors in a common metric.

Each table reports results of three separate analyses or models, each containing different sets of variables. The pair of columns labelled 1a and 1b reports the influence of being African-American or Hispanic (as compared to white, the omitted category), without controlling for any other factors. As such, they are comparable to Table 5-2. The second pair of columns, 2a and 2b, reports results of models that included controls for gender and age. The column labelled 3 is based on a model that included controls for parental education.

The first two models (1 and 2) are reported in two columns because the analyses were executed twice: once on the full November/December sample and once on a partial subsample, consisting of 1,751 cases from November and December that contained data on mother's and father's education. The latter data are somewhat biased because respondents who could not report their parents' educational level were disproportionately lower in socioeconomic status than the sample as a whole. On the other hand, the subsample includes information that is vital for understanding family influences.[2]

Columns 1a and 1b for tables 5-3 and 5-4 confirm that African-American and Hispanic respondents received significantly less childhood experience in the arts than their white counterparts. Columns 2a and 2b indicate that this difference remains constant (for parental guidance) or grows (for lessons and classes) after controlling for differences in gender composition and age among the three groups.

The models reviewed thus far fail to take into account the fact that parents of African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans, on average, received considerably less formal education than parents of white Americans. When we control for mother's and father's education in model 3, two things become clear. First, parental education explains much more variation in parental guidance than does race or ethnicity. Second, African-American and Hispanic respondents received no less parental guidance than did white

Table 5–4
Regression Analyses Predicting Scores on Childhood Lessons Scale

I.V.	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a
African-American	−.069 b	−.085 d	−.074 c	−.100 d	−.011
Hispanic	−.080 c	−.091 d	−.102 d	−.111 d	−.038
Female			.057 a	.051 b	.056 b
Age			−.341 d	−.371 d	−.209 d
Father's education					.168 d
Mother's education					.159 d
d.f.	1,750	2,254	1,750	2,254	1,750
R Squared	.009	.013	.125	.151	.192

Note: Additive scale of number of kinds of lessons or classes respondent reported taking before the age of 18. Models labeled "a" are based on only those respondents for whom data on mother's and father's education were available.

Americans of equivalent age with similarly educated parents. Indeed, both African-American and Hispanic respondents reported that their parents gave them slightly, but significantly, *more* kinds of exposure or encouragement than did parents of whites. Parental education had less influence on classes or lessons, which include those for which the schools as well as those for which the family are responsible. Nonetheless, once one controls for mother's and father's years of schooling, the effects of race and ethnicity on lessons are no longer significant.

Race, Ethnicity, Musical Taste, and Television Arts Viewing

We have seen that Hispanic and, especially, African-American respondents reported liking fewer of the genres on the art-music scale than whites and viewed somewhat fewer kinds of televised arts programs. Do race and ethnicity exert an independent influence on taste for art music or interest in the watching of arts programs on television? Or do differences stem entirely from intergroup variation in characteristics like socioeconomic status or artistic socialization that are related to artistic tastes or interests?

With respect to scores on the art-music scale (which includes big bands and easy listening as well as classical music, opera, and musical theater), being African-American, but not being Hispanic, makes a differences (see Table 5-5). Without controls, both African-Americans and Hispanics report liking significantly fewer of these musical styles than whites. Controlling for sociodemographic factors eliminates the difference between whites and Hispanics, and accounts for almost half the difference between African-Americans and whites. Nonetheless, the remaining effect of race indicates that African-American and white musical tastes are significantly different. Controlling for childhood experience reduces the remaining African-American/white margin by only 14 percent, and the difference remains statistically significant.

Race is not a major factor, however, compared to other significant predictors of differences in art-music scores. The effect of age, for example, is almost four times that of race, the influence of educational attainment almost three times as great, and the effects of parental guidance and childhood lessons twice as substantial. (See Appendix Table 5-5.)

The small but significant tendency for African-Americans and Hispanics to report viewing fewer kinds of televised arts programs than whites is entirely the result of sociodemographic differences among these groups. In other words, if we take such viewing as a measure of interest in the arts, African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans display just as much interest as do whites who are similar in educational attainment, occupational status, income, and related characteristics.[3]

Race, Ethnicity, and Artistic Participation

In this section we consider effects of race and ethnicity on five scales of participation: attending performing-arts events (jazz included); attendance at performing-arts events (jazz excluded); visiting museums, fairs, or exhibits,

Table 5–5
Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Art-Music Scale and Number of Kinds of Televised Arts Programs Viewed

	Art music			TV arts		
Model	1	2	3	1	2	3
African-American	−.179 d	−.093 d	−.080 d	−.057 b	.017	.028
Hispanic	−.067 b	.001	.019	−.047 a	.009	.030

Note: Standardized beta coefficients. a=p less than .05; b=p less than .01; c=p less than .001; d=p less than .0001. Model 1 includes no control variables. Model 2 includes controls for gender, age, educational attainment, occupation (white-collar v. other), family income, marital status (single or divorced v. other), and residence in SMSA. Model 3 includes same controls as model 2 as well as controls for parental guidance and childhood lessons. Based on 2,255-person sample from November/December 1982.

reading literature and related activities; performing on stage or working backstage at performances; and producing visual, craft, or literary arts.

Throughout this report we have emphasized that artistic participation is multi-dimensional. Because the participation scales used in this chapter vary along two dimensions (consuming/producing, performing arts/other arts), we can use them to pursue this point. The reader should remember, however, that even the broad array of activities included in the participation scales does not begin to exhaust the diversity of artistic activities in the contemporary United States. In particular, except for jazz, the SPPA did not ask people about art forms or activities with special links to African-American, Hispanic, or other American racial or ethnic minority communities.

Absent controls for other variables (Table 5-6, model 1 under each participation heading), African-Americans reported participating in fewer items than white Americans on each scale except performance activities. Hispanic respondents reported fewer consumption activities than non-Hispanic whites, but not fewer production activities. None of the zero-order differences is very large, although the differences between African-Ameri-

Table 5–6
Effects of Race and Ethnicity on Arts Participation Scales

	Attend performances				Attend performances†			
Model:	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.067 b	.015	.026	.031	−.107 d	−.022	−.013	−.006
Hispanic	−.061 b	−.002	.012	.001	−.070 c	−.008	.004	−.007

	Visual consumption				Performance activities			
Model:	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.199 D	−.115 d	−.101 d	−.094 d	−.016	−.004	.003	.007
Hispanic	−.088 d	−.024	−.004	−.016	.025	.038	.049 a	.045 a

	Other activities			
Model:	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.091 d	−.056 b	−.035	−.032
Hispanic	−.011	.016	.043 a	.034

†Second attendance scale does not include jazz. **Note:** Standardized beta coefficients. a=p less than .05; b=p less than .01; c=p less than .001; d=p less than .0001. Model 1 includes no control variables. Model 2 includes controls for gender, age, educational attainment, occupation (white-collar v. other), family income, marital status (single or divorced v. other), and residence in SMSA. Model 3 includes same controls as model 2 as well as controls for parental guidance and childhood lessons. Model 4 includes same controls as model 3 as well as controls for art-music scale, TV arts viewing, and hours spent watching all kinds of television on average day. Based on 2,255-person sample from November/December 1982.

cans and whites with respect to visually oriented consumption activities and, to a lesser extent, attending performances (excluding jazz) are moderate.

When sociodemographic controls are entered into the predictive equations (model 2), the negative coefficients of being African-American on performance attendance disappear (with jazz included) or become insignificant (with jazz excluded). Controlling for such factors as educational attainment, family income, having a white-collar occupation, and marital status eliminates all of the differences between African-Americans and whites on the performance-attendance scale that includes jazz, and almost 80 percent of the difference on the scale excluding jazz. Sociodemographic controls also reduce the effect of race on visually oriented consumption activities by more than 40 percent, and on visual-art, craft, and literary activities by almost as much, but the differences between whites and African-Americans remain statistically significant in these areas.

Sociodemographic differences account for almost all of the difference between whites and Hispanics in performance attendance and more than 70 percent of the gap in the exhibit-visiting scale. When these characteristics are taken into account, being Hispanic has no significant influence on any form of participation.

The third model adds controls for childhood experience (both parental guidance and lessons and classes) to the sociodemographic measures. These additional controls reduce the remaining effect of being African-American on visiting exhibits by only 12 percent, leaving a small but statistically significant difference between otherwise similar African-Americans and whites. They reduce the African-American coefficient for nonperformance creative activities by almost 40 percent, to nonsignificance.

Although the impact of being African-American on visiting exhibits is statistically significant, it is small relative to the influence of other predictors. For example, it is less than half the size of the effects of educational attainment, gender, and parental socialization, and well below the influence of lessons and classes during youth.[4]

We have already seen that whenever Hispanics had significantly lower scores on participation scales than whites, these differences were almost entirely the consequence of intergroup sociodemographic differences. With respect to the consumption scales — performance attendance and visually oriented activities — controlling for childhood experience makes no notable difference. With respect to the art-producing activities, both performance and nonperformance, when one controls for childhood experience in the arts, Hispanic Americans are involved in slightly, but significantly, *more* activities than are whites. In other words, Hispanic respondents reported partici-

pating in more artistic production activities than did white or African-American respondents of similar socioeconomic status and with comparable socialization into the arts.

With respect to nonperformance activities, the positive effect of being Hispanic is small relative to that of other predictors: about one-eighth as large as childhood lessons, less than one-third the effect of home socialization, less than half the size of educational attainment, and smaller than the effect of age, income, marital status, having a white-collar occupation, and living in an SMSA. By contrast, the coefficient for Hispanic origin, although small, is one of only four significant predictors of onstage or offstage performance activities, and the largest demographic predictor other than income.

The fourth model we investigated added three new control variables: the art-music scale, the TV arts viewing scale, and a measure of hours watched per day of all kinds of television. These additional controls did not materially alter the results of the earlier models, except insofar as they reduced the coefficient for being Hispanic as a predictor of participation in nonperformance production activities to insignificance. What this means is that more than one-fifth of the advantage associated with being Hispanic in nonperformance production ("other activities") results from Hispanic respondents having musical tastes and viewing habits associated with this kind of participation.

Summary of Findings Thus Far

The analyses reported above clarify certain issues raised in earlier chapters. In Chapter 2, we saw that African-American and Hispanic respondents received fewer forms of parental guidance in reading and the fine arts and took fewer arts-related classes or lessons at an early age than did whites. In this chapter, we have seen that these differences are entirely a result of the fact that African-American and Hispanic respondents had parents who had received fewer years of formal education than had the parents of white respondents. Controlling for parental education, African-American and Hispanic parents gave their children significantly more parental guidance experiences than did comparable white parents. To the extent that the way one socializes one's children reflects the value one places on the arts, then African-American and Hispanic families appear to value the arts (and reading) as much as comparable white families.

In Chapters 2 and 3 we raised the question of whether differences in participation between whites on the one hand, and African-Americans and

Hispanics on the other, resulted from differences in opportunity or from differences in taste. In this chapter we have looked at two proxy indicators of taste for the fine arts. The first, a scale of the number of kinds of art music and related genres respondents said they enjoyed, is a fairly direct indicator of a narrow spectrum of taste. The second, a scale of the number of kinds of arts programs respondents reported viewing on television, is a more indirect indicator of interest in a broader range of the arts.

If we treat television viewing of the arts as an indicator of interest in the arts, then we see that African-American and Hispanic-Americans are no less interested in the arts than are white Americans of similar socioeconomic status. The same is true of taste for classical and related forms of music for Hispanic-Americans. By contrast, African-Americans do report liking fewer kinds of art music (but recall that this scale includes big band, Broadway, and easy listening music, as well as classical) than whites, and only about half of the difference is explained by sociodemographic characteristics. However, the results reported in Table 5-6 for model 4 indicate that this small difference in taste cannot explain interracial differences in any of the arts participation scales.

Whereas most of the core questions examined in Chapter 3 concerned attendance at live, high-culture, performing arts events, use of the "other participation" items in constructing the participation scales permitted us to distinguish among the determinants of different kinds of participation. The analyses further confirmed that one cannot generalize about the effects of race or ethnicity on cultural participation *per se*. Hispanic Americans attended fewer public arts activities than whites, but this difference is almost entirely the result of the fact that white Americans have more formal education, higher incomes, and higher status occupations. When these factors are controlled, Hispanic-Americans participate in active art-making activities significantly *more* than do white Americans.

African-American/white differences in participation also vary for different kinds of activities. There is no statistically significant difference between African-American and white respondents with respect to participating on-stage or backstage in performing-arts events. And the significant difference between African-Americans and white Americans in the number of kinds of performing-arts events attended stems almost entirely from differences between African-Americans and whites in sociodemographic characteristics other than race.[5] Significant, although relatively small, differences between white and African-American respondents who are similar in sociodemographic profile did appear with respect to the scales measuring visually oriented consumption activities and in the nonperformance creative activity

scale. The latter difference was attributable to differences between African-Americans and whites in childhood experience, whereas the former persisted even after controls for childhood experience, musical taste, and televised arts viewing were entered into the model.

One advantage of multiple regression analysis over logistic regression analysis (the method used in Chapter 3) is that it enables one to compare the relative influence of different predictive factors using a common metric. The analyses reported above indicate that even in those relatively few cases in which race or ethnicity affect artistic outcomes after controlling for intergroup sociodemographic differences, those effects are usually dwarfed by those of childhood experience and educational attainment, and exceeded by other measures of socioeconomic status.

In other words, at least for the range of participation measures about which the SPPA surveys asked, most differences among white, African-American, and Hispanic respondents result from differences in the sociodemographic attributes of members of these groups. Where differences in participation other than those for which such factors account are found, they vary among kinds of participation. African-Americans report receiving more kinds of parental guidance into the arts, like art music and related genres less (but like jazz more), visit fewer kinds of public exhibitions, and engage in fewer arts, crafts, and literary creative activities than whites who are comparable with respect to sociodemographic characteristics. Hispanic-Americans report benefitting from more kinds of parental guidance and participate in more active art-producing activities (both performance and nonperformance) than white Americans who are comparable sociodemographically and with respect to childhood experience. Such net differences, where they are present, are in most cases small relative to other predictors.

Differences in Models Predicting Artistic Socialization, Taste, and Participation by Race

Do the same factors predict outcomes for African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites, or do members of these groups follow separate paths to artistic participation? Differences in the *predictors* of participation are relevant both to understanding intergroup differences in the *extent* of participation and to evaluating the likely effects of programs and policies aimed at reducing such differences.

In this section we investigate differences in the predictors of socialization, taste, and participation by applying the same predictive models described in the previous section (excluding the dichotomous African-

American and Hispanic variables, of course) separately to respondents from each group. For the childhood experience variables (parental guidance and childhood lessons) these analyses employ the subsample with data on mother's and father's educational attainment and also include gender and age. For art music and TV arts viewing, the full November/December subsample is used for two separate models: with sociodemographic predictors, and with both sociodemographic and socialization variables included. For the participation scales (attending performances with and without jazz, visiting exhibits, performance activities, and nonperformance activities), three models are run using the full November/December subsample: with sociodemographic predictors only; with sociodemographic and childhood experience independent variables; and with sociodemographic, childhood socialization, and taste proxy measures all included.

Table 5-7 reports all instances where predictors for two or more groups are significantly different across comparable models. (The full models are reported in Appendix Tables 5-13 through 5-20.) Most significant differences are between whites and African-Americans or between whites and Hispanics. In part, this is an artifact of sample size. Because the number of white respondents is much greater than the number of African-American or Hispanic respondents, differences between whites and other groups are more likely to be statistically significant than gaps between Hispanics and African-Americans.

Childhood experience. There were no significant intergroup differences in the predictors of childhood classes and lessons. By contrast, once parental education was controlled, age was a significantly positive predictor of parental guidance for whites but a significantly negative predictor for African-Americans. What this means is that whereas white parents of equivalent educational levels have been providing fewer kinds of parental guidance over the lifetimes of our respondents, comparable African-American parents have been providing more kinds of guidance over that same time span. This trend, along with increases in educational attainment among African-Americans, might be expected to moderate or eliminate African-American/white differences in family guidance.

Taste/interest proxies. Older white respondents watched significantly more kinds of televised arts programs and reported liking significantly more kinds of art music, other things equal, than younger whites. By contrast, older African-American and Hispanic respondents were no more likely than otherwise comparable younger ones to have high scores on these scales. Significant

Table 5–7
Significant Differences in Models Predicting Scores on Artistic Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales for African-American, Hispanic, and White Subsamples

SCALE	PREDICTOR	
Parental guidance	AGE	Significantly positive for whites, negative for African-Americans, controlling for gender and parental education
Childhood lessons	None	
TV arts viewing	AGE	Significantly positive for whites, only slightly positive for African-Americans with sociodemographic controls
	EDUCATION	Significantly positive for both whites and African-Americans, but effect for whites significantly stronger, with sociodemographic controls
Art music	AGE	Significantly positive effect for whites, insignificant weak effects for African-Americans and Hispanics, both with sociodemographic controls only and with socio-demographic and socialization controls.
	EDUCATION	With sociodemographic controls, strongly significant for whites, significant but less so for African-Americans; with socialization controls, still strongly significant for whites, insignificant for African-Americans
Performance attendance inc. jazz	EDUCATION	More strongly significant for whites than for African-Americans with sociodemographic control only; insignificant for Hispanics with sociodemographic controls and negative for Hispanics with additional controls
Performance attendance exc. jazz	EDUCATION	More strongly significant for whites than for African-Americans with sociodemographic and socialization controls; insignificant for Hispanics with sociodemographic controls and negative with other controls
	SMSA	Significantly positive for whites, negative for African-Americans with sociodemographic controls; negative and significant for African-Americans, insignificant for whites with sociodemographic and socialization controls

Table 5–7 (Continued)
Significant Differences in Models Predicting Scores on Artistic Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales for African-Americans, Hispanic, and White Subsamples

SCALE	PREDICTOR	
Exhibition visiting	EDUCATION	Strongly significant for whites, all models; for African-Americans, more weakly significant with sociodemographic controls, insignificant with other controls
	OCCUPATION (white collar)	More significantly positive for African-Americans than for whites with sociodemographic controls; significantly positive for Hispanics, insignificant for whites, with sociodemographic, socialization, and taste controls
	GENDER (female)	Significantly positive for whites, insignificant for Hispanics, all models
	PARENTAL	More significantly positive for African-Americans than for whites, all models
	TV ARTS	More significantly positive for Hispanics than for whites
Performance activity	INCOME	Significantly negative for whites, all models; significantly positive for Hispanics with sociodemographic and with sociodemographic and socialization controls, and positive but insignificant with all controls
Nonperformance activity	AGE	Significantly negative for whites, positive for African-Americans, with all controls
	EDUCATION	More significantly positive for whites than for African-Americans with sociodemographic controls
	OCCUPATION (white collar)	Significantly positive for African-Americans, all models; significantly but less positive for whites, models with sociodemographic and with sociodemographic and socialization controls, insignificant in model with all controls
	PARENTAL SOCIALIZATION	Significantly positive for Hispanics but not for African-Americans, model with socialization controls
	TV ARTS VIEWING	Significantly positive for Hispanics, less significantly positive for whites, not significant for African-Americans

Note: For full models, see Appendix Tables 5-11 through 5-17.

differences in the effects of age for whites as compared to African-Americans (for art music and TV arts viewing) and Hispanics (for art music) suggest the possibility of a convergence in musical taste and interest in the arts. Although these differences may simply represent an absence of aging effects in the minority subpopulations, they may instead reflect cohort change in the African-American and Hispanic communities. One other intergroup difference was evident. Educational attainment was more strongly and positively predictive of TV arts viewing and liking for art music and related genres for white than for African-American respondents.

Participation Scales. The most notable intergroup difference was that educational attainment was more strongly related for whites than for African-Americans to performing-arts attendance (both including and excluding jazz), exhibition attendance and related activities, and nonperformance creative activities. In most cases, the effect of education was significant for African-Americans as well as for whites, but smaller in magnitude. A similar pattern appeared in the difference between white and Hispanic respondents in effects of education on attending the performing arts (both including and excluding jazz), but not on the other participation scales.

In other words, to use the language of economics, returns to investments in education in the form of increased participation in a range of artistic activities are larger for whites than for African-Americans or Hispanics. One possible explanation for such a finding is that African-American respondents may have received different *kinds* of education than white respondents. If, for example, African-Americans were more likely to go to high schools where the arts were not stressed, to take vocational rather than college preparatory courses, to attend community colleges rather than liberal arts colleges, or to major in technical or business subjects rather than in the humanities, any of these factors might account for the differences in the effects of education.

By contrast, the effects of having a white-collar occupation on nonperformance consumption and production activities were larger for African-Americans than for whites, as they were on visiting exhibitions and related activities for Hispanics. In other words, there is some evidence that, at least with respect to nonperformance items, occupation plays a more important role in determining the participation of African-Americans and Hispanics than of whites, whereas education is more important in determining participation levels of whites than of African-Americans and Hispanics.

Other intergroup differences in the effects of sociodemographic factors were each restricted to just one form of participation in the arts. Living in an

SMSA had a positive effect on performing-arts attendance (excluding jazz) for white respondents, but a negative influence on attendance for African-Americans. Other things being equal, white women were more likely to visit museums and exhibits than white men, but no such gender differences appeared for Hispanics. Family income was positively related to onstage and backstage performance activities for Hispanic respondents, but negatively related to such activities for whites. Consistent with findings described in Chapter 3, the gap in participation between women and men was greater among whites than among African-Americans for all the scales, but unlike those analyses, the differences never reached statistical significance.

In general, the effects of childhood socialization on participation scores were weaker, although still significant, for whites than for members of other groups. The only difference between groups that was significant, however, was for visually oriented consumption activities, where parental guidance exerted a significantly stronger impact on participation by African-Americans respondents than on that of whites.

In Chapter 2, we noted that differences between African-Americans and whites with respect to taking classes or lessons in the arts were relatively small, compared to differences in participation in the core activities, and speculated about the efficacy of the schools in increasing equality of opportunity for participation in the arts. Except for the performance attendance scale that included jazz, the effects of lessons or classes in the arts were smaller for African-Americans than for whites or Hispanics. This finding is consistent with the weaker effects of educational attainment on participation for African-Americans than for whites, and may indicate either that African-Americans took different kinds of classes or lessons than members of other groups or that, for some other reason, classes or lessons were less effective in stimulating adult activity among African-Americans than among other respondents. On the other hand, these differences, although pervasive, never reached statistical significance, so, at most, they suggest hypotheses for further research.

In Chapter 2, we also noted the smaller differences in patterns of watching the arts on television than in patterns of live attendance between white Americans, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans, on the other, and speculated as to whether television might be a force for increasing minority participation in the arts. For Hispanic respondents, this hypothesis seems to be a credible one: watching televised arts programs is significantly related to each of the participation scales, even after controlling for sociodemographic factors, childhood experience measures, taste for art music, and amount of television viewing of all kinds. For each

scale, the impact of viewing the arts on television is greater for Hispanics than for any other group, and for the nonperformance scales, both visually oriented consumption and nonperformance production activities, the relationship is significantly stronger for Hispanic respondents than for African-Americans. By contrast, for African-Americans, viewing the arts on television has a weaker effect on each of the participation scales than for whites or for Hispanics, and is a significant predictor only of the performance attendance scales. The effects of TV arts viewing on participation for whites is intermediate between that for Hispanics and African-Americans for each kind of participation.

What can we make of these differences? One possibility is that televised arts programs boost arts participation among Hispanic-Americans more than among African-Americans or whites. A plausible alternative explanation is that participating in the arts as consumers or producers makes Hispanics want to watch arts programs on television more than it does African-Americans or whites. Or, viewing arts programs may simply be a better proxy measure of interest in the arts for Hispanics than for members of other groups. These possibilities can at best serve as hypotheses for further research, especially given the fact that only two of the intergroup differences are statistically significant.

Taken together, however, the findings suggest an intriguing and potentially important hypothesis: the links between childhood classes and lessons (but not parental guidance), formal education, televised arts viewing, and artistic participation may be weaker among African-Americans than for the Hispanic or white subpopulations. Whether this conclusion would survive replication, given the statistical insignificance of many of the results, is uncertain. If the hypotheses are confirmed, it remains to be seen whether the differences result from differences in the kinds of education African-Americans and other Americans receive, the kinds of classes they take, and the kinds of arts programs they watch; or from aspects of the African-American experience that blunt the impact of education on artistic interests and behavior.

Do Intergroup Differences Vary by Gender, Educational Attainment, or Age?

Table 5-8 displays means by race for subsamples based on differences among respondents in educational attainment, gender, and age. The educational attainment categories are less than high school, high school graduation

Table 5–8
Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables by Race by Education, Gender, Age — Including Respondents without Data or Parental Education

	N	Lessons	Home	Art music	Attend	Visit	Attend no jazz	Perform	Dovis	TV arts
EDUCATION										
11 & Less										
White	447	0.528	0.550	0.894	0.148	1.065	0.129	0.079	0.276	0.660
		1.054	0.674	1.195	0.482	1.203	0.447	0.346	0.692	1.333
African-American	106	0.318	0.516	0.316	0.115	0.467	0.058	0.023	0.143	0.668
		0.752	0.659	0.927	0.319	0.812	0.233	0.149	0.452	1.386
Hispanic	54	0.290	0.626	0.886	0.161	0.966	0.088	0.152	0.494	0.806
		0.810	0.919	1.272	0.368	1.331	0.284	0.496	0.927	1.681
12 Years										
White	801	1.187	1.027	1.368	0.387	2.275	0.323	0.082	0.694	1.260
		1.312	0.870	1.287	0.785	1.630	0.696	0.341	1.025	1.689
African-American	80	1.272	0.990	0.872	0.304	1.400	0.084	0.181	0.469	1.200
		1.557	0.824	1.168	0.549	1.586	0.337	0.502	0.874	1.498
Hispanic	38	1.093	0.804	1.239	0.332	1.959	0.264	0.244	0.781	0.955
		1.297	0.650	1.062	0.738	1.653	0.553	0.642	1.317	1.455
13–15 Years										
White	342	1.758	1.558	1.833	0.837	2.779	0.700	0.166	1.044	1.676
		1.580	0.963	1.490	1.169	1.674	1.023	0.536	1.297	1.847
African-American	28	1.082	1.285	1.088	0.673	1.993	0.432	0.111	0.910	1.299
		1.206	0.855	1.384	0.906	1.688	0.735	0.400	1.102	1.528
Hispanic	20	0.714	1.209	1.344	0.605	2.347	0.460	0.101	1.069	1.687
		0.760	0.589	1.202	1.209	1.316	0.896	0.301	1.412	1.732
16 & Over										
White	318	1.781	1.738	2.339	1.308	3.457	1.120	0.194	1.286	2.471
		1.510	1.025	1.427	1.345	1.596	1.196	0.618	1.305	2.103
African-American	16	1.649	1.438	1.625	1.474	3.001	1.046	0.067	1.242	2.471
		1.566	0.940	1.371	1.534	1.575	1.137	0.249	1.119	2.286
Hispanic	5	1.292	0.987	1.022	0.432	2.602	0.216	0.000	1.008	1.271
		1.179	0.458	1.602	0.823	2.220	0.411	0.000	1.256	1.993

Table 5–8 (Continued)
Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables by Race by Education, Gender, Age — Including Respondents without Data or Parental Education

	N	Lessons	Home	Art music	Attend	Visit	Attend no jazz	Perform	Dovis	TV arts
GENDER										
Male										
White	860	1.177	1.033	1.357	0.475	1.839	0.389	0.094	0.688	1.319
		1.344	0.896	1.349	0.906	1.594	0.787	0.399	1.075	1.770
African-American	92	0.921	0.783	0.652	0.361	0.890	0.168	0.090	0.450	1.055
		1.450	0.823	1.217	0.754	1.249	0.511	0.341	0.855	1.621
Hispanic	56	0.631	0.817	0.994	0.241	1.473	0.161	0.134	0.742	1.085
		1.020	0.722	1.069	0.692	1.351	0.496	0.469	1.223	1.593
Female										
White	48	1.296	1.225	1.645	0.657	2.690	0.567	0.135	0.828	1.480
		1.494	1.029	1.459	1.096	1.756	0.974	0.477	1.162	1.864
African-American	138	0.818	0.922	0.776	0.369	1.457	0.220	0.097	0.447	1.104
		1.199	0.847	1.171	0.780	1.684	0.603	0.375	0.864	1.599
Hispanic	61	0.703	0.783	1.175	0.368	1.723	0.268	0.197	0.675	0.968
		1.120	0.870	1.368	0.778	1.824	0.590	0.556	1.156	1.738
AGE										
18–30										
White	605	1.915	1.288	1.023	0.528	2.511	0.401	0.136	1.142	1.134
		1.653	0.921	1.113	0.982	1.712	0.811	0.467	1.349	1.535
African-American	80	1.454	1.018	0.680	0.544	1.606	0.197	0.140	0.600	1.310
		1.515	0.799	1.099	0.809	1.609	0.555	0.465	0.969	1.661
Hispanic	44	1.058	0.917	1.229	0.282	1.874	0.196	0.248	1.167	1.177
		1.268	0.589	1.145	0.765	1.621	0.549	0.629	1.469	1.630
31–51										
White	647	1.192	1.129	1.751	0.693	2.517	0.595	0.148	0.789	1.547
		1.303	0.965	1.468	1.082	1.696	0.962	0.519	1.082	1.877
African-American	74	0.737	0.950	0.964	0.312	1.244	0.223	0.078	0.506	1.044
		1.238	0.909	1.340	0.769	1.611	0.589	0.267	0.913	1.517
Hispanic	47	0.481	0.794	1.019	0.386	1.701	0.287	0.062	0.494	0.989
		0.811	0.806	1.251	0.817	1.709	0.629	0.318	0.955	1.645

Table 5–8 (Continued)
Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables by Race by Education, Gender, Age — Including Respondents without Data or Parental Education

	N	Lessons	Home	Art music	Attend	Visit	Attend no jazz	Perform	Dovis	TV arts
Over 51										
White	656	0.660	0.996	1.717	0.488	1.852	0.446	0.065	0.382	1.511
		0.979	1.007	1.498	0.961	1.710	0.888	0.313	0.746	1.978
African-American	78	0.208	0.535	0.484	0.184	0.604	0.165	0.050	0.172	0.815
		0.543	0.706	1.069	0.648	1.062	0.544	0.276	0.492	1.599
Hispanic	26	0.309	0.603	0.945	0.197	0.914	0.115	0.209	0.283	0.828
		0.872	1.037	1.309	0.475	1.135	0.319	0.548	0.618	1.752

but no further education, some college, and at least college graduation. Age categories were derived by dividing the population into three groups of similar size: 18 to 30, 31 to 51, and older than 51 years of age.

The educational means must be interpreted with caution, because only 16 African-American respondents and only 5 Hispanic respondents in the November/December sample had 16 or more years of formal education, and only 28 African-Americans and 20 Hispanics had attended college for 1 to 3 years. Differences in means between African-American and white respondents were smaller (expressed as ratios) among college graduates than among other groups with respect to taste for art music, performing-arts attendance, museum and exhibition visiting, and nonperformance creative activities. By contrast, the gaps between Hispanics and whites in participation (again, expressed in ratios) tended to be greater among the more highly educated. For example, Hispanics without high-school degrees had higher means than their non-Hispanic white counterparts on performing-arts attendance (including jazz), watching arts television, and participating in performance and nonperformance production activities.

Comparisons of intergroup differences by age are also complicated by small subsample sizes. Nonetheless, the results are striking (see Table 5-9). Comparing mean scores of respondents 52 years of age or over, 31 to 51 years old, and 18 to 30 years of age, we see that the ratio of white to African-American participation rises monotonically with age for lessons and classes, art music, televised arts viewing, performing-arts attendance (in-

Table 5–9
Ratio of White to African-American and of White to Hispanic Weighted Means for Socialization, Taste, and Participation Scales, by Age of Respondent (Nov./Dec. 1982 Subsample)

Ratios, white means: African-American means

Age	Parental guidance	Lessons	Art music	TV arts	Attend (w/jazz)
18–30	1.27	1.32	1.50	0.87	0.97
31–51	1.19	1.62	1.82	1.48	2.23
52+	1.86	3.17	3.55	1.85	2.65

	Attend (no jazz)	Exhibits	Perform	Other creative
18–30	2.04	1.56	0.97	1.90
31–51	2.67	2.02	1.90	1.56
52+	2.70	3.07	1.30	2.22

Ratios, white means: Hispanic means

Age	Parental guidance	Lessons	Art music	TV arts	Attend (w/jazz)
18–30	1.40	1.81	0.83	0.96	1.87
31–51	1.48	2.48	1.72	1.56	1.80
52+	1.65	2.14	1.82	1.82	2.48

	Attend (no jazz)	Exhibits	Perform	Other creative
18–30	2.05	1.34	0.55	0.98
31–51	2.07	1.48	2.39	1.60
52+	3.88	2.03	0.31	1.35

Number of respondents

Age	White	African-American	Hispanic
18–30	605	80	44
31–51	647	74	47
52+	656	76	26

cluding and excluding jazz), and visually oriented activities. Indeed, a convergence of African-American and white participation is visible for all but performance and nonperformance activities. Among the youngest cohort, African-American means were higher than those of whites for viewing art programs on television, attending performances (including jazz), and participating onstage and backstage in performances.

Reduction among age groups of the white/Hispanic ratios are less marked than those for whites and African-Americans (perhaps due to higher levels of Hispanic immigration), but a monotonic trend appears with respect to parental guidance activities, art music, televised arts viewing, performing-arts attendance (excluding jazz), and visiting exhibits, museums and related activities. Among the youngest cohort, Hispanic means are higher than white means for taste for art music, television arts viewing, and both performance and other creative activities.

Do these declining differences reflect changes in the net effects of race and ethnicity, or changes in the sociodemographic profiles of African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans over the past decades? There is good reason to believe the latter is the case, especially changes in levels of formal education attained by Hispanics and African-Americans. Among the over-51 subsample, the average white respondent had 11.25 years of education, the average African-American respondent, 7.43, and the average Hispanic, 6.52. Among the subsample aged 18 to 30, the white average was 12.82, while the African-American average had risen to 12.33, and the Hispanic average had increased to 11.87. Given the powerful role of education in stimulating participation in the arts, we would expect that such relative advances for African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans should make these groups more similar to whites in patterns of taste and artistic participation.[6]

Summary

White respondents had higher mean scores on all the childhood experience, taste, and participation scales than African-Americans and, with the exception of performance activities, Hispanic respondents. Intergroup differences were modest because scores for all groups were low, and differences were greater for arts consumption than for arts production.

Because their parents had less formal education than white parents, African-American and Hispanic respondents reported receiving fewer kinds of parental guidance experiences and taking fewer kinds of arts lessons or

classes as children and adolescents than white respondents. African-Americans and Hispanics reported about the same number of classes and lessons and significantly more parental guidance experiences than whites of comparable age and family background.

Hispanics liked art music as much and watched as many kinds of televised arts programs as whites with comparable sociodemographic characteristics, and the television arts viewing habits of African-Americans were similar to those of sociodemographically comparable whites. By contrast, sociodemographic differences account for only half of the significant tendency for African-Americans to report enjoying fewer kinds of art music and related genres than whites, and differences in socialization explained little of the remaining gap. Thus, small but significant differences in musical taste are directly related to race.

The effects of being African-American or Hispanic on participation varied depending on whether the activities entailed the consumption or production of art and whether the activities involved the performing arts or the visual and literary arts. Both Hispanics and African-Americans, on average, participate in fewer activities than whites on all three arts consumption scales. By contrast, there is no significant difference between Hispanic and white respondents on either production scale, or between African-Americans and whites with respect to onstage or backstage performance activities. The gap between African-Americans and whites is wider for the visual and literary arts than for the performing arts.

Despite the gross differences, Hispanic-Americans participate in about as many arts-consumption activities as sociodemographically comparable non-Hispanic whites. Hispanic-Americans report being involved in *more* production activities (of both kinds) than sociodemographically similar white Americans with similar amounts of childhood experience in the arts.

Significant differences between African-Americans and whites in performing-arts attendance are also fully accounted for by sociodemographic differences between the two groups. By contrast, sociodemographic factors explain only about two-fifths of the African-American/white difference in visually oriented consumption *and* production activities. Controlling for childhood experience eliminates the significant gap between African-Americans and whites with respect to visual-art and literary production, but has little effect on African-American/white differences in exhibit attendance, literature reading, and related activities. The latter difference remains significant even after controls for artistic taste and interest are added.

Taken together, these findings indicate that intergroup differences vary

across different kinds of participation, that such differences are largely the result of sociodemographic variation between whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics, and that such effects of race or ethnicity as remain once sociodemographic factors are controlled are small relative to the impact of such variables as educational attainment and parental guidance.

For the most part, childhood experience, taste, and participation measures were predicted by the same variables for African-Americans and Hispanics as for whites. Two exceptions were notable, however. The first of these had to do with the effects of age on parental socialization, musical taste, and television arts watching. With parental education controlled, it appears that white parents offer fewer guidance experiences than they used to, while African-American parents offer more, suggesting that a convergence is occurring. Similarly, controlling for other sociodemographic factors, tastes for art music and viewing arts programs on TV increased with age for whites, but not for African-Americans or Hispanics. (Differences were significant except for white/Hispanic TV arts program viewing.) Although these results could mean that white Americans' tastes change more with aging than those of African-Americans or Hispanic-Americans, it seems more likely to indicate a convergence of all groups with respect to tastes for art music and convergence between African-American and white Americans in artistic interests as expressed through watching arts programs on television. These findings are consistent with inspection of means by race and age: among younger respondents, intergroup differences in parental guidance, taste for art music, and television viewing of the arts are smaller than for older respondents.

Second, education had a stronger effect on television viewing of the arts and on all of the participation scales except for performance production activities for whites than for African-Americans, although in most cases it was a significant predictor for both groups. Although the differences were not significant, the effects on the participation scales of taking lessons or classes in the arts were also weaker for African-Americans than for other groups. The same was true of television viewing of the arts, and the differences between African-Americans and Hispanics were significant with respect to nonperformance consumption and production activities. In other words, there is some evidence that formal education, both general and specific to the arts, is more weakly related to adult interest and participation in the arts for African-Americans than for other groups.

For most participation activities, gaps between white and minority subpopulations were greater for older than for younger respondents. The declin-

ing intergroup differences appear to be the result of changes in the sociodemographic profiles of African-Americans, Hispanics, and white Americans, especially rapid increases in the educational attainment of the two former groups, rather than of changes in the effects of race on the participation of otherwise similar men and women.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 1, we called attention to three distinct ways of thinking about "underrepresentation" of groups as participants in artistic activities. The first focuses on gross differences in *rates* of participation. In this view, any statistical underrepresentation is a matter of public concern. The second emphasizes differences in *net rates* of participation between people who are similar in terms of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics other than race or ethnicity. In this view, differing rates of participation are of concern only if they stem directly from racial or ethnic identity. The third perspective asks whether differences in participation, gross *or* net, result from differences in taste or demand between groups or from differences in the degree to which groups face different obstacles to participation. In this view, varying participation is a concern only if it results from inequality of opportunity to participate rather than from differences in taste.

Which of these perspectives one favors will depend on one's more general attitudes towards inequality. It will also depend on one's beliefs about artistic participation. If one believes that participation in the arts is absolutely essential to an acceptable quality of life, one is more likely to believe that gross differences in participation are important. If one believes that participation in the arts is essential, but not so important as education, income, or a good job, one might be more likely to focus upon net differences in participation. If one is not certain whether participation in the arts is important for people, one is more likely to focus on equality of opportunity and to see no virtue in stimulating demand.

In this section, we summarize the results of our analyses of the SPPA data on participation in selected artistic activities by African-Americans, Hispanics, and white Americans.[1] We organize our conclusions along the lines of the questions raised by the three perspectives noted above: gross differences in participation, net differences in participation, and evidence bearing on the relative roles of variation in tastes and varying exposure to barriers in accounting for the differences observed.

Because patterns of differences among groups vary for different kinds of artistic activities and because the SPPA did not ask people about many kinds of artistic activities, we can draw no general conclusions about differences in artistic participation *per se*. Thus, we shall call attention to the kinds of activities to which specific conclusions do and do not apply.

The Surveys of Public Participation in the Arts represent the best resource available for investigating the question with which this report is concerned. But no survey, especially one designed to address a great many different issues, can tell us everything we wish to know. In the final section, we set out an agenda of questions that remain, along with some suggestions about how such questions might be answered.

Do Rates of Participation Vary?

The answer to this question is unambiguous. Rates of participation in most of the activities about which the SPPAs asked vary among white, African-American, and Hispanic respondents. White Americans participate at higher rates than African-Americans or Hispanic-Americans in most of these activities that involved attendance at museums, visual art exhibitions, and live performances. African-Americans participate at higher rates than others, however, as members of jazz audiences.

Differences in rates of participation between whites, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanics on the other, were modest for two kinds of active performing: playing a musical instrument onstage and singing, dancing, or acting in public. With respect to the former, however, differences between whites and African-Americans were greater if only public performances of classical music or jazz were considered. Whites were also more likely than African-Americans or Hispanics to participate in producing visual arts objects such as drawings, paintings, or crafts. For most of these activities, rates of participation were somewhat higher for Hispanic than for African-American respondents, although the differences between white and Hispanic rates exceeded those between Hispanic and African-American rates.

Except for reading imaginative literature, fewer than half of the people surveyed participated in any of the activities about which the "core" and "other activity" questions of the SPPA asked. With respect to all of the activities but reading, visiting art exhibits, visiting science and history museums, visiting historical monuments, and doing needlecrafts, fewer than 20 percent were active. Fewer than 5 percent of respondents attended opera

or musical performances, or performed publicly on musical instruments or by singing, acting, or dancing.

Because relatively few people participated, especially in core activities, absolute differences in participation rates between groups were often small. But absolute differences between participation rates of whites and those of African-Americans were .10 or more in both 1982 and 1985 for visiting art exhibitions, reading works of imaginative literature, visiting science or history museums, visiting historical monuments, attending arts and crafts fairs, and engaging in such needlecrafts as sewing or knitting. White rates exceeded Hispanic rates by this margin in both years for these same activities, except for visiting science or history museums and visiting art exhibits.

By contrast to the relatively small absolute margins of difference, ratios of whites' to others' participation rates were in many cases greater than two to one. African-Americans were less than half as likely as whites in both 1982 and 1985 to work in pottery or other craft media, or to attend classical music concerts, opera performances, musicals, plays, arts and crafts fairs, or ballet performances. Hispanic respondents were less than half as likely to attend plays in both years.

Thus, there were persistent and substantial gaps in the extent to which non-Hispanic white Americans, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans, on the other, reported participating in the arts about which the SPPA asked. African-Americans and Hispanics were less likely than whites to be consumers of both the performing arts and the visual arts. Both groups were less likely to participate in visual-arts activities. Differences between groups were less for performing onstage, particularly in popular genres. Differences were not restricted to Euro-American "high culture" art forms, however. They also appeared for making crafts, reading literature, and visiting historical or scientific museums or exhibits.

Does Participation Vary Net of Sociodemographic Factors?

Do African-American, Hispanic, and white Americans who are similar with respect to such characteristics as gender, age, educational attainment, marital status, occupation, family income, and residence in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) participate at different levels? Here the answer is more complicated.

If we take each of the core activities, one at a time, and control for socioeconomic and demographic effects, we find different patterns for

African-American and Hispanic respondents. For most of the core activities in which whites participated significantly more than African-Americans (all but jazz attendance and performing in public), between approximately 25 and 40 percent of the gap resulted from differences in sociodemographic position between the races. The remaining margins were statistically significant, but small compared to differences associated with educational attainment and other background factors. These differences indicate that some factor or factors make the probability that African-Americans participate in these activities significantly lower than the probability of participation by white Americans who are similar with respect to the socioeconomic and demographic factors for which we controlled. Nonetheless, policies that made African-Americans more similar to whites with respect to educational attainment, occupational status, and family income would diminish differences in rates of participation for every core activity but jazz attendance.

Sociodemographic differences between white and Hispanic respondents accounted for most of the gross differences between whites and Hispanics in attendance at classical music concerts, ballet performances, and art exhibits. With such factors controlled, white participation was significantly greater than Hispanic participation only for attendance at musical stage performances, plays, and (in 1985 only) opera; and for reading imaginative literature and (in 1982 only) acting, singing, or dancing onstage. In 1982, Hispanic respondents were significantly more likely than comparable non-Hispanic whites to attend ballet performances. Because the core activities for which significant differences persisted tended to be those that in the United States are usually presented in the English language (musicals, plays, literature), we speculated that the high proportion of Hispanic-Americans for whom Spanish is the native language may have played a role. If this speculation is correct, then differences between whites and Hispanics in core participation are largely attributable to socioeconomic and linguistic differences. Thus, policies that increased the educational attainment, occupational levels, and incomes of Hispanic-Americans would eliminate much or all of the significant differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites in participation in most of the core activities. Moreover, differences in attendance at plays and musicals and differences in reading literature might be moderated by increasing the availability of such works in Spanish.

We also looked at net differences between groups in scores on five scales developed with the use of factor analysis. These scales represented the number of activities in which respondents participated, rather than the probability of participating in a specific activity. Drawing on a smaller sample of respondents who were asked a wider range of questions, these

analyses looked at scores on five scales: participation as consumers at live performances (with and without jazz included); participation as consumers of visual materials (art and history museums and exhibits and imaginative literature); participation as producers onstage or backstage of performing arts events; participation as producers of visual arts and crafts.

Nearly all of the difference between African-Americans and whites on the performing-arts attendance scale (all of it when jazz was included on the scale) resulted from sociodemographic differences between members of the two racial groups. Once such factors were taken into account, no significant differences remained between comparable African-Americans and whites in the number of kinds of performing-arts activities they reported attending. There was no significant difference between white and African-American scores on the performing-arts production scale.

African-American respondents participated in significantly fewer visual-arts and literature consumption and production activities than whites. Moreover, only about 40 percent of these differences were attributable to the socioeconomic and demographic factors for which we controlled.

In other words, these analyses indicate that one cannot generalize about net differences between African-Americans and whites in artistic participation. African-Americans are more likely than whites to attend jazz concerts, and the margin only increases when sociodemographic differences between the races are taken into account. African-Americans are no less likely than whites to participate in performing-arts activities as performers or by working backstage. African-Americans on average attend fewer kinds of the performing-arts activities about which the SPPA asked (excluding jazz) than whites, but about the same number as whites who are comparable with respect to socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. By contrast, African-Americans participate in significantly fewer kinds of visual-arts activities than comparable whites, both as consumers and as producers.

Differences between white and Hispanic respondents can be described more succinctly. There were no significant differences between non-Hispanic whites and Hispanics on either performing-arts or visual-arts production scales. Hispanic respondents scored significantly lower than whites on each of the consumption scales, but both of these differences resulted from differences between the groups in socioeconomic standing and demographic characteristics. In other words, there are no significant differences in any of these scales between sociodemographically comparable white and Hispanic respondents.

Does Demand for Artistic Participation Vary?

This question is the hardest to address with the resources provided by the SPPAs, and we have reached no definitive conclusions. The best we can do is to hold the data up like so many prisms and report the results from a variety of angles.

The SPPAs asked a subsample of respondents whether they liked a wide range of musical genres. Within each group, responses were very stable between 1982 and 1985. White and Hispanic tastes were quite similar. African-American and white respondents' tastes differed more, although, like Hispanics and whites, African-Americans tended to prefer commercially popular genres to most other kinds of music. Larger proportions of whites and Hispanics liked country western, rock and easy listening music than any other kind of music, whereas African-American respondents were most likely to choose hymns/gospel music, soul/blues/rhythm and blues, and jazz. Those genres favored by whites and Hispanics ranked fourth, fifth, and sixth among African-American respondents, well ahead of the seven other genres about which the survey asked. Moreover, substantial minorities of whites and Hispanics enjoyed gospel, rhythm and blues, and jazz. Such genres as bluegrass, barbershop, and opera were distinctly less popular among all three groups. Taken together, the results demonstrate strong similarity of tastes between whites and Hispanics, and patterns of musical taste for whites and African-Americans that, although different, involve different degrees of participation in the same commercially popular musical forms rather than sharply opposed preferences.

Looking more closely at the four kinds of music related to the SPPA core participation activities (classical music, opera, show tunes, and jazz), we see that differences between African-Americans and whites in taste for classical music mirrored differences in African-American and white rates of attendance at classical music concerts. By contrast, the proportion of Hispanic respondents who said they enjoyed classical music was close to that of whites in 1982 and greater in 1985. Taken together with the finding that Hispanics were about as likely to attend classical music concerts as sociodemographically comparable white respondents, this pattern suggests that Hispanics would attend classical music performances at the same rates as whites if they had the resources to do so.

Similarly, differences between African-Americans and whites with respect to opera, show tunes, and jazz are comparable to differences in attendance at operas, musicals, and jazz performances. So were differences between Hispanics and whites for opera and show tunes in 1982, but not in

1985, when differences in attendance far exceeded differences in taste. Hispanic respondents were more likely than whites to report liking jazz in both years, but less likely to report attending jazz concerts. Taken together, these results again suggest that disparities between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites in attendance at these activities reflect socioeconomic barriers rather than differences in taste, whereas differences between African-Americans and whites would appear to be largely accounted for by differences in taste.

This conclusion, however, would conflict with results of analyses predicting probabilities of participation in the core attendance activities (other than jazz), which showed that between 25 and 40 percent of differences between African-Americans and whites were accounted for by differences in socioeconomic and demographic factors. In other words, it seems likely that some portion of differences in taste are themselves the result of socioeconomic inequality. Consistent with this interpretation, once sociodemographic factors are taken into account, differences in musical taste or in childhood socialization explain little of the intergroup variation that remains.

The SPPAs also asked respondents if they wanted to participate in the seven core attendance activities more than they had in the previous year. Respondents from all groups who had participated in a given activity in the previous year were much more likely than those who had not to wish that they had attended more. And respondents who had not participated were more likely to wish that they had if they were members of groups that participated at relatively high rates. For most activities, the proportion of people who did not participate but said that they wanted to exceeded the proportion that actually participated.

What this implies is that if all reported barriers to attendance were removed — that is, if everyone who reported wanting to participate, but did not, joined the ranks of attenders — the absolute differences in probabilities of attendance at core activities between members of different groups would increase. The margin between African-American attendance at jazz concerts and attendance by whites and Hispanics would become greater, as would the margin between white attendance at classical concerts, operas, musicals, plays, ballet performances, and art exhibitions, and African-American and Hispanic attendance. For many activities, however, the large increase in the proportions attending in each group would reduce the ratios of rates of participation between groups.

We caution against taking this finding too seriously for several reasons. First, we are not sure what respondents meant when they said they wanted to attend more than they did. Second, we suspect that respondents factored

in the cost of attendance in deciding whether they wished to do something they had not done, so that respondents facing socioeconomic barriers would have been less likely to report "wanting" to attend an event than more well-to-do respondents whose taste for the activity in question was similar to theirs. Finally, we suspect that many barriers to participation work by reducing demand for participation in such activities, rather than by keeping people from satisfying demand.

Indeed, other analyses, including the results on Hispanic musical tastes mentioned above, cast doubt upon the degree to which whites do value the SPPA core arts more highly than do African-Americans or Hispanics. Differences in the extent to which whites, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanics, on the other, watch the core attendance activities (other than jazz) on television are not so great as differences in the extent of live participation. This may suggest that when cost is not a factor (because most Americans have access to televised arts programs), intergroup rates of participation are more comparable than when participation is more costly and time-consuming.

Moreover, parents of Hispanic and African-Americans appeared to value certain kinds of artistic guidance even more highly than comparable white parents. When age, gender, and educational attainment of parents are controlled, Hispanic and African-American respondents reported significantly if modestly higher scores on a parental guidance scale comprising being encouraged to read, being taken to museums, being exposed to classical music, and being taken to live performances.

Taken individually, the results of the analyses described in this section point in somewhat different directions. Taken together they suggest that the issue of motivation is extremely complex. On the one hand, participation in the artistic activities for which intergroup differences appear is not something that everyone clearly desires. For example, eliminating all barriers to attendance at jazz concerts or ballet or opera (by providing free vouchers, transportation, and babysitting), would seem unlikely to eliminate differences between African-Americans and whites in rates of attendance. On the other hand, it would be simplistic, and at odds with many of our other findings, to suggest that African-Americans and Hispanics attend certain activities less than whites simply because they like them less. Rather, differences in participation rates appear to result, in part, from differences in socioeconomic opportunity, in part from differences in taste, and in part from the interaction of these two factors.

Summary Conclusions

1. Rates of participation in the activities about which the SPPA asked differ by race and ethnicity. White rates are greatest for almost all these activities (with the notable exception of those associated with jazz, for which African-American rates are highest). In general, differences are greater for attendance and reading than for viewing the arts on television, parental guidance into the arts through home activities and (for African-Americans) taking formal classes and lessons, participating in most art producing activities, and (for Hispanics) musical tastes. For most activities, absolute differences are relatively small (with minorities of any group participating), although ratios of white to other rates are often as high as two to one.
2. African-Americans participate somewhat less than sociodemographically comparable white Americans in most of the core activities, but most of these net differences are small. Net differences between African-Americans and whites are more marked for the visual arts than for the performing arts. African-Americans are significantly more likely than comparable whites to attend jazz concerts.
3. Hispanic-Americans participate somewhat less than comparable whites in some core activities, especially those usually presented in the English language. In general, however, Hispanic-Americans participate at rates similar to those of socioeconomically comparable white Americans.
4. Differences in participation associated with race are very small compared to those associated with educational attainment and are usually exceeded by those associated with income, occupational status, and gender. The principal barriers to participation for African-Americans and, especially, Hispanics, are socioeconomic. These barriers reduce minority participation by influencing demand for the arts and by making it difficult for less well-off Americans to satisfy their demand.
5. Measurable differences in taste or in parental guidance into the arts, other than those associated with differences in socioeconomic standing, play a small role in explaining most of the observed differences in participation between African-American, Hispanic, and white Americans. Much of the observed differences in taste, demand, or childhood experience appears to result from socioeconomic differences between these groups.
6. Intergroup differences in participation in most of the activities about which the SPPA asked are smaller for younger than for older respondents. Most of this apparent decline in the participation gap is probably

the result of increases in socioeconomic resources, especially years of schooling, of African-American and Hispanic respondents.

Further Research

We have emphasized throughout this report that one cannot generalize meaningfully about "artistic participation." Patterns of differences between non-Hispanic whites, on the one hand, and African-Americans and Hispanics, on the other, vary among activities.

The SPPA questions focused upon categories of participation that a pretest indicated were widely understood by all or most people interviewed. The requirements of a national survey tended to exclude such forms as mariachi music or clog dancing that are unfamiliar to most Americans, including many forms with roots in specific ethnic or racial communities. The questions also tended to focus on consumption activities associated with nonprofit cultural institutions rather than on the most widely consumed forms of popular culture. We suspect that there are many activities (like jazz) for which white participation is lower than African-American. Consequently, we would not generalize the findings of this report beyond the specific kinds of activities that the SPPA considered. Because the SPPA items cover a broad range of activities, including ones with which public policy has been particularly concerned, we do not regard this as a serious problem given the purposes of this report. But it does mean that it would be a mistake to consider this a full treatment of all aspects of the artistic participation of African-Americans, Hispanics, and white Americans.

Even within the scope of artistic participation as defined by the SPPA, this report could not address a number of questions that are of substantial interest. The limitations we describe below are natural ones for a national survey that was not designed specifically to address racial and ethnic differences in participation. Nonetheless, without questioning the importance of what the SPPAs have already accomplished, it may be useful to sketch a few tasks that remain.

Each of the groups we examined is heterogeneous. The SPPA data did not permit close analysis of participation by ethnic subgroups, in part because the number of Hispanic respondents (other than Mexican-Americans) was relatively small, in part because of the way in which ethnic background was coded on the SPPA. In particular, it is important from the standpoint of public policy to distinguish among the ethnic groups that constitute the Hispanic and Asian categories, between native-born and

immigrant (*e.g.*, West Indian) African-Americans, and between Native Americans and other respondents. A design that stratified the sample on ethnicity and oversampled these groups relative to their percentage of the population, and a coding scheme that distinguished more clearly among groups would be helpful in this respect.

To mask the identity of respondents, the Census Bureau did not include regional data on the SPPA files. Broad regional classifications would permit investigation of regional differences (which may interact with race or ethnicity) without breaching confidentiality.

Especially for those groups for which recent immigration rates have been relatively high (Hispanics and Asians), it is important to be able to assess the impact of native language on participation in activities relying on the spoken or written word. A question on language should be included in subsequent surveys.

Even if we had found no differences in the rates of participation of African-Americans, Hispanics, and white Americans in the activities that the SPPA described, we could not have concluded that these groups participated in the same way. Do African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites who attend theater, for example, see the same kind of plays at the same kind of venues? If attenders vary by race or ethnic origin in the kinds of activities they prefer, we might be able to assess the extent to which different rates of participation result from the undersupply of the kinds of activity preferred by members of the groups that participate less. Such questions could perhaps be addressed best in local surveys that would ask respondents about attendance at specific events or specific institutions. We suspect that such questions would reveal greater intergroup diversity than questions phrased in more general terms.

We found some suggestive evidence of differences in the effects of gender, education, occupation, and artistic socialization on participation by members of different groups, but could explore them only superficially due to the relatively small number of African-American, Hispanic, and especially Asian respondents. Particularly with respect to activities in which relatively few people participate, cell sizes (*e.g.*, for college-educated Hispanic opera attenders) were very small. A research design that permitted oversampling of minority respondents (relative to their share of the population) would alleviate this problem to some degree.

Although one can make rough inferences about change over time on the basis of cohort analysis, as we have attempted to do in this report, confident conclusions require data collected over a wide range of time. The 1982 and 1985 SPPAs represent an excellent first step in this process. There can be no substitute for the routine collection of comparable data at regular intervals.

How widespread is participation in the activities about which the SPPA could not ask because they were not sufficiently familiar to the average American? Some of these activities, such as reggae music or Balkan folk dance, might be characterized by racially or ethnically homogeneous audiences, even though the proportion of persons in the relevant ethnic groups who participate would be low. Such art forms may add a great deal to our national cultures and to specific artistic subcultures even if they are participated in by too few persons to catch in a national sample survey. Regional or SMSA-based surveys might be able to explore the distribution of participation in such activities more effectively.

The one SPPA question that provided information about taste for large-scale commercial popular-culture genres, the music preference question, revealed patterns of racial and ethnic cleavage and convergence that were not apparent in responses to questions about other activities. Because much, probably most, of the arts that Americans consume are provided by the national popular-culture industries, a comprehensive analysis of differences in artistic participation would require attention to participation in popular culture broadly defined.

The foregoing is a wish list and, as such, is unrestricted by the costs, multiple priorities, and tradeoffs that constrain actual research decisions. Some of the suggestions offered above will be impractical, while others may not. In conclusion, we offer the following recommendations:

- That information on region of residence be included in the SPPA data file.
- That information on native language be collected and included in the SPPA data file.
- That the Arts Endowment explore the possibility of a design for the SPPA that oversamples African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American respondents relative to their share of the population.
- That ethnicity codes comparable to those provided in the Census of Population, including multiple ethnic origins, be collected for the SPPA.
- That the Arts Endowment or other research sponsors explore the possibility of supporting comparable local surveys of participation in the arts in several regions that include questions about attendance at specific events or specific institutions.

NOTES

Executive Summary

1. For the sake of simplicity, we drop the modifier "non-Hispanic" when referring to whites and African-Americans throughout this report. The reader should recognize that this modifier is implicit.
2. Throughout this report, "childhood socialization" or "socialization" refer to *both* forms of early experience: "parental guidance" and "lessons and classes."
3. SMSA residence refers to whether respondents lived in an urban area, an area within an SMSA but not a city (ordinarily, a suburb), or an area outside a center of concentrated population. SMSA stands for Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Chapter One

1. See, *e.g.*, Richard Bach, *The Place of the Arts in American Life* (New York: The Carnegie Corporation, 1924); and Frederick P. Keppel and Robert L. Duffus, *The Arts in American Life* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1933); Melvin E. Haggerty, *Art as a Way of Life* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935).
2. A detailed technical description of the procedures for the 1982 SPPA (which were similar to those for the 1985 survey) is available in John P. Robinson, Carol A. Keegan, Terry Hanford, and Timothy A. Triplett, *Public Participation in the Arts: Final Report on the 1982 Survey*, October 1985 report to the Research Division, National Endowment for the Arts. Background information on the 1985 survey is available in Timothy A. Triplett and Jeffrey M. Holland, *Public Participation in the Arts: The 1982 and 1985 User's Manual* (draft, October 1985), report to the Research Division, National Endowment for the Arts.

3. The text of the survey is available from the National Endowment for the Arts, Research Division. Because only tiny percentages engaged in any given activity more than once in the month preceding the survey, only data on participation during the previous year are analyzed in this report.
4. The survey was administered each month for 12 months in 1982, and 6 months in 1985, with all but the core questions rotated from month to month. (All questions were asked in the final two months of 1982.) Consequently, analyses of responses to all but the core questions are based on only a portion of the total number of respondents. Because responses were weighted to be representative of the non-institutionalized population over 18 for each month, as well as for each of the two years, findings are equally generalizable.
5. William L. Yancey, Eugene P. Ericksen, and Richard Juliani, "Emergent Ethnicity: A Review and Reformulation," *American Sociological Review* 41 (1976): 391–403; Susan Olzak, "Contemporary Ethnic Mobilization," *Annual Review of Sociology* 9 (1983): 355–74.
6. Ninety-five percent of respondents to the 1982 SPPA who reported their race as Black reported their ethnicity as Afro-American or Negro. In 1985, the figure was 92 percent. Each year, most other Black respondents reported their ethnicity as "other," a category that would have included such Caribbean ethnicities as Jamaican or Haitian. In each year more than 99 percent of respondents who reported their ethnicity as Afro-American or Negro reported their race as Black. We use "African-American," which has come into common usage since the surveys were conducted.
7. The "Other" category in 1982 consists of Asian-Americans, American Indians, and persons who failed to choose one of several races from a set presented by the interviewer. In 1985, it excluded Asian-Americans and included only a very small number of respondents. We do not report results for the "Other" category. Because of its heterogeneity and because we do not have data on its composition, such results could not be interpreted. Unfortunately, then, the data do not permit us to describe the artistic participation of Native Americans.
8. Our aggregation of ethnic categories into a broader Hispanic group yields a category consistent with the federal government's definition of Hispanic as "A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race" (OMB Directive Number 15, as revised May 12, 1977).
9. By contrast, in the 1980 Census (the report cited in the note at the bottom of Table 1-2), 41 percent of Hispanic respondents reported their race as

something other than Black or White. The difference is a result of different question phrasing: SPPA respondents were asked to designate their race and given a brief set of options that did not include "other." Census respondents, by contrast, were asked to choose from among a longer list that included both racial and ethnic categories. We are grateful to Carmen DeNavas, Helen Montagliani, and Robert Tinari of the Bureau of the Census for explaining the manner in which the Bureau asked about race and ethnicity in its interviews.

10. As Table 1-1 indicates, the percentages of Hispanic-Americans in the SPPA samples are close to, but not identical with, the proportion of these groups in the American population. Furthermore, a review of census data reveals that 1985 SPPA Hispanic-American respondents were typical of their specific ethnic groups with respect to educational attainment, a variable of particular interest in the analysis of arts participation. Census data are from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, *Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1985* (Advance Report), December 1985 Series P-20, No. 403, p. 4. For insightful criticism of the "Hispanic" category, see David E. Hayes Bautista and Jorge Chapa, "Latino terminology: Conceptual bases for standardized terminology," *American Journal of Public Health* 77 (1987): 61–68; for a pragmatic defense, see Fernando M. Trevino, "Standardized terminology for Hispanic populations," pp. 69–72 in the same issue.

Chapter Two

1. A second reason for focusing on the annual rather than the monthly rates is the evidence reported by John Robinson and his colleagues that respondents' recollections "telescoped" their annual attendance into the previous month, thus making the monthly estimates less reliable than the annual ones. See John P. Robinson, Carol A. Keegan, Terry Hanford, and Timothy A. Triplett, *Public Participation in the Arts: Final Report on the 1982 Survey*, Report of the Research Division of the National Endowment for the Arts, October, 1985, pp. 227–29.
2. Paul DiMaggio, Michael Useem, and Paula Brown, *Audience Studies of the Performing Arts and Museums: A Critical Review*, Research Division Report #9 (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1978), pp. 37–38.
3. For the sake of simplicity, we drop the modifier "non-Hispanic" when referring to whites and African-Americans throughout this report. The

reader should recognize that this modifier is implicit in the remainder of the report.

4. For a careful analysis of responses to the SPPA questions about jazz, see Harold Horowitz, *The American Jazz Music Audience* (Washington, D.C.: National Jazz Service Organization, 1986).
5. We know that people who watch an art form on television are more likely than those who do not to attend it in person; but, without data over time on the same people, we cannot ascertain whether this is the case because television viewing leads to attendance, because attenders are more likely to watch arts programming on television, or because attending live events and watching the arts on television are caused by some third set of factors.
6. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984); Paul DiMaggio, "Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students," *American Sociological Review* 47 (1982): 189–201; and Paul DiMaggio and John Mohr, "Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection," *American Journal of Sociology* 90 (1985): 1231–61.
7. John P. Robinson *et al.*, *Public Participation in the Arts*, p. 368.
8. The 1985 figures showed an increase for whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics in the extent to which parents listened to classical music while the respondents were growing up. Because the question referred to previous parental behavior, which by definition could not have changed between 1982 and 1985, as opposed to respondent behavior (which could have), we do not regard these increases as meaningful ones. None of the differences are statistically significant. Moreover, because the sample was not designed to be representative of Hispanic-Americans, it is possible that some portion of the difference for that group, which is the largest, is an artifact of sample composition changes. Because the number of respondents in 1982 was substantially greater than that in 1985, we place more confidence in the results for the earlier year.
9. Fewer than 10 percent of respondents in any group in either year reported that their parents "often" listened to classical music, though whites were somewhat more likely than members of other groups to give this response.
10. Fewer than 5 percent of any group in either year reported that their parents "often" took them to art museums or galleries.
11. White respondents were more likely than others to report that their parents "often" took them to such events, but fewer than 6 percent of any group in either year reported this frequency of attendance.
12. The single exception: in 1982, 7.31 percent of the Hispanic respondents

as compared to 6.92 percent of the African-Americans reported having taken acting lessons.

13. It may be that Hispanic-Americans have gone to schools where fewer arts courses have been offered or required; that they are less likely than African-Americans or whites to take optional arts courses; or that they have in some way been excluded from courses that were available to African-Americans or whites. Note, however, that a far higher proportion of Hispanic-Americans than of whites or African-Americans are immigrants who received their schooling outside of the United States. Unfortunately, data on where respondents were born are not available in the SPPA.
14. To pursue this issue further, we compared the percentages of African-American, Hispanic, and white respondents participating in the core consumption items among respondents who did and did not take lessons relevant to each item before the age of 18. (For example, we compared attendance at classical music concerts by respondents who took music appreciation courses to the attendance by those who did not take such courses. See Appendix tables 2-4 and 2-5.) As expected, persons in each group who had taken relevant classes or lessons participated in most activities at higher levels than others. In 1982, the difference between respondents with and without lessons was greatest for most activities for African-Americans and Hispanics, and the odds ratio of participation between whites and other groups was in most cases lower among persons who had taken lessons or classes, suggesting the possibility that formal instruction tends to depress intergroup differences. (Alternatively, African-Americans and Hispanics who reported taking lessons or classes in their youth in 1982 may simply have had more of other characteristics that are associated with attendance than did whites who reported having taken lessons.) These differences were not so apparent, however, among respondents to the 1985 SPPA. Because the number of African-American and Hispanic respondents is greater in the 1982 SPPA, we have more confidence in those data. But given the discrepancy in results between the two years, it would be incautious to regard the 1982 patterns as any more than bases for hypotheses for further research.

Chapter Three

1. We ask the same question about Asian-Americans, but there are so few Asian-Americans in the sample that we answer it with less confidence than for the other groups.

2. In Chapter 5, we shall return to other forms of participation and explore similar questions using different methods and a wider range of variables.
3. The following description of our approach will be somewhat tedious for the reader unfamiliar with statistical analyses of the type reported here; but reading it is necessary if one is to interpret the tables in this chapter.
4. For a fuller description, see John H. Aldrich and Forrest D. Nelson, *Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models* (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1984). We used the LOGIST procedure provided by SAS (a statistical package) and developed by Frank E. Harrell, Jr.
5. Education and income, which were categorized in the survey, were recoded to their natural metric (using midpoints of categories where appropriate). Because of changes in the federal occupational classification system between the 1982 and 1985 surveys, the occupational classifications were somewhat different, although occupations were aggregated to maximize comparability between the two years. For residence, the omitted category was "outside SMSA." For occupation, the omitted category in 1982 was "craft, operative, service, farm, transport, laborers, private household, and armed forces"; in 1985, it was "craft, operative, service, farm, armed forces." For marital status, the omitted category was "married."
6. Because logistic regression analyses cannot generate standardized regression coefficients, comparison of effects is less straightforward than for ordinary least squares regression analysis of the kind used in Chapter 5. We compare the magnitude of effects by comparing the R statistic for specific independent variables. The R statistic measures the net contribution of each predictor to the model's total explanatory power.
7. William Julius Wilson, *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Stanley Lieberson, *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).
8. The results of these analyses are presented in Appendix Table 3-1. Note that the coefficient for each independent variable represents the effect of that variable on participation among members of the group in question.
9. By "more likely," we mean "more likely after controlling for other sociodemographic differences between white men and white women." Unless otherwise specified, all comparative statements in this chapter refer to *net* differences *after* the inclusion of sociodemographic controls.

Chapter Four

1. Questions on unsated demand for and barriers preventing the other three core activities (two kinds of public performance and reading imaginative literature) were not included in the SPPA.
2. See Roger A. McCain, "Reflections on the Cultivation of Taste," *Journal of Cultural Economics* 3, 1 (1979): pp. 30–52; and "Game Theory and Cultivation of Taste," *Journal of Cultural Economics* 10, 1 (1986): 1–16.
3. John Robinson, *Public Participation in the Arts: A Project Summary* (College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland Survey Research Center, 1985), pp. 2–3*ff*.
4. Note that there is nothing circular about this argument. In the case of most other goods, demand is greater among those with less. If I do not have a washing machine, I am likely to want one. Once I have one, I will not need another until the one I have breaks down. Similarly, my demand for breakfast is higher before rather than after I have eaten. The arts may be different.
5. See, *e.g.*, David Featherman and Robert Hauser, "Changes in Socioeconomic Stratification of the Races, 1962–1973," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (1976): 621–51.
6. The 1982 SPPA data set contained several precoded "Other" responses, none of which was chosen by even 10 percent of the would-be attenders.
7. Results for any group are not reported when the base number of respondents — those "wanting more" of something — is smaller than 10. Results for a given reason are not reported when fewer than 10 percent of any group in either year marked that reason as applicable.
8. In 1982, none of the percentages for Hispanic-Americans is based on more than 48 respondents and in 1985, none is based on more than 21. Ns for African-Americans ranged from 23 (for opera) to 113 (for jazz performance) in 1982; and from 10 (opera) to 59 (jazz) in 1985.
9. Can we assume that underlying valuations of arts attendance are the same for all three groups? The answer to this question is not obvious. The most cautious assumption is that the underlying distributions of value that African-American, Hispanic, and white respondents place on the activities in which they report wanting to take part are basically similar. On the one hand, we have seen in chapter 3 that after controlling for measures of educational and economic resources (which can be interpreted as measures of economic barriers to participation), African-Americans are more likely to attend jazz performances and less likely to attend the other activities than white Americans, whereas Hispanic-Americans attend

most activities at levels not significantly different from those of white Americans. A rough inference from these results would be that the average African-American values jazz more highly and the other activities less highly than the average white American, and that white and Hispanic-Americans value them more or less to the same degree. But the figures in this section are based not on average African-American, Hispanic, or white respondents but on those who did not attend but said that they wanted to do so. Such persons seem likely to value the arts more than their peers who neither participated nor wish to participate; and, if the speculations about social-desirability bias set out earlier in this chapter are correct, such bias may be less important for African-Americans and Hispanics than for whites. Consistent with this hypothesis, white respondents tended to give such reasons as procrastination, a lack of motivation, or a preference for watching television (each of which we regard as evidence of a relatively low valuation of the activity in question) more frequently than African-Americans or Hispanics. However, the differences are small and inconsistent.

Chapter Five

1. Non-Hispanic respondents whose race was coded as "Other" (including Asian-Americans, Native Americans, and those not classifiable) were removed from the sample. (There were too few of these respondents for most of our purposes and, in any case, the heterogeneity of the category would have made any results uninterpretable.) A few respondents for whom data on key variables were missing were likewise eliminated. Respondents classified as "Other" were not included in these analyses.
2. Although we undertook all of the analyses reported below on both the full November/December subsample and the partial subsample (of respondents reporting data on parental education), in most cases we report only the results from the full subsample, because of the nonresponse bias problem. For most taste and participation outcomes, parental education exerts a small positive influence by virtue of its causal relationship to the two socialization measures, which are positively related to participation. In other words, because it seems that more educated parents lead their children to participate more in the arts as adults because they help them have more artistic experiences in their youth (rather than through some other means not measured by the socialization scores), we can use the

more reliable full sample without fear that including measures of parental education would alter our results.

3. In Chapter 2, we raised the question of whether the lesser gross differences between African-American and white respondents in television viewing than in live attendance were the result of the fact that African-Americans also watched more television, in general, than whites. To explore this possibility, we controlled for hours of television viewing of all kinds. Although people who watch a great deal of television in general also watch significantly more arts television than people who do not, the effect is very small and does not explain the relatively high levels of arts viewing among African-American respondents. See Appendix Table 5-6 for the full model.
4. The full models are displayed in Appendix Tables 5-6 through 5-10.
5. This finding was unexpected for the performance attendance scale that excluded jazz attendance, which African-American respondents reported at higher rates that whites, because the logistic regression analyses reported in Chapter 3 revealed that African-American respondents were less likely to have attended most of the activities included in the performance attendance scale even after controlling for sociodemographic factors. But although they were statistically significant, these differences were small. The apparent difference stems from the difference in sizes between the full sample and the November/December subsample. Because the latter is smaller than the former, effects are less likely to be statistically significant. To confirm this, we reran logistic models using only November/December data. Although the coefficients for race were comparable in magnitude to those for the full sample, once sociodemographic controls were added, the effects of race on attendance at performing-arts events (other than jazz) were not statistically significant. We also considered and ruled out three alternative explanations for the apparent disparity in results. First, we asked if they resulted from systematic differences between the November/December subsample and the sample for 1982 as a whole. But, as Table 5-1 indicates, African-American/white differences in the likelihood of attendance at core performing-arts activities were about as large for the November/December subsample as for the 1982 sample as a whole. Moreover, regression analyses to predict the performing-arts attendance scales using the full sample (Appendix Table 5-5) yielded results that were substantively the same as those from the November/December subsample (although the large size of the full sample made the tiny effect of race statistically significant). Second, we

considered the possibility that racial effects might have been altered because a somewhat shorter list of control variables was employed in the analyses in Chapter 5 than in the analyses in Chapter 3 (due to the merging of several occupational, marital, and residential categories). If anything, however, this would have magnified the effects of race by eliminating variation in control variables with which both race and participation are correlated. Third, we considered the possibility that the logarithmic form used in the logistic regression analyses in Chapter 3 better represented the relationship between race and participation than the linear models reported above. To test this possibility, we ran the models using the logarithmic form of the attendance scale as our dependent variable, and discovered that this transformation made no substantive difference to the results. Having eliminated these three alternative explanations, we feel confident in attributing the difference to the smaller size of the November/December subsample. Because a sample of 2,255 (the size of the November/December subsample) is sufficiently large that no substantively important effect could be deemed insignificant, we are satisfied with the reliability of these findings.

6. For more detailed analyses of intercohort differences in the relationship between race and participation, see Paul DiMaggio and Francie Ostrower, "Participation in the Arts by Black and White Americans," *Social Forces* 68 (1990): 753–78.

Chapter Six

1. We do not include Asian-Americans in this summary because the SPPA's information on this group was so limited.

Appendix

Appendix Table 2–1
Z Scores for Musical Tastes by Racial/Ethnic Group and Year

	Whites		African-Americans		Hispanics	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Classical	–0.14	–0.44	–0.44	–0.68	0.18	0.13
Opera	–1.55	–1.68	–0.96	–0.92	–1.36	–1.33
Show tunes	–0.43	–0.47	–0.62	–0.70	–0.59	–0.43
Jazz	–0.51	–0.20	0.95	1.27	0.26	0.84
Soul/blues	–0.62	–0.30	1.87	1.90	0.42	0.37
Big band	0.31	0.20	–0.30	–0.32	0.05	–0.55
C&W	2.38	1.95	0.00	–0.05	2.00	1.63
Bluegrass	–0.23	–0.41	–0.99	–1.10	–1.05	–0.94
Rock	0.39	0.82	0.26	0.16	1.09	1.49
Easy listening	1.55	1.74	0.02	0.63	1.31	1.17
Folk	–0.25	–0.42	–0.80	–0.64	–0.40	–0.66
Barbershop	–1.09	–1.20	–1.01	–1.10	–1.39	–1.51
Hymns/gospel	0.21	0.43	2.04	1.58	–0.52	–0.20

Appendix Table 2–2
Percentages Participating in Core Activities by Respondents Who Did and Did Not Watch Such Events on Television, 1982 SPPA

Core Item:	Jazz			Classical		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	5.64	29.36	5.21	6.56	31.68	4.83
(N)	(2,733)	(550)		(2,421)	(865)	
A	10.70	28.39	2.65	3.66	12.92	3.53
(N)	(269)	(97)		(308)	(58)	
H	4.41	4.66	1.06	1.76	20.49	11.64
(N)	(170)	(33)		(160)	(43)	
W/A odds	0.53	1.03		1.79	2.45	
W/H odds	1.28	6.30		3.73	1.55	

Core Item:	Opera			Musical theater		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	1.39	11.22	8.07	14.94	42.46	2.84
(N)	(2,863)	(423)		(2,584)	(694)	
A	0.32	2.83	8.84	5.17	27.22	5.26
(N)	(333)	(33)		(303)	(63)	
H	0.48	9.57	19.93	7.68	35.58	4.63
(N)	(183)	(20)		(167)	(36)	
W/A odds	4.34	3.96		2.89	1.56	
W/H odds	2.90	1.17		1.95	1.19	

Core Item:	Plays			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	7.27	25.98	3.57	2.49	16.03	6.44
(N)	(2,375)	(909)		(2,712)	(566)	
A	1.83	18.14	9.91	0.51	2.87	5.63
(N)	(302)	(64)		(327)	(38)	
H	4.37	8.37	1.92	0.49	17.14	34.98
(N)	(173)	(30)		(172)	(31)	
W/A Odds	3.97	1.43		4.88	5.59	
W/H Odds	1.66	3.10		5.08	0.94	

Appendix Table 2–2 (Continued)
Percentages Participating in Core Activities by Respondents Who Did and Did Not Watch Such Events on Television, 1982 SPPA

Core Item:	Art		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.13	47.93	2.97
(N)	(2,492)	(781)	
A	9.14	26.64	2.91
(N)	(299)	(67)	
H	11.16	44.87	4.02
(N)	(169)	(33)	
W/A Odds	1.76	1.80	
W/H Odds	1.45	1.07	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. "Yes" refers to respondents who watched relevant television programs, "No" to those who did not. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who watched programs to those who did not. W/A Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for African-Americans.W/H Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 2–3
Percentages Participating in Core Activities by Respondents Who Did and Did Not Watch Such Events on Television, 1985 SPPA

Core Item:	Jazz			Classical		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	6.05	25.59	4.23	6.00	34.55	5.76
(N)	(1,443)	(257)		(1,263)	(446)	
A	2.81	34.27	12.19	4.52	34.25	7.58
(N)	(116)	(69)		(146)	(41)	
H	2.98	24.86	8.34	2.32	28.98	12.49
(N)	(105)	(18)		(101)	(23)	
W/A odds	2.15	.75		1.33	1.01	
W/H odds	2.03	1.03		2.59	1.19	

Core Item:	Opera			Musical theater		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	1.33	12.02	9.04	13.44	42.07	3.13
(N)	(1,474)	(234)		(1,394)	(313)	
A	0.00	11.68	NA	4.89	30.96	6.33
(N)	(169)	(18)		(151)	(35)	
H	0.82	6.41	7.82	4.86	28.07	5.78
(N)	(108)	(15)		(104)	(20)	
W/A odds	NA	1.03		2.75	1.36	
W/H odds	1.62	1.88		2.77	1.50	

Core Item:	Plays			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	6.65	28.16	4.23	2.97	16.99	5.72
(N)	(1,299)	(406)		(1,431)	(276)	
A	4.00	14.30	3.58	0.00	14.30	NA
(N)	(150)	(36)		(155)	(32)	
H	3.97	23.41	5.90	1.97	23.34	11.85
(N)	(105)	(18)		(102)	(21)	
W/A Odds	1.66	1.97		NA	1.19	
W/H Odds	1.68	1.20		1.51	0.72	

Appendix Table 2–3 (Continued)
Percentages Participating in Core Activities by Respondents Who Did and Did Not Watch Such Events on Television, 1985 SPPA

Core Item:	Art		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.49	44.09	2.67
(N)	(1,242)	(461)	
A	11.04	18.96	1.72
(N)	(143)	(44)	
H	8.11	56.30	6.94
(N)	(101)	(23)	
W/A Odds	1.49	2.33	
W/H Odds	2.03	0.78	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. "Yes" refers to respondents who watched relevant television programs, "No" to those who did not. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who watched programs to those who did not. W/A Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for African-Americans. W/H Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 2–4
Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1982 SPPA

Core item:	Jazz attendance			Jazz attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	4.70	13.22	2.81	6.37	18.56	2.91
(N)	(2,283)	(2,301)		(3,593)	(991)	
A	8.76	33.96	3.87	14.87	34.47	2.32
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	9.18	11.23	1.22	7.69	29.36	3.82
(N)	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/A odds	0.54	0.39		0.43	0.54	
W/H odds	0.51	1.18		0.83	0.63	

Core item:	Classical attendance			Classical attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	7.58	21.45	2.83	10.53	29.34	2.79
(N)	(2,287)	(2,301)		(3,597)	(991)	
A	3.98	11.62	2.92	4.17	18.09	4.34
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	4.42	12.66	2.86	3.79	31.32	8.26
(N)	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/A odds	1.90	1.85		2.53	1.62	
W/H odds	1.71	1.69		2.78	0.94	

Core item:	Opera			Opera		
Lesson:	Music			Music appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	2.00	3.81	1.91	2.17	5.64	2.60
(N)	(2,286)	(2,301)		(3,597)	(990)	
A	0.21	1.79	8.52	0.44	2.42	5.50
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	1.42	1.44	1.01	0.54	10.39	19.24
(N)	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/A Odds	9.52	2.13		4.93	2.33	
W/H Odds	1.41	2.65		4.02	0.54	

Appendix Table 2–4 (Continued)
Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1982 SPPA

Core item:		Musical			Musical	
Lesson:		Music			Music appreciation	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	13.65	27.50	2.01	15.91	37.89	2.38
(N)	(2,287)	(2,302)		(3,598)	(991)	
A	5.05	18.31	3.63	6.75	24.38	3.61
(N)	(318)	(195)		(414)	(99)	
H	6.25	14.54	2.33	5.23	37.20	7.11
N	(240)	(65)		(276)	(29)	
W/A Odds	2.70	1.50		2.36	1.55	
W/H Odds	2.18	1.89		3.04	1.02	

Core item:		Musical			Plays	
Lesson:		Acting			Acting	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	18.01	44.53	2.47	11.34	29.55	2.61
(N)	(4,139)	(450)		(4,138)	(449)	
A	9.52	22.72	2.39	4.24	14.69	3.46
(N)	(481)	(32)		(481)	(32)	
H	7.36	17.55	2.38	3.22	12.51	3.89
(N)	(282)	(23)		(282)	(23)	
W/A Odds	1.89	1.96		2.67	2.01	
W/H Odds	2.45	2.54		3.52	2.36	

Core item:		Art exhibits			Art exhibits	
Lesson:		Art			Crafts	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	15.39	45.43	2.95	16.28	36.42	2.24
(N)	(3,441)	(1,144)		(3,065)	(1,519)	
A	9.37	33.22	3.55	6.70	35.92	5.36
(N)	(426)	(88)		(396)	(118)	
H	12.54	35.10	2.80	12.11	33.56	2.77
(N)	(256)	(49)		(246)	(59)	
W/A Odds	1.64	1.37		2.43	1.01	
W/H Odds	1.25	1.29		1.34	1.09	

Appendix Table 2–4 (Continued)
Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1982 SPPA

Core item:		Art exhibits			Ballet	
Lesson:		Art appreciation			Ballet	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.11	49.50	3.07	2.65	22.89	8.64
(N)	(3,647)	(938)		(4,215)	(374)	
A	9.53	36.39	3.82	1.23	15.14	12.31
(N)	(437)	(77)		(493)	(21)	
H	12.16	50.52	4.15	2.19	32.44	14.81
(N)	(272)	(33)		(294)	(11)	
W/A Odds	1.69	1.36		2.15	1.51	
W/H Odds	1.32	0.98		1.21	0.71	

Core item:		Reading literature	
Lesson:		Creative writing	
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	55.82	84.38	1.51
(N)	(3,694)	(879)	
A	37.18	82.59	2.22
(N)	(445)	(68)	
H	32.69	60.82	1.86
(N)	(266)	(37)	
W/A Odds	1.50	1.02	
W/H Odds	1.71	1.39	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who have taken lessons/probability for those who have not. W/A Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for African-Americans. W/H Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 2–5
Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1985 SPPA

Core item:	Jazz attendance			Jazz attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	5.45	15.52	2.85	7.38	22.21	3.00
(N)	(928)	(993)		(1,482)	(439)	
A	8.12	16.99	2.09	7.16	32.15	4.49
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	0.57	14.56	25.54	2.55	22.72	8.91
(N)	(105)	(37)		(129)	(13)	
W/A odds	0.67	0.93		1.03	0.69	
W/H odds	9.56	1.07		2.89	0.98	

Core item:	Classical attendance			Classical attendance		
Lesson:	Music			Music appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	7.34	24.19	3.30	10.88	34.18	3.14
(N)	(929)	(992)		(1,482)	(439)	
A	2.39	9.29	3.89	3.90	10.09	2.59
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	1.68	31.60	18.81	7.78	22.91	2.94
(N)	(106)	(37)		(130)	(13)	
W/A odds	3.07	2.60		2.79	3.39	
W/H odds	4.37	0.77		1.40	1.49	

Core item:	Opera			Opera		
Lesson:	Music			Music appreciation		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	1.71	4.51	2.64	2.23	6.43	2.88
(N)	(928)	(992)		(1,481)	(439)	
A	0.00	3.56	NA	0.00	7.76	NA
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	0.00	2.24	NA	0.58	0.00	0.00
(N)	(105)	(37)		(129)	(13)	
W/A Odds	NA	1.27		NA	0.85	
W/H Odds	NA	2.01		3.84	NA	

Appendix Table 2–5 (Continued)
Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1985 SPPA

Core Item:		Musical			Musical	
Lesson:		Music			Music appreciation	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	10.80	26.25	2.43	14.39	34.17	2.37
(N)	(929)	(991)		(1,481)	(439)	
A	7.59	11.69	1.54	6.36	22.56	3.55
(N)	(122)	(77)		(166)	(33)	
H	3.46	18.92	5.47	5.48	29.60	5.40
(N)	(106)	(37)		(130)	(13)	
W/A Odds	1.42	2.25		2.26	1.51	
W/H Odds	3.12	1.39		2.63	1.15	

Core Item:		Musical			Plays	
Lesson:		Acting			Acting	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	15.84	42.24	2.67	11.57	33.56	2.90
(N)	(1,714)	(206)		(1,715)	(207)	
A	8.65	14.04	1.62	4.41	15.79	3.58
(N)	(182)	(17)		(181)	(17)	
H	6.58	18.93	2.88	6.58	0.00	0.00
(N)	(133)	(10)		(133)	(10)	
W/A Odds	1.83	3.01		2.62	2.13	
W/H Odds	2.41	2.23		1.76	NA	

Core Item:		Art exhibits			Art exhibits	
Lesson:		Art			Crafts	
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.26	46.46	2.86	10.57	37.53	3.55
(N)	(1,383)	(538)		(1,183)	(738)	
A	4.25	30.71	7.23	6.40	14.93	2.33
(N)	(161)	(38)		(140)	(59)	
H	17.91	36.89	2.06	19.05	25.46	1.34
(N)	(123)	(20)		(116)	(27)	
W/A Odds	3.83	1.51		1.65	2.51	
W/H Odds	0.91	1.26		0.55	1.47	

Appendix Table 2–5 (Continued)
Percentage Participating in Core Activities, Respondents with and without Specific Lessons or Classes Before Age 18, 1985 SPPA

Core Item:	Art exhibits			Ballet		
Lesson:	Art appreciation			Ballet		
	No	Yes	Y/N	No	Yes	Y/N
W	16.37	54.98	3.36	3.56	18.40	5.17
(N)	(1,492)	(429)		(1,731)	(191)	
A	4.93	28.00	5.68	1.14	14.38	12.61
(N)	(166)	(33)		(193)	(6)	
H	18.63	39.15	2.10	2.95	0.00	0.00
(N)	(133)	(10)		(137)	(6)	
W/A Odds	3.32	1.96		3.12	1.28	
W/H Odds	0.88	1.40		1.21	NA	

Core Item:	Reading literature		
Lesson:	Creative writing		
	No	Yes	Y/N
W	53.45	90.37	1.69
(N)	(1,508)	(410)	
A	38.55	62.99	1.62
(N)	(173)	(25)	
H	36.04	89.18	2.47
(N)	(138)	(5)	
W/A Odds	1.39	1.43	
W/H Odds	1.48	1.01	

Ns unweighted, percentages weighted. Y/N=probability of participation for persons who have taken lessons/probability for those who have not. W/A Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability of participation for African-Americans. W/H Odds=probability of participation for whites/probability for Hispanics.

Appendix Table 3–1
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1982 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attend jazz concerts			Attend classical concerts			Attend opera		
	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
WOMEN									
b	.101	–.451	–.026	.650	.226	.066	.444	.521	1.573
se	.065	.158	.252	.057	.228	.260	.107	.518	.558
sig	NS	a	NS	d	NS	NS	d	NS	a
SMSA									
b	.373	.658	–.318	.107	.602	.453	.666	.357	–.387
se	.077	.207	.341	.062	.310	.453	.139	.686	.702
sig	d	a	NS	NS	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
AGE									
b	–.028	–.041	–.028	.016	.018	.003	.031	–.012	.013
se	.003	.007	.012	.002	.008	.010	.003	.022	.019
sig	d	d	a	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.216	.235	.083	.335	.274	.191	.250	.385	.427
se	.015	.038	.046	.012	.048	.049	.022	.120	.101
sig	d	d	NS	d	d	c	d	a	d
INC									
b	.073	.002	.071	.114	.037	.142	.200	.325	.143
se	.021	.065	.095	.018	.088	.095	.032	.158	.163
sig	b	NS	NS	d	NS	NS	d	a	NS
OCC									
b	.184	.422	.838	.252	.546	.463	.392	.519	.063
se	.072	.178	.282	.061	.258	.287	.121	.628	.512
sig	a	a	a	d	a	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.810	.236	.010	.467	.736	.602	.773	.031	.753
se	.073	.172	.290	.067	.245	.293	.124	.550	.536
sig	d	NS	NS	d	a	a	d	NS	NS
INT	4.98	–3.66	–2.52	–7.89	–7.93	–5.83	–9.85	–10.58	–10.72

Appendix Table 3–1 (Continued)
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1982 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attend musical			Attend play			Attend ballet		
	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
WOMEN									
b	.583	−.139	.510	.581	−.050	−.175	1.101	.960	1.202
se	.049	.186	.235	.058	.240	.316	.097	.477	.394
sig	d	NS	a	d	NS	NS	d	a	a
SMSA									
b	.482	.659	.737	.202	1.266	.226	.617	1.155	8.073
se	.055	.258	.427	.064	.423	.539	.114	.705	*
sig	d	a	NS	a	a	NS	d	NS	*
AGE									
b	.009	.001	−.001	.013	.017	.009	.010	−.032	.019
se	.002	.007	.009	.002	.009	.012	.003	.020	.014
sig	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS	b	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.241	.219	.189	.288	.211	.275	.283	.462	.380
se	.010	.041	.044	.012	.051	.064	.019	.106	.077
sig	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d
INC									
b	.189	.262	.197	.187	.256	.146	.112	.032	.211
se	.016	.068	.086	.018	.086	.111	.028	.167	.131
sig	d	c	a	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.400	.314	.644	.459	.310	.738	.471	−.088	.769
se	.053	.214	.255	.063	.277	.351	.102	.493	.399
sig	d	NS	a	d	NS	a	d	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.271	.184	.360	.504	.582	.145	.525	.668	.645
se	.059	.206	.263	.063	.264	.366	.104	.458	.415
sig	d	NS	NS	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
INT	−6.25	−6.02	−5.91	−7.54	−7.92	−7.22	−9.12	−10.94	−18.09

Appendix Table 3–1 (Continued)
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1982 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Visit art museum or gallery			Perform: Play musical instrument			Perform: Act, sing, or dance		
	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	C
WOMEN									
b	.436	–.157	.101	.011	.046	.237	.300	.069	.295
se	.047	.177	.202	.091	.293	.424	.086	.248	.420
sig	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	b	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.245	1.364	–.071	–.006	–.522	8.080	–.061	–.190	7.959
se	.051	.297	.298	.099	.304	*	.092	.274	*
sig	d	d	NS	NS	NS	*	NS	NS	*
AGE									
b	.001	–.000	–.012	–.011	–.001	–.018	–.020	–.016	–.020
se	.002	.007	.009	.003	.011	.018	.003	.010	.018
sig	NS	NS	NS	b	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.320	.279	.279	.106	.091	.001	.112	.084	–.072
se	.011	.040	.042	.019	.057	.067	.019	.050	.065
sig	d	d	d	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
INC									
b	.115	.152	.226	–.089	.072	–.145	–.062	.042	.202
se	.015	.068	.076	.033	.117	.199	.030	.100	.166
sig	d	a	a	a	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.255	.710	.444	–.055	.161	.657	.209	.403	.906
se	.050	.197	.219	.103	.343	.488	.095	.282	.488
sig	d	b	a	NS	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.415	.194	.019	.418	.515	.018	.245	.275	.444
se	.056	.193	.234	.105	.325	.478	.099	.273	.473
sig	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
INT	–6.29	–7.07	–5.02	–3.96	–4.40	–10.98	–3.80	–3.58	–10.94

Appendix Table 3–1 (Continued)
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1982 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Read novels, short stories, poems, or plays		
	W	A	H
WOMEN			
b	.889	.552	.496
se	.041	.123	.156
sig	d	d	a
SMSA			
b	.085	.310	−.120
se	.043	.137	.219
sig	a	a	NS
AGE			
b	.002	−.014	−.004
se	.001	.004	.006
sig	NS	a	NS
EDUC			
b	.288	.204	.222
se	.009	.026	.028
sig	d	d	d
INC			
b	.079	.126	.034
se	.015	.053	.065
sig	d	a	NS
OCC			
b	.225	.711	.411
se	.047	.146	.183
sig	d	d	a
MARIT			
b	.245	.261	.029
se	.052	.134	.183
sig	d	NS	NS
INT	−4.03	−3.09	−3.15

Notes: b is the unstandardized logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .01, c=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS= not significant. Variables are defined in the text. The coefficients and standard errors for INC are multiplied by 10,000 for purposes of display. *=The program does not compute reliable standard errors and significance tests for coefficients of this magnitude.

Appendix Table 3–2
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1985 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attend jazz concerts			Attend classical concerts			Attend opera		
	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
WOMEN									
b	.143	−.491	−.161	.542	.336	.276	.473	.156	−1.415
se	.072	.182	.316	.064	.256	.315	.125	.501	1.262
sig	a	a	NS	c	NS	NS	c	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.359	.358	−.388	.165	.090	.269	.099	8.227	7.111
se	.088	.232	.403	.072	.331	.474	.147	*	*
sig	c	NS	NS	a	NS	NS	NS	*	*
AGE									
b	−.024	−.034	−.010	.016	.024	.012	.019	.029	−.032
se	.003	.008	.014	.002	.009	.012	.004	.016	.054
sig	c	c	NS	c	a	NS	c	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.265	.235	.175	.342	.280	.369	.320	.361	.214
se	.017	.043	.059	.014	.051	.065	.027	.103	.215
sig	c	c	a	c	c	c	c	b	NS
INC									
b	.081	.230	−.014	.103	.268	.100	.133	.031	.470
se	.021	.061	.112	.018	.079	.102	.034	.169	.267
sig	c	b	NS	c	b	NS	c	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.193	−.340	.429	.299	.068	−.592	.549	.345	7.805
se	.082	.214	.349	.071	.280	.354	.150	.561	*
sig	a	NS	NS	c	NS	NS	b	NS	*
MARIT									
b	.548	.132	.040	.477	.816	.337	.431	.819	−.155
se	.083	.200	.348	.076	.277	.350	.147	.536	1.135
sig	c	NS	NS	c	a	NS	a	NS	NS
INT	−5.72	−3.97	−4.12	−8.08	−8.31	−7.97	−9.92	−18.67	−21.56

Appendix Table 3–2 (Continued)
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1985 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attend musical			Attend play			Attend ballet		
	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
WOMEN									
b	.513	.560	.186	.436	.285	.189	.980	.198	−.161
se	.057	.233	.284	.065	.269	.325	.105	.416	.429
sig	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.593	.836	−.021	.402	.594	.111	.233	8.544	−.084
se	.067	.353	.417	.077	.393	.477	.120	*	.600
sig	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS	NS	*	NS
AGE									
b	.007	.014	.023	.009	.009	.021	.004	.006	−.002
se	.002	.008	.011	.002	.010	.012	.003	.014	.019
sig	d	NS	a	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
EDUC									
b	.217	.255	.394	.294	.372	.251	.318	.259	.205
se	.012	.046	.060	.014	.059	.061	.022	.082	.082
sig	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	a	a
INC									
b	.162	.188	.089	.117	.226	.126	.125	.016	.170
se	.016	.072	.093	.018	.083	.105	.027	.143	.133
sig	d	a	NS	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.377	.492	.448	.414	−.180	−.080	.287	.744	.311
se	.063	.242	.308	.073	.296	.363	.115	.453	.479
sig	d	a	NS	d	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.244	.458	−.071	.415	.712	.304	.445	−.726	.106
se	.069	.242	.323	.077	.290	.363	.115	.482	.477
sig	a	NS	NS	d	a	NS	c	NS	NS
INT	−6.11	−7.88	−8.35	−7.45	−9.25	−6.97	−8.94	−15.93	−6.12

Appendix Table 3–2 (Continued)
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1985 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Visit art museum or gallery			Perform: Play musical instrument			Perform: Act, sing, or dance		
	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
WOMEN									
b	.383	.276	.141	−.147	.051	−1.185	.240	.129	−.258
se	.052	.203	.203	.124	.433	.604	.103	.326	.471
sig	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	a	a	NS	NS
SMSA									
b	.495	.362	−.083	−.483	.154	−.125	196.278	.020	8.004
se	.060	.269	.286	.131	.533	.687	.109	.396	*
sig	d	NS	NS	b	NS	NS	a	NS	*
AGE									
b	−.001	−.007	.007	−.023	−.042	6.026	−.016	.003	−.066
se	.002	.008	.008	.005	.020	.026	.004	.012	.029
sig	NS	NS	NS	d	a	NS	d	NS	a
EDUC									
b	.312	.272	.155	.179	.058	.153	.143	.101	−.037
se	.012	.044	.037	.028	.095	.097	.022	.064	.084
sig	d	d	d	d	NS	NS	d	NS	NS
INC									
b	.097	.208	.114	.090	.017	.019	−.056	.084	−.031
se	.015	.065	.072	.039	.154	.180	.032	.112	.173
sig	d	a	NS	a	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
OCC									
b	.257	.385	.688	.412	.743	.058	.348	.413	.820
se	.058	.217	.224	.143	.466	.585	.117	.360	.537
sig	d	NS	a	a	NS	NS	a	NS	NS
MARIT									
b	.297	.252	.125	.155	−.104	.149	.101	.631	.074
se	.063	.218	.228	.143	.471	.571	.120	.356	.532
sig	d	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
INT	−6.23	−6.34	−3.98	−4.64	−3.58	−4.26	−4.35	−5.33	−9.10

Appendix Table 3–2 (Continued)
Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in Core Activities for 1985 Disaggregated Subsamples: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Read novels, short stories, poems, or plays		
	W	A	H
WOMEN			
b	.912	.362	.595
se	.046	.127	.171
sig	d	a	b
SMSA			
b	.122	.797	.119
se	.048	.155	.239
sig	a	d	NS
AGE			
b	.002	−.007	.013
se	.001	.004	.007
sig	NS	NS	a
EDUC			
b	.240	.171	.187
se	.010	.026	.029
sig	d	d	d
INC			
b	.091	.069	.102
se	.015	.050	.066
sig	c	NS	NS
OCC			
b	.290	.648	.776
se	.052	.152	.193
sig	d	d	c
MARIT			
b	.101	.031	.234
se	.057	.143	.193
sig	NS	NS	NS
INT	−3.60	−3.10	−3.72

Notes: b is the unstandardized logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .01, c=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant. Variables are defined in the text. The coefficients and standard errors for INC are multiplied by 10,000 for purposes of display. *=Program does not compute reliable standard errors or significance statistics when regression coefficients are this high.

Appendix Table 4–1
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Who Wished to Attend Jazz Music Performances More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Tickets sold out	3.96	4.77	14.87	1.18	0.80	0.00
Cost	31.35	59.05	34.14	25.62	45.05	39.94
Not available	29.07	16.66	31.52	22.43	12.67	14.06
Child care	3.80	8.90	12.87	7.94	8.26	11.49
Too far to go	13.98	2.02	20.04	15.59	7.00	12.95
Transportation	7.28	10.91	28.47	5.66	13.75	6.35
Fear crime	0.66	0.00	0.00	2.89	5.17	0.00
Lack motivation	8.33	6.11	14.08	13.85	9.53	11.12
Too little time	42.97	37.83	29.52	41.39	24.20	37.22
N (unweighted)	220	55	15	532	113	39
1985						
Tickets sold out	0.87	3.90	NA	1.40	1.23	0.00
Cost	21.68	51.31	NA	28.63	39.26	54.62
Not available	24.25	30.81	NA	23.43	12.73	15.56
Child care	8.69	8.76	NA	10.97	2.57	21.15
Too far to go	15.13	9.30	NA	14.22	5.75	0.00
Transportation	5.74	22.93	NA	5.20	7.56	2.68
Fear crime	2.71	11.42	NA	1.12	3.52	4.04
Lack motivation	11.05	0.00	NA	14.88	3.62	31.32
Too little time	47.23	19.83	NA	45.16	41.48	30.54
N (unweighted)	102	20	4	241	59	21

In 1985, too few Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported discomfort, no one to go with, handicap, poor quality, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 4–2
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Classical Music Performances More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous 12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Cost	32.83	34.71	55.96	28.30	43.96	48.43
Not available	21.44	0.00	8.92	23.27	14.32	8.07
No one to go with	7.63	9.61	19.11	7.18	6.40	2.31
Child care	5.28	21.98	0.00	7.51	9.96	8.66
Handicap	2.32	0.00	8.78	10.04	7.81	2.88
Too far to go	17.24	0.00	15.76	15.02	12.31	19.69
Transportation	7.19	8.00	19.11	8.15	20.50	15.43
Lack motivation	11.79	17.61	9.00	14.71	6.73	3.18
Too little time	41.40	35.30	16.13	39.10	34.53	32.96
N (unweighted)	303	14	10	552	48	36
1985						
Cost	22.93	NA	NA	30.08	23.53	NA
Not available	18.34	NA	NA	23.79	3.76	NA
No one to go with	9.14	NA	NA	5.83	8.32	NA
Child care	7.65	NA	NA	10.17	10.74	NA
Handicap	3.27	NA	NA	6.43	3.03	NA
Too far to go	11.50	NA	NA	25.46	10.28	NA
Transportation	5.76	NA	NA	8.55	16.86	NA
Lack motivation	16.42	NA	NA	12.06	9.50	NA
Too little time	51.06	NA	NA	34.70	47.98	NA
N (unweighted)	130	7	4	207	23	9

In 1985, too few African-American and Hispanic attenders and Hispanic nonattenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, crime, poor quality, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience as reasons for not attending.

Appendix Table 4–3
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Opera Performances More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous 12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Cost	38.47	NA	NA	34.55	38.52	68.01
Not available	32.95	NA	NA	25.98	8.63	6.82
No one to go with	11.68	NA	NA	9.22	3.30	11.98
Handicap	4.32	NA	NA	10.56	2.09	7.24
Too far to go	14.15	NA	NA	17.40	12.27	36.14
Transportation	9.84	NA	NA	8.39	11.52	7.24
Lack motivation	7.02	NA	NA	10.34	10.28	0.00
Too little time	20.21	NA	NA	30.27	30.48	15.05
N (unweighted)	50	1	1	311	23	14
1985						
Cost	43.54	NA	NA	36.59	8.99	NA
Not available	17.55	NA	NA	14.31	10.87	NA
No one to go with	3.56	NA	NA	6.38	5.68	NA
Handicap	0.00	NA	NA	5.42	0.00	NA
Too far to go	16.14	NA	NA	25.97	13.59	NA
Transportation	4.51	NA	NA	13.00	30.16	NA
Lack motivation	4.61	NA	NA	16.49	0.00	NA
Too little time	56.36	NA	NA	33.48	61.20	NA
N (unweighted)	21	2	0	141	10	7

In 1982 and 1985, too few African-American and Hispanic attenders, and in 1985 too few Hispanic nonattenders, reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, child care, crime, poor quality, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience as reasons for not attending.

Appendix Table 4–4
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Musical Theater Performances More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous 12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Cost	36.56	55.08	62.86	30.93	47.08	37.41
Not available	22.75	13.90	19.15	21.02	11.85	13.12
No one to go with	6.92	9.33	7.14	8.79	3.09	8.81
Child care	6.09	10.98	3.18	7.58	11.68	16.15
Too far to go	15.65	5.26	15.98	15.95	4.95	29.42
Transportation	7.42	4.46	8.92	7.56	8.18	17.40
Fear crime	2.75	7.49	3.95	3.57	3.41	5.17
Lack motivation	10.79	24.01	3.99	12.07	12.18	9.44
Too little time	36.58	44.78	33.08	36.52	29.30	32.90
N (unweighted)	620	24	23	969	81	44
1985						
Cost	28.83	53.27	NA	32.10	43.48	53.39
Not available	17.86	13.47	NA	19.07	15.20	0.00
No one to go with	5.81	4.81	NA	5.55	12.04	14.46
Child care	4.99	0.00	NA	10.33	7.07	17.07
Too far to go	16.31	0.00	NA	18.84	15.40	5.99
Transportation	7.26	4.29	NA	8.83	14.24	0.00
Fear crime	2.35	0.00	NA	2.95	12.24	0.00
Lack motivation	13.19	10.17	NA	15.14	2.95	14.38
Too little time	47.05	33.31	NA	34.07	25.51	37.28
N (unweighted)	247	17	5	373	40	15

In 1985, too few Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Fewer than 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, handicap, poor quality, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience as reasons for not attending.

Appendix Table 4–5
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Plays More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous 12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Cost	30.83	69.64	NA	31.10	24.18	43.63
Not available	22.32	7.81	NA	19.59	20.23	10.72
Child care	5.90	0.00	NA	8.49	13.64	9.50
Handicap	2.79	11.45	NA	5.34	3.91	0.00
Too far to go	14.91	8.69	NA	15.35	9.93	6.07
Transportation	5.79	12.08	NA	5.98	8.51	5.93
Fear crime	1.52	11.45	NA	3.20	0.00	3.45
Poor quality	5.18	0.00	NA	3.27	10.29	0.00
Lack motivation	11.33	13.20	NA	13.85	10.12	11.53
Too little time	41.17	42.89	NA	38.68	14.80	40.82
N (unweighted)	364	15	NA	852	48	27
1985						
Cost	28.32	43.07	NA	25.14	37.64	60.19
Not available	22.01	18.70	NA	21.39	9.54	0.00
Child care	8.87	8.06	NA	7.40	7.96	5.76
Handicap	2.58	0.00	NA	3.82	4.73	0.00
Too far to go	14.44	10.63	NA	17.25	4.14	0.00
Transportation	5.78	10.63	NA	5.08	13.51	5.82
Fear crime	3.30	8.06	NA	1.61	4.14	0.00
Poor quality	6.37	4.66	NA	1.15	0.00	0.00
Lack motivation	12.23	0.00	NA	12.81	2.41	25.30
Too little time	43.38	21.54	NA	39.10	38.72	50.91
N (unweighted)	149	12	1	358	24	13

In 1982 and 1985, too few Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Under 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, no one to go with, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 4–6
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Ballet Performances More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous 12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Cost	43.21	NA	NA	28.98	42.93	45.93
Not available	27.91	NA	NA	27.08	13.90	16.33
No one to go with	8.15	NA	NA	11.96	6.97	12.85
Child care	6.07	NA	NA	7.22	11.62	16.72
Handicap	3.00	NA	NA	8.27	3.09	10.01
Too far to go	10.91	NA	NA	15.88	13.61	20.38
Transportation	8.37	NA	NA	7.74	10.69	17.29
Fear crime	1.76	NA	NA	2.84	0.00	14.32
Lack motivation	3.12	NA	NA	13.35	2.61	21.39
Too little time	27.35	NA	NA	32.23	32.72	26.47
N (unweighted)	100	2	4	468	31	22
1985						
Cost	23.60	NA	NA	33.31	36.98	43.72
Not available	26.81	NA	NA	17.72	0.00	7.50
No one to go with	8.71	NA	NA	10.90	9.07	14.03
Child care	8.26	NA	NA	11.23	6.19	12.60
Handicap	1.87	NA	NA	5.89	0.00	0.00
Too far to go	10.61	NA	NA	22.11	5.65	15.63
Transportation	1.94	NA	NA	6.93	0.00	5.43
Fear crime	0.00	NA	NA	3.18	11.84	0.00
Lack motivation	8.26	NA	NA	14.20	0.00	9.05
Too little time	42.47	NA	NA	35.29	51.09	28.31
N (unweighted)	45	5	2	204	16	16

In 1982 and 1985, too few African-American and Hispanic attenders reported wanting to go more to report statistics. Under 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, poor quality, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 4–7
Weighted Percentages of Respondents Wishing to Attend Art Museums and Galleries More, Citing Selected Reasons for Not Doing So: Whites (W), African-Americans (A), and Hispanics (H)

	Attended during previous 12 months			Did not attend during previous 12 months		
	W	A	H	W	A	H
1982						
Cost	6.95	7.40	28.98	10.73	22.66	0.00
Not available	25.09	5.79	19.00	24.81	15.31	7.11
No one to go with	5.23	2.99	10.22	5.97	6.62	9.67
Child care	3.49	15.86	4.69	5.44	6.46	15.43
Too far to go	16.96	5.05	28.05	20.25	10.46	5.85
Transportation	5.23	22.31	6.97	6.46	11.68	13.21
Lack motivation	14.58	13.34	2.81	12.84	17.76	13.19
Too little time	51.01	51.80	67.86	40.12	30.85	47.33
N (unweighted)	606	26	40	812	89	48
1985						
Cost	9.40	11.07	11.00	13.78	17.37	29.65
Not available	20.04	0.00	16.61	23.98	15.09	0.00
No one to go with	2.39	20.42	9.98	6.74	5.37	0.00
Child care	5.79	0.00	5.92	5.39	3.60	8.54
Too far to go	25.20	15.51	7.81	21.28	6.80	8.96
Transportation	6.30	14.82	3.33	10.70	18.94	14.82
Lack motivation	14.32	0.00	21.71	16.75	7.94	34.49
Too little time	48.29	33.72	45.77	38.90	52.72	74.05
N (unweighted)	274	52	21	323	20	18

Under 10 percent of any group reported tickets sold out, discomfort, handicap, crime, poor quality, publicity, work-related reasons, performance times, or transience.

Appendix Table 5–1
Results of Factor Analysis of Core and Other Activity Participation Measures: Rotated Factor Loadings

	Factors			
Variables	1	2	3	4
Attend jazz	.018	.407	.343	.060
Attend classical	.307	.551	.029	.108
Attend opera	−.031	.479	.001	.039
Attend musical	.360	.573	−.019	.047
Attend play	.272	.607	.040	.064
Attend ballet	.003	.602	.151	.054
Visit art exhibit	.599	.341	.172	−.018
Perform on instrument	.049	−.002	−.045	.716
Perform: act, sing, dance	.057	.002	.002	.777
Read novels, etc.	.481	.148	.210	.044
Visit science or history museum	.651	.164	.023	.011
Visit historic monument	.686	.153	.144	.000
Read/listen to poetry	.284	.234	.415	.092
Visit art/craft fair	.670	.084	.173	.034
Art lessons	.098	.038	.603	.150
Make pottery	.297	−.216	.435	.065
Do needlecrafts	.397	−.150	.136	.102
Work on play set	.104	.105	.187	.565
Work on music set	−.044	.155	.087	.557
Creative writing	−.014	.220	.618	.167
Do photography	.192	.070	.452	−.044
Paint or draw	.172	−.025	.622	−.077

Based on data from November and December, 1982. Underlined variables are included in additive scales.

Appendix Table 5–2
Results of Factor Analysis of Socialization Measures: Rotated Factor Loadings

	Factors	
Variables	1	2
Parents listened to classical music	.097	.748
Parents took child to art museums	.174	.747
Parents took child to plays/concerts	.128	.777
Parents encouraged child to read	.208	.604
Instrumental/singing class/lessons	.494	.320
Art class/lessons	.693	.082
Acting class/lessons	.542	.072
Ballet class/lessons	.322	.268
Writing class/lessons	.667	.113
Craft class/lessons	.559	.083
Art appreciation class/lessons	.680	.220
Music appreciation class/lessons	.618	.256

Based on data from November and December, 1982. Underlined variables are included in additive scales. Only lessons taken before age of 18 are included.

Appendix Table 5–3
Results of Factor Analysis of Music Preference Measures: Rotated Factor Loadings

	Factors		
Variables	1	2	3
Classical/chamber	.713	.030	−.004
Opera	.665	−.075	−.092
Operetta/show tunes	.695	.115	.165
Jazz	.353	−.006	.648
Soul/blues	.204	.099	.659
Big band	.549	.299	.153
Country western	−.214	.701	.024
Bluegrass	.063	.730	.207
Rock	−.202	.058	.712
Mood/easy listening	.437	.226	.202
Folk	.362	.623	.144
Barbershop	.420	.526	−.107
Hymns/gospel	.214	.430	−.315

Based on data from November and December, 1982. Underlined variables are included in additive scales.

Table 5–4
Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables for the Full Sample, and by Race and Spanish Origin, by Education, by Gender and by Age — Including Respondents without Data on Parental Education

	N	Lessons	None	Art music	Attend	Visit	Attend no jazz	Perform	Dovis	TV arts
FULL SAMPLE	2,255	1.166	1.005	1.396	0.533	2.177	0.436	0.116	0.723	1.347
		1.408	0.957	1.407	0.980	1.745	0.854	0.438	1.105	1.795
RACE/SP ORIGIN										
White	1,908	1.240	1.134	1.509	0.571	2.208	0.483	0.116	0.762	1.404
		1.426	0.973	1.416	1.015	1.734	0.895	0.443	1.124	1.822
African-American	230	0.864	0.860	0.720	0.365	1.203	0.197	0.094	0.449	1.092
		1.318	0.839	1.193	0.768	1.531	0.564	0.360	0.860	1.609
Hispanic	117	0.667	0.900	1.084	0.305	1.597	0.214	0.166	0.708	1.027
		1.072	0.799	1.230	0.738	1.609	0.547	0.515	1.191	1.665
EDUCATION										
11 & Less	607	0.467	0.550	0.785	0.143	0.945	0.112	0.075	0.273	0.675
		0.989	0.697	1.179	0.446	1.176	0.403	0.337	0.685	1.379
12 Years	919	1.192	1.014	1.312	0.376	2.174	0.296	0.099	0.675	1.241
		1.338	0.858	1.276	0.763	1.648	0.667	0.380	1.027	1.662
13–15 Yrs	390	1.646	1.517	1.744	0.811	2.689	0.665	0.158	1.034	1.644
		1.547	0.945	1.486	1.153	1.676	0.999	0.516	1.288	1.820
16 & Over	339	1.766	1.708	2.275	1.305	3.416	1.101	0.183	1.279	2.450
		1.510	1.020	1.445	1.356	1.614	1.190	0.399	1.294	2.118
GENDER										
Male	1,008	1.118	0.993	1.259	0.449	1.714	0.352	0.096	0.665	1.277
		1.348	0.884	1.341	0.882	1.576	0.752	0.398	1.065	1.747
Female	1247	1.209	1.167	1.517	0.608	2.494	0.511	0.134	0.775	1.409
		1.458	1.010	1.453	1.054	1.805	0.929	0.471	1.137	1.835

Table 5–4 (Continued)
Means and Standard Deviations for Regression Variables for the Full Sample, and by Race and Spanish Origin, by Education, by Gender and by Age — Including Respondents without Data on Parental Education

	N	Lessons	None	Art music	Attend	Visit	Attend no jazz	Perform	Dovis	TV arts
AGE										
18–30	729	1.800	1.229	0.989	0.515	2.350	0.361	0.143	1.071	1.160
		1.632	0.897	1.121	0.950	1.725	0.771	0.479	1.325	1.559
31–51	768	1.098	1.089	1.618	0.632	2.325	0.535	0.135	0.739	1.457
		1.289	0.955	1.471	1.046	1.742	0.920	0.487	1.063	1.837
Over 51	758	0.603	0.937	1.569	0.448	1.696	0.407	0.065	0.358	1.419
		0.953	0.994	1.505	0.928	1.688	0.852	0.322	0.723	1.951

Appendix Table 5–5
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Performing-Arts Events Attended, 1982 Full Sample

I.V.	Jazz included		Jazz not included	
African-American	−.074 d	−.008	−.103 d	−.033 d
Hispanic	−.056 d	.013	−.061 d	.012
Female		.088 d		.100 d
Age		.095 d		.132 d
Education		.299 d		.298 d
Occupation		.109 d		.105 d
Income x 10,000		.132 d		.141 d
Single/divorced		.110 d		.089 d
SMSA residence		.063 d		.057 d
d.f.	15,012	15,012	15,012	15,012
R squared	.008	.193	.013	.191

Standardized regression coefficients. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001

Appendix Table 5–6
Regression Analyses Predicting Scores on Fine-Arts Music Scale

I.V.	1	2	3
African-American	−.179 d	−.093 d	−.080 d
Hispanic	−.067 b	.001	.019
Female		.107 d	.073 d
Age		.273 d	.312 d
Education		.338 d	.234 d
Occupation		.073 c	.057 b
Income x 10,000		.095 d	.074 c
Single/divorced		.035	.007
Lives in SMSA		.076 d	.055 b
Childhood lessons			.163 d
Parental guidance			.200 d
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.034	.218	.286

Additive scale of number of kinds of fine-arts music respondents reported enjoying. Based on November/December 1982 subsample. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001

Appendix Table 5–7
Regression Analyses Predicting Scores on Television Arts Scale

I.V.	1	2	3
African-American	−.057 b	.017	.028
Hispanic	−.047 a	.009	.030
Female		.054 b	.009
Age		.192 d	.233 d
Education		.306 d	.181 d
Occupation		.042	.029
Income x 10,000		.100 d	.078 c
Single/divorced		.081 c	.047 a
Lives in SMSA		.072 c	.047 a
Childhood lessons			.173 d
Parental guidance			.266 d
Hours watch TV			.044 a
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.004	.140	.243

Additive scale of number of kinds of artistic programs respondents reported watching on television during previous year. Models based on data from November/December 1982 subsample. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001

Appendix Table 5–8
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Performing Events Attended (Including Jazz)

I.V.	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.067 b	.015	.026	.031
Hispanic	−.061 b	−.002	.012	.001
Female		.107 d	.080 d	.076 d
Age		.119 d	.150 d	.065 b
Education		.280 d	.196 d	.123 d
Occupation		.125 d	.112 d	.090 d
Income x 10,000		.144 d	.128 d	.098 d
Single/divorced		.088 d	.065 b	.052 b
Metropolitan		.051 a	.034	.017
Parental guidance			.165 d	.076 c
Childhood lessons			.129 d	.074 c
Hours watch TV				−.077 d
Likes art music				.085 c
Watch TV arts				.257 d
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.007	.182	.226	.299

Standardized beta coefficients. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001 Models based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–9
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Performing Events Attended (Excluding Jazz)

I.V.	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.107 d	−.022	−.013	−.006
Hispanic	−.070 c	−.008	.004	−.007
Female		.117 d	.094 d	.089 d
Age		.152 d	.178 d	.093 d
Education		.275 d	.202 d	.129 d
Occupation		.123 d	.112 d	.089 d
Income x 10,000		.150 d	.136 d	.106 d
Single/divorced		.068 b	.048 a	.036
Metropolitan		.043 a	.029	.012
Parental guidance			.144 d	.058 b
Childhood lessons			.106 d	.052 a
Hours watch TV				−.079 d
Likes art music				.101 d
Watch TV arts				.234 d
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.014	.183	.215	.283

Standardized beta coefficients. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001 Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–10
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities

I.V.	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.199 d	−.115 d	−.101 d	−.094 d
Hispanic	−.088 d	−.024	−.004	−.016
Female		.255 d	.219 d	.213 d
Age		−.059 b	−.013	−.103 d
Education		.371 d	.260 d	.184 d
Occupation		.080 d	.063 c	.040 a
Income x 10,000		.084 d	.062 b	.031
Single/divorced		−.012	−.043 a	−.056 b
Metropolitan		.024	.002	−.016
Parental guidance			.208 d	.118 d
Childhood lessons			.186 d	.129 d
Hours watch TV				−.077 d
Likes art music				.106 d
Watch TV arts				.247 d
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.043	.310	.390	.465

Standardized beta coefficients. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001 Based on November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–11
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities

I.V.	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.016	−.004	.003	.007
Hispanic	.025	.038	.049 a	.045 a
Female		.050 a	.035	.031
Age		−.039	−.010	−.049
Education		.088 c	.044	.013
Occupation		.039	.033	.025
Income x 10,000		−.042	−.051 a	−.062 b
Single/divorced		.034	.020	.015
Metropolitan		−.030	−.041	−.048 a
Parental guidance			.063 b	.028
Childhood lessons			.112 d	.088 c
Hours watch TV				−.015
Likes art music				.059 a
Watch TV arts				.085 b
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.000	.016	.032	.006

Standardized beta coefficients. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001 Data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–12
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Nonperformance Creative Activities

I.V.	1	2	3	4
African-American	−.091 d	−.056 b	−.035	−.032
Hispanic	−.011	.016	.043 a	.034
Female		.074 c	.038 a	.039 a
Age		−.151 d	−.074 c	−.133 d
Education		.215 d	.104 d	.050 a
Occupation		.098 d	.082 d	.062 b
Income x 10,000		−.024	−.047 a	−.070 c
Single/divorced		.096 d	.059 b	.049 a
Metropolitan		−.018	−.044 a	−.056 b
Parental guidance			148 d	.081 c
Childhood lessons			.300 d	.261 d
Hours watch TV				−.088 d
Likes art music				.039
Watch TV arts				.205 d
d.f.	2,254	2,254	2,254	2,254
R Squared	.007	.149	.258	.301

Standardized beta coefficients. a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001 Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–13
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Lessons Taken Before Age 18 and Number of Kinds of Activities with Parents as Child, by Race

	Kinds of lessons			Activities with parents		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	−.016	−.025	−.015	.009	−.003	.007
	.002	.066	.008	.001	.004	.005
	−.194	−.333	−.206	.159	−.064	.132
	d	d		d		
Female	.185	−.106	.168	.223	.295	.048
	.067	.204	.253	.043	.124	.164
	.064	−.039	.073	.114	.166	.030
	b			d	a	
Father's education	.070	.061	.109	.100	.098	.068
	.014	.047	.052	.009	.029	.033
	.161	.130	.313	.340	.317	.283
	d		a	d	d	a
Mother's education	.085	.061	−.055	.090	.085	.053
	.016	.051	.064	.011	.031	.041
	.171	.128	−.127	.269	.273	.181
	d			d	b	
d.f.	1,525	140	83	1,525	140	83
Adj. R squared	.187	.217	.047	.267	.329	.154

a: p less than or equal to .05 b: p less than or equal to .01 c: p less than or equal to .001 d: p less than or equal to .0001 Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample, respondents with information on parents' education only.

Appendix Table 5–14
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Music and Related Genres Enjoyed, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	.023	.004	.003	.026	.011	.003
	.002	.005	.008	.002	.005	.008
	.296	.069	.046	.337	.174	.036
	d			d	a	
Female	.353	.110	.201	.243	.089	.198
	.058	.153	.229	.057	.140	.220
	.124	.046	.082	.086	.037	.080
	d			d		
Education	.175	.070	.077	.122	.041	.038
	.012	.028	.038	.013	.025	.038
	.346	.225	.243	.241	.131	.122
	d	a	a	d		
Occupation	.190	.574	−.186	.175	.265	−.193
	.068	.196	.278	.066	.183	.266
	.065	.205	−.067	.060	.095	−.069
	b	b		b		
Income	.098	.008	−.052	.080	.023	−.059
x 10,000	.021	.075	.103	.021	.069	.100
	.105	.008	−.051	.086	.022	−.058
	d			d		
Single/divorced	.128	−.106	.405	.023	−.074	.280
	.073	.178	.268	.071	.161	.261
	.039	−.041	.155	.007	−.029	.107
Lives in SMSA	.201	.358	.305	.153	.222	.239
	.062	.189	.411	.060	.172	.395
	.068	.124	.069	.052	.077	.054
	b			a		

Appendix Table 5–14 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Music and Related Genres Enjoyed, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H
Parental				.261	.491	.350
guidance				.033	.095	.148
				.180	.345	.227
				d	d	a
Childhood lessons				.158	.176	.205
				.023	.061	.114
				.159	.195	.179
				d	b	
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
Adj. R Squared	.214	.133	.028	.272	.290	.108

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December subsample.

Appendix Table 5–15
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Television Arts Program Watched in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	.020	.003	.005	.024	.015	.001
	.002	.007	.012	.002	.007	.011
	.204	.037	.046	.245	.174	.015
	d			d	a	
Female	.255	.099	−.096	.073	.034	−.074
	.078	.208	.316	.075	.188	.285
	.070	.031	−.029	.020	.010	−.022
	c					
Education	.206	.064	.096	.124	.026	.017
	.016	.037	.052	.017	.034	.049
	.317	.151	.225	.191	.061	.041
	d			d		
Occupation	.120	.594	−.291	.114	.169	−.303
	.091	.266	.383	.087	.243	.347
	.032	.157	−.077	.030	.045	−.080
		a				
Income	.116	.166	.037	.090	.188	.048
x 10,000	.029	.102	.142	.027	.091	.129
	.097	.117	.027	.075	.132	.034
	d			c	a	
Single/divorced	.335	.323	.370	.177	.363	.177
	.098	.242	.369	.093	.213	.338
	.080	.094	.104	.042	.105	.050
	c					
Lives in SMSA	.256	.477	−.230	.183	.244	−.303
	.083	.256	.566	.079	.228	.516
	.067	.123	−.038	.048	.063	−.050
	b			a		

Appendix Table 5–15 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Television Arts Program Watched in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H
Parental guidance				.451 .044 .241 d	.693 .126 .361 d	.875 .192 .419 d
Childhood lessons				.215 .030 .168 d	.294 .082 .240 c	.223 .147 .143
Hours TV				.030 .018 .035	.037 .028 .077	−.001 .069 −.001
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
Adj. R Squared	.151	.121	−.004	.236	.319	.186

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–16
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended in Previous 12 Months, Including Jazz, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	.006	.002	.001	.008	.004	.000	.003	.002	.000
	.001	.003	.005	.001	.003	.005	.001	.003	.005
	.118	.042	.027	.151	.097	.011	.063	.045	.001
	d			d			b		
Female	.257	.018	.127	.192	.007	.132	.175	.004	.145
	.042	.093	.137	.042	.091	.134	.040	.090	.131
	.126	.012	.086	.095	.005	.090	.086	.002	.098
	d			d			d		
Education	.112	.045	.003	.081	.034	−.016	.052	.029	−.019
	.009	.017	.022	.009	.016	.023	.009	.016	.023
	.309	.222	.014	.223	.168	−.082	.144	.145	−.099
	d	b		d	a		d		
Occupation	.198	.529	.269	.189	.417	.266	.141	.386	.296
	.050	.119	.166	.048	.119	.162	.046	.117	.159
	.094	.294	.161	.090	.232	.159	.067	.214	.177
	d	d		d	c		b	b	
Income	.086	.113	.121	.076	.117	.124	.055	.096	.113
x 10,000	.016	.046	.061	.015	.044	.061	.015	.044	.059
	.128	.168	.196	.113	.174	.201	.082	.143	.183
	d	a		d	b	a	c	a	
Single/	.242	−.013	.151	.181	−.093	.107	.150	−.038	.087
divorced	.053	.108	.160	.052	.112	.159	.050	.103	.155
	.104	−.008	.096	.078	−.050	.068	.064	−.023	.055
	d			c			b		
Lives in	116	−.046	−.203	.088	−.093	−.220	.051	−.126	−.154
SMSA	.045	.114	.245	.041	.112	.241	.042	.110	.237
	.055	−.025	−.077	.042	−.050	−.083	.024	−.068	−.058
	a			a					
Parental				.153	.191	.204	.069	.096	.088
guidance				.025	.062	.090	.024	.066	.096
				.147	.209	.220	.066	.105	.096
				d	b	a	b		

Appendix Table 5–16 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended in Previous 12 Months, Including Jazz, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Childhood lessons				.092	.053	.050	.053	.016	.023
				.017	.040	.069	.016	.040	.068
				.129	.092	.073	.075	.027	.033
				d			d		
Hours TV							−.037	−.007	−.018
							.010	.013	.032
							−.078	−.030	−.050
							c		
Art music							.063	.037	−.020
							.018	.046	.066
							.088	.058	−.033
							c		
TV art programs							.143	.109	.142
							.014	.035	.051
							.257	.229	.320
							d	b	b
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
R Squared	.188	.234	.039	.226	.280	.081	.301	.315	.134

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–17
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended in Previous 12 Months, Excluding Jazz, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	.007	.007	.002	.008	.008	.001	.004	.006	.001
	.001	.002	.004	.001	.002	.004	.001	.002	.004
	.140	.237	.061	.168	.258	.041	.079	.205	.034
	d	b		d	b		b	b	
Female	.239	.070	.095	.190	.057	.100	.172	.057	.108
	.037	.067	.100	.037	.067	.098	.036	.066	.098
	.134	.062	.087	.106	.050	.091	.096	.050	.098
	d			d			d		
Education	.097	.038	.010	.073	.032	−.004	.048	.028	−.005
	.008	.012	.016	.008	.012	.017	.008	.012	.017
	.304	.254	.073	.230	.215	−.027	.149	.188	−.039
	d	b		d	b		d	a	
Occupation	.174	.411	.196	.168	.358	.194	.125	.331	.210
	.044	.086	.122	.043	.087	.119	.042	.086	.118
	.094	.311	.158	.090	.270	.156	.067	.250	.169
	d	d		d	d		b	c	
Income x 10,000	.077	.113	.099	.069	.112	.102	.051	.098	.095
	.014	.033	.045	.014	.033	.044	.013	.032	.044
	.131	.227	.216	.117	.225	.222	.086	.198	.209
	d	c	a	d	c	a	d	b	a
Single/ divorced	.158	.041	.098	.111	.046	.066	.085	.025	.055
	.047	.078	.117	.047	.077	.116	.044	.076	.116
	.077	.034	.084	.054	.038	.057	.041	.021	.047
	c			a					
Lives in SMSA	.095	−.155	−.003	.074	−.171	−.014	.040	−.194	.023
	.040	.083	.180	.039	.082	.176	.038	.081	.177
	.051	−.113	−.002	.039	−.125	−.007	.022	−.142	.012
	a				a			a	
Parental guidance				.118	.122	.163	.044	.054	.099
				.022	.045	.066	.022	.048	.071
				.128	.181	.239	.048	.080	.145
				d	b	a	a		

Appendix Table 5–17 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended in Previous 12 Months, Excluding Jazz, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Childhood lessons				.070	.001	.031	.037	–.025	.016
				.015	.029	.051	.015	.030	.051
				.112	.002	.062	.058	–.058	.032
				d			a		
Hours TV							–.032	–.007	–.010
							.009	.010	.024
							–.076	–.043	–.037
							d		
Art music							.067	.038	–.012
							.016	.034	.049
							.105	.081	–.027
							d		
TV art programs							.118	.070	.079
							.012	.026	.038
							.239	.198	.241
							d	b	a
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
R Squared	.182	.258	.058	.210	.278	.106	.283	.309	.125

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:

a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–18
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	−.007	−.009	−.002	−.002	−.008	−.001	−.011	−.005	−.001
	.002	.006	.010	.002	.006	.009	.002	.006	.008
	−.071	−.109	−.017	−.025	−.009	−.015	−.118	−.062	−.012
	b						d		
Female	1.015	.537	.182	.874	.503	.152	.838	.518	.197
	.067	.178	.276	.065	.158	.250	.061	.157	.215
	.292	.174	.057	.252	.163	.047	.241	.168	.061
	d	b		d	b		d	b	
Education	.256	.089	.141	.188	.051	.081	.136	.039	.078
	.014	.032	.045	.015	.029	.043	.014	.028	.037
	.413	.222	.343	.303	.127	.197	.220	.097	.190
	d	b	b	d			d		a
Occupation	.129	1.009	.732	.111	.613	.721	.024	.531	.890
	.079	.228	.334	.075	.207	.302	.071	.204	.260
	.036	.281	.201	.031	.171	.198	.007	.148	.244
		d	a		b	a		b	c
Income x 10,000	.085	.130	.048	.062	.146	.016	.026	.116	.002
	.025	.088	.124	.024	.078	.113	.022	.076	.097
	.074	.097	.035	.054	.109	.012	.022	.086	.002
	c			b					
Single/ divorced	.036	−.427	−.107	−.100	−.386	−.359	−.151	−.430	−.436
	.084	.207	.323	.081	.183	.296	.076	.180	.254
	.009	−.130	−.031	−.025	−.118	−.105	−.038	−.131	−.127
		a			a		a	a	
Lives in SMSA	.092	−.012	−.361	.030	−.181	−.515	−.037	−.233	−.423
	.072	.219	.494	.069	.195	.448	.064	.191	.388
	.025	−.003	−.062	.008	−.049	−.089	−.010	−.063	−.073
Parental guidance				.326	.658	.421	.178	.485	.009
				.038	.108	.168	.037	.114	.157
				.183	.360	.209	.100	.266	.004
				d	d	a	d	d	

Appendix Table 5–18 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Childhood lessons				.214	.203	.485	.146	.143	.384
				.026	.070	.129	.025	.071	.120
				.176	.174	.323	.120	.123	.256
				d	b	c	d	a	c
Hours TV							−.065	−.029	.057
							.015	.023	.052
							−.079	−.064	.074
							d		
Art music							.136	.113	−.025
							.028	.080	.107
							.111	.088	−.019
							d		
TV art programs							.234	.163	.476
							.021	.061	.083
							.246	.171	.494
							d	b	d
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
R Squared	.302	.290	.176	.367	.448	.330	.445	.476	.511

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–19
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	−.001	−.000	−.004	−.000	−.000	−.004	−.001	−.000	−.004
	.001	.002	.004	.001	.002	.003	.001	.002	.003
	−.045	−.018	−.123	−.014	−.008	−.155	−.058 a	−.016	−.140
Female	.050	−.001	.090	.034	−.002	.091	.028	−.011	.101
	.020	.050	.096	.020	.050	.094	.020	.051	.095
	.057 a	−.001	.087	.039	−.003	.088	.032	−.006	.098
Education	.017	.003	−.016	.010	.002	−.029	.004	.002	−.030
	.004	.009	.016	.005	.009	.016	.005	.009	.016
	.109 d	.031	−.123	.061 a	.020	−.223	.024	.024	−.224
Occupation	.025	.099	.042	.024	.088	.039	.015	.092	.039
	.024	.064	.116	.024	.066	.114	.024	.067	.115
	.027	.117	.036	.026	.105	.034	.016	.109	.033
Income x 10,000	−.017	−.017	.091	−.020	−.017	.091	−.024	−.018	.085
	.008	.024	.043	.007	.025	.042	.007	.025	.043
	−.059 a	−.053	.212 a	−.068 b	−.052	.212 a	−.082 b	−.055	.197
Single/ divorced	.020	.084	.186	.002	.085	.148	−.003	.084	.151
	.026	.058	.112	.025	.058	.111	.025	.059	.113
	.019	.109	.169	.002	.110	.135	−.002	.109	.137
Lives in SMSA	−.035	.002	.188	−.043	−.002	.170	−.050	−.008	.204
	.022	.061	.172	.022	.062	.168	.022	.063	.172
	−.038	.002	.102	−.046 a	−.002	.092	−.054 a	−.009	.110
Parental guidance				.026	.019	.133	.010	.015	.111
				.012	.034	.063	.012	.037	.070
				.057 a	.044	.207 a	.022	.035	.172
Childhood lessons				.037	.004	.055	.029	−.000	.054
				.008	.022	.048	.008	.023	.050
				.118 d	.014	.115	.093 c	−.001	.111

Appendix Table 5–19 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Hours TV							−.004	.006	−.012
							.005	.008	.023
							−.021	.057	−.047
Art music							.022	.011	−.038
							.009	.026	.048
							.070	.036	−.090
							a		
TV art programs							.022	−.000	.042
							.007	.020	.037
							.089	−.001	.135
							b		
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
R Squared	.018	.002	.028	.034	−.004	.075	.047	−.014	.063

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–20
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Nonperformance Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Age	−.010	−.003	−.011	−.005	.004	−.012	−.009	.003	−.013
	.001	.004	.008	.001	.004	.007	.001	.004	.007
	−.168	−.054	−.157	−.091	.092	−.176	−.150	.060	−.185
	d			d			d		
Female	.223	−.041	−.042	.124	.001	−.038	.116	.010	.010
	.048	.107	.219	.045	.098	.203	.044	.099	.184
	.099	−.024	−.018	.055	.000	−.016	.052	.006	.004
	d			b			b		
Education	.099	.039	.040	.052	.026	−.008	.028	.022	−.011
	.010	.019	.036	.010	.018	.035	.010	.018	.032
	.247	.172	.132	.129	.117	−.025	.069	.099	−.037
	d	a		d			b		
Occupation	.129	.702	.311	.121	.527	.303	.073	.499	.376
	.056	.137	.266	.053	.128	.245	.052	.129	.223
	.056	.348	.115	.052	.261	.112	.031	.247	.139
	a	d		a	d			d	
Income x 10,000	−.023	−.043	.020	−.039	−.015	.019	−.057	−.025	−.011
	.018	.053	.098	.017	.048	.092	.016	.048	.083
	−.031	−.056	.020	−.053	−.019	.019	−.076	−.033	−.011
				a			c		
Single/ divorced	.313	−.022	.075	.206	.002	−.064	.179	−.016	−.094
	.060	.124	.256	.057	.113	.240	.055	.114	.217
	.121	−.012	.030	.080	.001	−.025	.069	−.008	−.037
	d			c			b		
Lives in SMSA	−.064	.072	−.171	−.111	−.044	−.236	−.142	−.059	−.070
	.051	.132	.392	.048	.121	.363	.047	.121	.332
	−.028	.035	−.040	−.047	−.021	−.055	−.060	−.028	−.016
				a			b		
Parental guidance				.158	.067	.481	.088	.009	.210
				.027	.066	.136	.027	.072	.134
				.137	.065	.323	.077	.009	.141
				d		c	c		

Appendix Table 5–20 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of NonPerformance Activities in Previous 12 Months, by Race

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
I.V.s	W	A	H	W	A	H	W	A	H
Childhood lessons				.229	.268	.202	.200	.249	.146
				.018	.043	.104	.018	.044	.096
				.291	.410	.182	.254	.381	.131
				d	d		d	d	
Hours TV							−.046	−.013	−.026
							.011	.015	.044
							−.088	−.050	−.046
							d		
Art music							.041	.026	−.121
							.020	.051	.092
							.051	.035	−.125
							a		
TV art programs							.120	.061	.362
							.015	.039	.071
							.194	.115	.503
							d		d
d.f.	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116	1,907	229	116
R Squared	.158	.188	.053	.257	.331	.194	.299	.336	.347

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–21
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Lessons Taken Before Age 18, Number of Kinds of Activities with Parents as Child, and Number of Kinds of Television Arts Programs Watched, by Gender

	Lessons		Parents		Arts on TV		Arts on TV	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
African-American	−.251 .126 −.058 a	−.595 .118 −.133 d	−.248 .088 −.088 b	−.334 .087 −.108 d	.163 .172 .029	.036 .154 .006	.167 .164 .030	.159 .145 .028
Hispanic	−.689 .171 −.117 d	−.707 .177 −.105 d	−.260 .120 −.068 a	−.472 .131 −.101 c	.243 .232 .032	−.100 .228 −.012	.357 .222 .047	.134 .214 .016
Age	−.029 .002 −.381 d	−.028 .002 −.365 d	−.009 .002 −.178 d	−.008 .002 −.141 d	.021 .003 .218 d	.017 .003 .176 d	.026 .003 .265 d	.021 .003 .213 d
Education					.149 .020 .291 d	.215 .021 .324 d	.098 .019 .191 d	.120 .021 .180 d
Occupation					.460 .123 .127 c	−.069 .114 −.018	.322 .119 .089 b	−.035 .108 −.009
Income x 10,000					.063 .040 .054	.161 .037 .131 d	.040 .038 .034	.133 .035 .108 d
Single/ divorced					.462 .130 .119 c	.220 .121 .052	.349 .124 .090 b	.063 .113 .015

Appendix Table 5–21 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Lessons Taken Before Age 18, Number of Kinds of Activities with Parents as Child, and Number of Kinds of Television Arts Programs Watched, by Gender

	Lessons		Parents		Arts on TV		Arts on TV	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Lives in SMSA					.225 .114 .060 a	.313 .107 .080 b	.120 .109 .032	.236 .100 .060 a
Childhood lessons							.239 .042 .184 d	.205 .036 .163 d
Home activities							.426 .064 .216 d	.536 .053 .295 d
Hours TV/ day							.041 .025 .047	.031 .018 .043
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.153	.148	.039	.034	.141	.150	.219	.265

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–22
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Music and Related Genres Enjoyed, by Gender

	Model 1		Model 2	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F
African-American	−.305	−.507	−.297	−.398
	.125	.118	.122	.112
	−.071	−.113	−.069	−.089
	a	d	a	c
Hispanic	.111	−.094	.184	.059
	.169	.175	.164	.166
	.019	−.014	.032	.009
Age	.020	.021	.024	.024
	.002	.002	.002	.002
	.273	.269	.315	.307
	d	d	d	d
Education	.135	.178	.105	.111
	.014	.016	.014	.016
	.343	.338	.268	.211
	d	d	d	d
Occupation	.324	.119	.235	.124
	.089	.088	.088	.083
	.116	.039	.085	.040
	c		b	
Income x 10,000	.077	.096	.063	.075
	.029	.028	.028	.027
	.085	.099	.069	.076
	b	c	a	b
Single/ divorced	.039	.176	−.024	.063
	.094	.093	.092	.088
	.013	.052	−.008	.019
Lives in SMSA	.230	.214	.171	.160
	.083	.082	.081	.078
	.080	.069	.060	.052
	b	b	a	a

Appendix Table 5–22 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Art Music and Related Genres Enjoyed, by Gender

	Model 1		Model 2	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F
Childhood lessons			.155 .031 .155 d	.164 .028 .164 d
Parental guidance			.217 .047 .143 d	.341 .041 .237 d
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.223	.201	.270	.287

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
a less than or equal to .05
b less than or equal to .01
c less than or equal to .001
d less than or equal to .0001
Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–23
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended, Including Jazz, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
African-American	.108	−.003	.113	.053	.101	.088
	.085	.086	.083	.085	.080	.081
	.038	−.001	.040	.016	.036	.027
Hispanic	−.016	−.002	.027	.073	−.022	.030
	.115	.128	.112	.126	.108	.119
	−.004	−.000	.007	.015	−.006	.006
Age	.004	.008	.006	.010	.002	.004
	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002
	.086	.145	.123	.176	.051	.080
	a	d	c	d		b
Education	.061	.125	.038	.096	.023	.064
	.010	.012	.010	.012	.010	.012
	.237	.327	.149	.252	.090	.168
	d	d	d	d	a	d
Occupation	.334	.211	.266	.215	.212	.183
	.061	.064	.059	.063	.058	.060
	.183	.094	.146	.096	.116	.082
	d	c	d	c	c	b
Income x 10,000	.066	.116	.055	.107	.049	.077
	.020	.021	.019	.020	.018	.019
	.111	.164	.093	.151	.082	.109
	c	d	b	d	b	d
Single/ divorced	.156	.204	.111	.150	.068	.133
	.064	.068	.062	.067	.060	.063
	.080	.084	.056	.062	.035	.054
	a	b		a		a
Lives in SMSA	.133	.071	.089	.046	.072	−.004
	.057	.060	.055	.059	.053	.056
	.070	.032	.047	.020	.038	−.002
	a					

Appendix Table 5–23 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended, Including Jazz, by Gender

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F	M	F
Parental guidance			.089	.093	.058	.048
			.021	.021	.021	.020
			.137	.128	.088	.066
			d	d	b	a
Home activities			.196	.131	.134	.018
			.032	.031	.032	.031
			.197	.125	.135	.017
				d	d	
Hours TV/day					−.023	−.031
					.012	.010
					−.053	−.075
						b
Art music					.015	.093
					.023	.023
					.023	.128
						d
TV arts programs					.131	.149
					.017	.018
					.259	.258
					d	d
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.169	.196	.224	.229	.280	.313

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–24
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended, Excluding Jazz, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
African-American	−.017	−.091	−.013	−.049	−.018	−.013
	.073	.076	.071	.075	.069	.072
	−.007	−.032	−.005	−.017	−.007	−.005
Hispanic	−.012	−.050	.018	.007	−.021	−.031
	.098	.113	.096	.112	.093	.106
	−.004	−.012	.005	.002	−.006	−.007
Age	.006	.008	.007	.010	.004	.005
	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
	.137	.168	.168	.194	.098	.098
	d	d	d	d	b	c
Education	.056	.104	.039	.082	.026	.054
	.008	.010	.008	.011	.008	.011
	.251	.310	.177	.243	.118	.160
	d	d	d	d	b	d
Occupation	.247	.214	.198	.217	.152	.187
	.052	.057	.051	.056	.050	.054
	.158	.109	.127	.110	.097	.095
	d	c	d	d	b	c
Income x 10,000	.066	.101	.058	.094	.052	.068
	.017	.018	.016	.018	.016	.017
	.130	.161	.115	.150	.103	.108
	d	d	c	d	b	d
Single/ divorced	.109	.126	.076	.085	.045	.070
	.055	.060	.054	.059	.052	.056
	.065	.059	.046	.040	.027	.033
	a	a				
Lives in SMSA	.085	.064	.053	.044	.038	.001
	.048	.053	.047	.052	.046	.050
	.053	.032	.033	.022	.024	.001

Appendix Table 5–24 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performing Events Attended, Excluding Jazz, by Gender

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F	M	F
Childhood lessons			.063 .018 .112 c	.069 .019 .108 c	.037 .018 .067 a	.030 .018 .047
Parental guidance			.143 .028 .168 d	.104 .028 .113 c	.092 .027 .108 c	.006 .027 .007
Hours TV/day					−.023 .011 −.060 a	−.027 .009 .076 b
Art music					.023 .020 .042	.091 .020 .142 d
TV arts programs					.100 .015 .232 d	.122 .016 .241 d
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.170	.191	.208	.215	.258	.297

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–25
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities, by Gender

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F	M	F
African-American	−.414 .142 −.082 b	−.813 .139 −.147 d	−.402 .134 −.080 b	−.664 .132 −.120 d	−.407 .128 −.081 b	−.596 .124 −.108 d
Hispanic	.129 .192 .019	−.492 .206 −.059 a	.228 .181 .033	−.294 .195 −.035	.131 .171 .019	−.369 .182 −.044 a
Age	−.004 .003 −.042	−.007 .003 −.069 a	.001 .003 .006	−.002 .003 −.019	−.007 .003 −.080 b	−.011 .003 −.115 d
Education	.181 .016 .391 d	.255 .019 .390 d	.132 .016 .285 d	.181 .019 .276 d	.099 .015 .213 d	.126 .018 .193 d
Occupation	.420 .101 .128 d	.196 .103 .051	.274 .096 .084 b	.207 .097 .054 a	.159 .092 .049	.148 .092 .039
Income x 10,000	.050 .033 .047	.129 .033 .107 d	.027 .031 .026	.106 .031 .087 c	.011 .029 .011	.055 .029 .045
Single/ divorced	−.039 .107 −.011	−.059 .109 −.014	−.138 .101 −.039	−.200 .103 −.048	−.213 .096 −.061 a	−.230 .097 −.055 a
Lives in SMSA	.133 .094 .040	.035 .097 .009	.039 .089 .011	−.032 .091 −.008	−.001 .085 −.000	−.116 .085 −.030

Appendix Table 5–25 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Visually Oriented Consumption Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Childhood lessons			.207	.249	.143	.174
			.035	.033	.033	.031
			.177	.201	.122	.140
			d	d	d	d
Parental guidance			.406	.333	.281	.142
			.052	.048	.050	.047
			.228	.186	.158	.080
			d	d	d	b
Hours TV/day					−.051	−.055
					.020	.016
					−.065	−.078
					b	c
Art music					.080	.170
					.037	.035
					.068	.137
					a	d
TV arts programs					.236	.241
					.028	.027
					.262	.245
					d	d
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.277	.288	.358	.366	.428	.448

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–26
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
African-American	.006	–.023	.007	.001	.006	.008
	.042	.042	.042	.042	.042	.043
	.004	–.016	.005	.000	.005	.006
Hispanic	.046	.105	.055	.134	.043	.130
	.057	.062	.056	.062	.056	.062
	.027	.048	.032	.061 a	.025	.059 a
Age	–.000	–.001	.000	–.000	–.001	–.001
	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001	.001
	–.011	–.056	.006	–.017	–.036	–.053
Education	.005	.022	.000	.016	–.004	.011
	.005	.006	.005	.006	.005	.006
	.047	.131 d	.003	.092 b	–.030	.065
Occupation	.053	.020	.038	.023	.026	.020
	.030	.031	.030	.031	.030	.032
	.065	.020	.046	.023	.031	.020
Income x 10,000	–.014	–.013	–.016	–.015	–.018	–.019
	.010	.010	.010	.010	.010	.010
	–.052	–.041	–.061	–.047	–.068	–.059
Single/ divorced	.038	.033	.028	.015	.019	.013
	.032	.033	.031	.033	.032	.033
	.043	.030	.031	.014	.021	.011
Lives in SMSA	.001	–.056	–.009	–.064	–.014	–.072
	.028	.029	.027	.029	.028	.029
	.001	–.056	–.010	–.064 a	–.016	–.072 a

Appendix Table 5-26 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Performance Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1 M	Model 1 F	Model 2 M	Model 2 F	Model 3 M	Model 3 F
Childhood lessons			.018	.047	.011	.040
			.011	.011	.011	.011
			.063	.147	.036	.124
				d		c
Parental guidance			.045	.012	.031	−.005
			.016	.015	.017	.016
			.100	.026	.068	−.010
			b			
Hours TV/day					−.003	−.001
					.006	.005
					−.017	−.005
Art music					.010	.025
					.012	.012
					.035	.075
						a
TV arts programs					.028	.016
					.009	.009
					.121	.061
					b	
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.005	.024	.016	.042	.029	.050

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–27
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Nonperformance Activities, by Gender

I.V.s	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
African-American	−.093	−.293	−.083	−.164	−.084	−.140
	.104	.095	.098	.089	.096	.087
	−.027	−.084 b	−.024	−.047	−.025	−.040
Hispanic	.137	.020	.239	.181	.197	.133
	.140	.141	.132	.132	.130	.128
	.029	.004	.052	.034	.043	.025
Age	−.008	−.010	−.004	−.005	−.007	−.009
	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002	.002
	−.140 d	−.062 d	−.067 a	−.079 b	−.119 c	−.142 d
Education	.056	.103	.023	.057	.009	.031
	.012	.013	.012	.013	.012	.013
	.178 d	.250 d	.075 a	.139 d	.028	.076 a
Occupation	.442	.043	.343	.059	.286	.022
	.074	.071	.070	.066	.070	.065
	.200 d	.018	.156 d	.025	.130 d	.009
Income x 10,000	−.060	.013	−.077	−.000	−.084	−.027
	.024	.023	.023	.021	.022	.021
	−.084 a	.017	−.107 c	−.001	−.117 c	−.035
Single/ divorced	.203	.292	.131	.185	.099	.171
	.078	.075	.074	.070	.073	.068
	.086 b	.111 d	.055	.070 b	.042	.065 a
Lives in SMSA	.044	−.130	−.025	−.180	−.041	−.218
	.069	.066	.065	.062	.064	.060
	.019	−.054 a	−.011	−.074 b	−.018	−.090 c

Appendix Table 5–27 (Continued)
Regression Analyses Predicting Number of Kinds of Nonperformance Activities, by Gender

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
I.V.s	M	F	M	F	M	F
Childhood lessons			.218	.246	.191	.214
			.025	.022	.025	.022
			.276	.316	.242	.274
			d	d	d	c
Parental guidance			.193	.138	.135	.050
			.038	.033	.038	.033
			.160	.123	.112	.045
			d	d	c	
Hours TV/day					−.038	−.043
					.028	.011
					−.071	−.098
					a	d
Art music					.028	.033
					.028	.024
					.036	.043
TV arts programs					.107	.139
					.021	.019
					.175	.224
					d	d
d.f.	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246	1,007	1,246
R Squared	.158	.156	.252	.267	.284	.317

First row is unstandardized regression coefficient.
Second row is standard error.
Third row is standardized regression coefficient.
Fourth row indicates significance:
- a less than or equal to .05
- b less than or equal to .01
- c less than or equal to .001
- d less than or equal to .0001

Based on data from November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–28
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Gender (Female [G]) for Selected Models

	18 to 31 years (N=728)			32 to 51 years (N=767)			over 51 years (N=757)		
	b	se	beta	b	se	beta	b	se	beta
D.V.: Lessons/*									
A	.060	.209	.012	−.109	.175	−.023	−.240	.161	−.063
H	−.235	.273	−.035	−.251	.221	−.044	−.041	.283	−.006
G	.293	.122	.091(a)	.034	.097	.013	.158	.088	.075
D.V.: Home/*									
A	.265	.106	.092(a)	.222	.119	.065	−.138	.148	−.036
H	.192	.138	.052	.178	.151	.042	.280	.260	.041
G	.256	.062	.144(d)	.215	.066	.112(b)	.187	.081	.088(a)
D.V.: TV arts – Model 1									
A	.132	.172	.029	−.148	.200	−.025	.179	.232	.027
H	.064	.241	.010	−.112	.260	−.014	.184	.372	.017
G	.116	.115	.037	.281	.121	.077(a)	.221	.132	.056
D.V.: TV arts – Model 2									
A	.312	.166	.068	−.164	.186	−.028	.143	.215	.022
H	.349	.229	.054	−.009	.243	−.001	.052	.345	.005
G	−.017	.111	−.005	.100	.114	.027	.034	.123	.009
D.V.: Art music – Model 1									
A	−.383	.121	−.117(b)	−.471	.153	−.101(b)	−.568	.169	−.113(c)
H	.252	.170	.054	−.328	.200	−.053	−.167	.271	−.020
G	.243	.081	.108(b)	.421	.093	.143(d)	.288	.096	.095(b)
D.V.: Art music – Model 2									
A	−.254	.115	−.077(a)	−.482	.147	−.103(b)	−.585	.157	−.116
H	.461	.161	.099(b)	−.266	.192	−.043	−.255	.251	−.031
G	.154	.077	.069(a)	.307	.090	.104(c)	.154	.090	.051
D.V.: Attend performance, inc. jazz – Model 1									
A	.081	.101	.029	−.110	.109	−.033	.085	.111	.027
H	−.157	.141	−.040	.016	.143	.004	.114	.178	.022
G	.130	.068	.069	.347	.066	.166(d)	.178	.063	.095(b)
D.V.: Attend performance, inc. jazz – Model 2									
A	.161	.098	.058	−.115	.105	−.035	.073	.109	.023
H	−.028	.138	−.007	.061	.137	.014	.084	.175	.017
G	.074	.066	.039	.273	.064	.131(d)	.141	.062	.075(a)
D.V.: Attend performance, inc. jazz – Model 3									
A	.171	.095	.061	−.033	.103	−.010	.071	.105	.023
H	−.125	.131	−.031	.066	.133	.015	.073	.166	.014
G	.085	.063	.045	.243	.063	.116(d)	.136	.059	.073(a)

Appendix Table 5–28 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Gender (Female [G]) for Selected Models

	18 to 31 years (N=728)			32 to 51 years (N=767)			over 51 years (N=757)		
	b	se	beta	b	se	beta	b	se	beta
D.V.: Attend performance, exc. jazz – Model 1									
A	–.141	.082	–.063	–.141	.097	–.048	.067	.102	.023
H	–.111	.114	–.034	–.033	.126	–.009	.027	.163	.006
G	.158	.055	.102(b)	.306	.058	.166(d)	.164	.058	.095(b)
D.V.: Attend performance, exc. jazz – Model 2									
A	–.086	.080	–.038	–.144	.094	–.050	.057	.101	.020
H	–.022	.113	–.007	.001	.123	.000	.003	.162	.001
G	.120	.054	.077(a)	.250	.058	.136(d)	.133	.058	.078(a)
D.V.: Attend performance, exc. jazz – Model 3									
A	–.065	.079	–.029	–.065	.092	–.022	.052	.097	.018
H	–.092	.109	–.029	.012	.119	.003	–.008	.154	–.002
G	.133	.053	.086(a)	.217	.056	.118(d)	.129	.055	.075(a)
D.V.: Visually oriented consumption – Model 1									
A	–.772	.172	–.153(d)	–.750	.173	–.136(d)	–.347	.182	–.061
H	–.296	.241	–.041	–.220	.226	–.030	–.004	.291	–.000
G	.919	.115	.266(d)	1.022	.105	.293(d)	.783	.103	.230(d)
D.V.: Visually oriented consumption – Model 2									
A	–.564	.160	–.112(c)	–.738	.164	–.134(d)	.377	.172	–.067(a)
H	.034	.224	.005	–.107	.214	–.015	–.093	.276	–.010
G	.771	.107	.223(d)	.900	.100	.258(d)	.662	.098	.195(d)
D.V.: Visually oriented consumption – Model 3									
A	–.572	.154	–.113(c)	–.581	.157	–.105(c)	–.312	.159	–.055
H	–.114	.213	–.016	–.093	.203	–.013	–.090	.253	–.010
G	.791	.103	.229(d)	.838	.096	.240(d)	.641	.090	.188(d)
D.V.: Performance activities – Model 1									
A	–.012	.054	–.009	–.025	.058	–.016	.020	.042	.018
H	.102	.075	.051	–.024	.076	–.012	.197	.067	.112(b)
G	.018	.036	.071	.066	.035	.068	.008	.024	.013
D.V.: Performance activities – Model 2									
A	.011	.054	.008	–.025	.058	–.016	.019	.042	.018
H	.141	.075	.071	–.010	.076	–.005	.193	.067	.110(b)
G	.053	.036	.055	.048	.035	.049	.003	.024	.004

Appendix Table 5–28 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Gender (Female [G]) for Selected Models

	18 to 31 years (N=728)			32 to 51 years (N=767)			over 51 years (N=757)		
	b	se	beta	b	se	beta	b	se	beta
D.V.: Performance activities – Model 3									
A	–.006	.054	–.004	.007	.058	.004	.008	.043	.008
H	.114	.075	.058	–.001	.075	–.001	.187	.067	.106(b)
G	.066	.036	.045	.033	.035	.034	.005	.024	.007
D.V.: Nonperformance activities – Model 1									
A	–.533	.143	–.137(c)	–.037	.120	–.011	.083	.090	.034
H	.103	.201	.019	–.002	.156	–.000	.265	.144	.067
G	.243	.096	.091(a)	.222	.072	.104(b)	.114	.051	.078(a)
D.V.: Nonperformance activities – Model 2									
A	–.349	.131	–.090(b)	–.025	.116	–.007	.073	.085	.030
H	.411	.184	.075(a)	.067	.151	.015	.224	.137	.057
G	.124	.088	.047	.160	.071	.075(a)	.054	.049	.037
D.V.: Nonperformance activities – Model 3									
A	–.316	.127	–.081(a)	.038	.115	.011	.079	.083	.033
H	.293	.175	.053	.067	.148	.015	.214	.131	.054
G	.162	.085	.061	.138	.070	.065(a)	.052	.047	.036

*For starred models only, respondents without data on father's and mother's education excluded, and mother's and father's educational attainment used as controls. Ns for these models are 629 for the 18–30 group, 629 for the 31–51 group, and 480 for the over 51 group. Model numbers refer to their counterparts in Appendix tables 5–14 through 5–20. a: p less than or equal to .05; b: p less than or equal to .01; c: p less than or equal to .001; d: p less than or equal to .001. Analyses based on November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–29
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

		1–11 years N=606			high school N=918		
D.V.	I.V.	b	se	beta	b	se	beta
Childhood lessons	A	–.156	.128	–.056	.250	.178	.050
	H	–.031	.181	–.008	–.101	.234	–.017
	G	.202	.095	.094(a)	.137	.094	.051
Parental guidance	A	.166	.093	.085	.191	.113	.061
	H	.350	.132	.127(b)	.194	.150	.049
	G	.109	.070	.072	.166	.060	.098(b)
TV arts programs (Model 1)/*	A	.065	.150	.018	.115	.188	.021
	H	.115	.204	.024	–.172	.257	–.021
	G	.084	.114	.031	.207	.110	.062
TV arts programs (Model 2)	A	.091	.142	.026	.139	.178	.025
	H	.182	.196	.038	.023	.257	.003
	G	–.047	.110	–.017	.083	.103	.025
Art music (Model 1)	A	–.501	.123	–.166(d)	–.241	.138	–.057
	H	–.010	.168	–.002	.103	.202	.016
	G	.160	.093	.068	.361	.081	.140(d)
Art music (Model 2)	A	–.466	.120	–.154(d)	–.206	.132	–.049
	H	.061	.164	.015	.215	.194	.034
	G	.076	.091	.032	.294	.078	.114(c)
Performing-arts attendance, including jazz (Model 1)	A	–.008	.048	–.007	–.032	.085	–.013
	H	–.007	.066	–.004	–.024	.125	–.006
	G	.032	.037	.036	.214	.050	.139(d)
Performing-arts attendance, including jazz (Model 2)	A	.006	.047	.005	–.022	.085	–.009
	H	.022	.065	.014	.012	.124	.003
	G	.004	.036	.004	.191	.050	.124(d)

Appendix Table 5–29 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

D.V.	I.V.	1–11 years N=606 b	se	beta	high school N=918 b	se	beta
Performing-arts attendance, including jazz (Model 3)	A	.018	.047	.016	.005	.081	.002
	H	.006	.064	.004	−.016	.117	−.004
	G	.008	.036	.009	.155	.047	.101(b)
Performing-arts attendance, excluding jazz (Model 1)	A	−.052	.044	−.050	−.162	.074	−.073(a)
	H	.056	.059	−.040	−.003	.128	−.001
	G	.049	.033	.060	.209	.043	.155(d)

D.V.	I.V.	13–15 years N=389 b	se	beta	16 or more N=338 b	se	beta
Childhood lessons	A	−.375	.296	−.065	.133	.393	.019
	H	−.856	.359	−.121(a)	−.473	.645	−.041
	G	.159	.156	.051	.300	.167	.100
Parental guidance	A	.193	.169	.055	.090	.266	.019
	H	.058	.205	.013	−.543	.403	−.068
	G	.438	.089	.230(d)	.412	.105	.199(d)
TV arts programs (Model 1)/*	A	−.247	.328	−.038	−.096	.470	−.011
	H	.228	.413	.028	-1.003	.901	−.059
	G	.187	.180	.051	.714	.233	.167(b)
TV arts programs (Model 2)	A	.011	.317	.002	.034	.443	.004
	H	.530	.401	.064	−.475	.846	−.028
	G	−.046	.177	−.013	.412	.224	.096
Art music (Model 1)	A	−.693	.259	−.131(b)	−.666	.302	−.110(a)
	H	−.200	.326	−.030	-1.068	.579	−.092
	G	.577	.142	.194(d)	.330	.150	.113(a)

Appendix Table 5–29 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

		13–15 years N=389			16 or more N=338		
D.V.	I.V.	b	se	beta	b	se	beta
Art music (Model 2)	A	–.441	.247	–.083	–.565	.295	–.093
	H	.123	.312	.018	–.802	.567	–.069
	G	.396	.138	.133(b)	.184	.150	.063
Performing-arts attendance, including jazz (Model 1)	A	–.137	.208	–.034	.156	.299	.027
	H	–.126	.262	–.024	–.862	.572	–.079
	G	.380	.114	.165	.653	.148	.238(d)
Performing-arts attendance, including jazz (Model 2)	A	.035	.202	.008	.279	.289	.049
	H	.115	.256	.022	–.546	.555	–.050
	G	.290	.113	.126(a)	.475	.147	.173(b)
Performing-arts attendance, including jazz (Model 3)	A	.106	.192	.026	.310	.278	.054
	H	.039	.241	.008	–.427	.529	–.039
	G	.277	.108	.120(a)	.388	.140	.141(b)
Performing-arts attendance, excluding jazz (Model 1)	A	–.246	.180	–.069	–.069	.263	–.014
	H	–.122	.227	–.027	–.848	.503	–.088
	G	.366	.099	.183(c)	.552	.130	.229(d)

Appendix Table 5–29 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

D.V.	I.V.	1–11 years			high school		
Performing-arts attendance, excluding jazz (Model 2)	A	–.041	.043	–.039	–.157	.073	–.071(a)
	H	–.034	.059	–.024	–.022	.107	–.007
	G	.027	.033	.033	.192	.043	.143(d)
Performing-arts attendance, excluding jazz (Model 3)	A	–.029	.043	–.028	–.125	.071	–.057
	H	–.047	.058	–.033	–.003	.102	–.001
	G	.030	.033	.037	.162	.041	.121(d)
Visually oriented consumption activities (Model 1)	A	–.456	.120	–.151(c)	–.857	.177	–.157(d)
	H	–.068	.163	–.017	–.301	.260	–.037
	G	.559	.090	.235(d)	1.041	.104	.313(d)
Visually oriented consumption activities (Model 2)	A	–.429	.113	–.142(c)	–.801	.167	–.147(d)
	H	–.015	.155	–.004	–.129	.245	–.016
	G	.462	.086	.195(d)	.942	.098	.283(d)
Visually oriented consumption activities (Model 3)	A	–.376	.110	–.125(c)	–.742	.158	–.136(d)
	H	–.059	.149	–.014	–.174	.228	–.021
	G	.464	.083	.196(d)	.891	.092	.268(d)
Performance activities (Model 1)	A	–.034	.037	–.040	.082	.043	.065
	H	.101	.051	.086(a)	.149	.064	.078(a)
	G	.009	.028	.013	.014	.025	.018
Performance activities (Model 2)	A	–.026	.037	–.030	.087	.043	.069(a)
	H	.119	.051	.101(a)	.161	.064	.085(a)
	G	–.005	.028	–.007	.007	.025	.009
Performance activities (Model 3)	A	–.045	.038	–.052	.080	.044	.063
	H	.113	.051	.096(a)	.159	.063	.084(a)
	G	.001	.029	.001	.001	.026	.001

Appendix Table 5–29 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

D.V.	I.V.	1–11 years			high school		
Nonperformance activities (Model 1)	A	−.118	.072	−.067	−.360	.115	−.106(b)
	H	.150	.098	.063	−.027	.168	−.005
	G	.119	.055	.086(a)	.103	.067	.049
Nonperformance activities (Model 2)	A	−.060	.065	−.034	−.308	.107	−.090(b)
	H	.268	.089	.112(b)	.097	.157	.019
	G	.032	.050	.023	.041	.062	.020
Nonperformance activities (Model 3)	A	−.055	.065	−.031	−.270	.106	−.079(a)
	H	.247	.088	.103(b)	.081	.153	.016
	G	.037	.049	.027	.031	.062	.015
D.V.	**I.V.**	**13–15 years**			**16 or more**		
Performing-arts attendance, excluding jazz (Model 2)	A	−.113	.177	−.032	.022	.258	.004
	H	.077	.223	.017	−.617	.495	−.064
	G	.317	.099	.158(b)	.421	.131	.175(b)
Performing-arts attendance, excluding jazz (Model 3)	A	−.045	.168	−.013	.066	.248	.013
	H	.015	.211	.003	−.497	.472	−.052
	G	.300	.094	.150(b)	.343	.125	.143(b)
Visually oriented consumption activities (Model 1)	A	−.931	.289	−.156(b)	−.554	.352	−.082
	H	−.251	.364	−.033	−.874	.675	−.067
	G	1.205	.158	.360(d)	1.089	.175	.334(d)
Visually oriented consumption activities (Model 2)	A	−.640	.276	−.110(a)	−.426	.339	−.063
	H	−.656	.349	.013	−.531	.651	−.041
	G	1.009	.155	.301(d)	.906	.173	.277(d)
Visually oriented consumption activities (Model 3)	A	−.506	.260	−.085	−.383	.321	−.057
	H	.011	.327	.001	−.373	.609	−.029
	G	.947	.146	.282(d)	.790	.162	.242(d)

Appendix Table 5–29 (Continued)
Effects of Race (African-American [A]), Ethnicity (Hispanic [H]), and Female Gender (G), by Own Educational Attainment, for Selected Models

D.V.	I.V.	13–15 years			16 or more		
Performance activities (Model 1)	A	−.069	.096	−.038	−.166	.138	−.066
	H	−.061	.121	−.026	−.196	.264	−.041
	G	.098	.053	.095	.165	.068	.136(a)
Performance activities (Model 2)	A	−.017	.096	−.009	−.153	.138	−.061
	H	.011	.122	.005	−.158	.265	−.033
	G	.069	.054	.067	.146	.061	.120(a)
Performance activities (Model 3)	A	.009	.095	.005	−.108	.138	−.043
	H	−.009	.120	−.004	−.096	.263	−.020
	G	.056	.054	.054	.131	.070	.108
Nonperformance activities (Model 1)	A	−.249	.225	−.054	−.149	.293	−.028
	H	−.048	.283	−.008	−.348	.562	−.033
	G	.374	.123	.145(b)	.411	.145	.157(b)
Nonperformance activities (Model 2)	A	−.011	.213	−.002	−.055	.283	−.010
	H	.286	.269	.049	−.091	.544	−.009
	G	.253	.119	.098(a)	.276	.144	.105
Nonperformance activities (Model 3)	A	.057	.207	.012	.043	.273	.008
	H	.231	.260	.040	.052	.520	.005
	G	.242	.116	.094(a)	.200	.138	.076

*/ For starred analyses only, cases without information on mother's or father's education were omitted and controls for mother's and father's education were included. For these models, Ns are 365 for 1–11 years, 717 for high school graduate, 352 for 13–15 years, and 317 for 16 or more years. Model numbers refer to their counterparts in Appendix tables 5–14 through 5–20. a=p less than or equal to .05; b=p less than or equal to .01; c=p less than or equal to .001; d=p less than or equal to .0001. Results based on analyses of November/December 1982 subsample.

Appendix Table 5–30: Coefficients Representing Effects of African-American (A) and Hispanic (H) on Core Participation Items (1) with Race/Ethnicity only (2) with Demographic Controls for November/December 1982 Subsample

		Jazz		Classical		Opera		Musical		Play	
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
A	b	.745	1.039	−.931	−.513	1.188	−.953	−.961	−.501	−.930	−.436
	se	.185	.207	.295	.319	.920	.934	.229	.246	.296	.318
	sig	b	c	a	NS	NS	NS	c	a	a	NS
H	b	.030	.223	-1.790	-1.275	−.725	−.374	−.601	−.056	-1.164	−.547
	se	.331	.351	.638	.654	1.079	1.098	.291	.312	.479	.499
	sig	NS	NS	a	NS	NS	NS	a	NS	a	NS

		Ballet		Art		Instrument		Act, sing		Read	
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
A	b	−1.660	−1.422	−1.032	−.730	−.024	.078	.034	.129	−.883	−.564
	se	.729	.741	.216	.236	.351	.365	.324	.339	.136	.157
	sig	a	NS	c	a	NS	NS	NS	NS	c	b
H	b	−.333	.044	−.472	−.008	.207	.410	.644	.863	−.713	−.282
	se	.574	.597	.257	.282	.456	.474	.363	.384	.192	.219
	sig	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	a	b	NS

b is the logistic regression coefficient. se is the standard error. sig refers to the level of statistical significance, where a=probability less than .05, b=probability less than .001, c=probability less than .00005, and NS=not significant.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Paul DiMaggio is Professor of Sociology at Princeton University and author of *Managers of the Arts* (NEA Research Division Report #20, Seven Locks Press, 1986)

Francie Ostrower received her Ph.D. in sociology from Yale University and is currently Assistant Professor of Sociology at Harvard University.

Race, Ethnicity, and Participation in the Arts

Based on evidence from two trail-blazing national surveys, this volume examines rates of participation of African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and whites in activities ranging from performing-arts attendance and visits to art museums, to creating craft works and performing onstage. The study reveals a pattern of differentiation without segmentation for the activities included in the survey: significant differences, but many activities and experiences held in common. The study goes beyond simply demonstrating that patterns of participation vary among the groups to ask why these differences exist, exploring the impact of such factors as education, gender, and income. The authors conclude by highlighting the need for future surveys to collect information on more activities with roots in many different ethnic and racial communities, and on the rich ethnic diversity within the groups studied. By opening up the issues, however, this volume serves as essential background for any discussion of cultural diversity and the arts in the United States.

A survey report by

Paul DiMaggio
Princeton

Francie Ostrower
Harvard University

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

Research Division Report #25

SEVEN LOCKS PRESS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

51195
9 780929 765037
ISBN 0-929765-03-6