

Considering Cultural Integration in the United States

Empirical Essays on Immigrants' Arts Participation

Jennifer L. Novak

This document was submitted as a dissertation in August 2016 in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the doctoral degree in public policy analysis at the Pardee RAND Graduate School. The faculty committee that supervised and approved the dissertation consisted of Gery Ryan (Chair), Julia Lowell, and Norman Bradburn.

The research presented in this thesis was made possible by support from the Kip and Mary Ann Hagopian Dissertation Award, the Anne and James Rothenberg Endowed Dissertation Award, scholarship support from the John L. and Barbara Vogelstein Foundation, the Agency for Healthcare and Research Quality at the National Institutes of Health (Grant# 1R36HS017531-01 Revised), and the Research: Art Works program at the National Endowment for the Arts (Grant# 14-3800-7012).



PARDEE RAND GRADUATE SCHOOL

For more information on this publication, visit http://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD379.html

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

© Copyright 2016 RAND Corporation

RAND® is a registered trademark

Limited Print and Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law. This representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for noncommercial use only. Unauthorized posting of this publication online is prohibited. Permission is given to duplicate this document for personal use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of its research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please visit www.rand.org/pubs/permissions.html.

The RAND Corporation is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.

RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

Support RAND

Make a tax-deductible charitable contribution at
www.rand.org/giving/contribute

www.rand.org

Abstract

By 2065, a record-breaking high of 1 in 3 US residents is projected to be either an immigrant or the child of an immigrant. How well immigrants and second-generation immigrants are settling into the US is of great importance to the well-being and vibrancy of the US as a whole. While economic, political, and social facets of immigration are regularly considered for policy-making, relatively little research has examined the cultural and artistic lives of immigrants. Through four empirical investigations, I explore arts participation as a means of broader civic and social engagement facilitating immigrants' integration into the US.

First, I consider how arts participation differs between current immigrant generations. Overall, I find immigrants participating at lower rates than US-born citizens, with the notable exception of Latin music activities. I also find second-generation immigrants participating in arts at higher rates than third+ generations in general. These results are consistent with the second-generation advantage theory for immigrant integration.

Second, I explore whether the length of time an immigrant has lived within the US affects their cultural integration with US-born citizens. I find first-generation immigrants residing in the US for longer periods have higher chances of going to see a live musical play or a live jazz performance. However, residence in the US for longer than five years decreases the chances of first-generation immigrants attending live Latin music events. These results align with classical assimilation theory, which posits that over time, first-generation immigrants adopt the practices of mainstream culture in place of their own.

Third, I examine arts participation by non-citizens' legal and undocumented statuses and consider the practical implementation of these statuses in survey data. I fail to find evidence of significant differences between non-citizen legal statuses. This finding empirically suggests that arts participation can serve as a non-threatening means to facilitate integration.

Fourth, I explore how well current survey tools measure arts participation by cognitively testing the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts with individuals in the Chinese immigrant community, providing a needed case study for investigating immigrants within the US more generally.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Summary	ix
Acknowledgements.....	xiii
I. Introduction.....	1
Organization	4
Data	5
II. Context.....	7
Periods of Mass Immigration & Theories of Immigrant Integration	7
Arts Participation as Civic Engagement & Cultural Identity.....	15
Measuring Arts Participation	17
III. Current Differences in How Immigrant Generations Participate in Art	20
Does arts participation differ between current immigrant generations?	22
Why are there differences?	33
Conclusions	42
IV. An Exploratory Look at Immigrants' Length of Time in the US.....	44
Analytical approach	44
Results.....	48
Conclusions	54
V. Non-Citizen Immigrants' Legal Statuses	56
Limited identification of legal status in survey data.....	57
Overview of imputation strategies	60
Applying the logical cross-survey multiple imputation strategy.....	63
Results.....	68
Conclusion.....	69
VI. Minding the gap: elucidating the disconnect between arts participation metrics and arts engagement within immigrant communities.....	71
Introduction	71
Methodology.....	73
“Does this count?”	76
Questioning culturally specific activities	77
Questioning the importance of artistic intentions.....	78
Limitations.....	80

Discussion	80
VII. Discussion of Implications	83
Implications for policy	83
Implications for research	85
Appendix.....	87
Technical Note	87
Exploratory Analysis of 1.5-Generation Immigrants.....	88
Additional Tables	91
References.....	96

List of Tables

Table 1. 2012 SPPA Sample Sizes.....	22
Table 2. Rates of Adult Attendance within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generation (2012)...	23
Table 3. Rates of Adult Attendance for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generation (2012)	25
Table 4. Rates of Digital Media Use within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generation (2012)	27
Table 5. Rates of Digital Media Use for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generation (2012)	28
Table 6. Rates of Creating & Sharing Art through Media within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generation (2012)	29
Table 7. Rates of Creating & Sharing Art through Media for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generation (2012)	30
Table 8. Rates of Creating, Performing & Supporting Art within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generations (2012).....	31
Table 9. Rates of Creating, Performing & Supporting Art for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generations (2012).....	32
Table 10. Demographic Summary of Current Adult Immigrant Generations (2012).....	37
Table 11. Regression Results	39
Table 12. Year of Entry Brackets, by SPPA wave.....	46
Table 13. Estimated Calculations of Years Since Entry into US	47
Table 14. Rates of Arts Attendance & Reading, by Nativity (2002, 2008 & 2012).....	49
Table 15. Regression Results	51
Table 16. Estimated Model for Predicting Non-Citizen Undocumented Status	66
Table 17. Rates of Arts Attendance, by Citizen & Non-Citizen Legal Statuses (2008)	69
Table 18. Interview questions drawn from the 2012 SPPA.....	75
Appendix Table A. Significant Differences between 1.5-Generation & First-Generation Immigrants who entered the US as adults (2012)	89
Appendix Table B. Rates of US Adult Arts Participation, by Nativity (2012).....	91
Appendix Table C. Predictive Power of Immigrant-Generation for Arts Participation	93
Appendix Table D. Continued Regression Results from Table 15 (Demographic Control Variables).....	94
Appendix Table E. Distribution of Demographic Characteristics within Imputed Legal Statuses	95

List of Figures

Figure 1. Marginal Differences in Participation Rates, by Nativity (2012).....	3
Figure 2. Number of Immigrants & Their Share of the US Population (1850-2014).....	8
Figure 3. Composition of the Immigrant Population Living in the US, by Region of Birth (1960-2014) .	12
Figure 4. Predictive Power of Immigrant Generations for Arts Participation (2012).....	34
Figure 5. Levels of Proxy Measures Used for Immigrants' Legal Statuses	57

Summary

The population of the United States (US) is undergoing historic demographic shifts. Between 2040 and 2050 the US will become a “majority-minority” nation, net immigration will become the primary driver of population growth, and by 2065 a record-breaking high of 1 in 3 US residents is projected to be either an immigrant or the child of an immigrant. How – and how well – immigrants and their children are settling into the US is of great importance to the well-being and vibrancy of the country as a whole. Although substantial effort and consideration for policy-making has been devoted to the economic, political, and social facets of immigration, immigrants’ experiences, and the impact of immigrants on non-immigrants, relatively little research, especially quantitative study, has focused on the cultural, artistic, and expressive lives of immigrants. Notably, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine’s recent Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015) identified the important role that immigrants’ civic engagement and social participation plays in their integration, and prior research has noted arts and cultural participation as a means for immigrants to engage civically, build social capital, and process their own experiences. Yet, there is a dearth of research on immigrants’ cultural integration through expressive and artistic means as a specific dimension of broader civic and social engagement. The central goal of this dissertation is to understand the role that arts participation may play as part of new strategies to address the important policy challenge of integrating a heterogeneous immigrant population into American society.

In this dissertation, I examine differences in US residents’ arts and cultural participation by nativity, accounting for heterogeneity among immigrant groups in their arts participation. I begin by providing an overview of immigration to the US, introducing the related theories of assimilation and integration into the US, and examining considerations for exploring arts participation as a means of cultural integration (Chapter II). While theories vary regarding how immigrants adapt to the US as their home, there is consensus that it takes time – including both the time that an individual spends living in the US and the time that passes over generations. The first empirical investigation considers how arts participation currently differs between immigrant generations and what may explain differences (Chapter III). Specifically, I examine if there is evidence to support the second-generation advantage theoretical immigrant integration model. Second, I explore how the length of time an immigrant has lived within the US affects their cultural integration with the native-born US citizens (Chapter IV). I investigate whether rates of arts participation have changed over the last decade for foreign- and native-born US residents, whether there is evidence to support the classical assimilation theoretical model, and whether becoming a US citizen is associated with greater acculturation. The third empirical investigation considers the

practical implementation of imputing non-citizen immigrant legal statuses in survey data and examines arts participation by legal status (Chapter V). Fourth, I examine how well current survey tools serve as a means for measuring arts participation by cognitively testing the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts survey instrument with individuals in the Chinese immigrant community in Chicago as a case of studying immigrants within the US more generally (Chapter VI). Finally, in Chapter VII, I discuss the implications of these findings for policy and future research.

Data & Methods

In this thesis, I use the National Endowment for the Arts' Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA), spanning the decade 2002-2012, to investigate immigrants' arts participation. In these years, the SPPA was conducted as a supplement to the Current Population Survey, which asks questions about the place of birth (nativity) for each household member, the place of birth of the respondent's parents, the year of entry into the US, and citizenship status, thereby enabling investigations of first-generation immigrants to the US and the children of immigrants. This thesis employs descriptive statistics, multivariate and fixed-effects regression modeling, a cross-survey imputation methodology, and cognitive testing.

Summary of Findings

- First-generation immigrants reported dramatically lower levels of participation than both second-generation and third+ generation immigrants across almost all 2012 SPPA indicators. The primary exception was rates of attendance at live Latin music events and significantly higher rates of using the Internet to access programs about dance (other than ballet, modern or contemporary dance) and using mobile devices to access theater or dance than other immigrant generations.
- Over the decade from 2002 to 2012, first-generation immigrants reported significantly lower participation rates than US-born individuals in almost all arts attendance and reading measures. The key exception to this trend was reported rates of attendance at live Latin music events, for which immigrants reported higher rates than US-born natives in both 2008 and 2012.
- Second-generation immigrants, overall, reported higher rates of arts participation than did first-generation immigrants. For some activities, second-generation immigrants reported even higher levels of participation than did other US-born individuals (third+ generation immigrants), including creating and sharing visual art and accessing film and video through digital media. These results are consistent with the second-generation advantage theory for immigrant integration.

- Although demographic variables explain some aspects of arts participation, as expected, being an immigrant or the child of an immigrant does indeed hold separate predictive power for specific kinds of arts and cultural participation. For example, being the child of at least one immigrant parent (second-generation immigrant) positively predicted attending musical theater, dancing socially, and owning art, even after accounting for the influence of education, income, and additional influential demographic and socioeconomic variables.
- Immigrants residing in the US for less than fifteen years have lower chances of going to see a live musical play or a live jazz performance than immigrants who have lived in the US for fifteen or more years. However, residence in the US for less than five years significantly increases the chances of first-generation immigrants attending live Latin music events. These results align with classical assimilation theory, which posits that over time, first-generation immigrants adopt the practices of mainstream culture in place of their own.
- I fail to find evidence of significant differences between legally resident non-citizen immigrants and undocumented immigrants.
- There is a gap between the reality of what people do and what people report in response to current national survey items about arts participation. Further research is warranted to understand what creative and cultural activities matter to people living within the US and the multiple cultural frames of reference that need to be considered.

Overview of Discussion

Although much is known and studied about the rich aesthetic and cultural practices of immigrant cultures and groups in the US, prior to this thesis relatively little was known about the levels, or rates, of arts participation within immigrant communities. The dramatically lower levels of participation reported by first-generation immigrants across almost all 2012 SPPA indicators examined in this thesis is an issue of concern. This disparity prompts questions about the capacity of immigrants to engage civically, build social capital, and process their own experiences, all of which are aspects of arts and cultural participation that have been identified as particular benefits for immigrant populations. Research is needed in this particular area, as the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine's recent Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015) identified the important role that immigrants' civic engagement and social participation plays in their integration, but noted the dearth of research on immigrants' cultural integration through expressive and artistic means as a specific dimension of broader civic and social engagement.

There is urgency to address the disparity and questions raised in this thesis as first- and second-generation immigrants will constitute a record-breaking share of the US population within a few short decades.

While the findings in this thesis suggest that segments of the current second-generation are highly engaged with arts, the findings also raise questions about *future* second-generation immigrants and their interest in and ability to access means of participating in artistic activities and forms of expression.

Altogether, these investigations provide an important baseline for understanding the arts and cultural participation of immigrants and their children. In particular, it brings attention to the heterogeneity within first-generation immigrant adults, between them and the current second-generation of immigrants in the US, and considerations for *future* second-generation immigrants.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to my committee, Dr. Gery W. Ryan, Dr. Julia F. Lowell, and Dr. Norman Bradburn. Each of them worked at amazing speed to provide discerning and encouraging feedback for which I am incredibly grateful.

The research presented in this thesis was made possible by support from the Kip and Mary Ann Hagopian Dissertation Award, the Anne and James Rothenberg Endowed Dissertation Award, scholarship support from the John and Barbara Vogelstein Foundation, the Agency for Healthcare and Research Quality at the National Institutes of Health (Grant# 1R36HS017531-01 Revised), and the Research: Art Works program at the National Endowment for the Arts (Grant# 14-3800-7012).

While there are too many people to name individually, I would like to extend my appreciation to the many colleagues and friends who have over the years supported my pursuits to contribute novel research to inform policy-making that intersects with art, culture, and creative expression. Specifically, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Betty Farrell and Gwendolyn Rugg for their critical feedback on facets of my thesis research and for their encouragement. I thank Dr. Carole Roan Gresenz, Dr. Lou Mariano, and Dr. James P. Smith for their input during earlier stages of my research, and Matt Niedelman and Anthony Damico for their willingness to field questions about R scripts.

Finally, I want to extend my deepest appreciation to Dr. Josh Leonard and Calvin Leonard, whose enduring encouragement, patience, and support made this thesis, and so much more, possible.

I. Introduction

The population of the United States (US) is undergoing historic demographic shifts. Between 2040 and 2050 the US will become a “majority-minority” nation, net immigration will become the primary driver of population growth, and by 2065 first- and second-generation immigrants will constitute a record-breaking share of the nation’s population, with about 1 in 3 US residents projected to be either an immigrant or the child of an immigrant (Lopez and Passel 2015, U.S. Census Bureau 2013c). Immigration is a key aspect of American history and identity. How – and how well – immigrants and their children are settling into the US is of great importance to the well-being and vibrancy of the US as a whole (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015). However, changes in the demographic composition of the immigrant population in the US and its growing size are raising concerns at the highest levels that our mechanisms for facilitating immigrants’ integration may not be well-suited to current and incoming immigrant populations. Although substantial effort and consideration for policy-making has been devoted to the economic, political, and social facets of immigration, immigrants’ experiences, and the impact of immigrants on non-immigrants, research on cultural integration is relatively limited. In particular, relatively little research, especially quantitative study, has focused on the cultural, artistic, and “expressive lives” of immigrants (Ivey 2008, DiMaggio and Fernandez-Kelly 2010). Notably, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine’s recent Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015) identified the important role that immigrants’ civic engagement and social participation plays in their integration, and prior research has noted arts and cultural participation as a particularly promising means for immigrants to engage civically, build social capital, and process their own experiences. Yet, there is a dearth of research on immigrants’ cultural integration through expressive and artistic means as a specific dimension of broader civic and social engagement. The central goal of this dissertation is to understand the role that arts participation may play as part of new strategies to address the important policy challenge of integrating a heterogeneous immigrant population into American society.

In this dissertation I examine differences in US residents’ arts and cultural participation by nativity, accounting for heterogeneity among immigrant groups in their arts participation. Toward this purpose, I use data from the National Endowment for the Arts’ Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA), spanning the decade from 2002 to 2012. Taking an initial look at differences in reported rates of arts participation across nativity (foreign-born compared with US-born

individuals) reveals dramatic disparities (Figure 1). Nativity alone, however, is too blunt an instrument to describe the arts and cultural participation of immigrant generations fully, since there is a great deal of diversity within immigrant communities and in immigrants' relationships with arts. Qualitative studies have revealed heterogeneity in the ways in which immigrants engage with art that stem from differences in generation, country of origin, ethnic identity, social class, and culturally-influenced values.

Figure 1. Marginal Differences in Participation Rates, by Nativity (2012)



Blue bars indicate activities where foreign-born individuals reported higher rates than US-born; red bars indicate activities where US-born individuals reported higher rates than those foreign-born. Darker hues indicate a significant difference between rates reported by US- and foreign-born individuals at minimum 90% confidence using data from the 2012 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (n=35,735). Appendix Table B contains all reported rates and significance levels.

Classical assimilation theory from the earlier half of the 20th-century suggested that immigrants needed to forego their cultural identity of their country of origin and fully adopt the culture of what was mainstream America, and in doing so would achieve upward social mobility. This theory alone is no longer adequate in the 21st-century. Rather, contemporary theories of integration suggest that maintaining one's cultural identity can potentially benefit an immigrant's social mobility. In this thesis, I explore arts participation as a means for fostering immigrants' integration into American society, while simultaneously retaining one's sense of cultural identity from their or their parents' place of origin.

Organization

The document begins by providing an overview of immigration to the US, introducing the related theories of assimilation and integration into the US, and examining considerations for exploring arts participation as a means of cultural integration (Chapter II). While theories vary regarding how immigrants adapt to the US as their home, there is consensus that it takes time – including both the time that an individual spends living in the US and the time that passes over generations. The first empirical essay considers how arts participation currently differs between immigrant generations, looking specifically at differences between third+ generation immigrations and both first- and second-generations, and what may explain differences (Chapter III). The second empirical essay explores how the length of time an immigrant has lived within the US affects their cultural integration with the native-born US citizens (Chapter IV).

How immigrant parents fare within the US is an important variable impacting how their children will fare; the well-being of immigrants' children is of particular importance because most are born within the US, with the rights and identity of a US citizen. Given that non-citizen immigrants' legal status affects the degree of their integration across a range of social outcomes and bears heavily on their children's prospects, the third empirical essay examines arts participation by legal status and considers the practical implementation of imputing non-citizen immigrant legal statuses in survey data, which is a necessary step for such an investigation (Chapter V). The fourth essay reflects on how well current survey tools serve as a means for measuring arts participation by cognitively testing the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts survey instrument with individuals in the Chinese immigrant community in Chicago as a case of studying immigrants within the US more generally (Chapter VI). Finally, in Chapter VII, I discuss the implications of these findings for policy and future research.

Data

In this dissertation, I primarily use data from the National Endowment for the Arts' Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA), which is the primary source of data on adult arts participation in the US. Since 2002, the SPPA has been conducted as a supplement to the US Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS), which is one of the most commonly used national data sets in social science research in the US. The CPS samples civilian, non-institutionalized, US residents aged 15 or older, and uses a multistage probability sample of housing units across the US, while the SPPA was administered to respondents aged 18 and older. The CPS is a monthly survey, which uses a 4-8-4 rotation sample (4 consecutive months an individual is surveyed, 8 consecutive months off, and 4 consecutive months surveyed). The CPS collects a broad range of data related to the US workforce and socio-demographic characteristics of the population. In 1994, questions were added to the CPS to collect information about the place of birth (nativity) for the respondent and for each household member, as well as the place of birth of the respondent's parents, the year of entry into the US, and citizenship status (Schmidley and Robinson 1998). Thus, the 2002 SPPA wave is the first that can be linked with the measures enabling various analyses of immigrants and the children of immigrants. These measures have enabled the analyses conducted in this thesis. Hence, I use data from each wave of the SPPA that has been conducted as part of the CPS: 2002, 2008, and 2012.¹

In Chapter IV, I utilize the SPPA Combined data file, which contains merged data from each SPPA wave conducted from 1982 through 2012 (National Endowment for the Arts 2014c).² The SPPA Combined data file offers normalized weights and a subset of measures that have been collected consistently over time. Additionally, I match and utilize demographic variables available from separate SPPA year-specific files to the SPPA Combined data file.

¹ The SPPA was fielded as a supplement to the CPS in August 2002 (n=17,135), May 2008 (n=18,444), and July 2012 (n=35,735). Due to concerns about length, the SPPA switched to a modular questionnaire design in 2008 and this modular design continued in 2012. All respondents receive the Core Module, which contains questions about attendance (in 2012, two core modules were fielded, one using questions previously fielded and the second using experimental questions), and then 2 of the possible 4 additional modules in 2008, 2 of the additional 5 in 2012. Due to this modular structure, care must be given to samples sizes and efforts to aggregate and construct variables. An additional change from 2002 to 2008 was the use of proxy respondents. Proxy responses were not used in all modules and hence care must also be given to the use of the appropriate weights (Triplett 2009, 2014).

² In 1982, 1985 and 1992, the SPPA was piggybacked onto the US Census Bureau's National Crime Victimization Survey (previously known as the National Crime Survey). In 1997, Westat conducted the SPPA as a stand-alone survey; due to a different survey design, the 1997 SPPA wave is not used for cross-sectional analysis and is not included in the SPPA Combined Data file.

In Chapter V, I use data from the 2008 SPPA as well as from the US Census Bureau's 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), which is the only nationally-representative survey that directly measures immigrants' legal status. Similar to the CPS, the SIPP samples civilian, non-institutionalized, US residents aged 15 or older, and uses a multistage-stratified sample. The SIPP collects data on income, demographics, labor force participation, and eligibility and use of social programs, such as Medicaid.

II. Context

The United States is currently undergoing a historic demographic shift. The proportion of the US population comprised of immigrants first reached record levels, a high of 14.8%, at the turn of the 20th-century. Today, over 41.3 million people living in the US are foreign-born, accounting for 13% of the total US population (Zong and Batalova 2015). This proportion has doubled just since the 1960s and 1970s and is rivaling prior records (U.S. Census Bureau 2013b). By about 2030, the US Census Bureau projects that net international migration will surpass natural increases (i.e., domestic reproduction) as the primary driver of population growth in the US for the first time in the nation's history since approximately 1850 (U.S. Census Bureau 2013c). Today, about 15% of the US population is comprised of children of immigrants, which are termed "second-generation immigrants." In total, just over 1 in 4 US residents is currently an immigrant or the child of an immigrant; by 2065, it is projected that over 1 in 3 US residents (36%) will be an immigrant or the child of an immigrant (Lopez and Passel 2015). How this large and growing segment of the US population is faring is of great importance to the economic well-being and the vibrancy of the US as a whole (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015).

Immigration is a key aspect of American history and identity. The United States is known as a nation built of and by immigrants, and this new cadre of immigrants is again playing a major role in reshaping the demographic, social, and cultural fabric of the US. However, how well and the manner in which the current waves of immigrants are settling into the US is different from that of waves entering the US during the earlier parts of the 20th-century. In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of the US' immigration history and the relevant theories regarding how immigrants settle into American society. I also discuss how arts participation can work to foster integration into American society and provide an overview of how "arts participation" has historically been measured and understood in the context of the increasingly diverse composition of the American public.

Periods of Mass Immigration & Theories of Immigrant Integration


There are three notable phases in the history of US immigration: an initial period of great migration from Europe (1880-1930), a phase of dramatic decline (1930-1970), and a current, second wave of increased immigration (1970-present) (Portes and Rumbaut 2014). The Immigration Act of 1965 instated a critical change in US immigration policy, changing it from being based on quotas to one prioritizing family unification and skill-based employment needs,

and is the driving force behind the inflection point in immigration observed in 1970; therefore, I organize my overview of US immigration and theories about how immigrants settle into the US into the pre- and post-1965 periods.

Immigration & Assimilation Pre-1965

This first phase of mass immigration between 1880 and 1930 is characterized in particular by the years between 1900 and 1920, referred to as “The Great Wave,” during which the portion of the US population comprised of immigrants reached a record-high of 14.8% (Figure 2). In the lead up to this phase and during its earliest years, immigrants primarily came from Northern Europe; from about 1890 onward, however, immigrants primarily came from Southern and Eastern Europe, marking a shift in the composition of the incoming immigrant population which became less like the existing native US population (Martin 2011, Portes and Rumbaut 2014, Lopez and Passel 2015).

Figure 2. Number of Immigrants & Their Share of the US Population (1850-2014)



Source: Migration Policy Institute Data Hub (2017). Migration Policy Institute tabulation of data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 - 2014 American Community Surveys and 1970, 1990, and 2000 decennial Census data. Additional data from Gibson and Lenon (1999).

The mounting tensions stemming from worries about whether immigrants would fit into US society and economic competition during this time, and the growth of disparate local policies ultimately resulted in centralized, restrictive policies. The Immigration Act of 1875 was the first restrictive policy, barring criminals from immigrating to the US, and later policies banned most Asians.³ Then, the 1921 Emergency Quota Act and the Immigration Act of 1924 put into place a nationality-based quota system for US immigration. The quota system was essentially designed to return the composition of immigration inflows to what they had been, as the quotas were based on the *prior* representation of nationalities within the 1890 US census (Lopez and Passel 2015). For example, the quota for Italians was set at approximately 2% of what the average annual inflow of Italians had been during the earlier part of the century (American Social History Project and the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media).

Reflecting on the social and cultural dynamics of this period, sociologists began to develop theories on the process required for immigrants to settle into US society and to experience upward social and economic mobility within American society. The classical immigrant assimilation theory is a progression of cultural assimilation and then structural assimilation (Warner and Srole 1945, Gordon 1964, Park and Burgess 1925). This theory describes a linear process – referred to as “straight-line assimilation” – that begins with acculturation, or cultural assimilation, wherein immigrants fully adopt the language and social and cultural norms of the native mainstream culture, and fully forego the culture of their country of origin. After an immigrant is acculturated, then the immigrant can experience structural assimilation, meaning that they participate fully in core aspects of society – including employment, education, and pursuing opportunities for their children. Additionally, after an immigrant is acculturated, Gordon (1964) describes that an immigrant then may also intermarry with a US native or experience “identificational assimilation,” meaning a full adoption and identification with the symbols, their meanings, and values of the core American society.⁴ Classical immigrant assimilation theory exemplifies the notion of the “melting pot,” where immigrants are theoretically melting into an Anglo-centric mainstream (Gordon 1964).

Using classical immigration theory as a foundation, later theories also describe assimilation as a function of time, both in terms of the length of an immigrant’s residence within the US and of

³ Immigrants from the Philippines were not subject to this ban as the country was a US colony at the time.

⁴ Gordon (1964) states that acculturation must come first, then the order in which structural assimilation, amalgamation (intermarriage) and identificational assimilation are experienced may differ.

subsequent generations. Classical theory posits that assimilation is inevitable and irreversible once an individual starts on its path (Portes and Rumbaut 2014, Zhou 1997). As an explanation of the variation in assimilation times, classical theory considers the extent to which an individual is “foreign” or peripheral to the core, mainstream culture; according to this theory, immigrants who are more dissimilar from the core, in terms of language or physical appearance, would take longer to assimilate (Portes and Rumbaut 2014, Alba and Nee 2003).

In general, assimilation is thought to be a two-way exchange, meaning that the presence of immigrants in any context would inevitably have some detectable effect on mainstream culture. But, while nativists’ worried about unwelcomed social changes stemming from immigrants during the first phase of US immigration around the turn of the 20th-century, the core American cultural and social structures remained virtually unchanged during this time (Portes and Rumbaut 2014).⁵ Portes and Rumbaut (2014, 15-16) write of this time period:

“In the American case, however, the process was definitely one-sided, as existing institutions held the upper hand. Eventually, children and grandchildren of immigrants began ascending the ladder of the American economy and the status system, but to do so, they had first to become thoroughly acculturated, learning fluent English and accepting the existing value system and normative order.”

However, the implementation of restrictive immigration policies marked a turning point for US immigration. The quota system, followed quickly thereafter by the Great Depression, led to a precipitous decline in the share of the US population comprised of immigrants. As Portes and Rumbaut (2014, 18-19) explain, “The Great Depression proved to be the greatest immigrant-control measure of all times, since no matter what the quota was, foreigners had no incentive to come and join the masses of unemployed Americans.” Figure 2 illustrates the decline in immigration from 1930, at 11.6%, to a low of 4.7% in 1970.

While immigration was low in the middle years of the 20th-century, there were also social undercurrents evolving and helping to change historic negative attitudes towards immigrants making way for significant changes to US immigration. Portes and Rumbaut (2014) explain that the camaraderie forged between US natives, immigrants, and those of recent immigrant-descent by fighting side by side in World War II, and the GI Bill helped put natives and immigrants on equal footing and relieve many standing prejudices. In 1942, the US began the Bracero Program with Mexico, which brought temporary agricultural laborers from Mexico into the US to address

⁵ Portes and Rumbaut (2014) write further about the exception to this being religion thereby introducing, in particular, more Catholicism and Judaism into America.

a labor shortage due to World War II. Importantly, in later years of this period, the Civil Rights Movement propelled a broad ethos of anti-discrimination in the US (Portes and Rumbaut 2014).

Post-1965 & Immigrant Integration

The changing political, social, and economic dynamics within the US led to the 1965 amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which is recognized as the critical milestone that set the stage for a new era of mass immigration into the US. Significantly, the 1965 Act replaced the nationality-based quota system for immigration with a preference system that prioritizes family unification and skill-based employment needs. The preference system for entering immigrants essentially equalized immigration opportunities for Europeans and non-Europeans alike by removing all selection criteria based on race or nationality, marking the beginning of dramatic change to the composition of immigrants to the US (Pew Research Center 2013b, Wolgin 2011).


Subsequently, from 1970 and into recent years, US immigration has been on the rise (Figure 2), with the share of the US population comprised of immigrants doubling over this period (U.S. Census Bureau 2013b). An additional factor driving the overall growth in the size of the immigrant population during this time is that emigration rates decreased from levels seen in the earlier part of the 20th-century (Ahmed and Robinson 1994, Warren and Peck 1980).

However, since the earlier part of the 20th-century, there had been a dramatic reorganization of the US economy and labor market, and the types of industry-related jobs that often provided a linear path of economic mobility were no longer a significant part of the labor market. Rather, the labor market bifurcated into high-skilled service sector jobs, which drew immigrants from Asia and Africa, and low-skill service sector jobs, which were largely filled by immigrants from Latin America (Portes and Rumbaut 2014). Additionally, the US ended the Bracero Program with Mexico in 1964⁶ and, as part of the 1965 Act, placed restrictions on immigrants entering via the southern US border. By limiting the legal pathways available to immigrants through the US' southern border, these policies are associated with the beginnings of what would become large-scale illegal immigration into the US (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American

⁶ The Bracero Program opened up opportunities for its participants, but also reinforced the dominant association between Mexican immigrants and the unskilled labor market in the US, which was also associated with Blacks in the southern part of the US (Portes and Rumbaut 2014). Additionally, the program allowed travel back and forth to Mexico, thereby enabling its participants to keep cultural and social ties with their country of origin. Many Bracero participants ultimately ended up remaining in the US, but their close ties to the culture of their country of origin distanced them culturally from mainstream America, and their role as unskilled labor along with Blacks, rendered these two demographic groups “unmeltable,” (Portes and Rumbaut 2014, 23).

Society 2015).⁷ Figure 3 shows that 75% of the immigrant population living in the US in 1960 was European, but that over time this share shrunk as the share of the immigrants born in the Americas (primarily Latin America) and Asia grew substantially, as did the share of immigrants coming from Africa. In 2014, just over half (52%) of new immigrants arrived from Latin America, with over half of this group (28% of all immigrants) coming from Mexico; 30% came from Asia, and about 11% came from European countries (Migration Policy Institute Data Hub 2017).

Figure 3. Composition of the Immigrant Population Living in the US, by Region of Birth (1960-2014)



Source: Migration Policy Institute Data Hub (2017). Migration Policy Institute tabulation of data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 - 2014 American Community Surveys and 1970, 1990, and 2000 decennial Census data. Additional data from Gibson and Lenon (1999).

The changing composition of the immigrant stock population over time has also led to subsequent shifts in the composition of the second-generation immigrant population in the US. Current second-generation immigrants include both children of European immigrants from the earlier part of the 20th-century and the children of recent waves of immigrants, essentially those entering the US since 1965. Scholars have commented that it is important to understand how the children of immigrants, perhaps even more so than first generation immigrants, are faring in terms of cultural

⁷ For example, oftentimes the same people who had often been hired legally through the Bracero Program were being hired back for the same jobs, but were now considered to be doing so illegally (Portes and Rumbaut 2014).

and structural integration outcomes, as second-generation immigrants are even more likely than first-generation immigrants to remain within the US and are born native US citizens, fully entitled to voting and other rights (Portes et al. 2009).

With these new dynamics and varied contexts for immigration, classical assimilation theory runs into challenges. The classical theory emerged when inflows of immigrants were relatively homogeneous and reflective of the existing US population. The classical theory has been widely criticized for its deterministic nature and for minimally acknowledging the influence that immigrants have on mainstream culture. While the classical theory focused on the *assimilation* of immigrants into the US, contemporary theories largely focus on the *integration* of immigrants into the US. Beginning in the 1960s, assimilation as a goal was broadly recognized as normative and undesirable, whereas integration focuses on the outcomes of a two-way exchange (Schunck 2014). Similar to classical assimilation theory, however, contemporary theories for immigrant integration speak to aspects of cultural and social acceptance, as well as the structural aspects of integration and overall participation in society (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015, Alba and Nee 2003).

Alba and Nee (1997) put forward the “new assimilation theory,” which builds directly on the idea of the melting pot – everyone in society melding together toward a single, homogeneous culture – from the classical assimilation model, but which differs from the original theory in its account of what the single culture is. Rather than an Anglo-centric culture, Alba and Nee consider how immigrants’ cultures also affect the mainstream, but argue that immigrants do largely need to let go of their ethnic distinctiveness in order to acclimate within American society. In contrast to classical assimilation theory, Alba and Nee argue that acculturation happens separate from structural assimilation (Portes and Rivas 2011).

Theories that focus on structural aspects of integration offer a range of outlooks on the circumstances for the children of immigrants (Portes and Rivas 2011). Telles and Ortiz (2008) offered a dim perspective for Mexican Americans. The authors suggested that over generations, Mexican American immigrants have been excluded from mechanisms for upward mobility, given associations drawn between their cultural identity and the “racial underclass” within the US (Portes and Rivas 2011, 222). The Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015) also identified racialized integration as a current key concern. An alternative theory is “segmented assimilation,” which accounts for multiple paths that may occur for the children of immigrants (Portes and Zhou 1993, Zhou 1997). The theory of segmented assimilation has been

highly influential in the study of immigrant integration since it was introduced in the early 1990s (Waters et al. 2010). Portes and Zhou (1993) explained that while some second-generation immigrants may experience upward mobility, others might not experience any upward mobility, and others yet may experience downward mobility. What pathway plays out is a function of various social and economic variables; of critical concern in recent years is the effect of the parents' legal status on their children. The Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015, 148) concluded that undocumented status "poses the highest barrier to immigrant integration" and "presents a formidable barrier to integration and economic progress." As a result of this, undocumented status can have detrimental impacts on the children of immigrants' mental health and development, and socioeconomic prospects (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015).

Whether an immigrant gains upward mobility is also a function of the degree and context of acculturation. Portes and Zhou (1993) explained that immigrant parents may choose to share certain aspects of their cultural and ethnic identities with their children in order to best position them for socioeconomic mobility and success, which the authors refer to as "selective acculturation." Waters et al. (2010) explains further that selective acculturation is of particular note because while standard models of attaining socioeconomic mobility suggest that children of parents with higher incomes and education levels do better overall, selective acculturation suggests that upward mobility is a possibility for children whose parents have lower levels of education and income, and maintain – at least in part – their cultural identity and ties to communities in the US that share their cultural identity. Kasinitz et al. (2008) offered a quite positive perspective, suggesting that when children of immigrants maintain identification with their parents' country of origin, they are uniquely and particularly well-positioned to make the best of both their connections with US natives and their immigrant connections. The authors refer to this advantageous position as the "second-generation advantage." Supporting this notion, Portes and Rivas (2011, 240) write, "The available evidence supports the paradox that preserving the linguistic and cultural heritage of the home countries often helps migrant children move ahead in America." While classical assimilation theory conceived of the immigrant's experience as letting go of one's cultural identity, contemporary theories suggest that maintaining cultural identity can potentially be advantageous to immigrants' structural integration. A study of second-generation immigrants conducted in 2011 found that approximately 60% of second-generation immigrants identify themselves as a "typical American" (Pew Research Center 2013b). With a majority of these individuals also reporting that they identify themselves by their parents' country

of origin or pan-ethnic group (Pew Research Center 2013b), it seems that a substantial proportion of individuals who are technically defined as second-generation immigrants may not derive a unique sense of identity from the fact that their parent or parents immigrated to the US. This evidence may suggest that the idea of the “melting pot” may be still be at play or that the concept of “typical American” has evolved, such that a more pluralistic conception of what it means to be American may be prevalent among the children of immigrants.

Arts Participation as Civic Engagement & Cultural Identity

Arts and cultural activities are broad and varied. While people may engage in art in solitude, such as painting or playing an instrument, for one’s own pleasure or practice, oftentimes arts activities and events are experienced with other people. It is this fundamental social interaction that makes arts participation a form of, and an avenue to further, civic engagement (Stern 2011a). Stern and Seifert (2009) describe two contemporary theories of how arts participation fosters civic engagement:

- Discursive theory – where the intention of the art activity or event is to gather people to engage in the exchange of ideas in an inclusive, safe space. The civic dialogue that stems from bringing diverse people and perspectives together may be an end, in and of itself, or may catalyze behavior toward another goal. Commonly, the purpose of such arts activities is to create a public space inclusive of diverse or marginalized groups. Stern and Seifert (2009, 20) explain:

“Historically, settlement houses often used arts and cultural programs to engage migrant populations. Contemporary evidence suggests that the arts and culture—because they view immigrants’ background as an asset, not a deficit—can serve a similar role (Stern et al. 2008).”
- Ecological theory – where arts participation, regardless of the intent or type of art event or activity, is associated with community well-being and civic vitality because the arts activities occur within “social and institutional networks” of a “given social environment or place community” thereby providing connections to other parts of the network (Stern and Seifert 2009, 22).

Furthermore, Stern and Seifert (2009, 21) explain that active engagement in doing, creating, and making art is a means of civic engagement due to the likelihood that participating in such activities will lead to increased social capital and an expansion in one’s social network.

Civic engagement follows from the act of participating in arts activities, not necessarily the subject matter or content of those experiences. The arts activity could be representative of the so-called American mainstream arts and culture, or even purposefully aim to teach about the mainstream culture,⁸ although the activity may just as well represent or celebrate the culture of one's country of origin. In the classical assimilation theoretical model, immigrants need to give up the culture of their country of origin and completely adopt the culture of their new host society. In contrast, cultural *integration* means taking on the culture of the new host country, but still appreciating or maintaining facets of the culture of one's country of origin. Cultural integration allows immigrants to adopt a dual cultural identity, leading to multiculturalism instead of a mono-cultural melting pot. Presumably, however, the culture of the host country remains dominant and is the basis for the commonalities that hold society together.

For immigrants to the US, arts are a means to celebrate pride in their country of origin, as well as to connect with and acculturate into their new host society. Arts and cultural participation are often an important means by which new immigrants engage civically, build social capital and process their immigrant experiences (Lena and Cornfield 2008, Stern et al. 2010, Moriarty 2004). Silva et al. (2014) examine how voluntary membership in arts and cultural organizations and participation in arts activities influence democratic and civic engagement. In their study of Nashville, Lena and Cornfield (2008) suggest that immigrants engage in arts at greater rates than they participate in other forms of civic engagement, such as belonging to civic organizations, attending worship services, or volunteering on community projects.

Existing qualitative studies have revealed heterogeneity in the ways in which immigrants engage with art that stem from differences in generation, country of origin, ethnic identity, social class, and culturally-influenced values. Some investigations have identified differences in the ways in which first- and second-generation immigrants within specific communities or locales participate culturally. When examining generational differences in immigrant communities, it seems that participating in activities that maintain a connection to heritage and tradition is often more prevalent among first-generation immigrants than among the second generation. For the first generation, the arts are a means to affirm national pride in their country of origin and to sustain a "culture of nostalgia," focused on the nature of life in their home country (Fernández-Kelly 2010). Participation in arts and culture is also an important avenue for immigrants to strike a balance between the two motivations of connecting with their new host society and connecting

⁸ Stern and Seifert (2009) refer to art that aims to teach or to be persuasive as "didactic theories of action."

with their own culture (Fernández-Kelly 2010). One example of the balance struck by first-generation immigrants between participating in US “high culture” while retaining a sense of connection to their past involves attending exhibits at art museums and connecting with heritage through objects (Farrell and Medvedeva 2010, Fernández-Kelly 2010). Other investigations suggest, however, that widespread use of technology with online connectivity provides access to content from around the world and is changing how people spend their leisure time (Wei-Jue et al. 2015). This may lessen the reliance upon in-person artistic and cultural activities as means to maintain cultural ties with one’s place of origin.

Several case studies have suggested that second-generation immigrants tend to participate in arts and cultural activities in a wider range of ways than do first-generation immigrants, incorporating both traditional cultural practices and contemporary arts experiences, and often resulting in a blurring of cultural and artistic forms (Fernández-Kelly 2010, Rodriguez 2012). Kasinitz (2014), however, explains that second-generation immigrants do not necessarily feel the need to merge cultures, or to hold onto the cultural traditions or tastes of their parents. Rather, second-generation immigrants are uniquely positioned to innovate and experiment, with the experience of navigating two cultural identities.

Measuring Arts Participation

While the Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015) reviewed the substantial bodies of research examining economic, political and social facets of integration, relatively little research - and virtually no quantitative research - has focused on the artistic, cultural and expressive lives of immigrants (DiMaggio and Fernandez-Kelly 2010). A key consideration, however, for taking on such quantitative investigations is the availability and validity of data.

Developing definitions for arts participation and strategies for approaching its measurement is an active and dynamic topic of both research and policy (UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2012, Rife et al. 2014, Novak-Leonard et al. 2014, Novak-Leonard in press). Since 1982, the National Endowment for the Arts’ Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) has served as the primary, long-standing source of data on adult arts participation in the US. The SPPA asks whether respondents were involved in a range of arts-related activities during the prior twelve months. The SPPA has always included questions about individual’s involvement in making and creating various forms of art, such as painting, playing an instrument, and creative writing, and of consuming artistic content through different means of technology, such as television and tablets.

However, until recently, the key statistic reported from the SPPA data has been the rate of US adults' attendance at the "benchmark arts." *Benchmark arts* are defined as the share of the US adult population that did any of the following activities within the prior twelve months: attended a live ballet, musical theater, non-musical theater, opera, jazz or classical music performance, or visited an art museum. The rate of adult attendance at benchmark arts events reached a high of 41% in 1992, and it dropped to a low of 33.4% in 2012 (National Endowment for the Arts 2014b). Over the last two decades, this single metric has essentially defined "arts participation" writ large, and the decline of this metric has been oft invoked in policy discourse about the non-profit arts sector (Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011). The mantra "broaden, deepen and diversify arts audiences," which is used widely in the non-profit arts sector, stemmed from the seminal work of McCarthy and Jinnett (2001), in which they examined strategies that arts organizations could adopt to grow their audiences.

Over the same twenty years that the rate of benchmark arts attendance has declined, American society has of course changed as well. In work not included in this dissertation, I have argued that technology has rapidly advanced, making the means for consuming and making art more and more accessible (Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011), and that forms of art and aesthetic expression have evolved along with technology and the growth of cultural identities within the US (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c). Considering these changes in the international context, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2012, 12) described the current challenge aptly:

"We are currently observing big changes and the rise of new cultural paradigms and behaviour, armed with a set of research tools elaborated in the last century and adapted to analyse social life through a well-defined taxonomy that is every year less adequate for helping our understanding."

This challenge seems particularly acute within the US context given the dramatic demographic changes that have occurred over recent years and that are projected to occur over the next few decades, as discussed earlier in this chapter.

During the development of the first SPPA, questions were raised about the boundaries of what would be considered as "arts participation" for the purpose of measurement and for informing policy (Orend 1977, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c). Would the SPPA be inclusive of the broad range of activities that people partake in as everyday activities (e.g. watching television, listening to music, and dancing socially with friends) or would the SPPA focus on activities that connected closely with non-profit arts organizations (e.g. attending live ballet or classical music performances and visiting art museums)? Ultimately, the SPPA's instrument design, questions, and "benchmark" arts participation statistic largely served as means to monitor the well-being of

non-profit arts organizations (Tepper and Gao 2008, AMS Planning and Research Corp 1995, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015a). The SPPA has been fielded approximately every five years since 1982, and over the years, the NEA has made modifications to the survey in order to better reflect cultural consumption and engagement that is meaningful in a contemporary context.

Substantial revisions were made to the 2012 SPPA, which aimed to include more activities generally, along with a richer understanding of the use of technology to create, share, and consume art. In balance with efforts to provide more contemporary measures of arts participation is the effort to maintain consistent cross-sectional data, namely from the measures of benchmark arts attendance, for the purpose of monitoring trends over time (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015a, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015d). Outside of this thesis, I developed and tested survey measures for the California Survey of Arts & Cultural Participation (CSACP) (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015a), which may serve as an alternative approach to that taken by the SPPA. The CSACP measures were purposively designed to: (1) be more inclusive of a greater diversity of artistic forms than have been captured on earlier SPPA instruments; and (2) collect more detail about the context and motivations for people's engagement with art. One design approach was to ask close-ended questions that use wording about artistic forms, in combination with open-ended questions regarding style or genre, as opposed to close-ended questions that use wording about specific genres of art, which has typically been a feature of the SPPA that has received criticism for its focus on traditional Western European forms (Rosenstein 2005). This CSACP work has subsequently been considered by the NEA as a model for the redesign of the 2017 SPPA. Additionally, the pilot test for the 2017 SPPA suggests a greater balance of measures inquiring about creating art, consuming and making art via and with technology, and arts attendance may be fielded in the next SPPA wave (Novak-Leonard in press, National Endowment for the Arts 2016).

As a general population survey that aims to capture cultural and artistic activity, there exist several limitations arising from the SPPA's historic emphasis on attendance-based cultural activity and on artistic genres stemming from a Western European artistic tradition (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015b, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015a, Rosenstein 2005, Tepper and Gao 2008). These limitations are examined further in Chapter VI. Nonetheless, the SPPA is a unique, large dataset offering nationally representative data of arts participation over time. Moreover, it includes the advantageous feature of being able to link individual-level responses to extensive demographic data, uniquely enabling this thesis's exploration of the role of arts participation as a means of cultural integration.

III. Current Differences in How Immigrant Generations Participate in Art

The term “generation” has several meanings when applied to immigrant populations. One use of the term describes the shared identity of immigrants entering the US at a similar period in time; another use refers to living familial generations (e.g., grandparent, parent, child). Still yet, the term can refer to immigrants entering the US, their children born in the US, and following generations born in the US (Rumbaut 2004). In this chapter, I use the latter meaning of “generation” with the following specifications:

- ***First-generation*** immigrants – individuals living in the US who were born outside of the US, inclusive of individuals born in US territories;
- ***Second-generation*** immigrants – individuals born in the US who have at least one parent born outside of the US, including parents born in US territories;
- ***Third+ generation*** immigrants – individuals born in the US whose parents were also born in the US.

In this chapter, I examine a broad range of arts participation activities as a means to gain insight on immigrants’ process of navigating the culture and aesthetics of one’s country of origin along with that of the US as a new home. Therefore, I use an operational definition for first-generation immigrants that has previously been utilized to examine the immigrant population and art (Kasinitz 2014), but differs somewhat from the operational definition oft used to examine immigrants’ social and economic integration. Such research typically treats individuals living in the US, but who were born in a US territory, or who has a parent born in a US territory differently than I have here. Even though individuals born in US territories are legal US citizens, when coming to the US they still are navigating two cultures despite their citizenship (Kasinitz 2014). The operational definition of a second-generation immigrant being an individual born in the US with at least one foreign-born parent is a commonly used specification.

Using these specifications, I first examine whether current immigrant generations (first-, second- and third+ generations) differ in their levels of reported arts participation using comparisons of means. Because the compared aggregate means for each generation can obscure differences within subpopulations, I also examine differences between generations within Latino and Asian subpopulations. Of those foreign-born in the 2012 SPPA, 46.9% are of Hispanic origin and 24.3% are Non-Hispanic Asian, the two largest subpopulations among those who are foreign-born. The US Census Bureau has used the broad pan-ethnic groupings, such as Latino and Asian, in an effort to identify some level of shared heritage or ancestry within its population statistics; however, I would emphasize that these groupings indeed mask a great deal of heterogeneity (DiMaggio and Ostrower 1992, DiMaggio and Fernandez-Kelly 2010, Farrell and Medvedeva 2010). Furthermore, as second-stage analyses, I isolate immigrant-generation identity from socioeconomic and demographic characteristics to examine its potential influence on a subset of arts participation measures from the SPPA.⁹

Based on the classical assimilation theoretical model, I expect first-generation immigrants to report relatively lower levels of participation than both second- and third+ generations on outcome measures that could be deemed indicative of mainstream culture. Following this theory, I also expect second-generation immigrants to report lower rates than first-generation immigrants for measures indicative of their country of origin's cultural heritage, and third+ generation immigrant to report even lower levels. However, if second-generation immigrants have the "advantage" of dual reference frames and networks to draw upon and therefore are positioned advantageously for employment and other means of social mobility, as Kasinitz et al. (2008) suggest, then I expect second-generation immigrants to report higher rates of participation than both first- and third+ generation immigrants. Furthermore, Kasinitz (2014) expanded the second-generation advantage theory to suggest that children of immigrants are also advantageously positioned to be creative and expressive due to their experience of needing to innovate and be nimble having had to navigate dual cultural identities.

⁹ See Technical Note in the Appendix for further details.

To examine potential heterogeneity, I investigate potential differences between immigrant generations for Latino and Asian subpopulations. The integration theory of segmented assimilation suggests that it is plausible to observe differences in participation patterns by racial and ethnic subgroups across immigrant generations. It is important to note that the 2012 SPPA data used in this chapter provide a snapshot of differences between *current* immigrant generations and their reported arts participations. The SPPA does not enable investigations into intergenerational progression, meaning that the second-generation analyzed in this chapter should not be interpreted as comprising the children of the first-generation analyzed herein.

Does arts participation differ between current immigrant generations?

The 2012 SPPA data reveal many differences between first-, second-, and third+ generation immigrants' participation in arts. Table 1 summarizes the sample sizes available in the 2012 SPPA. Given the relatively small sample size available for Asians, the estimates associated with this population have relatively larger standard errors, and hence only comparatively large rate differentials have the potential to be detected as statistically significant.

Table 1. 2012 SPPA Sample Sizes

	N	Weighted Proportions		
		1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations
Total US Population	35,735	17.0%	8.4%	74.6%
Hispanic Population	3,836	54.8%	23.8%	21.4%
Asian Population	1,665	78.0%	14.4%	7.6%

To explore whether and how immigrant generations differ in their participation in the arts, I look at a broad range of measures in the 2012 SPPA. I discuss the measures in terms of the following groupings: (1) Attendance & Reading, (2) Accessing & Creating Arts Through Digital Media, and (3) Creating, Performing & Supporting Art.

Attendance & Reading

The first prominent trend observed for the US adult population is that for most attendance-based arts activities, the behaviors of second-generation immigrants more closely mirrored those reported by third+ generations than those reported by first-generation immigrants (Table 2). Overall, second-generation immigrants attended arts events at significantly higher rates than did first-generation immigrants, and second-generation immigrants reported significantly higher rates

of attendance than did third+ generation immigrants for going to the movies, visiting an art museum, attending dance (other than ballet) and opera performances, and attending free performance arts events. However, in the total US adult population, second- and first-generation immigrants reported similar levels of attending live Latin, Spanish or salsa music performances, and these levels are significantly higher than the 3% rate at which third+ generation immigrants reported attending such events. This finding counters expectations based on the classical assimilation theoretical model, based on which I would expect second-generation immigrants' rate of attending live Latin, Spanish or salsa music performances to be lower than that of first-generation immigrants. This provides a more nuanced understanding of this activity than prior analyses using the 2008 SPPA, which was the first time questions had been asked about Latin, Spanish or salsa music. Prior research showed that native-born US residents, second- and third+ generations in the aggregate, went to live performances and listened to broadcasts of Latin, Spanish or salsa music at lower rates than did foreign-born US residents (Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011).

Table 2. Rates of Adult Attendance within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generation (2012)

	Total US Population (n=35,735)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
Go to the movies	51%	64%	61%	***	***	*
Visit an art museum	16%	26%	22%	***	***	***
Attend any Free Music, Theater, or Dance Performances	14%	20%	16%	***		**
Live dance (other than ballet)	4%	8%	6%	***	*	**
Live opera	2%	3%	2%	**		**
Read literature	32%	46%	48%	***	***	
Visit a historic park or monument	16%	25%	26%	***	***	
Visit a craft or visual art fair	13%	24%	24%	***	***	
Visit an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	14%	23%	22%	***	***	
Live musical play	8%	18%	16%	***	***	
Any other music, theater, or dance performance	6%	13%	13%	***	***	
Live jazz	5%	10%	9%	***	***	
Live classical music	6%	10%	9%	***	***	
Live nonmusical play	5%	9%	9%	***	***	
Live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	11%	12%	3%		***	***
Attend book club	2%	3%	4%		***	**
Live ballet	2%	3%	3%		*	
Live book reading/storytelling	3%	4%	4%			

* Significance at the 0.10 level; ** Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012; Note: in addition to attendance-based activity, reading literature is also included here.

Third+ generation immigrants reported a significantly higher rate of attendance at book clubs than did either first- or second-generation immigrants; however, the marginal difference in rates

is quite narrow. It remains possible that trends within different ethnic and racial groups may differ from these overall trends.

Within the Latino population, the stark differences in reported levels of arts attendance between first- and second-generation immigrants generally followed the trends observed for overall immigrant populations (Table 3). One exception, however, is that all Latino immigrant generations reported similar levels of attending free art exhibits and performing arts events. Also, there are few significant differences detected between Latino second- and third+ generation immigrants; the only differences were attending performances of Latin, Spanish or salsa music and going to a live book reading or storytelling event. This pattern is consistent with prior research demonstrating that story-telling has been used as a central mechanism for passing along cultural traditions and personal stories (Brown et al. 2008) and that there is a marked preference for Latin music among Latinos (Silber and Triplett 2015). Moreover, the distinct shift observed between first and second-generation immigrants follows a pattern of diminishing identification with the country of origin over time that has been observed in other investigations (Pew Research Center 2013b).

Few significant differences were detected between generations of Asian immigrants, potentially due in part to the sample size limitations within the SPPA discussed above. However, for the activities where significant differences were found, the magnitudes of difference between the lower participation rates of first-generation immigrants and the higher rates reported by second- and third+ generations were approximately two-fold. A notable exception is that a greater proportion of first-generation Asian immigrants (5%) than second-generation (1%) reported having participated in a live book reading or storytelling event during the 12 months prior to their survey interview in July 2012. Interestingly, this pattern would seem to contradict that observed for Latino immigrants, although the reason for this difference is not clear.

Table 3. Rates of Adult Attendance for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generation (2012)

	Hispanic Subpopulation (n=3,836)						Asian Subpopulation (n=1,665)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
Go to the movies	44%	70%	66%	***	***		54%	68%	59%	*		
Visit an art museum	9%	19%	22%	***	***		21%	24%	30%			
Attend any Free Music, Theater, or Dance Performances	12%	14%	13%				12%	19%	8%			
Live dance (other than ballet)	3%	7%	6%	**	*		4%	12%	10%	*		
Live opera	1%	2%	2%				2%	6%	4%			
Read literature	22%	37%	43%	***	***		37%	41%	45%			
Visit a historic park or monument	9%	20%	18%	***	***		19%	16%	29%			
Visit a craft or visual art fair	12%	22%	23%	***	***		12%	14%	21%		*	
Visit an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	12%	24%	19%	***	**		13%	20%	20%			
Live musical play	5%	11%	10%	***	***		8%	22%	22%	**	**	
Any other music, theater, or dance performance	4%	11%	9%	***	***		5%	8%	17%		**	
Live jazz	3%	6%	8%	**	**		6%	11%	9%			
Live classical music	2%	4%	7%	**	***		7%	13%	7%			
Live nonmusical play	2%	5%	5%	**	**		4%	8%	10%			
Live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	19%	21%	13%		**	***	2%	5%	2%			
Attend book club	1%	2%	1%				2%	3%	7%			
Live ballet	1%	1%	3%				2%	1%	1%			
Live book reading/storytelling	2%	4%	1%			**	5%	1%	6%	***		
Go to an Art Exhibit or Music, Theater, or Dance performance at:												
College or University	3%	8%	5%	**			2%	7%	26%		**	
Park or open-air facility	11%	13%	13%				11%	17%	17%			
Theater, concert hall, or auditorium	7%	11%	10%				7%	12%	22%			
Restaurant, bar, nightclub, or coffee shop	7%	12%	13%	*	*		7%	19%	22%	*		
Art museum or gallery	3%	7%	9%	*	**		11%	8%	16%			
Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	9%	7%	6%				4%	4%	3%			
Elementary, middle or high school	9%	12%	12%				6%	6%	3%			
Community center	4%	3%	3%				4%	3%	7%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Accessing & Creating Arts Through Digital Media

I next examine whether current immigration generations differentially access and engage in art online and through digital media. First-generation immigrants watched fewer hours of television each day, and a smaller proportion of first-generation immigrants used the Internet and mobile devices than did second- and third-generation immigrants (Table 4). For digital media, a pattern of participation somewhat akin to that observed for attendance-based activities emerged: second-generation immigrants tended to report higher rates of participation than did first-generation immigrants. An exception to this trend was accessing Latin, Spanish or salsa music (through either TV or radio, or Internet), wherein first- and second-generation immigrants, on average, reported similar levels, each of which was higher than those reported by third+ generation immigrants. Within the Latino population (Table 5), first-generation immigrants reported the highest rates for accessing Latin, Spanish or salsa music through both TV and radio (48%), as well as through the Internet (37%), with second- and third+ generations reporting successively lower rates, respectively. The pattern of third+ generation immigrants reporting significantly lower rates of participation than earlier generations mirrors the pattern for those attending live Latin, Spanish or salsa music events discussed earlier.

In contrast to the low rates of attendance at live events, first-generation immigrants reported significantly higher rates of using the Internet to access programs about dance (other than ballet, modern or contemporary dance) and using mobile devices to access theater or dance than did other immigrant generations (Table 4). Within the Latino population, first- and second-generation immigrants reported similar rates, which are significantly higher than those reported by third+ generation Latinos (Table 5). The 2012 SPPA also shows a modestly higher participation rate of accessing classical music, opera, and ballet through the Internet among first-generation immigrants, especially as compared to third+ generation immigrants. Second-generation Asian immigrants reported several patterns of Internet use similar to that of first-generation Asian immigrants; however they also reported a notably higher rate of using the Internet to access programs about visual arts (17%) than did the first generation (3%). One important note is that it is not clear whether SPPA questions regarding accessing artistic content through the Internet and through mobile devices measure the same or separate types of activity (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015d).

Second-generation immigrants reported higher levels of working with visual art through media, film and video than did either first- or third+ generation immigrants (Table 6). Specifically, second-generation Latino immigrants reported relatively higher levels of creating visual art through media (7%) than did either first- or third+ generation Latino immigrants (Table 7). However, in activities related to

photography and creative writing, second-generation immigrants reported participation rates similar to third+ generation immigrants, which were higher than those of first-generation immigrants.

Table 4. Rates of Digital Media Use within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generation (2012)

	Total US Population (n=35,735)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
No. of Hours of TV Watched on Average Day	1.95	2.26	2.44	**	***	
Used a DVD, or CD player or record or tape player to access art	27%	26%	27%			
Used TV or radio to watch or listen to . . .						
Latin, Spanish or salsa music	26%	22%	6%	*	***	***
Programs or information about the visual arts	6%	10%	8%	***	**	*
Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	22%	45%	44%	***	***	
Classical music	9%	14%	12%	***	***	
Jazz	8%	11%	10%	*	*	
Other dance programs or shows	7%	10%	8%	*		
Programs or information about books or writers	5%	9%	8%	***	***	
Theater productions	4%	7%	7%	**	***	
Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	3%	4%	4%		**	
Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	4%	5%	4%			
Opera	4%	5%	3%			
Used the Internet	60%	74%	73%	***	***	
Used the Internet to watch, listen to or download . . .						
Programs or information about the visual arts	5%	9%	6%	**		**
Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	26%	39%	36%	***	***	
Other dance programs or shows	5%	2%	3%	***	**	
Latin, Spanish or salsa music	17%	17%	5%		***	***
Classical music	10%	10%	8%		*	
Opera	3%	3%	2%		*	
Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	3%	2%	1%		**	
Programs or information about books or writers	7%	9%	7%			
jazz	6%	8%	7%			
Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	6%	7%	7%			
Theater productions	2%	2%	3%			
Used handheld or mobile device	45%	58%	55%	***	***	
Used any handheld or mobile devices to download, watch, or listen to . . .						
Music	57%	69%	65%	***	***	
Novels, short stories, poetry or plays	26%	29%	31%		**	
Theater or dance	8%	6%	6%		*	
Visual arts	14%	16%	15%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Table 5. Rates of Digital Media Use for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generation (2012)

	Hispanic Subpopulation (n=3,836)						Asian Subpopulation (n=1,665)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
No. of Hours of TV Watched on Average Day	2.20	2.40	2.87		***	*	1.48	1.81	1.42			
Used a DVD, or CD player or record or tape player to access art	27%	25%	28%				27%	29%	39%			
Used TV or radio to watch or listen to . . .												
Latin, Spanish or salsa music	48%	40%	29%	*	***	***	2%	4%	0%		*	
Programs or information about the visual arts	4%	7%	5%	*			6%	11%	11%			
Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	18%	45%	43%	***	***		23%	43%	33%	**		
Classical music	6%	6%	10%				8%	17%	10%	*		
Jazz	6%	9%	6%				8%	9%	10%			
Other dance programs or shows	6%	8%	3%		*	***	8%	12%	12%			
Programs or information about books or writers	3%	5%	6%				4%	11%	7%			
Theater productions	3%	3%	3%				3%	6%	6%			
Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	2%	2%	5%				3%	4%	0%		*	
Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	3%	4%	2%				3%	6%	6%			
Opera	3%	1%	2%	*			2%	6%	6%			
Used the Internet	46%	76%	71%	***	***		73%	77%	80%			
Used the Internet to watch, listen to or download . . .												
Programs or information about the visual arts	4%	7%	4%				3%	17%	6%	**		
Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	20%	37%	37%	***	***		27%	43%	33%	*		
Other dance programs or shows	3%	2%	3%				6%	3%	0%		***	
Latin, Spanish or salsa music	37%	27%	17%	**	***	*	4%	13%	6%			
Classical music	9%	7%	7%				10%	15%	0%		***	***
Opera	3%	1%	3%				2%	4%	0%		*	
Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	2%	2%	2%				3%	2%	0%		**	
Programs or information about books or writers	6%	5%	4%				6%	8%	1%		**	*
Jazz	4%	6%	9%		*		6%	13%	11%			
Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	4%	6%	8%		*		7%	8%	5%			
Theater productions	2%	2%	3%				2%	2%	0%		*	
Used handheld or mobile device	36%	62%	54%	***	***		52%	59%	65%			
Used any handheld or mobile devices to download, watch, or listen to . . .												
Music	58%	76%	75%	***	***		53%	64%	80%		***	
Novels, short stories, poetry or plays	24%	22%	29%				23%	23%	39%			
Theater or dance	7%	4%	3%		*		8%	8%	9%			
Visual arts	13%	17%	10%				12%	18%	32%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Table 6. Rates of Creating & Sharing Art through Media within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generation (2012)

	Total US Population (n=35,735)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
Email, post, share: films or video	12%	17%	14%	***		
Create visual art	5%	8%	6%	**		
Email, post, share: visual art created	3%	5%	3%	**		
Create films/video	2%	5%	3%	*		
Edited/remixed film/video	2%	5%	2%	**		
Email, post, share: film/video edited/remixed	2%	4%	2%	*		
Email, post, share: photographs created/edited	11%	17%	16%	***	***	
Photo editing	9%	16%	14%	***	***	
Create photos	9%	13%	13%	**	***	
Creative Writing	3%	7%	6%	***	***	
Edited/remixed music	2%	6%	5%	***	***	
Email, post, share: creative writing	1%	3%	3%	**	***	
Email, post, share: photography	22%	25%	28%		***	
Scrapbooking	5%	5%	7%		**	
Email, post, share: music	19%	23%	22%			
Email, post, share: other visual art	5%	7%	6%			
Create or perform music	4%	6%	5%			
Email, post, share: dance	6%	5%	5%			
Used mobile device/Internet to visual art	2%	4%	3%			
Email, post, share: poetry, short stories, or plays	4%	4%	5%			
Email, post, share: music created, performed edited/remixed	1%	2%	2%			
Email, post, share: scrapbooking	3%	2%	2%			
Used mobile device/Internet to create music	1%	2%	1%			
Create or perform dance	1%	2%	1%			
Edited/remixed dance performances	1%	1%	1%			
Email, post, share: dance performances created, performed edited/remixed	0%	0%	0%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Table 7. Rates of Creating & Sharing Art through Media for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generation (2012)

	Hispanic Subpopulation (n=3,836)						Asian Subpopulation (n=1,665)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
Email, post, share: films or video	9%	14%	11%	*			15%	27%	11%	*		*
Create visual art	3%	7%	2%	**		**	4%	7%	7%			
Email, post, share: visual art created	2%	3%	1%				2%	6%	4%			
Create films/video	1%	3%	5%	**	**		2%	6%	2%			
Edited/remixed film/video	1%	3%	3%	*			2%	3%	2%			
Email, post, share: film/video edited/remixed	1%	2%	5%		**		2%	4%	1%			
Email, post, share: photographs created/edited	7%	12%	12%	*	*		14%	13%	12%			
Photo editing	5%	10%	10%	**			11%	12%	8%			
Create photos	6%	10%	10%				9%	8%	11%			
Creative Writing	2%	5%	9%	*	***		2%	8%	7%			
Edited/remixed music	1%	6%	8%	**	***		0%	4%	1%			
Email, post, share: creative writing	1%	4%	5%	*	**		1%	6%	4%			
Email, post, share: photography	17%	20%	23%				26%	32%	10%		***	***
Scrapbooking	5%	5%	6%				6%	3%	5%			
Email, post, share: music	18%	27%	28%	*	**		18%	31%	28%	*		
Email, post, share: other visual art	4%	7%	5%				6%	5%	5%			
Create or perform music	3%	6%	6%	**	*		4%	7%	4%			
Email, post, share: dance	6%	4%	9%				3%	7%	8%			
Used mobile device/Internet to visual art	1%	2%	1%				2%	6%	3%			
Email, post, share: poetry, short stories, or plays	2%	4%	6%		*		3%	3%	6%			
Email, post, share: music created, performed edited/remixed	0%	2%	5%		**		0%	2%	0%			
Email, post, share: scrapbooking	2%	2%	2%				4%	0%	1%	**	**	
Used mobile device/Internet to create music	1%	2%	4%		**		0%	3%	1%			
Create or perform dance	2%	2%	1%				1%	0%	0%	*	*	
Edited/remixed dance performances	1%	1%	1%				0%	0%	1%			
Email, post, share: dance performances created, performed edited/remixed	0%	0%	0%	**	**		0%	0%	0%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Creating, Performing & Supporting Art

Second-generation immigrants also reported higher levels of participation than did first-generation immigrants across the many ways that people create, perform or support artistic activity (Table 8). Among all immigrant generations, those in the second generation reported the highest rates of social dancing (44%) and of performing or practicing dancing (8%), classical music (3%) and Latin, Spanish or salsa music (2%).

Table 8. Rates of Creating, Performing & Supporting Art within the Total US Population, by Immigrant Generations (2012)

	Total US Population (n=35,735)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
Leatherwork, metalwork, woodwork	4%	7%	9%	***	***	*
Perform or practice classical music	1%	3%	2%	***	***	*
Social dancing	30%	44%	31%	***		***
Perform or practice dancing	5%	8%	5%	**		**
Perform or practice Latin, Spanish or salsa music	1%	2%	0%	**		**
Own art	16%	31%	31%	***	***	
Play a musical instrument	9%	14%	13%	***	***	
Weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting	11%	14%	14%	**	***	
Donate to an arts or cultural organization	9%	14%	11%	***	***	
Perform or practice singing	6%	9%	9%	**	***	
Purchase or acquire art	4%	8%	10%	***	***	
Play a musical instrument with other people	4%	5%	5%	*	***	
Pottery, ceramics, jewelry	3%	5%	5%	**	***	
Teach art lessons or classes	1%	3%	2%	***	***	
Perform or practice opera	0%	1%	0%	*	*	
Gardening for pleasure	33%	35%	41%		***	***
Subscribe to an arts or cultural organization	5%	5%	8%		***	***
Perform or practice choral music/choir	2%	2%	3%		*	
Sing with other people	4%	6%	7%		***	
Perform or practice jazz	0%	1%	1%		***	
Acting	1%	2%	1%			
Perform or practice musical or nonmusical play	1%	1%	1%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Specifically among Latinos, second-generation immigrants also reported the highest rates of social dancing (48%) and performing or practicing dance (10%) (Table 9). Significantly greater proportions of second-generation Latino immigrants also donated to an arts or cultural organization (10%) and taught art (3%) than did either first- or third+ immigrant generations. First-generation Latino immigrants reported the highest rates of gardening for pleasure (30%) compared to later immigrant generations. Within the Asian population, only two significant differences between first- and second-generation immigrants were observed: second-generation Asian immigrants reported higher rates than did first-generation immigrants for playing an instrument (26% vs. 11%) and specifically performing or practicing classical music (15%

vs. 1%). First-generation Asian immigrants reported a significantly higher rate of performing/practicing choral music (2%) than did third+ generation immigrants (0%).

Table 9. Rates of Creating, Performing & Supporting Art for Latino & Asian Subpopulations, by Immigrant Generations (2012)

	Hispanic Subpopulation (n=3,836)						Asian Subpopulation (n=1,665)					
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generation	Diff. b/n 1st & 2nd Gen.	Diff. b/n 1st & 3rd Gen.	Diff. b/n 2nd & 3rd Gen.
Leatherwork, metalwork, woodwork	5%	3%	6%				1%	2%	6%			
Perform or practice classical music	0%	1%	2%		**		1%	15%	7%	*		
Social dancing	32%	48%	34%	***		***	22%	30%	41%		*	
Perform or practice dancing	4%	10%	5%	***		**	4%	4%	12%			
Perform or practice Latin, Spanish or salsa music	1%	2%	1%				0%	2%	0%			
Own art	9%	16%	16%	***	**		17%	29%	33%		*	
Play a musical instrument	4%	12%	9%	***	***		11%	26%	19%	*		
Weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting or sewing	10%	11%	7%				10%	11%	16%			
Donate to an arts or cultural organization	5%	10%	5%	**		*	11%	15%	7%			
Perform or practice singing	4%	9%	5%	**			6%	9%	11%			
Purchase or acquire art	2%	6%	8%	***	***		4%	6%	20%			
Play a musical instrument with other people	2%	5%	4%	*	*		3%	8%	16%		**	
Pottery, ceramics, jewelry	2%	3%	4%				2%	4%	14%		*	
Teach art lessons or classes	1%	3%	1%	**		**	0%	4%	10%			
Perform or practice opera	0%	2%	0%	*			0%	0%	6%			
Gardening for pleasure	30%	22%	24%	**	*		37%	40%	30%			
Subscribe to an arts or cultural organization	2%	3%	3%				5%	6%	15%			
Perform or practice choral music/choir	1%	2%	0%				2%	5%	0%		***	
Sing with other people	3%	6%	4%	**			5%	9%	11%			
Perform or practice jazz	0%	1%	1%	*	*		1%	3%	0%		*	
Acting	1%	2%	0%		*	**	1%	0%	0%			
Perform or practice musical or nonmusical play	0%	1%	0%	*		*	1%	1%	6%			

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012


Why are there differences?

Building upon the observed differences described above, I next attempt to test explicitly whether immigrant generation classification can explain the observed variations in arts participation as measured in the 2012 SPPA. Note that observing a difference in participation rates between generations is not sufficient to answer this question, and thus the following analysis applies a quantitative statistical test to determine whether any observed difference can truly be ascribed to differences in generational classification. Furthermore, I seek to determine whether second-generation immigrants might have an “advantage” that plays a role in the observed differences in participation rates between first- and second-generation immigrants.

Does being an immigrant or the child of an immigrant “explain” variation in arts participation?

To begin investigating this question, I applied a diagnostic in order to identify which of the 2012 SPPA outcome variables were most impacted by differences in immigrant generation. To this end, the outcome variables used in the earlier, descriptive portion of this chapter were regressed against immigrant generation identity (the input variable) in order to obtain a quantitative indicator (R-squared) of the degree to which variability in the outcome variable might be attributed to immigrant generation identity (Figure 4). Using a simple model that does not include control variables, immigrant generation identity explained 0.4% of the observed variation in participation levels on average, and for some outputs, generational identity explained up to 7.5% of the observed variation. To investigate this relationship in more detail, I next focus on the subset of outcome variables for which generational identity explained the most variation (those that were in the 90th-percentile of R-squared values, which includes outcome variables for which at least 0.7% of variation was explained by the simple model). Because no outcome variables measuring one’s own creation or performance of, or support for, arts was in the 90th-percentile, I also consider two additional variables (social dancing and doing leather work, metal work, or woodwork), which had the highest R-squared value (0.6%) within this category of outcome variables of particular general relevance to the overarching question under investigation. In total, I assess 12 outcome variables in the regression analyses.

Figure 4. Predictive Power of Immigrant Generations for Arts Participation (2012)



This histogram summarizes the extent to which immigrant-generational identification, using a simple regression, has predictive power on arts and cultural activities measured in the 2012 SPPA. R-squared values for separate activities are available in Appendix Table C.

Numerous studies have investigated the predictive power of demographic variables on arts participation, and I include those around which there is consensus about having significant predictive power related to the analysis presented here. Collectively, such demographic variables have accounted for approximately 15-20% of the observed variation in arts participation rates (Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011). These variables include:

- Household or family income. Higher levels of income have been shown to predict a higher likelihood of attendance at live arts events (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015d, Dimaggio and Useem 1978).
- Educational attainment. Higher levels of educational attainment tend to predict higher levels of participation in the arts. Specifically, having a college-education or graduate degree generally predicts a higher likelihood of participating in the arts. This pattern is particularly relevant for predicting attendance at live arts events, and to creating and making art; engagement through digital media is predicted to a lesser extent (McCarthy et al. 2001, Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011, Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c, Rabkin and Hedberg 2011, Orend and Keegan 1996).

- Childhood arts lessons or classes. Childhood experience with arts lessons or classes positively predicts arts participation, creating and making art to a greater extent than attending arts events (Rabkin and Hedberg 2011, Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011), and some research has found it to be the single strongest predictor of attending art (Bergonzi and Smith 1996). For this analysis, I use a constructed variable, aggregating childhood experience taking lessons or classes in any of the following: voice-training or playing an instrument; photography or filmmaking; other visual arts such as drawing, painting, pottery, weaving, graphic or fashion design; acting or theater; dance; creative writing; art appreciation or art history; music appreciation.
- Parents' level of educational attainment. Parental education level at college degree or higher has a positive effect on benchmark art attendance (Rabkin and Hedberg 2011).
- Age. Age has been shown to have significant, yet modest effect on arts attendance. Studies have shown mixed results for how age affects other modes of arts participation. For example, although Stern (2011b) found limited to no effect of age on other forms of arts participation, other studies have found that younger adult ages positively predicted participation in activities where one actively makes art, after controlling for additional demographic characteristics (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c).

Additionally, I include related factors of potential relevance to the experiences of early immigrant generations that could affect arts participation:

- Available leisure time. Ribar (2012) shows that immigrants spend less time on leisure activities and more time during an average week working both in the home and in the market than non-immigrants. Here I use the number of hours worked in an average week as an indicator of available leisure. This indicator is limited in that it does not include hours spent working in the home.
- Mobility. This binary variable evaluates whether an individual has attained a level of education higher than the highest level attained by either parent. Nine percent of individuals in the SPPA reported having one parent with a graduate degree (the highest classification of education level considered); hence these children could not attain a higher level of education and were coded as 0 (no mobility indicated). This variable is intended specifically to serve as a relative measure, examining upward mobility as measured by educational attainment. The absolute level of one's own educational attainment is also included as a separate variable.

To begin investigating the degree to which the aforementioned control variables may explain the trends observed, the demographic composition and summary statistics of these variables was first profiled (Table 10). In the 2012 SPPA data, the population of second-generation immigrants is comprised of almost equal proportions White, Non-Hispanic (44.8%) and Hispanic (40.9%). White, Non-Hispanic second-generation immigrants are older, on average, than second-generation Latino immigrants (55.7 vs. 33.5 years old). It is important to note that Latino and Asian first-generation immigrants have varying distributions of education attainment and income; on average, Asians reported higher levels of both education and income. Race and ethnicity were included as a control variable, along with additional demographic variables typically used to examine arts participation – gender, marital status, children in the household, and type of area of residence (Live in Metropolitan Region).

The different rates in childhood arts lessons in Table 10 shed light on the importance of historical and social context for understanding the current immigrant generations. More specifically, thinking about the bimodal nature of the current second-generation of immigrants, a greater proportion of White, Non-Hispanic second-generation immigrants received childhood arts lessons or classes than did second-generation Latino immigrants (53.5% vs. 38.4%).

Table 10. Demographic Summary of Current Adult Immigrant Generations (2012)¹⁰

	Total US Population (n=35,735)			Hispanic Subpopulation (n=3,836)			Asian Subpopulation (n=1,665)		
	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations	1st- Generation	2nd- Generation	3+ Generations
<i>Portion of Weighted Sample</i>	17.2%	8.4%	74.5%	54.0%	23.0%	23.0%	79.9%	12.7%	7.4%
Age (average)	44.9	43.6	47.3	43.3	33.5	40.3	45.3	35.8	43.5
Male	48.2%	49.5%	48.0%	50.3%	50.8%	48.9%	45.5%	50.8%	47.4%
Race & Ethnicity									
White, Non-Hispanic	20.4%	44.8%	79.3%						
Hispanic	46.8%	40.9%	4.6%						
Asian/Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic	25.1%	8.2%	0.5%						
African American or Black, Non-Hispanic	7.0%	4.5%	13.3%						
American Indian or Native Alaskan, Non-Hispanic	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%						
2 or more races, Non-Hispanic	0.7%	1.5%	1.4%						
Educational Attainment									
<9th grade	14.4%	2.3%	1.8%	24.8%	3.1%	5.1%	5.4%	0.8%	1.2%
Some HS	13.0%	9.2%	6.8%	21.0%	14.8%	13.3%	6.2%	5.7%	3.6%
HS or equivalent	26.9%	27.3%	31.6%	31.0%	34.1%	35.4%	21.0%	11.7%	30.4%
Some college	17.4%	33.3%	31.4%	12.9%	36.2%	33.8%	18.4%	36.4%	37.2%
BA or equivalent	17.6%	18.2%	18.9%	6.6%	7.8%	8.1%	30.7%	29.9%	18.9%
Graduate degree	10.7%	9.7%	9.5%	3.6%	4.0%	4.3%	18.4%	15.6%	8.7%
Highest level of parental educational attainment									
<9th grade	36.6%	16.9%	7.1%	59.4%	26.0%	17.8%	17.8%	5.4%	4.6%
Some HS	13.5%	10.5%	9.0%	14.7%	17.8%	10.8%	11.0%	6.9%	5.9%
HS or equivalent	20.2%	30.6%	41.7%	16.0%	27.8%	31.4%	22.2%	29.4%	43.3%
Some college	7.0%	10.0%	15.2%	3.8%	8.8%	21.0%	8.6%	9.8%	7.9%
BA or equivalent	14.7%	21.6%	17.0%	4.6%	17.4%	10.4%	26.8%	38.6%	29.8%
Graduate degree	8.0%	10.3%	10.0%	1.5%	2.3%	8.6%	13.6%	10.0%	8.6%
Mobility	51.0%	49.3%	42.6%	54.6%	53.7%	38.8%	48.9%	41.5%	47.2%
Family Income									
<\$20k	19.0%	16.4%	16.5%	24.1%	21.7%	21.1%	13.4%	10.6%	12.5%
\$20-29k	14.1%	11.1%	11.3%	19.3%	11.2%	11.6%	9.2%	11.4%	9.1%
\$30-39k	13.1%	13.0%	10.9%	17.3%	15.0%	12.9%	8.1%	8.9%	10.7%
\$40-49k	8.9%	9.7%	8.7%	9.1%	13.7%	10.7%	8.0%	6.9%	10.0%
\$50-59k	8.6%	7.6%	9.6%	7.9%	8.9%	13.0%	9.1%	8.2%	9.5%
\$60-75k	8.7%	8.4%	10.1%	7.3%	7.1%	9.9%	9.9%	15.4%	12.5%
\$75-99k	8.8%	12.1%	12.4%	6.7%	11.4%	9.6%	12.0%	9.9%	13.4%
\$100-149	10.7%	12.6%	12.4%	5.0%	9.0%	5.7%	17.2%	10.8%	12.5%
\$150k+	8.0%	9.1%	8.1%	3.3%	2.0%	5.6%	13.0%	18.1%	9.9%
Employed	62.6%	55.9%	58.5%	64.1%	61.5%	60.2%	63.0%	50.7%	65.6%
Usual Employment Hours Worked/Week (Average)	39.6	38.9	39.7	38.9	38.6	38.5	38.8	39.2	38.7
Married	63.5%	43.2%	53.5%	59.9%	35.2%	50.5%	71.7%	31.0%	44.9%
Child <18 in the home	40.0%	25.1%	26.6%	46.6%	33.5%	38.5%	37.6%	16.9%	30.9%
Lives in Metro Region	96.5%	92.9%	81.1%	96.0%	95.5%	88.5%	98.0%	94.9%	87.7%
Took Art lesson/class in Childhood	22.5%	48.5%	46.8%	12.1%	38.4%	40.5%	27.6%	65.9%	38.7%

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Regression Results

I next investigate how these control variables contribute to observed trends in arts participation. Table 11 contains the regressions results for each of the following three models for each of the 12 outcome variables:

- Model 1 is the simple regression on first- and second-generation dummy variables used to determine the R-square values in Figure 4 and to select outcome variables for this analysis;
- Model 2 is a partial model that examines the potential influence of educational mobility and available leisure time; and
- Model 3 is the full model, examining the main effects of each independent variable.

¹⁰ This table is generated using 2012 SPPA Module E survey weights due to the inclusion of childhood arts lessons and classes.

By and large, the trends observed resemble those reported in previous investigations. Higher incomes significantly predict attendance-based activities – specifically attending musicals, outdoor performing arts festivals, craft fairs, and historic parks or monuments. In addition, however, higher incomes also positively predict social dancing. Lower income brackets significantly predict the use of TV and radio for ‘other’ types of music. Additionally, higher levels of educational attainment positively predict attending live Latin, Spanish or salsa music, musicals, outdoor performing arts festivals, historic parks and monuments, and craft fairs, as well as owning art and reading literature. Having at least a high school-level education positively predicts social dancing. Lower levels of education positively predict the use of TV and radio to access ‘other’ types of music. Having taken art lessons or classes in childhood is also a significant positive predictor for each activity examined. These observations mirror the general trends previously observed.

However, even after controlling for these and additional demographic and influential socio-economic factors, identifying as a first- or second-generation immigrant still significantly predicts a number of aspects of arts participation. The regression results in Table 11 show that the observed differences in immigrant generations’ reported levels of arts participation are largely driven by income and education effects; yet even after controlling for these general driving forces, some generation-associated effects are observed. Being a current second-generation immigrant makes a distinct difference in positively predicting attending musical plays and owning art (Table 11, Column B). Being a current first-generation immigrant negatively predicted reading literature and using the TV or radio to listen to ‘other’ music; the effect is distinct from that of being a second-generation immigrant. While there are significant differences between third+ generation and first-generation immigrants in terms of listening to Spanish, Latin or salsa music by using TV or radio and by attending live music events, these regression results did not identify a distinct effect of being a second-generation immigrant. Additionally, while being a second-generation immigrant was a significant predictor of social dancing compared to third+ generation immigrants, results for Model 3 did not detect an effect of being a first-generation immigrant distinct from second- or third+ generation immigrants. Mobility and Employment Hours did not have significant explanatory power in Model 3 after additional demographic controls were considered.

Table 11. Regression Results

Outcome Variable	Model	Immigrant Generations (3+ generation omitted)			Income (<\$20k omitted)								Education (<9th grade omitted)				
		2nd Generation	1st Generation	Sig b/n 1st (D)	\$20-29,999	\$30-39,999	\$40-49,999	\$50-59,999	\$60-74,999	\$75-99,999	\$100-149,999	\$150,000+	Some HS	HS or GED	Some College/Ass oc Degree	College degree	Graduate degree
		(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to: Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)	1.17 ***	1.23 *** *														
	(2)	0.02	0.02														
	(3)	1.11 ***	1.19 ***														
Used the Internet to watch, listen to or download any Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)	0.04	0.04														
	(2)	1.03	1.1 ***														
	(3)	0.03	0.04		1.02	1.02	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	0.99	1.01	1.09	1.07	1.11	1.1	1.09
Attended live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	(1)	0.05	0.04		0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09
	(2)	1.13 ***	1.14 ***														
	(3)	1.12 **	1.06 **														
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	0.05	0.03														
	(2)	1.05	0.99														
	(3)	0.05	0.04		1	0.99	0.98	0.99	1	0.98	1	0.96	0.88	0.89	0.92	0.93	0.96
Own any pieces of art, such as paintings, drawings, sculpture, prints, or lithographs	(1)	1.09 ***	1.08 ***		0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18
	(2)	0.01	0.01														
	(3)	1.13 ***	1.12 ***														
Read literature	(1)	0.04	0.02														
	(2)	1.02	1.05 **		0.98	0.97 *	0.99	0.98	0.98	1.01	1	0.99	1.04	1.05	1.07 *	1.09 **	1.1 **
	(3)	0.02	0.02		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Visited a craft or visual art fair	(1)	1.01	0.81 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.01	0.79 *** **														
Visited a historic park or monument	(1)	0.05	0.03														
	(2)	0.99	0.83 *** **		1.03	1.1 *	1.08	1.09 *	1.04	1.08 *	1.09	1.05	1.22 ***	1.23 ***	1.27 ***	1.18 *	1.17
	(3)	0.05	0.04		0.05	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.1	0.12
Did social dancing	(1)	1	0.86 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	0.99	0.83 *** **		0.96	0.92 **	0.97	0.97	1.02	0.95	0.97	1.05	1.06	1.08	1.18 **	1.32 ***	1.41 ***
Did leatherwork, metalwork or woodwork	(1)	-0.04	-0.02		-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.05	-0.04	-0.05	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	-0.09	-0.12	-0.14
	(2)	1.1 **	0.99 **														
	(3)	-0.05	-0.04														
Attended live musical play	(1)	0.98	0.85 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1	0.85 *** **														
Visited an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	(1)	0.04	0.02														
	(2)	1.03	0.96 **		1.02	1	0.99	1	1	1.02	1	1.03	1.02	1.06 **	1.09 ***	1.15 ***	1.18 ***
	(3)	0.03	0.02		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.05
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to: Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)	1	0.9 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.01	0.91 *** **		1	1.06 *	1.02	1	1.05	1.06	1.07 **	1.07 *	1.04	1.05	1.09	1.16 **	1.19 **
Used the Internet to watch, listen to or download any Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)	0.04	0.02														
	(2)	1.03	0.98														
	(3)	0.03	0.02		0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08
Attended live musical play	(1)	1	0.91 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	0.97	0.92 ***		1.01	1.03	1.02	1	1.08 **	1.06 **	1.1 ***	1.2 ***	0.99	1.02	1.09 *	1.17 ***	1.29 ***
Did social dancing	(1)	0.04	0.02														
	(2)	1.03	0.98		0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.09
	(3)	0.03	0.03		0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.09
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Did leatherwork, metalwork or woodwork	(1)	0.04	0.02														
	(2)	1.04	0.99		-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07
	(3)	-0.03	-0.03														
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **		1.02	1.01	1	0.98	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.1 **	0.99	1	1.07	1.16 ***	1.2 ***
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)	1.01	0.92 *** **														
	(2)	0.02	0.01														
	(3)	1.07 *	0.94 *** **														

(Continued) Table 11. Regression Results

Outcome Variable	Model	Childhood art lesson /class	Race & Ethnicity (White, NonHispanic omitted)					Age	Age-squared	Parent Education (<9th grade omitted)				
			African American/Black, NH	Hispanic	American Indian, NH	Asian/Pacific Islander, NH	2 or more races, NH			Some HS	HS or GED	Some College/Associate Degree	College degree (BA or equiv)	Graduate degree
	(A)	(R)	(S)	(T)	(U)	(V)	(W)	(X)	(Y)	(Z)	(AA)	(AB)	(AC)	(AD)
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to: Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.08 *** 0.02	1 0.02	1.31 *** 0.06	0.98 0.03	0.91 *** 0.03	0.95 0.04	1 * 0.00	1.000 * 0.00	0.96 0.04	0.99 0.04	0.96 0.04	0.95 0.05	0.98 0.06
Used the Internet to watch, listen to or download any Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.04 ** 0.02	1.01 0.03	1.2 *** 0.06	1 0.04	1.04 0.06	0.92 *** 0.02	1 0.00	1.000 0.00	0.89 *** 0.04	0.96 0.05	0.95 0.05	0.93 0.06	0.92 0.06
Attended live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.02 ** 0.01	0.99 0.01	1.21 *** 0.03	1.02 0.03	0.98 0.03	1.04 0.04	1 0.00	1.000 * 0.00	1.02 0.03	1.02 0.02	1.01 0.03	1 0.03	1.03 0.03
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.23 *** 0.04	0.99 0.05	1.02 0.05	1 0.16	1.03 0.06	0.81 * 0.09	1.01 0.00	1.000 ** 0.00	0.97 0.05	0.93 0.05	1 0.08	1 0.08	0.99 0.10
Own any pieces of art, such as paintings, drawings, sculpture, prints, or lithographs	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.35 *** -0.03	0.88 *** -0.03	0.89 *** -0.04	0.88 -0.1	0.88 * -0.06	0.95 -0.12	1.01 *** -0	1.000 *** 0.000	0.99 -0.05	0.98 -0.05	0.96 -0.07	0.93 -0.06	0.98 -0.09
Read literature	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.06 *** 0.02	0.98 0.02	1.01 0.02	1.05 0.07	0.94 * 0.03	0.99 0.06	1 0.00	1.000 0.00	1.07 *** 0.03	1.05 ** 0.02	1.08 *** 0.03	1.12 *** 0.04	1.03 0.04
Visited a craft or visual art fair	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.18 *** 0.02	0.91 *** 0.02	1 0.03	0.89 ** 0.04	0.91 ** 0.04	0.98 0.06	1.01 ** 0.00	1.000 ** 0.00	1 0.03	1 0.03	1.05 0.04	1.02 0.05	1.03 0.05
Visited a historic park or monument	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.22 *** 0.02	0.93 *** 0.02	0.99 0.03	0.98 0.07	0.97 0.04	1.15 0.10	1 0.00	1.000 0.00	1 0.03	0.98 0.03	1.05 0.05	1.01 0.05	1.08 0.07
Visited an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.17 *** -0.02	0.99 -0.03	1.02 -0.03	0.98 -0.07	0.95 -0.04	1 -0.07	1 -0	1.000 0.000	1.01 -0.03	1.01 -0.03	1.02 -0.04	1.03 -0.04	1.01 -0.05
Attended live musical play	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.12 *** 0.02	0.99 0.02	0.99 0.03	0.93 ** 0.03	0.96 0.04	1.03 0.06	1 0.00	1.000 0.00	0.98 0.03	0.99 0.03	1.01 0.04	1.04 0.05	1.12 * 0.07
Did social dancing	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.21 *** 0.03	1.07 0.05	1.06 0.06	0.98 0.12	0.93 0.07	1.09 0.13	1 0.00	1.000 0.00	0.94 0.05	0.91 * 0.04	0.95 0.06	0.94 0.07	0.94 0.08
Did leatherwork, metalwork or woodwork	(1)													
	(2)													
	(3)	1.1 *** 0.02	0.93 *** 0.01	0.99 0.03	0.87 *** 0.02	0.93 ** 0.03	1.11 0.16	1 0.00	1.000 0.00	1.01 0.03	1 0.03	1.06 0.05	0.99 0.05	1 0.07

(Continued) Table 11. Regression Results

Outcome Variable	Model	Male	Live in metropolit an area	Child under age 18 in HH	Married	Mobility	Usual Emp. Hrs Worked/W	Constant	Obs.	R-squared
	(A)	(AE)	(AF)	(AG)	(AH)	(AI)	(AJ)	(AK)	(AL)	(AM)
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to: Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)							1.058 *** 0.00	22,967	7.5%
	(2)					1.03 * 0.02	1.000 0.00	1.04 *** 0.0126	15,730	5.4%
	(3)	0.99 0.01	1.01 0.02	1.01 0.02	1 0.02	1 0.07	1.000 0.00	0.867 * 0.00	15,715	16.4%
Used the Internet to watch, listen to or download any Latin, Spanish, or salsa music	(1)							1.048 *** 0.00	20,100	4.0%
	(2)					1.02 0.02	1.000 0.00	1.054 *** 0.0154	15,193	2.3%
	(3)	0.97 0.02	1.01 0.02	0.98 0.02	0.99 0.02	0.99 0.24	1.000 0.00	1.215 0.00	15,185	8.2%
Attended live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	(1)							1.03 *** 0.00	35,627	2.7%
	(2)					1.02 * 0.01	1.000 0.00	1.023 *** 0.0079	21,736	4.6%
	(3)	1.01 0.01	1.01 0.01	0.99 0.01	0.98 *** 0.01	1 0.04	1.000 * 0.00	0.933 0.00	17,776	10.7%
Used a TV or radio to watch or listen to any: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip- hop	(1)							1.547 *** 0.01	22,967	2.7%
	(2)					0.98 0.02	1.002 *** 0.00	1.545 *** 0.0336	15,730	3.5%
	(3)	0.99 0.03	0.96 0.03	0.98 0.03	0.98 0.03	1.01 0.14	1.000 0.00	1.168 0.00	15,715	11.7%
Own any pieces of art, such as paintings, drawings, sculpture, prints, or lithographs	(1)							1.362 *** 0.01	20,056	1.5%
	(2)					1.01 -0.02	1.001 ** ####	1.336 *** -0.026	12,721	2.4%
	(3)	1 -0.02	1 -0.03	0.95 * -0.03	1.06 ** -0.03	0.94 -0.04	1.000 ####	0.788 ** -0.075	15,761	25.6%
Read literature	(1)							1.621 *** 0.01	35,735	1.5%
	(2)					1.02 0.02	1.001 * 0.00	1.642 *** 0.0271	21,737	1.5%
	(3)	0.92 *** 0.01	1.02 0.02	0.98 0.01	1.03 ** 0.01	1.01 0.06	1.000 0.00	1.106 * 0.00	21,748	5.5%
Visited a craft or visual art fair	(1)							1.275 *** 0.01	35,463	1.0%
	(2)					0.98 0.02	1.001 *** 0.00	1.271 *** 0.0179	21,730	0.9%
	(3)	0.93 *** 0.02	0.95 ** 0.02	0.97 * 0.02	1 0.02	0.96 0.07	1.000 0.00	0.996 0.00	17,770	11.5%
Visited a historic park or monument	(1)							1.292 *** 0.01	35,422	0.8%
	(2)					1 0.01	1.002 *** 0.00	1.239 *** 0.0146	21,729	1.7%
	(3)	1.01 0.02	1.02 0.02	0.98 0.02	1.02 0.02	0.99 0.06	1.000 0.00	0.935 0.00	17,769	18.0%
Visited an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	(1)							1.248 *** 0.01	35,449	0.7%
	(2)					0.97 * 0.01	1.002 *** 0.00	1.237 *** 0.0192	21,729	1.4%
	(3)	0.99 -0.02	0.99 -0.02	0.97 * -0.02	0.97 * -0.02	0.97 -0.02	1.000 0.000	1.16 ** -0.083	17,769	11.1%
Attended live musical play	(1)							1.179 *** 0.01	35,564	0.7%
	(2)					1.01 0.01	1.002 *** 0.00	1.147 *** 0.0129	21,734	1.4%
	(3)	0.94 *** 0.01	1.05 *** 0.02	0.96 ** 0.02	1 0.01	1.02 0.05	1.001 0.00	0.895 ** 0.00	17,774	12.4%
Did social dancing	(1)							1.358 *** 0.01	24,453	0.6%
	(2)					0.93 *** 0.02	1.003 *** 0.00	1.356 *** 0.0319	12,719	3.2%
	(3)	0.95 ** 0.03	1.03 0.04	0.95 0.03	1.02 0.03	0.95 0.15	1.000 0.00	1.29 ** 0.00	15,760	12.7%
Did leatherwork, metalwork or woodwork	(1)							1.097 *** 0.00	24,495	0.6%
	(2)					0.98 0.01	1.001 *** 0.00	1.087 *** 0.0165	12,722	1.3%
	(3)	1.15 *** 0.02	0.97 0.02	0.99 0.02	1.04 ** 0.02	0.99 0.07	1.000 0.00	0.97 0.00	15,762	10.9%

*Significance at the 0.10 level;
 **Significance at the 0.05 level;
 ***Significance at the 0.01 level.

Source: Survey of Public
 Participation in the Arts, 2012

Conclusions

While first-generation immigrants' reported relatively lower rates of arts participation, the exception to this trend may also be informative. Overall, the main exception observed was in the rate of participation in activities involving Latin, Spanish or salsa music. Reported participation rates in these activities surged for those who self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, compared to non-Latino immigrants, and this trend was particularly pronounced for first- and second-generation Latino immigrants. Moreover, being a first-generation immigrant positively predicted attendance at live Latin, Spanish or salsa music events, as well as using TV or radio to listen to the music. This effect was significant even after controlling for the influence of being Latino and other demographic characteristics. One interpretation of these trends is that, because the SPPA asks specifically about styles of music that share a common lineage with people who self-identify as Latino, this result highlights the importance of asking questions that are relevant within multiple and diverse sets of cultural frames.

The dramatically lower levels of participation reported by first-generation immigrants across almost all 2012 SPPA indicators examined in this chapter may prompt concern and warrant action. The regression analyses show that this disparity, however, is not due solely to being an immigrant, but due to other socioeconomic factors such as race/ethnicity, level of educational attainment, and income. This disparity, however, may indicate missed opportunities to facilitate immigrants' civic engagement, building social capital and processing their own experiences, each of which is an area in which arts and cultural participation has been found to benefit immigrant populations.

Although demographic variables explained some aspects of arts participation, as expected, the immigrant experience does indeed hold separate predictive power for specific kinds of arts and cultural participation. My analyses suggest that second-generation immigrants may indeed have an "advantage," or a predilection relative to other generations, toward participating in certain aspects of arts and cultural activities. After controlling for variation in socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, second-generation immigrants are more likely to attend musicals, dance socially, and own art than first- or third+ generations.

As the proportion of the US population that is made up of first- and second-generation immigrants continues to grow, American society will be impacted by this dramatic demographic change. Understanding the concomitant cultural impact of this new immigrant population will be increasingly important. A growing body of research examines the social and economic facets and dynamics of second-generation immigrants, and this research is laying the foundation for an understanding of how second-generation immigrants will impact society in future years. Many of the immigrants who came to the US

post-1965 now have children who are aging into adulthood. In 2012, approximately 20 million second-generation adults (age 18 and older) lived in the US, comprising roughly 8% of the US adult population; at that time, 16 million second-generation immigrants were minors (age 17 and younger) (Pew Research Center 2013b). Hence, this chapter creates a baseline from which to study *future* second- and third+ generation immigrants and their cultural integration through arts participation.

How immigrants and the children of immigrants are settling into the US is a topic of great importance, but also of substantial uncertainty given the limitations in available data. The analyses in this chapter have identified factors that may help explain underlying trends in arts participation across current immigrant generations. Yet, there is much more to be understood about intergenerational integration and the degree to which immigrants, from varying countries of origin, retain their own cultural practices or adopt those that are predominant in American society. Relatively few data sources contain the necessary information to examine integration as a function of time across familial generations, and the SPPA is also limited in this regard. However, the SPPA does enable investigations of integration as a function of time in terms of the length of time an immigrant has lived in the US, and I examine this topic in the next chapter.

IV. An Exploratory Look at Immigrants' Length of Time in the US

In this chapter, I present exploratory analyses to examine whether disparities in arts participation levels change as a function of how long immigrants have resided in the US. Specifically, I address:

- Have rates of arts participation changed over the last decade for foreign- and native-born US residents?
- Does longer residence in the US lead to greater acculturation in patterns of arts participation among those immigrants who are foreign-born?
- Is becoming a US citizen associated with greater acculturation in patterns of arts participation among those immigrants who are foreign-born?

This analysis sheds light on changes in how immigrants report participating in arts over time in two steps. First, I examine the differences in reported levels of participation between foreign-born and US-born populations within each year of survey data using comparisons of means to evaluate whether there exist differences between these groups. Given that the composition of incoming populations of immigrants has changed substantially over time, as discussed in Chapter II, I also examine the potential cohort effects based on immigrants' year of entry into the US. Therefore, in my second step, I use regression models with fixed-effects to examine the impact that the length of time spent living in US has on levels of arts participation. If classical assimilation theory applies to arts participation, then I would expect to see rates of immigrants' arts participation move toward levels of participation reported by native US citizens. In general, this means seeing an increase in immigrants' levels of arts participation over time, but also, specifically, seeing a decline in immigrants' participation rates in Latin, Spanish, and salsa music activities.

Analytical approach

For analyses in this chapter, I use SPPA data from 2002, 2008, and 2012. With multiple waves of data, I can examine the effects of additional years of living in the US over the decade from 2002 to 2012. Combining the three cross-sectional survey waves provides variation so that the potential cohort effects posed by the remarkable demographic shifts from the US' first major wave of immigration to its second major wave can be examined separately from an immigrant's length of residence in the US.

The outcome variables for these analyses are necessarily limited to arts participation measures available in the SPPA Combined data file. The SPPA Combined data file includes normalized weights that enable investigations of question asked in the SPPA's Core 1, which encompasses questions about arts attendance.¹¹ As discussed in Chapter II, measures of attendance at seven benchmark arts have been asked consistently in each SPPA wave and I investigate these outcome variables in this chapter. In addition to the benchmark arts measures, several additional attendance-based and reading questions have been asked consistently since at least 2002: reading literature (aggregate measure of reading novels, poetry, or plays) and reading books; visiting historic parks or monuments; touring buildings or neighborhoods for their historic or design value; attending arts and cultural fairs or festivals, such as a crafts fair; and attending live performances of dance (other than ballet). Questions about attendance at Latin, Spanish or salsa music events and at outdoor festivals with performing artists were asked in 2008 and 2012; I also investigate these measures of arts participation. Here, I describe the regression models used for this investigation, followed by explication of how key variables are measured in the Current Population Survey on which the SPPA is piggybacked:

- Model 1 is a simple regression that analyzes the effect of years-since-entry on arts attendance and reading. Model 1 uses dummy variables for brackets of years-since-entry, omitting US-born individuals.
- Model 2 introduces year-of-entry fixed-effects in effort to control for cohort effects. Additionally, in this model I examine if becoming a US citizen is associated with greater acculturation in patterns of arts participation among immigrants.
- Model 3 builds on Model 2 by also including demographic factors known to be influential determinants of arts attendance and reading behaviors. I include demographic control variables that have been previously established in the research literature as being significant predictors of arts participation: income,¹² educational attainment, age, race/ethnicity and gender as described in Chapter III.¹³

¹¹ By creating a crosswalk file of the 2002, 2008 and 2012 SPPA variables, I determined that potentially up to eight indicators could be used to examine trends of making and doing art across the three survey waves. However, survey weights in the Combined SPPA data file are designed and tested for the questions asked in the SPPA Core 1 survey modules and it is not recommended to apply these weights to variables collected through other SPPS survey modules (M. Menzer, personal communication, August 28, 2014). Hence, I only use attendance and reading variables collected in the SPPA's Core 1 module for this chapter.

¹² While the 2012 SPPA asked about levels of household income above \$75,000 in greater detail, I collapse these categories to match those available in the 2002 SPPA.

¹³ I did not include childhood arts lessons as the relevant questions were asked in a separate SPPA module than the one for which normalized weights are available.

Immigrants’ year of entry into the US. An important variable available in the CPS that enables this pilot investigation is immigrants’ year of entry into the US, which I also use to calculate immigrants’ years since entry into the US. For immigrant’s year of entry into the US, each bracket must include at least two full years of entrants. Table 12 shows each SPPA wave and the year of entry brackets available; some brackets cover two years, some cover part of an additional third year (shaded cells in Table 12), but other brackets cover 10 years or more (Passel and Cohn 2009).

Table 12. Year of Entry Brackets, by SPPA wave

2012 SPPA	2008 SPPA	2002 SPPA
Before 1950	Before 1950	Before 1950
1950-1959	1950-1959	1950-1959
1960-1964	1960-1964	1960-1964
1965-1969	1965-1969	1965-1969
1970-1974	1970-1974	1970-1974
1975-1979	1975-1979	1975-1979
1980-1981	1980-1981	1980-1981
1982-1983	1982-1983	1982-1983
1984-1985	1984-1985	1984-1985
1986-1987	1986-1987	1986-1987
1988-1989	1988-1989	1988-1989
1990-1991	1990-1991	1990-1991
1992-1993	1992-1993	1992-1993
1994-1995	1994-1995	1994-1995
1996-1997	1996-1997	1996-1997
1998-1999	1998-1999	1998-1999
2000-2001	2000-2001	2000-2002
2002-2003	2002-2003	
2004-2005	2004-2005	
2006-2007	2006-2008	
2008-2009		
2010-2012		

US immigration history is varied, as discussed in Chapter II. In the first-half of the 20th-century immigrants primarily came from Europe. During the second half of the 20th-century, the majority of immigrants came from Latin America and Asia. Notably, the Mexican-born immigrant population in the US began to grow faster in the 1970s, both in terms of the proportion of the total immigrant population and number of immigrants. In 1970, Mexican-born immigrants made up 8% of the immigrant population in the US, by 1980 they comprised 23%, and since 1990 the portion has been around 30% of the immigration population (Migration Policy Institute Data Hub 2017). A range of economic and social

factors, as well as changes to US immigration policy are drivers behind the changes to the size and composition of the US' immigrant population. Thus, any investigation into trends in immigrant behavior must account for these substantial shifts in overall patterns of immigration.¹⁴

Years since entry into the US. This variable is calculated using immigrants' year of entry into the US and year of data collection (Table 13). As shown in Table 12, year of entry into the US is not a precise measure. Hence, length of time since entry is an ordinal measure that includes some imprecision around the cut-off points for those who report having entered the US within the last 2 years, as well as for those whose years-since-entry ranges are longer than 22 years. Using the three SPPA waves of data creates the variation necessary to examine both years-since-entry and potential year of entry cohort effects.

Table 13. Estimated Calculations of Years Since Entry into US

Years Since Entry	2012 SPPA	2008 SPPA	2002 SPPA
0 to 2	2010-2012 ¹	2006-2008 ²	2000-2002 ³
3 to 4	2008-2009	2004-2005	1998-1999
5 to 6	2006-2007	2002-2003	1996-1997
7 to 8	2004-2005	2000-2001	1994-1995
9 to 10	2002-2003	1998-1999	1992-1993
11 to 12	2000-2001	1996-1997	1990-1991
12 to 14	1998-1999	1994-1995	1988-1989
15 to 16	1996-1997	1992-1993	1986-1987
17 to 18	1994-1995	1990-1991	1984-1985
19 to 20	1992-1993	1988-1989	1982-1983
21 to 22	1990-1991	1986-1987	1980-1981
23 to 27/28	1988-1989 1986-1987	1984-1985 1982-1983	1975-1979
28 to 32/33	1984-1985 1982-1983 1980-1981	1980-1981 1975-1979	1970-1974
33 to 37/38	1975-1979	1970-1974	1965-1969
38 to 42/43	1970-1974	1965-1969	1960-1964
43 or more years	1965-1969 1960-1964 1950-1959 Before 1950	1960-1964 1950-1959 Before 1950	1950-1959 Before 1950

¹ SPPA fielded in August 2012

² SPPA fielded in May 2008

³ SPPA fielded in July 2002

¹⁴ A limitation is that the measure does not account for interim periods spent living outside of the US, but for the purposes of these analyses I assume the measure at least indicates length of strong affiliation with US culture since the time of the survey interview.

Citizenship Status. Surveys generally omit direct questions about legal status because of concerns that immigrants, legal and undocumented,¹⁵ shy away from responding to surveys when such questions are posed because of general mistrust of the government (Camarota and Capizzano 2004). In an effort to reduce response bias, citizenship is derived from a series of questions and this results in being able to identify whether a respondent is a native US citizen, a naturalized citizen, or a non-citizen, as is done in the CPS. Despite this approach to asking about citizenship status, research still suggests that there is self-reporting bias, resulting in an over-reporting of naturalized citizenship and an under-reporting of non-citizen statuses. I provide further discussion of potential self-reporting bias in Chapter V.

The purpose of mentioning the potential of self-reporting bias here in Chapter IV is to acknowledge this possibility. To check for potential self-reporting bias, I applied an adjustment methodology, first presented by Passel and Clark (1997) and recently treated by Van Hook and Bachmeier (2013), and applying sensitivity analyses. I find that only 0.6% of the 2012 SPPA sample is affected by the adjustment. Examining adjusted-data and non-adjusted data resulted in negligible differences, and given that the adjustment may introduce error, I move forward using non-adjusted data in this chapter.

Results

As the first step of my investigation into whether acculturation may impact engagement with the arts, I examine how rates of arts participation changed over the last decade for both foreign- and native-born US residents. Table 14 provides comparison of mean arts participation levels for US- and foreign-born individuals in 2002, 2008, and 2012. Across almost all arts participation outcome measures investigated, the foreign-born populations in each survey year reported significantly lower participation rates than did US-born individuals. This pattern mirrors that reported in a previous investigation of “non-citizens” over these same years (Silber and Triplett 2015). The single exception to this trend was in attendance at live Latin music events, for which foreign-born immigrants reported higher rates than US-born natives in both 2008 and 2012, 10% versus 4% respectively, in both years.

¹⁵ There are different views on what terminology should be applied to those illegally residing in the US, e.g. undocumented, illegal, unauthorized, and the implicit political leanings each implies. This study claims no particular view on what terminology should be used, but rather adopts the language generally used in federal and state welfare policies.

Table 14. Rates of Arts Attendance & Reading, by Nativity (2002, 2008 & 2012)

		Means			Standard Errors		
		2002	2008	2012	2002	2008	2012
Attend live jazz	US-Born	11%	9%	9%	0.39%	0.30%	0.35%
	Foreign-Born	7%	4%	5%	0.89%	0.52%	0.66%
Attend live classical music	US-Born	12%	10%	9%	0.39%	0.37%	0.36%
	Foreign-Born	8%	7%	6%	0.82%	0.59%	0.55%
Attend live opera	US-Born	3%	2%	2%	0.16%	0.15%	0.15%
	Foreign-Born	4%	2%	2%	0.50%	0.36%	0.38%
Attend live musical	US-Born	18%	18%	17%	0.41%	0.43%	0.47%
	Foreign-Born	9%	9%	8%	0.71%	0.92%	0.71%
Attend live non-musical play	US-Born	13%	10%	9%	0.42%	0.35%	0.34%
	Foreign-Born	7%	5%	4%	0.66%	0.64%	0.53%
Attend live ballet	US-Born	4%	3%	3%	0.22%	0.17%	0.18%
	Foreign-Born	3%	3%	2%	0.42%	0.43%	0.42%
Attend live dance (other than ballet)	US-Born	7%	5%	6%	0.25%	0.22%	0.22%
	Foreign-Born	5%	4%	4%	0.66%	0.54%	0.57%
Visit an art museum	US-Born	27%	24%	22%	0.48%	0.43%	0.49%
	Foreign-Born	23%	17%	16%	1.30%	1.10%	1.08%
Visit a crafts fair or visual arts festival	US-Born	35%	27%	24%	0.52%	0.50%	0.51%
	Foreign-Born	22%	13%	13%	1.28%	0.93%	0.96%
Visit...park/monument, ...bldgs/ neighborhoods...	US-Born	33%	27%	26%	0.55%	0.50%	0.54%
	Foreign-Born	22%	15%	15%	1.25%	1.17%	1.06%
Read Books	US-Born	59%	57%	57%	0.47%	0.50%	0.59%
	Foreign-Born	44%	38%	39%	1.41%	1.38%	1.55%
Read literature	US-Born	48%	52%	48%	0.50%	0.56%	0.57%
	Foreign-Born	33%	35%	31%	1.65%	1.44%	1.45%
Attend live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	US-Born		4%	4%		0.31%	0.21%
	Foreign-Born		10%	10%		1.26%	0.83%
Visit an outdoor festival [with] performing artists	US-Born		22%	22%		0.42%	0.48%
	Foreign-Born		13%	13%		0.93%	0.93%

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, Combined File (2002, 2008 & 2012)

The results in Table 14 show relatively steady levels of arts participation, such as for attending live opera and ballet, or significant declines in the rates of participation, such as for visiting art museums, craft fairs, parks, monuments, buildings or neighborhoods. The general decline in measures of arts participation for the total adult US population is discussed elsewhere (Silber and Triplett 2015), but pertinent to this investigation are the relative rates of decline for US- and foreign-born over time.

In Table 15, I present the results of the three regression models for each outcome variable investigated. The estimates for the demographic controls are included in Appendix Table D due to space constraints. As has been seen in prior research, higher levels of educational attainment and income positively predict higher levels of arts attendance and reading (Appendix Table D, Model 3). However, even beyond the influence of demographic characteristics and year of entry cohorts, the number of years since immigrants entered the US does seem to confer some uniquely attributable effects (Table 15, Model 3):

- **Attending live jazz.** The observed means in Table 14 indicate that immigrants attend jazz performances at lower rates than US-born; 5% versus 9% respectively, in 2012. Interestingly in the regression analyses, however, once controlling for variation in socioeconomic and demographic factors, being a first-generation immigrant positively predicts attendance at live jazz events. Having lived in the US for less than fifteen years, predicts lower chances of attending live jazz events.
- **Attending live musical plays.** Living in the US for fewer than 15 years is a significant negative predictor of attending a live musical play. However, living in the US for 15 or more years did not seem to predict any difference in attendance between immigrants and US-born individuals.
- **Attending live Latin, Spanish or salsa music events.** As noted in Chapter III, attending Latin music events is the single arts attendance measure that has been the exception to a pattern of disparity between immigrants and US-born individuals. Interestingly, the regression analyses suggest that the interest that first-generation immigrants have in these events may be strongest during the earliest years that they live in the US. After having lived in the US for 5-6 years, no significant differences are detected between the immigrant and US-born populations (Table 15, Model 3).

First-generation immigrants residing in the US for longer periods seems to increase the chances that one goes to see a live musical play, while longer residence in the US appears to decrease the chances of first-generation immigrants attending live Latin music events.

Finally, I do not find evidence in these analyses that becoming a US citizen is associated with greater acculturation in patterns of arts participation among foreign-born immigrants. Any significant and positive effects of being a naturalized citizen in Model 2 no longer remain significant or positive once socioeconomic and demographic factors are controlled for in Model 3. Naturalization is not a necessary characteristic for immigrants to be involved in arts or most other forms of civic engagement outside of voting, but it is an important indicator of immigrant integration in general (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015).

Table 15. Regression Results

	Attend live jazz			Attend live classical music			Attend live opera			Attend live musical			Attend live non-musical play			Attend live ballet		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
YEARS LIVES IN THE US (US-born omitted)																		
0 to 2	0.991 0.02	1.114** 0.05	1.084* 0.05	0.994 0.02	1.053 0.04	1.032 0.04	1.011 0.01	1.012 0.02	1.006 0.02	0.923*** 0.02	0.969 0.03	0.930** 0.03	0.946*** 0.01	1.001 0.03	0.98 0.03	1.009 0.01	1.011 0.02	1.003 0.02
3 to 4	0.966** 0.01	1.141** 0.06	1.119** 0.06	0.982 0.02	1.092* 0.06	1.08 0.05	1.011 0.01	0.99 0.03	0.982 0.03	0.887*** 0.01	0.900* 0.05	0.862** 0.05	0.946*** 0.01	1.053 0.05	1.037 0.05	0.996 0.01	0.994 0.03	0.984 0.03
5 to 6	0.957*** 0.01	1.128** 0.06	1.098* 0.06	0.972 0.02	1.042 0.06	1.023 0.05	0.993 0.01	0.993 0.03	0.986 0.03	0.915*** 0.01	0.961 0.05	0.918* 0.05	0.943*** 0.01	1.005 0.04	0.991 0.04	0.987 0.01	0.978 0.02	0.968 0.03
7 to 8	0.942*** 0.01	1.097* 0.05	1.083 0.05	0.927*** 0.01	1.013 0.05	1.008 0.05	0.993 0.01	0.972 0.03	0.967 0.03	0.892*** 0.01	0.926 0.05	0.890** 0.05	0.937*** 0.01	1.009 0.04	1.015 0.04	0.974*** 0.00	0.967 0.02	0.96 0.02
9 to 10	0.942*** 0.01	1.09 0.06	1.076 0.06	0.952*** 0.01	1.021 0.06	1.03 0.05	0.995 0.01	0.971 0.03	0.965 0.03	0.893*** 0.02	0.887** 0.05	0.858*** 0.05	0.947*** 0.01	1.002 0.04	1.008 0.04	0.995 0.01	0.971 0.03	0.966 0.03
11 to 12	0.948*** 0.01	1.105* 0.06	1.111** 0.06	0.947*** 0.01	1.013 0.05	1.024 0.05	0.99 0.01	0.962 0.03	0.961 0.03	0.891*** 0.01	0.931 0.04	0.911* 0.04	0.946*** 0.01	0.993 0.04	1.015 0.04	0.983*** 0.01	0.973 0.02	0.974 0.02
12 to 14	0.953*** 0.01	1.091 0.06	1.099* 0.06	0.973 0.02	1.037 0.06	1.06 0.06	0.991 0.01	0.954 0.03	0.95 0.03	0.895*** 0.01	0.903* 0.05	0.881** 0.05	0.937*** 0.01	1.006 0.04	1.025 0.04	0.991 0.01	0.975 0.03	0.974 0.03
15 to 16	0.943*** 0.01	1.100* 0.06	1.123** 0.06	0.961** 0.02	1.008 0.05	1.023 0.05	1.001 0.01	0.971 0.03	0.973 0.03	0.930*** 0.02	0.939 0.05	0.92 0.05	0.949*** 0.01	0.974 0.04	1.008 0.04	1.001 0.01	0.983 0.03	0.986 0.03
17 to 18	0.951*** 0.01	1.082 0.06	1.115** 0.06	0.961** 0.02	0.997 0.05	1.042 0.05	0.987* 0.01	0.943* 0.03	0.948 0.03	0.889*** 0.01	0.92 0.05	0.924 0.05	0.940*** 0.01	0.989 0.04	1.05 0.04	0.993 0.01	0.974 0.03	0.982 0.03
19 to 20	0.961*** 0.01	1.109* 0.06	1.138** 0.06	0.985 0.02	1.033 0.05	1.093* 0.05	0.997 0.01	0.962 0.03	0.966 0.03	0.920*** 0.02	0.918 0.05	0.921 0.05	0.954*** 0.01	0.983 0.04	1.039 0.04	0.988 0.01	0.97 0.03	0.979 0.03
21 to 22	0.958*** 0.01	1.093 0.06	1.135** 0.06	0.954*** 0.01	0.978 0.05	1.032 0.05	0.989* 0.01	0.942* 0.03	0.948* 0.03	0.923*** 0.02	0.948 0.05	0.952 0.05	0.950*** 0.01	0.973 0.04	1.04 0.04	1.001 0.01	0.977 0.03	0.992 0.03
23 to 27/28	0.963*** 0.01	1.081 0.07	1.132** 0.07	0.966** 0.01	0.979 0.05	1.04 0.05	1.005 0.01	0.958 0.03	0.966 0.03	0.929*** 0.02	0.942 0.05	0.955 0.05	0.958*** 0.01	0.96 0.04	1.037 0.05	0.992 0.01	0.97 0.03	0.978 0.03
28 to 32/33	0.953*** 0.01	1.059 0.06	1.131** 0.06	0.965*** 0.01	0.964 0.05	1.045 0.05	0.997 0.01	0.943* 0.03	0.953 0.03	0.916*** 0.01	0.932 0.05	0.961 0.05	0.944*** 0.01	0.933 0.04	1.034 0.04	0.991 0.01	0.958 0.03	0.98 0.03
33 to 37/38	0.964*** 0.01	1.031 0.06	1.129** 0.07	0.967** 0.01	0.932 0.05	1.04 0.06	0.998 0.01	0.929** 0.03	0.947* 0.03	0.918*** 0.02	0.904* 0.05	0.952 0.05	0.953*** 0.01	0.912* 0.04	1.044 0.04	0.996 0.01	0.945** 0.03	0.976 0.03
38 to 42/43	0.978 0.02	1.026 0.07	1.149** 0.08	0.982 0.02	0.932 0.06	1.048 0.07	1.019 0.01	0.936* 0.04	0.958 0.04	0.931*** 0.02	0.888** 0.05	0.951 0.06	0.938*** 0.01	0.886** 0.04	1.04 0.06	1.006 0.01	0.934** 0.03	0.97 0.04
43 or more years	0.982* 0.01	1.015 0.07	1.167** 0.08	1.007 0.01	0.942 0.06	1.092 0.07	1.01 0.01	0.908*** 0.03	0.934* 0.04	0.974* 0.02	0.91 0.06	1.004 0.07	0.988 0.01	0.903* 0.05	1.096 0.06	1.016 0.01	0.946 0.03	0.992 0.04
CITIZENSHIP STATUS (Non-citizen omitted)																		
Naturalized Citizen	1.011 0.01	0.982** 0.01		1.030*** 0.01	0.979** 0.01		1.019*** 0.01	1.008 0.01		1.042*** 0.01	0.980** 0.01		1.028*** 0.01	0.991 0.01		1.006 0.00	0.992 0.01	
Native Citizen	1.037*** 0.01	1.016 0.01		1.016 0.01	0.989 0.01		0.997 0.01	0.991 0.01		1.053*** 0.02	1.008 0.02		1.050*** 0.02	1.017 0.01		1.018* 0.01	1.007 0.01	
YEAR OF ENTRY INTO THE US (US-born omitted)																		
Before 1950	0.962 0.07	0.864** 0.06		1.069 0.08	0.911 0.07		1.124*** 0.05	1.085* 0.05		1.063 0.07	0.963 0.07		1.163*** 0.06	0.948 0.06		1.063 0.04	1.02 0.04	
1950-1959	1.004 0.07	0.897 0.06		1.07 0.07	0.932 0.07		1.093** 0.04	1.063 0.04		1.087 0.07	1.001 0.07		1.109** 0.06	0.914 0.05		1.077* 0.04	1.037 0.04	
1960-1964	0.991 0.07	0.883* 0.06		1.054 0.07	0.92 0.06		1.091** 0.04	1.063 0.04		1.114* 0.07	1.035 0.07		1.097* 0.05	0.914* 0.05		1.114*** 0.04	1.072* 0.04	
1965-1969	0.971 0.06	0.879** 0.06		1.044 0.06	0.945 0.06		1.086** 0.04	1.071* 0.04		1.052 0.06	1.005 0.06		1.089* 0.05	0.941 0.05		1.084** 0.04	1.056 0.04	
1970-1974	0.964 0.06	0.902 0.06		1.045 0.06	0.981 0.05		1.05 0.03	1.043 0.03		1.035 0.05	1.027 0.06		1.06 0.05	0.948 0.04		1.069** 0.03	1.054 0.04	
1975-1979	0.935 0.06	0.893* 0.06		1.006 0.05	0.962 0.05		1.045 0.03	1.042 0.03		1.013 0.05	1.023 0.06		1.059 0.04	0.974 0.04		1.043 0.03	1.033 0.03	
1980-1981	0.898* 0.05	0.868** 0.05		0.975 0.05	0.947 0.05		1.039 0.03	1.04 0.03		0.979 0.05	1.008 0.05		1.023 0.04	0.958 0.04		1.051* 0.03	1.044 0.03	
1982-1983	0.92 0.05	0.886** 0.05		0.971 0.05	0.954 0.05		1.045 0.03	1.052 0.03		1.008 0.05	1.037 0.06		1.032 0.04	0.982 0.04		1.034 0.03	1.035 0.03	
1984-1985	0.915 0.05	0.888** 0.05		0.986 0.05	0.963 0.05		1.031 0.03	1.03 0.03		0.992 0.06	1.018 0.06		1.013 0.04	0.954 0.04		1.038 0.03	1.034 0.03	
1986-1987	0.909 0.05	0.892* 0.05		0.99 0.05	0.993 0.05		1.028 0.03	1.034 0.03		1.022 0.05	1.064 0.05		1.028 0.04	0.992 0.04		1.035 0.03	1.04 0.03	
1988-1989	0.879** 0.05	0.868** 0.05		0.947 0.05	0.95 0.05		1.019 0.03	1.027 0.03		1.007 0.05	1.044 0.06		0.968 0.04	0.939 0.04		1.021 0.03	1.027 0.03	
1990-1991	0.900** 0.05	0.896** 0.05		0.966 0.05	0.974 0.05		1.038 0.03	1.05 0.03		0.998 0.05	1.051 0.05		0.98 0.04	0.96 0.04		1.03 0.02	1.033 0.03	
1992-1993	0.884** 0.05	0.889** 0.05		0.947 0.05	0.953 0.05		1.016 0.03	1.03 0.03		1.069 0.06	1.122** 0.06		1.009 0.04	0.998 0.04		1.044 0.03	1.053* 0.03	
1994-1995	0.905* 0.05	0.910* 0.05		0.948 0.05	0.972 0.05		1.036 0.03	1.051 0.03		1.005 0.05	1.065 0.06		0.963 0.04	0.949 0.04		1.034 0.03	1.047* 0.03	
1996-1997	0.862*** 0.04	0.865*** 0.04		0.936 0.05	0.961 0.05		1.016 0.03	1.027 0.03		0.977 0.05	1.022 0.05		0.989 0.04	0.985 0.04		1.021 0.02	1.029 0.02	
1998-1999	0.914* 0.05	0.922 0.05		0.934 0.05	0.949 0.05		1.031 0.03	1.045 0.03		1.058 0.06	1.106* 0.06		0.967 0.04	0.969 0.04		1.037 0.03	1.048* 0.03	
2000-2001*	0.894** 0.04	0.904** 0.04		0.928 0.04	0.953 0.04		1.012 0.03	1.025 0.03		1.002 0.04	1.05 0.05		0.995 0.03	1 0.03		1.028 0.02	1.039* 0.02	
2002-2003	0.873** 0.05	0.906* 0.05		0.942 0.05	0.99 0.05		0.999 0.03	1.019 0.03		1.018 0.05	1.094* 0.06		0.983 0.04	1.015 0.04		1.044 0.03	1.066** 0.03	
2004-2005	0.861*** 0.05	0.889** 0.05		0.899** 0.04	0.947 0.04		1.001 0.03	1.02 0.03		1.009 0.05	1.078 0.06		0.936* 0.04	0.963 0.04		1.008 0.02	1.028 0.02	
2006-2007*	0.898** 0.04	0.933 0.05		0.957 0.05	1.005 0.05		0.974 0.02	0.989 0.02		0.995 0.04	1.055 0.05		0.973 0.03	1.005 0.03		1.012 0.02	1.031 0.03	
2008-2009	0.843*** 0.05	0.854*** 0.05		0.895* 0.06	0.916 0.05		1.016 0.04	1.028 0.04		1.027 0.06	1.077 0.06		0.908** 0.04	0.929 0.04		1.004 0.03	1.017 0.03	
2010-2012 (omitted)	-	-		-	-		-	-		-								

(Continued) Table 15. Regression Results

	Attend live dance (other than ballet)			Visit an art museum			Visit a crafts fair or visual arts festival			Visit...park/monument, ...bldgs/ neighborhoods...			Read Books			Read literature		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
YEARS LIVES IN THE US (US-born omitted)																		
0 to 2	0.973***	1.004	0.975	0.986	1.076	0.97	0.833***	0.884***	0.891***	0.931**	1.1	1.032	0.884***	1.091	0.99	0.880***	1.04	0.97
	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.03	0.08	0.08
3 to 4	0.978*	1.018	0.984	0.923***	0.991	0.909	0.863***	0.907	0.935	0.891***	1.109	1.036	0.817***	1.05	0.964	0.827***	0.984	0.905
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.09	0.09
5 to 6	0.984	1.052	1.021	0.993	1.081	0.964	0.867***	0.917*	0.932	0.896***	1.063	0.982	0.859***	1.131	1	0.860***	1.07	0.971
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.09	0.08	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.09
7 to 8	0.979**	1.018	0.99	0.907***	0.967	0.891	0.858***	0.882**	0.926	0.867***	1.04	0.988	0.801***	0.996	0.9	0.821***	0.979	0.897
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.09	0.08	0.03	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.09	0.08
9 to 10	0.976**	1.022	0.995	0.943**	0.994	0.936	0.860***	0.864**	0.931	0.858***	0.999	0.962	0.825***	1.063	0.993	0.821***	1.007	0.943
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.09
11 to 12	0.987	1.023	1.002	0.927***	0.967	0.918	0.873***	0.869***	0.961	0.883***	1.014	1.021	0.856***	1.06	0.995	0.879***	1.052	1
	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.09	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.09
12 to 14	1.001	1.028	0.998	0.943**	0.97	0.937	0.865***	0.836***	0.944	0.928**	1.059	1.059	0.833***	1.019	0.968	0.834***	0.997	0.922
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.09
15 to 16	0.979	1.021	1.005	0.945**	0.955	0.938	0.877***	0.840***	0.964	0.872***	0.961	0.989	0.799***	0.989	0.957	0.838***	1.011	0.984
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.08	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.10
17 to 18	0.988	1.014	0.997	0.906***	0.889	0.896	0.884***	0.834***	0.984	0.858***	0.923	0.976	0.778***	0.922	0.898	0.832***	1.009	0.965
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.02	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.11	0.10
19 to 20	0.973**	1.009	0.997	0.949**	0.925	0.952	0.875***	0.796***	0.965	0.896***	0.972	1.03	0.858***	1.038	1.039	0.836***	1.017	0.993
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.10	0.03	0.12	0.11	0.02	0.11	0.11
21 to 22	0.989	1.01	0.994	0.932***	0.904	0.937	0.879***	0.808***	0.983	0.897***	0.938	1.036	0.827***	0.968	0.953	0.854***	1.014	0.975
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.09	0.09	0.03	0.11	0.10	0.02	0.11	0.10
23 to 27/28	0.987	1.011	0.999	0.966*	0.885	0.946	0.889***	0.767***	0.961	0.909***	0.928	1.028	0.858***	0.975	0.987	0.847***	0.992	0.972
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.09	0.03	0.11	0.10	0.02	0.11	0.11
28 to 32/33	0.982**	1.007	1.003	0.939***	0.831**	0.917	0.863***	0.716***	0.965	0.880***	0.875	1.029	0.825***	0.914	0.934	0.843***	0.971	0.952
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.01	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.10	0.02	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.11	0.11
33 to 37/38	0.987	0.996	1.002	0.937**	0.778***	0.906	0.912***	0.694***	1.013	0.902***	0.852*	1.065	0.804***	0.829	0.858	0.853***	0.909	0.905
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.08	0.02	0.08	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.10
38 to 42/43	0.981**	0.982	0.995	0.966	0.764***	0.912	0.961	0.689***	1.074	0.916***	0.825*	1.069	0.910***	0.883	0.937	0.896***	0.908	0.93
	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.05	0.09	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.03	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.11	0.12
43 or more years	0.989	0.98	1.004	0.968*	0.732***	0.941	0.925***	0.613***	1.052	0.933***	0.803*	1.143	0.938***	0.85	0.938	0.931***	0.899	0.95
	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.07	0.09	0.02	0.05	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.13	0.02	0.11	0.12	0.02	0.11	0.12
CITIZENSHIP STATUS (Non-citizen omitted)																		
Naturalized Citizen		1.013*	0.997		1.057***	0.969**		1.056***	0.995		1.036***	0.954***		1.088***	0.950***		1.065***	0.949***
		0.01	0.01		0.01	0.01		0.01	0.01		0.01	0.01		0.02	0.02		0.02	0.02
Native Citizen		1.01	0.993		1.042*	0.978		1.084***	1.024		1.082***	1.003		1.139***	1.015		1.115***	1.001
		0.01	0.01		0.02	0.02		0.02	0.02		0.03	0.02		0.03	0.03		0.03	0.03
YEAR OF ENTRY INTO THE US (US-born omitted)																		
Before 1950		1.013	0.974		1.294**	1.015		1.537***	0.914		1.184	0.875		1.169	1.113		1.042	1.01
		0.05	0.05		0.13	0.10		0.13	0.09		0.13	0.10		0.17	0.15		0.14	0.14
1950-1959		1.007	0.989		1.344***	1.077		1.597***	0.954		1.225*	0.893		1.172	1.129		1.11	1.106
		0.05	0.05		0.13	0.10		0.14	0.09		0.13	0.09		0.16	0.14		0.14	0.14
1960-1964		1.007	0.981		1.331***	1.073		1.545***	0.935		1.222*	0.901		1.177	1.138		1.104	1.097
		0.04	0.04		0.13	0.10		0.13	0.09		0.13	0.09		0.15	0.13		0.14	0.13
1965-1969		1.009	0.992		1.242**	1.054		1.430***	0.935		1.14	0.899		1.032	1.054		0.987	1.047
		0.04	0.04		0.12	0.10		0.11	0.08		0.12	0.09		0.14	0.13		0.12	0.13
1970-1974		0.984	0.983		1.218**	1.111		1.356***	0.971		1.115	0.95		1.049	1.139		1.017	1.133
		0.04	0.04		0.11	0.10		0.10	0.07		0.10	0.09		0.13	0.12		0.12	0.13
1975-1979		0.981	0.979		1.148*	1.067		1.295***	0.988		1.064	0.944		0.992	1.087		0.954	1.076
		0.04	0.04		0.09	0.08		0.09	0.07		0.10	0.08		0.11	0.11		0.11	0.12
1980-1981		0.97	0.979		1.078	1.04		1.210***	0.969		1.032	0.931		0.925	1.043		0.894	1.041
		0.04	0.04		0.09	0.08		0.08	0.07		0.09	0.08		0.11	0.11		0.10	0.12
1982-1983		0.975	0.983		1.128	1.106		1.211***	0.985		1.034	0.97		0.903	1.014		0.849	0.967
		0.04	0.04		0.09	0.08		0.09	0.07		0.09	0.09		0.10	0.11		0.10	0.11
1984-1985		0.973	0.984		1.113	1.071		1.186**	0.979		1.042	0.977		0.931	1.023		0.868	0.99
		0.04	0.04		0.09	0.08		0.08	0.07		0.09	0.09		0.11	0.10		0.10	0.11
1986-1987		0.988	1.004		1.035	1.019		1.116*	0.957		1.019	0.977		0.913	1.014		0.91	1.02
		0.04	0.04		0.08	0.08		0.07	0.06		0.09	0.08		0.09	0.10		0.09	0.11
1988-1989		0.971	0.983		1.015	1.023		1.148**	1.002		0.962	0.94		0.909	1.029		0.905	1.044
		0.04	0.04		0.08	0.07		0.07	0.06		0.09	0.08		0.10	0.11		0.10	0.11
1990-1991		0.987	1.009		1.014	1.046		1.100*	0.983		0.986	0.981		0.918	1.043		0.897	1.017
		0.04	0.04		0.08	0.07		0.06	0.06		0.08	0.08		0.09	0.09		0.10	0.10
1992-1993		0.96	0.978		0.996	1.033		1.122*	1.016		0.946	0.967		0.877	0.984		0.882	0.997
		0.04	0.04		0.07	0.07		0.07	0.06		0.08	0.08		0.08	0.09</			

(Continued) Table 15. Regression Results

	Attend live Latin, Spanish or salsa music			Visit an outdoor festival [with] performing artists		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
YEARS LIVES IN THE US (US-born omitted)						
0 to 2	1.054*	1.124***	1.089*	0.883***	0.996	0.915**
	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.04
3 to 4	1.074**	1.227	1.144	0.903***	1.24	1.086
	0.03	0.23	0.24	0.03	0.24	0.22
5 to 6	1.064**	1.170***	1.113*	0.928***	1.117	1.016
	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.07
7 to 8	1.111***	1.308	1.173	0.919***	1.198	1.064
	0.04	0.24	0.23	0.03	0.23	0.21
9 to 10	1.046	1.089	1.057	0.882***	1.064	0.97
	0.03	0.08	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.08
11 to 12	1.071***	1.263	1.174	0.929***	1.17	1.073
	0.02	0.21	0.22	0.02	0.21	0.20
12 to 14	1.097***	1.112	1.07	0.930**	1.116	1.027
	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.03	0.11	0.10
15 to 16	1.107***	1.291	1.223	0.914***	1.097	1.022
	0.04	0.21	0.22	0.03	0.19	0.18
17 to 18	1.083***	1.122	1.04	0.918***	1.141	1.036
	0.03	0.14	0.15	0.03	0.13	0.12
19 to 20	1.061**	1.191	1.11	0.908***	1.053	0.985
	0.03	0.19	0.20	0.02	0.17	0.16
21 to 22	1.157***	1.313*	1.222	0.923***	1.155	1.069
	0.05	0.20	0.20	0.02	0.15	0.15
23 to 27/28	1.055**	1.245	1.141	0.939***	1.124	1.054
	0.02	0.20	0.20	0.02	0.16	0.16
28 to 32/33	1.060***	1.315	1.189	0.898***	1.06	1.02
	0.02	0.22	0.22	0.01	0.16	0.16
33 to 37/38	1.047**	1.313	1.164	0.931***	1.063	1.038
	0.02	0.24	0.23	0.02	0.18	0.18
38 to 42/43	1.026	1.28	1.157	0.927**	1.02	1.003
	0.02	0.23	0.23	0.03	0.18	0.18
43 or more years	1.019	1.307	1.186	0.939***	0.981	0.993
	0.01	0.25	0.25	0.02	0.18	0.19
CITIZENSHIP STATUS (Non-citizen omitted)						
Naturalized Citizen		0.973	1.008		1.043***	1.009
		0.02	0.02		0.02	0.01
Native Citizen		1.027	1.026		1.081***	1.028
		0.02	0.02		0.02	0.03
YEAR OF ENTRY INTO THE US (US-born omitted)						
Before 1950		0.79	0.825		0.954	1.006
		0.15	0.18		0.18	0.20
1950-1959		0.809	0.856		1.009	1.059
		0.15	0.18		0.19	0.21
1960-1964		0.804	0.826		0.974	0.989
		0.15	0.17		0.19	0.20
1965-1969		0.824	0.849		0.982	1.013
		0.16	0.18		0.18	0.19
1970-1974		0.838	0.881		0.913	0.957
		0.15	0.17		0.16	0.17
1975-1979		0.825	0.864		0.908	0.951
		0.14	0.16		0.14	0.16
1980-1981		0.848	0.874		0.874	0.911
		0.15	0.17		0.13	0.15
1982-1983		0.886	0.918		0.872	0.917
		0.15	0.17		0.13	0.14
1984-1985		0.805	0.827		0.878	0.922
		0.13	0.15		0.13	0.14
1986-1987		0.853	0.857		0.832	0.88
		0.14	0.15		0.11	0.13
1988-1989		0.95	0.948		0.917	0.981
		0.16	0.17		0.14	0.15
1990-1991		0.935	0.934		0.843	0.915
		0.13	0.14		0.10	0.11
1992-1993		0.912	0.926		0.902	0.963
		0.15	0.16		0.14	0.16
1994-1995		1.058	1.053		0.863	0.949
		0.14	0.15		0.09	0.10
1996-1997		0.877	0.866		0.862	0.917
		0.15	0.16		0.15	0.17
1998-1999		1.007	0.969		0.901	0.951
		0.10	0.10		0.08	0.08
2000-2001*		0.878	0.894		0.834	0.89
		0.15	0.17		0.15	0.17
2002-2003		0.973	0.94		0.866*	0.931
		0.07	0.08		0.07	0.08
2004-2005		0.872	0.907		0.801	0.884
		0.16	0.18		0.15	0.17
2006-2007*		0.916*	0.918		0.922	0.979
		0.05	0.05		0.05	0.05
2008-2009		0.921	0.95		0.764	0.833
		0.18	0.20		0.15	0.17
2010-2012 (omitted)		-	-		-	-
SURVEY YEAR (2002 omitted)						
2008			0.00			0.00
2012			0.994			0.996
			0.00			0.01
Constant	1.039***	1.013	0.981	1.249***	1.155***	1.132***
	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.04
Obs.	28,010	28,010	26,947	35,972	35,972	34,148
R-squared	0.016	0.021	0.078	0.007	0.008	0.059

*Significance at the 0.10 level; **Significance at the 0.05 level; ***Significance at the 0.01 level. Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, Combined File (2002, 2008 & 2012). Note: The estimates for the demographic controls are included in Appendix Table D.

Conclusions

The analyses presented in this chapter suggest that residing in the US for longer periods of time, *ceteris paribus*, does indeed impact immigrants' arts attendance patterns. While not all of the examined arts participation outcome variables resulted in significant findings, three outcome variables did show significant results once controlling for socioeconomic and demographic factors. First-generation immigrants residing in the US for longer periods, a minimum of about 15-20 years, seems to increase the chances that one goes to see a live musical play or a live jazz performance; however, longer residence in the US, approximately five years or more, appears to decrease the chances of first-generation immigrants attending live Latin music events. These significant results support the predictions of classical assimilation theory for first-generation immigrants, that over time first-generation immigrants adopt the practices of mainstream American culture and let go of their own. Latin music events are certainly not indicative or representative of all immigrants' cultural practices, but over half (52%) of the immigrant population was from Latin American in 2000 and in 2012. Between these years, the portion of immigrants from Europe declined by 4%, while the portion of immigrants increased by 3% from Asia and by 1% from Africa (Migration Policy Institute Data Hub 2017). So, while the composition of the foreign-born did change over the last decade, it did so only modestly.

Although this pilot investigation proved to be informative, it is important to consider how limitations in the available data impact the scope of investigation that is currently possible. When attempting to isolate the effects of "years since entering the US," available data limit such analysis to differences in years lived in the US during the decade between 2002 and 2012. Hence, the analyses discussed here provide a retrospective look at the marginal effect of years lived in the US within the decade, 2002 to 2012, specifically on arts attendance activities. This approach cannot provide perspective on the absolute lengths of time immigrants live in the US, nor can this data provide perspective on the many forms of arts participation practiced by first-generation immigrants that would provide perspective on the degree of their integration and of retaining their own cultural and artistic practices. This is of particular relevance given that prior research has suggested that immigrants' cultural practices tend to be more oriented to direct participation as opposed to attendance-based (Wali et al. 2002, Moriarty 2004). In light of the growing portion of the immigrant population coming from Asia and Africa, measures indicative of cultural practices from these immigrants' countries of origin would aid in developing a more nuanced understanding of the immigrant population and their cultural integration experiences. Nonetheless, this pilot investigation suggests that there are indeed significant disparities in the rates at which immigrants and US-born persons participate in arts attendance and reading, but, for the most part, that disparity

dissipates the longer one resides in the US. Whether these trends extend beyond the time window analyzed remains an open question.

V. Non-Citizen Immigrants' Legal Statuses

As the immigrant population in the US has grown, increased attention has been paid to the resulting effects on the native population and economy. A topic that has garnered a great deal of attention is the number of undocumented immigrants present in the US and their level of access to public benefits, one example being access to publicly provided health insurance (Ku and Matani 2001, Fremstad and Cox 2004, Goldman et al. 2005, Kaushal and Kaestner 2005, Kim and Shin 2006, Ku 2006). The broader public debate regarding undocumented immigrants often invokes myriad concerns regarding free-ridership, legality, equity, and, in the instance of the example above, the quality of overall public health. For the most part, however, these arguments are based on limited empirical information. Researchers' ability to examine cultural integration or the effect of policies developed to differentially apply to immigrants on the basis of legal statuses is seriously hampered by the limited availability of data that includes measures to be able to determine differences between legal and undocumented status (Van Hook et al. 2015). Only in recent years have data on non-citizen immigration statuses and the means to impute non-citizen immigration statuses – whether legal or undocumented – using replicable methods have become more available. In particular, research seeking to understand health insurance coverage has helped to advance the development and evaluation of imputation methods for empirically analyzing variation between non-citizens (Van Hook et al. 2015, Garfield and Damico 2013, Garfield et al. 2016). Furthermore, there is now broad acknowledgement that a non-citizen immigrant's legal status significantly affects his or her overall well-being in terms of economics, eligibility to public benefits, and the degree of integration across a range of social outcomes (Bachmeier et al. 2014, Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015). This follows logically from the legal restrictions placed on those who are undocumented, but to the best of my knowledge no research has examined if non-citizen immigrants' legal statuses affect immigrant integration in terms of cultural means. While there are no legal restrictions barring non-citizen immigrants – whether documented or undocumented – from accessing and engaging in arts and cultural events and activities, it is possible that participation rates may vary along this potentially divisive line. Herein, I explore whether non-citizen legal statuses significantly factor into arts participation given their important effect on other measures of integration and social well-being.


In this chapter, I first provide further background on why it is necessary to impute non-citizen legal statuses and briefly discuss the merits of available imputation strategies. I then apply an imputation method to the 2008 CPS/SPPA data and investigate whether there are differences in arts participation across citizenship and non-citizens' legal statuses. Finally, I consider how observed differences in arts

participation across citizenship and legal statuses may be explained.

Limited identification of legal status in survey data

How *immigrants* are operationally defined depends on the extent to which these individuals can be identified in survey data. Surveys have typically omitted direct questions about non-citizen immigration statuses on the basis of concerns about the quality of self-reported data about legal status and whether immigrants will respond at all given the potential sensitivity of the questions (Camarota and Capizzano 2004, Bachmeier et al. 2014, United States General Accounting Office 1998). Thus, when variables regarding individuals' immigration statuses are absent from a dataset, proxy groups are created for subsequent analysis. The most coarse-grained proxy for immigration status is the classification of individuals by whether they are native or foreign-born, which is depicted in Figure 5, Level 1. Figure 5 illustrates the hierarchy of the levels of precision of proxy measures used to discuss immigrant groups, which are dependent on available measures in datasets. Foreign-born includes anyone born outside the borders of the United States, Puerto Rico, or any of the US' outlying territories, regardless of individual or parental citizenships.¹⁶ The designation foreign-born therefore encompasses a great deal of heterogeneity, including all immigrants as well as native US citizens who were born outside of the US to parents who are US citizens (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015, 21).

Figure 5. Levels of Proxy Measures Used for Immigrants' Legal Statuses



¹⁶ According to the Immigration and Nationality Act, Section 101(a)(15), the term “immigrant” defines the broad group of aliens (foreign-born) except those who have entered the US under specific nonimmigrant categories. Non-immigrant is another term for legal temporary migrants. <http://www.dhs.gov/ximgtn/statistics/stdfdef.shtml#8> [accessed 1/30/09]

A more refined look at immigration statuses considers citizenship (Figure 5, Level 2). Many federal, nationally representative surveys include questions about citizenship, asking whether a respondent is a US citizen and then if the person is a native or naturalized citizen. The questions used in the Current Population Survey are:

- a. In what country were you born? [If born in US, then end of question sequence; if born in Puerto Rico or US outlying area, then jump to (g)]
- b. In what country was your mother born? [If US, Puerto Rico, or US outlying area, then jump to (g)]
- c. In what country was your father born? [If US, Puerto Rico, or US outlying area, then jump to (g)]
- d. Are you a citizen of the United States?
- e. Were you born a citizen of the United States?
- f. Did you become a citizen of the United States through naturalization?
- g. When did you come to live in the United States?

Immigrants who have resided in the US for at least 5 years as a Legal Permanent Resident and who become legal US citizens are naturalized citizens; naturalization can be attained in fewer than 5 years if the individual is married to US citizen or has served in the US Armed Forces (US Citizenship and Immigration Services 2013). Altogether, this classification scheme enables analyses of differences between native citizens, naturalized citizens, and non-citizen immigrants. Like most national surveys, the CPS can, at best, differentiate between native citizens, naturalized citizens, and non-citizens.¹⁷ Therefore, to analyze measures of arts participation by non-citizen legal statuses using the SPPA, which is conducted as a supplement to the CPS, it is necessary to impute non-citizen survey respondents' legal status into the CPS.

Although examining rates of arts participation across racial and ethnic groups has been an important facet of analysis applied to the SPPA data since its earliest waves (DiMaggio and Ostrower 1992, National Endowment for the Arts 1999, Nichols 2003, Welch and Kim 2010), only in more recent analyses have indicators of immigrant identity been considered. Due to changes in the manner in which the SPPA survey was administered, the first SPPA wave for which analyses examining immigrants' rates of arts participation is possible is 2002. To date, several analyses have investigated differences in rates of arts participation by citizenship status – whether someone self-reports being a native or naturalized citizen, or a noncitizen (Silber and Triplett 2015, Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011, National Endowment for the Arts 2014b). Over a decade ago, DiMaggio and Ostrower (1992, 110-111) noted the need to examine immigrants' arts participation for the purposes of public policy and lamented the fact that it was not possible using data from the SPPA's 1982 and 1985 waves.

¹⁷ Throughout this chapter, the term “citizen” refers to the aggregate group of native and naturalized citizens. If referring to only one group, then “native citizen” or “naturalized citizen” will be explicitly identified.

As discussed earlier, non-citizen immigrants include individuals in the US both lawfully and unlawfully (Figure 5, Level 3), where undocumented immigrants to the US are classified as such if they enter the US unlawfully or overstay their legal, but temporary, time in the US. Few surveys inquire directly about the various types of legal residence within the US (Figure 5, Level 4) that encompasses individuals with divergent histories and reasons for entering, including:

- **Legal Permanent Residents (LPRs):** Non-citizens who are granted lawful, permanent residence in the US. LPRs are also commonly known as green-card holders.
- **Refugees and Asylees:** Individuals accepted into the US based on humanitarian concerns. These individuals must demonstrate existing persecution or have well-founded fear of persecution in their home country. Annual caps limit the number of persons accepted into the US each year.
- **Legal Temporary Migrants (LTMs):** Individuals permitted to enter the US on a temporary basis for specific employment, education, and visitation purposes. In order to enter on a permanent basis, with an option for acquiring US citizenship, the individual must meet the employment, familial, or diversity requirements enforced by the Department of Homeland Security's US Citizenship and Immigration Services.

While some regionally-focused surveys have included direct measures of immigrants' legal statuses, such as the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (LAFANS), which has been recognized as leading the field in terms of balancing the accuracy of self-reports with protecting immigrants identities (Bachmeier et al. 2014), the only nationally-representative survey that directly measures immigrants' legal statuses is the US Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) (Bachmeier et al. 2014, Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015, Van Hook et al. 2015). The 2008 SIPP (Wave 2) asks:¹⁸

- a. Are you a US citizen?
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
- b. How did you become a U.S. citizen?
 - (1) Naturalized
 - (2) Through your (or spouse's) military service in U.S. Armed Forces
 - (3) Adopted by U.S. citizen parent or parents
 - (4) Born in a U.S. Island Area or born in the United States
 - (5) Born abroad of U.S. citizen parent or parents
 - (6) Other

¹⁸ Full questionnaire available at <http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/programs-surveys/sipp/questionnaires/2008/SIPP%202008%20Panel%20Wave%2002%20-%20Topical%20Module%20Questionnaire.pdf> [accessed July 23, 2016]

- c. When you moved to the United States to live, what was your immigration status?
 - (1) Immediate relative or family sponsored permanent resident
 - (2) Employment-based permanent resident
 - (3) Other permanent resident
 - (4) Granted refugee status or granted asylum
 - (5) Non-immigrant (e.g., diplomatic, student, business, or tourist visa)
 - (6) Other
- d. [If non-citizen or non-permanent arrival] Has your status been changed to permanent resident?
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No

Empirical evidence from research using the LAFANS, SIPP and other approaches to collecting data on immigrants' legal statuses suggests that reservations about using direct measures may not be as problematic as they once were thought to be and argue for more widespread use of questions enabling more refined investigations of immigrants' legal statuses (Bachmeier et al. 2014, Van Hook et al. 2015). In the meantime, however, imputation strategies are needed in order to conduct investigations of immigrants' legal statuses and in the next section I review key imputation strategies.

Overview of imputation strategies

There are three general types of imputation strategies used to identify legal and undocumented immigrants in existing data: logical, demographic and statistical (Van Hook et al. 2015). I provide an overview of each approach in this section.

Logical Approach

Logical approaches assign legal status to non-citizens who have characteristics that would make them highly unlikely to be undocumented. The characteristics around which there is some consensus in the literature are:

- **Entering the US prior to 1980.** Immigrants entering the US prior to 1980 are presumed to have legal status, which is a generally applied assumption in other imputation strategies as well (Hoefler et al. 2008, Passel et al. 2004). Two provisions substantiate this assumption: 1) The Registry Provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which allows persons who have been in the US since January 1, 1972, to apply for LPR status, and 2) unauthorized individuals living in the US prior to 1982 were eligible to adjust to LPR status under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.
- **Receiving public benefits.** This assignment presumes that a check was done on the individual's legal residence in the US when determining benefit eligibility. Examples of public benefit

participation that is often measured in federal datasets and has legal eligibility requirements include: Medicare, social security payments, and other public needs-based assistance programs.

- **Certain forms of employment.** Working in certain occupations or industries that undergo a great deal of scrutiny and background checks, including citizenship or legal status, in order to be eligible for the position, such as the police force, US military, or working within the federal government (Passel et al. 2006).

Additional characteristics that are sometimes applied include migration from specific countries during known periods of high refugee inflows, and recent immigrant arrivals with characteristics that satisfy specific visa types. Notably, the logical method classifies individuals into mutually exclusive legal statuses based on individual-level data. This method utilizes prescriptive algorithms, meaning that if an individual has characteristics that align him or her with the criteria for legal status, then the individual's status will be classified as legal. Those who do not exhibit any of the specified characteristics are classified as undocumented. Variables needed to inform the criteria commonly used for the logical approach are available in multiple major nationally representative surveys conducted by the US Census Bureau, including the CPS and the American Community Survey (Bachmeier et al. 2014).

Demographic Approach

The demographic approach, which is also referred to as “demographic accounting” (Van Hook et al. 2015), builds on the steps of the logical approach. However, the demographic approach differently treats the residual pool of respondents after applying characteristics that are likely to identify if an individual has legal immigrant status. Rather than presume that all residuals – individuals who are not identified as *probably legal* through the logical approach steps – are undocumented as done in the logical approach, the demographic accounting approach estimates survey respondents' probabilities of being undocumented. This estimation is done by using external sources of population estimates for immigrant legal statuses to construct distributions of characteristics, such as occupation, state of residence, age and sex, and then the residuals are adjusted accordingly. Jeffrey Passel and researchers at the Pew Hispanic Center are recognized for employing this imputation strategy to inform policy discourse (Passel et al. 2013, Passel and Cohn 2008, Passel and Cohn 2009, Passel and Clark 1997, Passel et al. 2004, Van Hook et al. 2015). However, other researchers have raised concerns about the choice of external sources used to generate population estimates for immigrant legal statuses and have criticized the lack of transparency around the methods used by Passel et al. (Van Hook et al. 2015).

Adjustments for Self-Reporting Bias & Undercounts

Both the logical and demographic approaches work from the starting point that the dataset being used for analyses at minimum identifies foreign-born individuals (Figure 5, Level 1) or may identify citizens and non-citizens (Figure 5, Level 2). Using these starting points, some evidence suggests that self-reporting bias results in an over-reporting of naturalized citizenship and an underreporting of non-citizen status warranting adjustments to minimize the bias (Warren and Passel 1987, Passel and Clark 1997). Warren and Passel (1987) suggest that the over-reporting stems from two sources: 1) non-citizen foreign-born stating that they have naturalized, and 2) persons born abroad by American parents who actually qualify as native citizens, as opposed to naturalized citizens, with the former source being of greater concern for self-reporting bias than the latter. Passel and Clark (1997) estimated that over-reporting of naturalized citizen status was as high as 75% for recent immigrants to the US, and researchers have suggested various means for making adjustments for the bias (Van Hook and Bachmeier 2013, Passel and Clark 1997).

Once adjustments for self-reporting bias and legal statuses are imputed for enumerated survey respondents, further adjustments may be necessary to account for the unenumerated individuals or, in other words, the undercount of foreign-born individuals. Prior research identifies several causes for undercounting specifically in the CPS, including the sampling design and coverage, and survey non-response (Deardorff and Blumerman 2001, United States General Accounting Office 1998). Schmidley and Robinson (1998) propose that the treatment of primary sampling units (PSUs) in the final stage of CPS sampling may affect whether certain immigrant groups are included in different years. PSUs typically cover several contiguous neighborhoods and apartment buildings from which addresses or buildings are selected for interviews. The cluster of addresses within a PSU is rotated annually. Therefore, given that recent immigrants tend to live in enclaves, or in close proximity to each other, whether certain groups are included in the final sampling stage may vary from year to year.

One method to address undercount is to adjust the immigrant population size by the estimated undercount percent. Estimates as to the size of the undercount vary, but the undercount is generally assumed to be about 5% for all foreign-born individuals, in aggregate. Carmona (2007) uses a 5.2% undercount of total foreign-born for the 2005 CPS, which he derives from work done by the Pew Hispanic Center (Camarota and Capizzano 2004, 31). This percentage undercount mirrors similar undercount estimates generated for the Census 2000, which fell within the range of 3.3%-6.7% (Deardorff and Blumerman 2001, 10). These undercount rates represent an average of undocumented, legal immigrants, and naturalized citizens. However, the undercount is complicated by the expectation that there is greater undercount of undocumented foreign-born than of legal foreign-born (Camarota and Capizzano 2004, 4). For the

Census, Marcelli and Ong (2002) estimate ~10% undercount for undocumented and ~2.5% for LPRs. Passel and Cohn (2011) suggest that 10-15% of the undocumented immigrant population is not counted the Census. A similar approach is applied by the Department of Homeland Security (2007) to estimate the size of the unauthorized population in the US using the American Community Survey, which makes adjustments assuming an undercount rate of 10% for LTMs and undocumented immigrants, and an undercount of 2.5% for LPRs, refugees and asylees is used.

Statistical Approach

A third strategy for imputing immigrants' legal statuses is the use of a statistical approach. This method utilizes two sources of survey data and requires the both datasets contain the same set of variables for characteristics that are associated with legal statuses. The associations between the set of characteristics and legal statuses determined from the "donor" dataset are then used to impute legal statuses within the "target" dataset based on the same set of characteristics. A key advantage of this methodology, referred to as the cross-survey imputation method, is that it can be replicated and makes use of both single and multiple imputation analysis strategies (Van Hook et al. 2015). In their evaluation of strategies used for imputing noncitizen legal status, Van Hook et al. (2015) conclude that cross-survey imputation methods are most promising for inferring direct measures of immigrants' statuses onto other datasets when two conditions are met: 1) the "donor" and "target" samples must be drawn from the same universe, and 2) each pair of independent and dependent variables must be jointly observed in either the donor or target samples, which the authors refer to as the "joint-observation condition." The authors explain that violating the second condition may result in biased estimators, while the effect of violating the first condition is not clearly known (Van Hook et al. 2015).

Applying the logical cross-survey multiple imputation strategy

In order to impute non-citizen legal statuses into the 2008 CPS/SPPA dataset to investigate potential differences in arts participation across these groups, I apply a logical cross-survey multiple imputation method (logical-CSMI). This method begins with the logical approach described earlier and then applies a cross-survey imputation method, using multiple imputations, to predict the probability of legal status for the residuals of the logical approach. To predict the probabilities, I apply model specifications previously deployed in the literature (State Health Access Data Assistance Center 2013, Van Hook et al. 2015, Garfield and Damico 2013). For this imputation, I use a regression model built on the 2008 SIPP to impute the legal status of non-citizen immigrants in the 2008 CPS/SPPA dataset (Damico 2013b, Damico 2013a).

This imputation methodology relies upon measures of legal status available in SIPP. The imputation strategy makes use of the respondent's legal status at the time of the survey interview, not an individual's legal status at the time of entry to the US. The reliability of the imputation approach fundamentally rests on the reliability of the SIPP measures. Bachmeier et al. (2014) evaluated the reliability of the SIPP measures and determined that estimates of the undocumented population generated from SIPP are very similar to estimates produced independently.

In this chapter I use the 2008 SPPA data because it was conducted in May of 2008, which due the CPS's 4-8-4¹⁹ rotation sample, can be linked to the same year's March CPS, which contains variables needed to impute legal status. The 2002 SPPA wave was conducted in August with the outgoing rotation sample, and the 2012 SPPA wave was conducted in July with respondents in the outgoing rotation months.²⁰ Hence, with the CPS rotation sampling, the 2002 and 2012 SPPA waves cannot be linked with data from the March CPS of the same or following year. In the 2008 SPPA, there are 1,018 (unweighted) observations of self-reported non-citizens who entered the US since 1980; there are an additional 528 (unweighted) observations of self-reported naturalized citizens who entered the US since 1980.²¹ Here, I narrowed the outcome variables to those measuring live arts attendance and reading, based upon the findings of Novak-Leonard et al. (2015c). This study used the California Survey of Arts and Cultural Participation fielded in 2013-2014 and showed that most people who engage in personal arts participation or creation do so in private homes, whereas arts attendance measures capture more activity outside of the home. I am interested in understanding more about the effect of non-citizen legal status on cultural activities a means of social participation and civic engagement; hence, for this analysis, arts attendance measures are most appropriate metrics among the many available in the SPPA.

Conditions

The 2008 SIPP and the 2008 CPS/SPPA datasets satisfy the joint-distribution condition because, as Van Hook et al. (2015) explain, the SIPP and CPS use similar sampling frames and both datasets have similarly distributed sample characteristics. While the independent variables are separately observed with immigrant legal status in the 2008 SIPP, and with the dependent arts participation variables in the 2008 CPS/SPPA, legal status and the dependent variables are not jointly observed and therefore can potentially

¹⁹ A survey respondent is part of the sample for four consecutive months, then rotates out of the sample for eight consecutive months, and is then included in the survey for four consecutive months.

²⁰ Respondents in months 3, 4, 7 and 8 of their CPS sample rotation.

²¹ The SPPA was historically and most commonly accessed from the CPANDA website, which in 2014 transitioned to the University's of Michigan's National Center for Data on Arts and Culture. Using household identifiers and household member line numbers to merge the 2008 SPPA and 2008 ASEC, 5.6% (1,041) of the 2008 SPPA sample (n=18,444) could not be matched. Matched sample is 17,403.

result in biased estimates (Van Hook et al. 2015, 345). The authors conclude, however, that this limitation is not unlike those of other imputation strategies, and that such an approach even without the joint-observation condition is still a preferred strategy when compared with other approaches because using logical-CSMI can increase the portion of non-citizens classified as “probably legal” with greater certainty, thereby decreasing the potential for biased estimators decreases (Van Hook et al. 2015, 351).

Imputation steps

First, in Table 16, I estimate the regression coefficients for the “potentially undocumented” survey respondents in the 2008 SIPP (the donor data) using a model specification utilized in Garfield and Damico (2013), which is drawn from prior demographic research that has identified characteristics of undocumented immigrants (Judson and Swanson 2011, State Health Access Data Assistance Center 2013).

Table 16. Estimated Model for Predicting Non-Citizen Undocumented Status

**Omitted Dummy Variable*

Estimated Coefficients

Place of Birth		
	Central America*	
	Asia, Australia, New Zealand	-0.72433
	Europe	-0.87646
	South America	-0.35005
	Africa	-0.61459
	North America	-0.33801
Year of Entry to US		
	prior to 1984*	
	1984-1999	1.71692
	2000-2001	1.82304
	2002-2008	1.95447
Job		
	Construction*	
	Wholesale	0.20243
	Professional Services	-0.03459
	Other	-0.26776
	No paid job	-0.13252
State of Residence		
	California*	
	Florida	-0.40902
	New Jersey	-0.01464
	New York	-0.30715
	Texas	-0.34474
	Other	0.29724
Ratio: Total Family Income/US Census Poverty Level		
	0*	
	1	-0.11946
	2	-0.03348
	3 or 4	-0.09467
Workers in HH		
	0*	
	1, 2 or 3	-0.52296
	4 or 5	-0.51223
	6 or more	0.10047
Insurance Type		
	Employer*	
	Nongroup	0.60479
	Public	0.20107
	Other/uninsured	0.4689
Age		
	17 and younger*	
	18-24	0.46858
	25-34	0.55143
	35-44	0.4649
	45-54	0.19113
	55+	-0.0292
Ethnicity (Not Latino/Hispanic)		-0.15476
Renter		0.56457
Citizen in the HH		-0.3743
Less than 6 People Live in HH		-0.37807
All HH Members in Family		-0.50123
Moved into unit in 2008		0.18529
Constant		-0.156

Source: Survey of Income & Program Participation, 2008

Second, using the target data – the 2008 CPS/SPPA – I apply the following logical assignments to identify survey respondents considered to be *probably legal*:

- Individuals entering the US prior to 1980
- Individuals receiving Medicare
- Individuals receiving public assistance, specifically Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)
- Individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income
- Individuals receiving Social Security payments
- Individuals who are serving in the US military or are veterans, as measured by an individual receiving military health insurance coverage

Third, I apply the estimated regression model to the pool of *possibly undocumented* in the target data in order to predict the probability of being undocumented for each respondent. With the predicted probabilities for each non-citizen immigrant, then a random number is generated and compared to each the predicted probability and to make an imputed binary assignment as to whether a non-citizen was legal or undocumented. Additionally, in order to account for anticipated underreporting by undocumented immigrants due to expected under-coverage and survey non-response, the estimated probabilities for undocumented immigrants are adjusted by age strata and by the nine states of residence that have historically been estimated to have a large undocumented immigrant population²² in order to match the estimates of the undocumented immigrant population published by the Office of Immigration Statistics in the US Department of Homeland Security in 2008 (Hoefer et al. 2008, Hoefer et al. 2012).²³

Finally, I generated five imputations of non-citizens' legal and undocumented status and utilized multiple imputation (mi commands) estimation tools within Stata in order to account for the variability across the five imputations, in an effort to produce more accurate standard errors (Azur et al. 2011). Appendix Table E provides more details about the distribution of socioeconomic characteristics of the imputed groups.

The primary analysis is a comparison of means, examining the rates of arts attendance across citizen statuses and non-citizens' legal statuses. The prevalence of attending the events included as outcome variables here amongst adults (18+) is 25% or less (National Endowment for the Arts 2009, Novak-

²² The states are California, Texas, Florida, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Georgia, Arizona and North Carolina.

²³ Hoefer et al. (2008, 2012) utilize a residual method to generation their estimates of the undocumented population in the US, wherein the authors use estimates of the total foreign-born population and subtract estimates of the legally present immigrant population derived from details in the American Community Survey and administrative data on flows of permanent residents, refugees, asylees and temporary residents.

Leonard and Brown 2011); at 80% power, in order to use confidence intervals (CI) of 10%, I estimate that each group requires an approximate cell size of 200 for activities with a 25% prevalence. To use a 5% CI at 80% power, each analysis group would need substantially more observations. With a sample of 17,403 and an estimated 1.3% of the population being undocumented immigrants, the expected cell size is 226. Therefore, I examine significant differences using an up to 10% CI.

Results

Given disparities in integration outcome measures based on legal versus undocumented non-citizen statuses (Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society 2015), it leads me to also investigate if disparity along these same lines is found among select outcome measures of arts participation. While there are structural, lawful restrictions placed on undocumented immigrants' access to employment, forms of higher education, and public benefits, there are not similar, explicit restrictions placed on immigrants' engagement with arts. Yet, whether this pervasive dynamic of exclusion or other socioeconomic factors affect undocumented immigrants' levels of arts participation is the key question investigated here.

The results in Table 17 provide evidence that solely examining differences between US- versus foreign-born masks important differences. For visits to art museum and outdoor festival featuring performing artists, as well as attendance at musical theater, non-musical theater and dance (other than ballet) performances, native citizens' attendance rates in 2008 were significantly greater than were those reported by naturalized citizens, whose rates in turn were significantly higher than those of all non-citizens.²⁴ For attendances rates at live opera and live classical music performances, there were no significant differences detected between native and naturalized citizens. US citizens, in aggregate, reported having attended at significantly higher rates than did non-citizens. By and large, these results reflect those found earlier in this thesis and reported in Table 14, and well as analyses done by Silber and Triplett (2015) looking at differences between native and naturalized citizens, and non-citizens.

The prevalent pattern of significant differences between US-born and foreign-born individuals shown earlier in Chapter I for 2012 (Figure 1) is also found here. Other than attending live performances of Latin, Spanish, and salsa music, native-born individuals report higher rates of attendance than foreign-born for most other arts events. In the results in Table 17, however, I fail to detect differences between non-citizen groups on the attendance outcome variables.

²⁴ All statistically significant differences discussed generally within this text are at least $p < .10$. I used pairwise t-tests to examine potential differences.

Table 17. Rates of Arts Attendance, by Citizen & Non-Citizen Legal Statuses (2008)

		Foreign-Born			
		Native Citizen (n=15,450)	Naturalized Citizen (n=916)	Non-Citizen, Legal (n=811)	Non-Citizen, Undocumen ted (n=225)
Attend live Latin, Spanish or salsa music		3.77%	6.80%	10.64%	14.09%
	se	0.26%	1.31%	1.60%	4.38%
Visit a crafts fair or visual arts festival		26.52%	14.91%	10.31%	13.68%
	se	0.42%	1.30%	1.15%	3.13%
Visit an art museum		23.40%	19.28%	15.18%	14.40%
	se	0.41%	1.46%	1.40%	3.40%
Visit an outdoor festival [with] performing artists		21.87%	14.40%	12.62%	14.05%
	se	0.40%	1.30%	1.32%	3.34%
Attend live musical		17.94%	10.81%	7.82%	7.33%
	se	0.37%	1.14%	1.08%	2.85%
Attend live non-musical play		10.14%	5.81%	3.75%	3.23%
	se	0.28%	0.82%	0.72%	1.58%
Attend live classical music		9.58%	9.52%	5.97%	6.99%
	se	0.28%	1.07%	0.89%	2.32%
Attend live opera		2.26%	2.45%	0.86%	1.77%
	se	0.14%	0.56%	0.34%	1.32%
Visit...park/monument, ...bldgs/ neighborhoods...		26.61%	16.36%	13.36%	12.00%
	se	0.42%	1.34%	1.33%	3.32%
Attend live jazz		8.36%	3.60%	3.82%	3.41%
	se	0.26%	0.66%	0.70%	1.47%
Attend live dance (other than ballet)		5.46%	4.20%	2.87%	3.95%
	se	0.22%	0.71%	0.66%	1.94%
Attend live ballet		3.00%	2.82%	2.85%	3.00%
	se	0.16%	0.60%	0.61%	1.50%

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2008

Conclusion

While legal status is an important factor affecting non-citizen immigrants' integration in terms of economics, eligibility to public benefits, and other measures of social well-being, the analyses in this section suggest that non-citizen legal status is not necessarily a significant factor affecting whether immigrants go to various types of arts events. Chapters I and III provide evidence that first-generation

immigrants are participating in arts activities at significantly lower rates than individuals born in the US overall, but no additional disparity is observed for undocumented immigrants. In contrast to other indicators of integration and well-being, undocumented status does not seem to affect arts participation. Hence, participating in arts may offer undocumented immigrants a non-threatening means to engage with their local community and build social capital, fostering means for further social and economic integration.

This chapter addresses two key challenges to measurement. The first challenge is the difficulty in accounting for non-citizen legal statuses in survey data, and the evolving methods for executing and evaluating imputation strategies. The second challenge is the unknown reliability of available arts participation metrics when focusing on immigrant populations. Over the last decade, the SPPA has received criticism for its traditional emphasis on attendance-based cultural activity and, in particular, its emphasis on artistic genres stemming from a European artistic tradition (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015a, Rosenstein 2005, Tepper and Gao 2008). The next section explores the use of SPPA questions specifically to capture artistic activity within immigrant communities.

VI. Minding the gap: elucidating the disconnect between arts participation metrics and arts engagement within immigrant communities²⁵

A growing gap between national metrics of arts participation and the many, evolving ways in which people participate in artistic and aesthetic activities limits the degree to which such data can usefully inform policy decisions. The National Endowment for the Arts' Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) is the primary source of arts participation data in the USA, but this instrument inadequately evaluates how members of minority and immigrant communities participate in the arts. As the USA nears a historic demographic shift to being a majority-minority nation – non-Hispanic White individuals will no longer be a demographic majority by about 2041 – obtaining more accurate measures of artistic activities that are meaningful to a more diverse population will be of increasing importance for public policy-making. To better understand the extent to which the SPPA's questions capture the range of artistic activities engaged in by members of immigrant communities, we cognitively tested a subset of the survey's questions with Chinese immigrants to the USA as a pilot case. We found that interviewees participate in a range of culturally specific and non-culturally specific arts activities that they did not report in response to the survey's questions. In this article, we draw upon these interviews to discuss the reasons underpinning the gap and suggest implications for updating research tools and future research. A better understanding of the gap between measured and actual “arts participation” will lead to improved measures and information to support artistic expression and arts more reflective of contemporary society.

Introduction

Individuals express themselves artistically through many means and engage with art in numerous ways. Such expression includes attending arts events, consuming artistic products, and creating, collecting, curating and practicing cultural traditions that involve aesthetic expression. Although the domain of artistically expressive activity is evolving due to technological advances and is complex due to the varied contexts and motivations for these behaviors, available survey data capture only a fraction of this activity. In general, available survey data provide a largely reductionist view that places disproportionate emphasis on the consumption of cultural products stemming from a Western European tradition. The origins of such bias are that consumptive activities can be relatively straightforwardly defined and thus measured (UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2012, p.11). While the challenges associated with reliably measuring the

²⁵ Minding the gap: Elucidating the disconnect between arts participation metrics and arts engagement within immigrant communities, Jennifer L. Novak-Leonard, Michael K. O'Malley, Eileen Truong, *Cultural Trends*, reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd, www.tandfonline.com. This is the authors accepted manuscript of an article published as the version of record in *Cultural Trends* - 08 Apr 2015 - <http://tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09548963.2015.1031477>

broad domain of artistically expressive activity are readily acknowledged, the growing gap between what is measured and what people value and do with art is a growing concern.

In the USA, the National Endowment for the Arts' (NEA) periodic Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) is the primary source of data on adult arts participation. The SPPA has been fielded approximately every five years since 1982 and while questions have been amended and expanded over time, the changes made to the most recent survey instrument fielded in 2012 are the most substantial to date. In particular, the NEA added questions designed to collect information on new ways that individuals create and interact with arts online in order to measure a broader array of arts participation behaviors taking place in the USA. However, the SPPA's instrument continues its emphasis on arts attendance, which was originally intended to provide insights to non-profit arts organizations about their health (Novak-Leonard et al. 2014, Orend 1977, Tepper and Gao 2008). The SPPA's aggregate measure of attendance at *benchmark arts* – which includes having attended a ballet, classical music, jazz, opera, musicals or plays, or visiting an art museum during the prior 12 months – has remained consistent throughout the survey's history and makes the survey unmatched in its facilitation of long-term trend analysis of arts attendance in the USA (Pettit 2000). Nonetheless, the focus on measures of consumptive behavior is problematic for measuring arts-related behaviors within minority¹ and immigrant communities (Rosenstein 2005, Novak-Leonard and Brown 2011).

As the USA nears a historic demographic shift to being a majority–minority nation, more inclusive and accurate measures of arts participation within minority and immigrant communities become increasingly important for empowering cultural researchers and informing public policy-making. By approximately 2041, the U.S. Census Bureau projects that non-Hispanic Whites will no longer comprise the majority of the American public (U.S. Census Bureau 2013c). Hispanics are projected to comprise approximately 30 per cent of the US population, Blacks/African Americans about 13 percent and Asians/Pacific Islanders about 8 per cent (Farrell and Medvedeva 2010). Historically, the data captured by the SPPA have suggested that arts participation is disproportionately undertaken by non-Hispanic Whites and early analysis of the 2012 SPPA's data suggests the same (Welch and Kim 2010, Nichols 2003, National Endowment for the Arts 2014b, National Endowment for the Arts 1999, DiMaggio and Ostrower 1992).²

The SPPA has been deemed inadequate for measuring arts-related behaviors within minority and immigrant communities for two key reasons. First, the SPPA's emphasis on arts attendance, given that members of immigrant communities tend to favor participatory forms of engaging with art (Wali et al. 2002, Rosenstein 2005, Moriarty 2008, Alvarez 2005). Rosenstein (2005, 3) argues that “the relatively

narrow and passive definitions of arts participation used in the [SPPA] disproportionately affect the results measured among Hispanics and people who are not white, systematically producing lower rates of arts participation among these groups”. Additionally, studies using attendance measures typically find that higher levels of educational attainment and income strongly predict participation while race and ethnicity have little net predictive power (Love & Klipple, 1995; Welch & Kim, 2010), but recent research that looks closely at measures of participatory forms of engaging with art finds that identifying as a minority or as an immigrant has significant net effects on participation (Novak-Leonard, Reynolds, English, & Bradburn, 2015). A second reason is the implied meaning of the term “arts participation”, which connotes Western artistic forms, and the practical emphasis on these forms, given significance of the *benchmark arts* for trend analysis (Novak-Leonard et al. 2014). In some minority and immigrant communities, the concept of “art” is not distinct from the aesthetic elements of daily, cultural or ritual practice (Novak-Leonard et al. 2014, Jones 1971, Brown 2001). However, relatively little research has looked at this in depth or as it relates to studying “arts participation”.³ While this lack of clarity between what is artistic and what is a meaningful activity or object that embodies aesthetic qualities or creative expression applies across society, understanding how these distinctions are meaningful is particularly important for “arts participation” research relevant to racial and ethnic minority groups within the USA.

In this investigation, we applied cognitive testing to the 2012 SPPA in order to elucidate the process by which immigrants perceive and respond to these questions about arts participation. The SPPA's instruments have previously been subject to pilot testing with general population samples, but, to our knowledge, this is the first effort to explore how members of immigrant communities understand the SPPA's questions (Triplett 2011, Robinson et al. 1987, Keegan 1987). Specifically, we sought to understand whether immigrants would report culturally specific activities in response to the SPPA's questions and if not, why not. As researchers and federal agencies seek to update their surveys of arts participation and develop complementary forms of research, on the basis of our pilot case, we argue that greater attention needs to be paid to the forms of artistic and aesthetic expression that are happening within and across diverse populations. This pilot study thus provides a foundation for developing improved and different research tools for understanding and measuring “arts participation”.

Methodology

The objective of our study was to discover the extent to which the SPPA captures arts engagement within immigrant communities and to describe the reasons underlying any identified gaps. As a case for studying immigrants in the USA more generally, this article draws upon interviews conducted with 14 adult Chinese-Americans and Chinese immigrants who reside, work or utilize immigrant social services in

Chinatown in Chicago, Illinois in the USA.⁴ Eleven interviewees were recruited with the help of the Chinese American Service League, a social service agency for Chinese-American immigrants, and three interviewees were recruited by the Chinese-American Museum of Chicago. Both organizations are located in the heart of Chicago's Chinatown. Interviews were conducted onsite at each location in February and March 2014, and were conducted with the assistance of translators who spoke English, Mandarin and Cantonese. Interviewees were paid a \$10 incentive to participate and each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes.

Interviewees were asked a subset of questions from the 2012 SPPA's question series about attendance at arts events and about making art. Given the importance of the benchmark arts throughout the SPPA's history, these questions were used in the interviews. The subset of questions about making art were primarily selected on the basis that they had been used relatively consistently across the SPPA's waves. Table 1 lists the SPPA's questions tested in the interviews. Although the question about social dancing is new to the 2012 SPPA, it captured one of the highest rates of arts participation at 32 per cent (National Endowment for the Arts 2014b).

Table 18. Interview questions drawn from the 2012 SPPA.

The following questions are about your activities during the last 12 months between [date of interview], 2013 and [date of interview], 2014. During the last 12 months ...

Questions about art-making

- ... did you take any photographs as an artistic activity?
- ... did you create any other visual art, such as paintings, sculpture, or graphic designs?
- ... did you work with pottery, ceramics, or jewelry?
- ... did you do any leatherwork, metalwork or woodwork?
- ... did you do any weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting, or sewing?
- ... did you play a musical instrument?
- ... did you do any acting?
- ... did you perform or practice any dance?
- ... did you do any social dancing, including dancing at weddings, clubs, or other social settings?
- ... did you perform or practice any singing?

Questions about attending arts events

- ... did you visit an art museum or gallery?
- ... did you visit a crafts fair or a visual arts festival?
- ... , with the exception of elementary or high school performances did you go to a live classical music performance such as symphony, chamber, or choral music during the last 12 months?
- ... , with the exception of elementary or high school performances did you go to a live ballet performance during the last 12 months?
- ... , with the exception of elementary or high school performances, did you go to a live dance performance other than ballet, such as modern, contemporary, folk, traditional, or tap dance during the last 12 months?
- ... , with the exception of elementary or high school performances, did you go to a live musical, or nonmusical, stage play during the last 12 months?
- ... , with the exception of elementary or high school performances, did you go to a live opera during the last 12 months?
- ... did you visit an outdoor festival that featured performing artists?

Source: National Endowment for the Arts (2012)

Interviews were semi-structured and used probing questions in an attempt to establish context and motivation for the responses. Interviewers used concurrent and retrospective verbal probing techniques (Willis 1999). The probes included asking interviewees to describe specific instances or events that they thought about before answering the question, and specific instances or events they excluded from their response. Interviewees were asked about where, with whom, and at what time of year the activities occurred, and about why the interviewee engaged in the activity (McCarthy et al. 2004, Brown 2006). In addition, we asked an open-ended question about the interviewees' involvement in any activities that they considered to be "creative, cultural or artistic" (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c).

“Does this count?”

From the interview data, we find a gap between what interviewees reported they do in terms of arts participation in response to the SPPA's questions and the reality of what they do. While interviewees' direct answers to the SPPA's questions suggested low levels of arts participation, all the interviewees revealed that they participated in additional artistic and creative activities via subsequent probes. The gap between the direct responses given to the SPPA's questions and interviewees' actual activities seemed to stem from interviewees' uncertainty about what the SPPA's questions implied about what counts as “arts participation”. Interviewers were instructed to accept all responses and to clarify for interviewees that they were welcome to share anything that came to mind during the interview. However, despite this openness, interviewees projected awareness that they were operating without a clear understanding of what was intended by the survey questions. A third of the interviewees explicitly asked “does [this] count?”

In response to a question about visiting an art museum or a gallery during the past year, a middle-aged man who primarily spoke Mandarin in the interview, quickly replied “yes”, and listed the Field Museum, the Chicago Children's Museum, Adler Planetarium and the Chicago History Museum. The interviewer then asked him whether he visited any galleries in the past 12 months. He replied that he attended an exhibition of Chinese calligraphy at a library, but that he was not sure whether that could be counted as a visit to a gallery. Once probed about his own thoughts, he concluded that it should count as a visit to a gallery and ultimately added that he thought of things with historical and cultural significance when he heard the terms “museum” and “gallery”.

When a middle-aged interviewee was asked if she took any “photographs as an artistic activity”, she wanted to know whether pictures of “daily life when she goes outside” counted. She qualified her responses by saying that she was not sure if she would have the “right answers”, and although the interviewers tried to reassure her, there was no right answer, she appeared to remain unconvinced. In her later comments, she implied that she thought there were correct answers to questions about arts participation.

One interviewee explained more explicitly that certain activities would not count as a response to the SPPA's questions because the activity was not adequately formal. For example, one older male interviewee believed that for an activity to count as a response it “must be a public event”. He added that private activities were too ambiguous to define, as they were subject to the personal definition of the

participants and could be either artistic or not. Throughout the interview, he remained firm in his belief, further elaborating that for acting and singing performances, the performance must be on a public stage. From an etic perspective, these examples suggest that the interviewees are engaged in artistic and cultural activities; however, these individuals are uncertain whether these activities are legitimate activities when responding to the SPPA's questions. In one case, the interviewee is adamant about the kinds of activities that do not fit within the implied definitional boundaries of the SPPA's questions. In the following sections, we discuss reasons underlying the uncertainty that emerge from the interview data.

Questioning culturally specific activities

Chinese culture is generally recognized as one rich in arts, in both traditional and contemporary forms. Multiple interviewees reported engaging in activities rooted in Chinese culture, yet only a few explained that they included these activities when formulating direct responses to the SPPA's questions.

Six interviewees shared that they do calligraphy, but they shared differing views as to whether it counts as art. When asked if he had created any “visual art, such as paintings, sculpture or graphic designs”, a middle-aged interviewee quickly answered “no”. However, when the interviewer asked him if he could “extend the realm of visual art to anything he did in the past 12 months involving visual or graphic works”, he answered that he did Chinese calligraphy. In response to the same SPPA question, another interviewee who immigrated over 10 years ago hesitated before answering “no”. Later in the interview, she shared that she did calligraphy. The interviewer asked her why, since she practiced calligraphy, did she answer “no” to the previous question asking about visual arts in the last 12 months. She responded that she was unclear about what “visual art” entailed. She explained, “... calligraphy is extremely dependent on the hand and gestures from the hand, ... whereas visual art is something that you look at”. This same interviewee shared that she tied knots as a traditional Chinese art form. She finds the knots to be visually pretty and enjoys looking at and trying to replicate them, but seemed uneasy about considering it to be a means of engaging with art despite her appreciation of its aesthetics. She initially learned knot tying as physical therapy for her fingers while she was in the hospital back in Hong Kong. She said she found the activity fun and especially enjoyed the handmade aspect. Knot tying also gave her an opportunity to interact with friends. She said that when she gathers with her friends, everyone shares what they have learned and shows the knots they have already completed.

In another interview, when asked, “During the last 12 months, did you do any acting?”, the middle-aged interviewee answered in Chinese, and the translator responded, “she [the interviewee] mentioned Tai Chi,

but no acting”. The interviewer then asked if she considered Tai Chi as more of a dance, or if she does it for exercise. The translator responded after the interviewee spoke, “For fitness – she does that every night”.

Many of the activities interviewees engage in are hard to classify using Western definitions of art forms. As both Rosenstein (2005) and Moriarty (2004) point out, the culturally rooted arts activities of immigrant communities differ from the benchmark arts activities in the sense that they are often more participatory. Furthermore, individuals from immigrant communities show “clear difference[s] in attitudes about artistic or creative engagement” when compared to others from the majority culture of a host country Rosenstein (2005, 3). Therefore, their activities do not fit neatly into the categories of a survey instrument that has not been designed with such activities in mind. As a result, these activities may show up as survey responses in an unexpected place, such as Tai Chi being given in response to a question about acting, or they may not show up at all.

Questioning the importance of artistic intentions

A second explanation for the uncertainty about “what counts” as a response to the SPPA's questions is questioning whether activities undertaken for reasons besides expressing one's self artistically or to consume others' artistic creations count. This relates to our first suggested explanation, but goes beyond culturally rooted activities. In cases such as these, one might look at the motivation behind an activity to determine the degree of its creative or artistic nature or intent, but as has been found in other research, motivations are mixed, and not always conscious (Belfiore and Bennett 2007). The following responses were offered with some reluctance.

In response to the question, “In the last 12 months, did you do any work with leather, metal, or wood?”, a middle-aged interviewee responded that she built a desk for her daughter. When asked about her reasons for building the desk, the interviewee explained she did it for functional and creative reasons,

... I think it's more satisfying for myself so I get what I want, and cheaper, and more comfortable for myself because I know what I want and what I need. If I want a special design, it's more expensive, so why not do it? Because, I can.

Another middle-aged interviewee gave a similar response in discussing photographs she took of a children's performance of traditional Chinese dances. She noted that, on the one hand, the children were wearing traditional costumes, and they looked very beautiful, and she wanted to preserve the celebration

of Chinese culture. On the other hand, “children grow up very quickly and I wanted to be able to capture the moment and have good memories”.

Of the 14 respondents, seven interviewees reported practicing weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting, or sewing, but for differing motivations. One interviewee, a middle-aged woman, shared that she really liked sewing and explained that she makes hair accessories for her daughter and other embellishments for her daughter's clothes, such as flowers that can be attached to skirts. However, another respondent explained that the sewing she had done in the past 12 months was only to help mend a garment if someone at home had a tear in his or her clothes and wanted to know if that “counted”. Fixing things was also the motivation for another interviewee. Also of middle age, when asked about leatherwork, metalwork or woodwork, he answered that he rarely did these works for artistic purposes. For practical reasons, though, the interviewee had worked with metal or wood more than 10 times in the past 12 months. When asked to describe his work with metal and wood, he mentioned using nails to fix things. As for woodwork, he mentioned that he sometimes mends furniture and chairs.

Three interviewees cited health benefits as their main motivation for engaging in Tai Chi, traditional lion dancing, and kung fu, but also recognized each of these as a culturally based art. One interviewee began lion dancing with a performance group about 10 years prior, while she was still living in Hong Kong. Since coming to Chicago, however, she no longer performs at public events, but practices lion dancing as a way to exercise. Another interviewee explained that she practices Tai Chi and light kung fu exercise every morning, as she explained “[to] feel the energy flow all over the body”.

Three of our interviewees were parents who reported that their only motivation for attending museums or concerts was to expose their children to the arts and spend time with them. In response to a question asking about attending any museum or gallery in the last 12 months, one interviewee responded that she had visited multiple museums with her daughter and that the learning opportunities for her daughter were important to her. Another respondent confirmed that she attended concerts in the park during the summer. When the interviewer asked her why she and her friends wanted to go with their children, she replied that she and the other parents wanted to expose their children to as many kinds of culture and music as possible.

Six of the 14 interviewees reported singing karaoke when asked if they have sung in the past 12 months. One interviewee mentioned that he goes to his friend's house for karaoke every other month. An older

interviewee thinks that karaoke is especially important as it allows her to spend time with people who matter to her.

The interviewees' responses suggest some ambiguity about how central the "arts" must be to the activity or experience to qualify it as counting for a response to the SPPA's questions. This creates an interesting juxtaposition with existing literature that discusses the range of motivations for engaging in various arts-related activities, including promoting one's physical and mental health and, namely, social interactions (Blume-Kohout et al. 2015, Lena and Lindemann 2014, Moriarty 2004). Understanding the broad range of ways that experiences with arts and culture bring value to individuals is an explicit priority for the NEA (Iyengar et al. 2012); however, the interview data suggest that individuals may be filtering their responses to the SPPA's questions based on these same values and motivations when they feel that the "art" in the activity does not meet an implied threshold of artistic intention or awareness.

Limitations

This study takes an initial step toward elucidating the gap between what the SPPA captures in terms of arts engagement within immigrant communities and the reality. However, we recognize the limitations of this pilot study. The primary limitations to this study are considerations about translation and its limited sample. For the interviews, a subset of the SPPA's questions was translated into Mandarin and Cantonese and we acknowledge the complications introduced when translating a survey instrument (Davidov and De Beuckelaer 2010, Berkanovic 1980). As is the challenge with translations generally, direct translation does not always clearly convey the intended meaning. Further research is warranted to understand how well the terminology used in the SPPA translates, literally and conceptually, into other languages.

Our sample is limited to one specific community of immigrants and is modest in its size. The emergent themes from this pilot study should be tested with larger samples and refined through additional interviews with other immigrant communities. Additionally, while questions about the artistic intent of an activity emerged from our interviews with an immigrant sample, further testing is warranted to understand the generalizability of this finding to the whole of the US population.

Discussion

While this article focused on immigrant communities, several core concepts apply to the US population at large. Across society, addressing the gap between measured arts participation and actual engagement in artistic expression represents a contemporary policy priority (Rife et al. 2014). Given that many policy

decisions are reliant on quantitative measures of arts participation, greater clarity about the strengths and limitations of tools measuring arts participation is important for well-informed public policy.

In this study, we summarize a pilot set of cognitive interviews with members of the Chinese immigrant community as a case study of immigrant communities. The results help inform why there is a gap between the arts participation behavior captured by the SPPA's data within minority and immigrant communities and actual engagement with arts and culture. Even though this research is a pilot, it identifies several important questions that should be considered for measuring “arts participation”.

What is currently being measured? The SPPA serves as the preeminent source of data on how adults in the USA engage in art and cultural activities; however, it is important to understand the extent to which it captures the true nature of people's engagement with arts and culture. In this pilot study, we determined that even describing the survey as one about “arts participation” evoked notions about a limited set of qualifying activities and biased responses. Multiple interviewees did not think that their activities qualified as appropriate activities to report in response to the survey questions, despite the interviewees explicitly valuing the aesthetic and creative aspects of the activity, which seem like characteristics germane to much “arts participation”.

At a minimum, this pilot investigation suggests that future surveys on arts participation should include questions worded in a broader and more inclusive fashion. Currently, the SPPA's questions about attendance at arts events largely ask about events of specific artistic genres, such as ballet or classical music, as opposed to asking more generally about dance or music, respectively. When more broadly stated arts participation survey questions have been employed in other research, the distribution of participants more closely reflects the racial and ethnic composition of the population (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015c, Rosenstein 2005), suggesting that such broader question phrasing reduces racial and ethnic bias in survey responses.

But, this also raises questions about the types of research needed as society and “art” evolve to be clear about what is being measured with existing survey tools, what information is needed for policy-making purposes, and what are the most appropriate methods for developing this knowledge.

What needs to be understood? If research and policy communities are aiming to understand the range of ways that people in the USA engage in art and cultural activities, then this pilot study suggests that more research is needed to understand multiple cultural frames of reference; what activities are considered to be

artistic, creative and cultural within those frames; and the values that people derive from those experiences. This pilot suggests that interviewees were operating with an awareness that they did not have a good grasp of what might be deemed *American arts participation*, and in their survey responses, these individuals endeavored to describe their own activities with respect to that perceived frame of reference. As the demographic composition of the USA shifts to majority–minority, what might be deemed as *American arts participation* may shift and more research is needed to understand what creative and cultural activities matter to people living within the USA.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the members of the interview team, the Chinese American Service League, the Chinese-American Museum of Chicago, the Cultural Policy Center at the University of Chicago, and our interviewees for their assistance in carrying out this pilot research. This paper was greatly improved by the critical insights of reviewers.

Notes

1. We employ standard terminology used by the U.S. Census Bureau to describe subpopulations by race and ethnic identity, as well as use “minority” to refer to individuals who do not identify as non-Hispanic White. There is some contention about the use of these terms and the need to evolve the measures and terminology used to describe individuals’ racial and ethnic identity, especially in light of the demographic shifts underway.
2. Based on authors’ calculations for 2012.
3. The Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded Understanding Everyday Participation – Articulating Cultural Values research effort, which runs 2012–2017, is focused on understanding a “broader picture of how people make their lives through culture”. See: <http://www.everydayparticipation.org/>.
4. In 2012, Asians surpassed Hispanics as the fastest growing race and ethnic group in the USA, with migration being a primary driver behind the growth (U.S. Census Bureau 2013a). Immigrants coming from China comprise the second largest subgroup of immigrants, second only to immigrants coming from Mexico. Individuals of Chinese ethnicity represent almost a quarter (24 per cent) of the Asian population living in the USA (Pew Research Center 2013a).

VII. Discussion of Implications

Although much is known and studied about the rich aesthetic and cultural practices of immigrant cultures and groups in the US, relatively little is known about the levels, or rates, of arts participation within immigrant communities. We might also ask what this information can tell policy-makers about the extent to which immigrants are adopting the practices of the predominant culture in the US and balancing that with practicing and celebrating their own culture.

Implications for policy

This thesis provides an important baseline for understanding the arts and cultural participation of immigrants and their children. Historically, integrating into US society implied engaging with art and aesthetic practices from a Western-based cultural tradition. It was this tradition that also shaped the nonprofit arts infrastructure in the US since the mid 20th-century (Kreidler 1996). But, the policy paradigm that has persisted since the mid-1950s is currently in flux (Toepler 2013). The US does not have an official arts policy-making body, but since the mid 20th-century arts policy discourse in the US has been dominated by a “supply-side” paradigm, which is the notion that subsidies are needed to support and would expand the work of non-profit cultural organizations and institutions, whose offerings would then be consumed or utilized by the public (Kreidler 1996, Kreidler 2013). However, time trend analyses since the early 1990s available on a subset of arts attendance measures have shown declining rates of arts attendance among US adults in general (National Endowment for the Arts 2014b) and the research in this dissertation sheds light on the disparity between those born in the US and immigrant groups.

Currently, there is substantial momentum around the concept of “creative-placemaking” as a plausible next policy paradigm for arts and culture. Creative-placemaking is a concept of integrating art and art-making into various facets of community development (Markusen and Gadwa 2010). A ten year collaboration of federal agencies, foundations and banks, called ArtPlace America, is investing in creative-placemaking experimental projects, which include art as a part of policies affecting immigrants and their integration into local communities.²⁶ Furthermore, local agencies, such as the New York City Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs (Greenberger 2015), are experimenting with using arts and artists to ease and assist immigrant integration devoid of empirical research to inform and evaluate such policies.

²⁶ <http://www.artplaceamerica.org/about/introduction> [accessed June 20, 2016]

The results of the research in this dissertation show dramatically lower levels of participation reported by first-generation immigrants across most 2012 SPPA indicators. This disparity is of concern, since it raises questions about the extent to which immigrants have opportunities to access and engage with art. It also raises questions about whether art will remain a viable pathway to greater civic engagement for immigrants providing them with the tools to build social capital and process their own immigrant experiences. These have been identified as unique ways that immigrants, in particular, benefit by engaging with arts. Just in November 2014, President Obama created the White House Task Force on New Americans, an interagency group charged with strengthening the federal government's ability to help immigrants better integrate into their new communities. The December 2015 report issued by the Task Force recognized the historic influence of immigrants on culture within the US and the longstanding US position of being welcoming to immigrants. It did not, however, address the role that arts participation and creative expression play in the overall well-being of the immigrant population, nor the instrumental roles that such artistic and creative experiences can play in connecting immigrants with their new communities (The White House Task Force on New Americans 2015b). The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine's recent Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society (2015) noted the important role of arts and cultural participation as a particular means for immigrants to engage civically and build social capital, but did not address this any further due to the dearth of research available. This thesis aims to address this gap and inform empirically based policy discourse.

Furthermore, the proportion of the US population comprised of second-generation immigrants is projected to grow to a record-breaking share over the next few decades. However, the current second-generation of immigrants is not the same second-generation of the future. Rather, it will be comprised of the children of the first-generation immigrants discussed in this thesis, who – with little exception beyond activities related to Spanish, Latin, and salsa music – reported significantly lower levels of participation in activities measured in the 2012 SPPA than did either second- or third+ generation immigrants. Will this coming trend affect *future* second-generation immigrants' participation in arts and culture? If so, how? Will the relatively robust arts and cultural participation of current second-generation immigrants positively affect later generations? Will the arts participation of second-generation immigrants (at least as measured by the SPPA) positively influence later generations, or will interest dwindle, as does college attainment between second- and third-generation immigrants? Neither the SPPA nor any other data sources currently available has data collected over the number of years that is sufficient to enable examining key questions about whether or how the behavior of earlier immigrant generations might influence later generations in terms of cultural integration through arts-based means. Although this thesis

provides a snapshot, further investigations are required to understand and respond appropriately to the evolving landscape.

Recent regional qualitative studies have demonstrated that immigrants are actively engaged in cultural and artistic practices of their own—many of which involve direct participation—and that many immigrants are largely disengaged from mainstream nonprofit cultural institutions (Moriarty 2004, Alvarez 2005, Moriarty 2008, Stern et al. 2010, Wali et al. 2002, Byrd 2014). The results of the analyses presented in Chapter 1, Figure 1 illustrates this disengagement. Prior research has suggested that immigrant communities are “changing the social organization of the arts and culture” in the US (Stern et al. 2010). In light of the dramatic demographic shifts underway in the US, the cultural landscape may shift extensively within a few short decades.

Implications for research

This thesis provides insights about the importance of asking questions that are relevant to multiple and diverse set of cultural frames. Such investigations should be careful not to perpetuate stereotypes, but rather carefully examine the relevance and implied cultural meaning of questions being asked. While eliciting and capturing high quality data about arts and cultural activity is important for all residents in our rapidly changing society (National Endowment for the Arts 2014a, UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2012, Rife et al. 2014), this is a particularly acute issue for first- and second-generation immigrant populations. Cognitive testing has revealed the challenges that immigrant populations have with the cultural frame of reference conveyed by the current SPPA instrument (Novak-Leonard et al. 2015b). As the US population shifts to “majority-minority” composition over the next few decades, understanding cultural participation through multiple cultural frames will become increasingly important in order to obtain useful information and understanding that can inform policy-making.

In addition to identifying the need for measures of arts participation from multiple cultural perspectives, this thesis also demonstrates the need for longitudinal study of immigrants’ arts and cultural participation. A longitudinal study could answer many of the questions raised in this discussion about the cultural participation of future generations of immigrants – both descendants of today’s immigrants as well as future immigrant cohorts.

Dramatic ongoing changes in the demographic composition of the US population are catalyzing arts policymakers, practitioners and researchers to reflect on what is understood as “arts participation.” How immigrant populations should be measured, as well as how immigrant groups engage in art and connect with culture are recognized as challenging areas of measurement and analysis and this thesis includes

both. In light of these challenges, this thesis offers empirically-driven insights on the cultural lives of immigrant groups in the US and how they are faring in comparison to the US population overall.

Appendix

Technical Note

For analyses in Chapters III and IV, I used Stata 14.1 to execute the comparison of means, significance testing, and multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS). I use the classical OLS assumptions for the OLS linear probability models. I then transformed the coefficients into relative risk for ease of interpretation. All dependent variables used are binary with $P(Y=1)$ defined as the probability of participation in the arts activity being analyzed.

For Chapter V, I used RStudio (Version 0.99.902), an open-source integrated development environment for R, to adapt and run R script developed by the Kaiser Family Foundation in order to impute non-citizen immigrant legal statuses into the 2008 CPS/SPPA data (Damico 2013b, Damico 2013a). These scripts utilize immigrants' self-reported legal statuses, demographic and socioeconomic variables, and public program participation information from the 2008 SIPP in order to estimate the degree to which such characteristics predict legal statuses. I generated five imputations of non-citizens' legal and undocumented status and utilized multiple imputation (mi commands) estimation tools within Stata 14.1 in order to account for the variability across the five imputations, in an effort to produce more accurate standard errors. Then, I used Stata 14.1 to carry out the comparison of means and significance testing.

Exploratory Analysis of 1.5-Generation Immigrants

I take a separate look at 1.5-generation immigrants to examine whether their cultural participation patterns are distinct from those of first-generation immigrants who entered the US as adults. 1.5-generation immigrants are a subset of first-generation immigrants, who entered the US as a minor (under age 18). In prior studies, the exact age limits used to define 1.5-generation immigrants vary. Two oft-cited operational definitions of the 1.5-generation is anyone entering the US while under age 10 (Perlmann and Waldinger 1997) and another being children entering the US between ages 6 and 12 (Rumbaut 1997). Rumbaut (2004) has gone further to investigate the differential effects of arrival-age to examine the 1.25- (arrival in US between ages 13-17 years) and 1.75-generations (arrival in US between ages 0-5 years). In order to have adequate statistical power for the analysis presented here, I defined 1.5-generation immigrants as anyone entering the US while under age 18.

Within the weighted 2012 SPPA sample, I estimate that 3.9% of the total US population sample can be classified as 1.5-generation immigrants. Identification as a 1.5-generation immigrant is based upon a calculation of the immigrant's year of entry into the US; then, his or her reported age and survey year are used to estimate such an individual's age-at-arrival into the US. A limitation of the calculation is that immigrants' year of entry is reported as a bracket of years as opposed to a single year and therefore is not precise. Hence, the results should be considered with this caveat. Using the estimated age-at-arrival, a comparison of means shows that there are some differences between 1.5-generation and first-generation immigrants who arrived as adults. However, for the majority of arts and cultural activities measured in the 2012 SPPA, no differences were detected (Appendix Table A).

Appendix Table A. Significant Differences between 1.5-Generation & First-Generation Immigrants who entered the US as adults (2012)

	1st Generation		2nd Generation
	Entered US as minor (1.5 Gen.)	Entered US as adult	
Mobile device: music	77.3%	48.4% ***	69.0% *
Used Internet: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	42.6%	20.1% ***	39.3%
Used handheld or mobile device	56.3%	40.7% ***	57.5%
Go to the movies	61.7%	47.7% ***	64.2%
Used Internet: Latin, Spanish or salsa music	26.8%	13.9% ***	17.1% **
Used the Internet	68.9%	56.9% ***	74.4%
Used TV or radio: Latin, Spanish or salsa music	31.7%	24.4% **	21.6% ***
Social dancing	34.5%	28.1% *	43.7% **
Email, post, share: music	23.6%	17.8% *	23.3%
Live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	15.4%	9.7% ***	11.6% *
Park or open-air facility	16.5%	10.9% *	17.5%
Email, post, share: photographs created/edited	14.2%	9.6% *	16.9%
Photo editing	12.3%	7.7% *	15.8%
Play a musical instrument with other people	6.7%	2.6% **	5.4%
Perform or practice opera	0.0%	0.1% *	0.8% **
Create or perform dance	0.3%	1.4% *	1.6% **
Pottery, ceramics, jewelry	1.1%	3.1% ***	4.8% ***
Used TV or radio: Opera	1.9%	4.4% **	4.6% **
Weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting or sewing	8.3%	11.5% *	13.8% ***
Live classical music	3.3%	6.6% ***	9.7% ***
Donate to an arts or cultural organization	5.3%	10.0% ***	13.6% ***
Used TV or radio: Classical music	5.6%	10.4% **	14.2% ***
Own art	11.7%	17.7% **	31.1% ***
Gardening for pleasure	21.9%	36.6% ***	34.7% ***
No. of Hours of TV Watched on Average Day	1.74	2.02	2.26 ***
Used TV or radio: None of the Above	51.5%	50.2%	40.0% ***
Read literature	32.8%	31.8%	46.0% ***
attend	31.2%	33.1%	47.7% ***
Used TV or radio: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	25.0%	21.6%	44.7% ***
Attend "Benchmark Art" event(s)	22.7%	23.8%	36.8% ***
Did volunteer or charity work	19.4%	20.7%	29.8% ***
Visit an art museum	16.2%	16.4%	25.7% ***
Visit a historic park or monument	16.0%	15.5%	25.1% ***
Visit an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	14.9%	13.1%	23.5% ***
Participate in any community activities, meetings, or events	14.0%	16.7%	24.5% ***
Visit a craft or visual art fair	12.7%	13.4%	24.3% ***
Email, post, share: films or video	12.2%	11.4%	17.1% *
Mobile device: visual arts	10.2%	15.1%	16.1% *
Live musical play	9.4%	8.2%	17.6% ***
Art museum or gallery	6.6%	6.1%	10.8% *
Any other music, theater, or dance performance	6.4%	5.8%	13.1% ***
College or University	6.2%	3.5%	10.0% *
Used Internet: Other dance programs or shows	6.2%	4.3%	2.0% *
Live jazz	5.8%	5.3%	9.8% ***
Live dance (other than ballet)	5.2%	4.2%	7.7% *
Live nonmusical play	5.2%	4.5%	9.5% ***
Used Internet: Programs or information about the visual arts	5.0%	5.1%	8.7% *
Used TV or radio: Programs or information about the visual arts	4.8%	6.4%	10.1% **
Purchase or acquire art	4.0%	4.2%	8.0% ***
Used TV or radio: Programs or information about books or writers	3.8%	5.0%	9.0% ***
Email, post, share: other visual art	3.7%	5.4%	7.1% **
Perform or practice dancing	3.5%	5.0%	7.6% ***
Leatherwork, metalwork, woodwork	3.4%	4.1%	7.4% ***
Creative Writing	3.0%	3.0%	6.8% **
Used TV or radio: Theater productions	2.8%	4.7%	6.9% ***
Live ballet	1.4%	2.3%	3.0% **
Live opera	1.4%	2.1%	3.3% **
Email, post, share: creative writing	1.2%	1.4%	3.2% **
Perform or practice classical music	0.8%	1.2%	3.4% ***
Teach art lessons or classes	0.6%	0.6%	2.8% ***

(Continued) Appendix Table A. Significant Differences between 1.5-Generation & 1st-Generation Immigrants who entered US as adults

Used a DVD, or CD player or record or tape player to access art	27.6%	27.1%	26.3%
Mobile device: Novels, short stories, poetry or plays	26.4%	25.8%	28.9%
Email, post, share: photography	23.9%	21.0%	24.9%
Attend any Free Music, Theater, or Dance Performances	17.2%	12.7%	19.7%
Theater, concert hall, or auditorium	11.4%	8.5%	15.3%
Play a musical instrument	10.8%	8.1%	14.5%
Restaurant, bar, nightclub, or coffee shop	10.5%	7.2%	14.8%
Used Internet: Classical music	9.6%	10.5%	9.8%
Elementary, middle or high school	9.6%	8.1%	11.0%
Mobile device: theater or dance	9.4%	7.9%	6.0%
Create photos	9.2%	8.5%	12.8%
Used Internet: Programs or information about books or writers	8.9%	5.7%	9.1%
Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	8.0%	7.3%	7.4%
Used TV or radio: jazz	7.5%	8.1%	11.2%
Used Internet: Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	7.0%	5.7%	7.3%
Email, post, share: dance	6.7%	5.7%	5.0%
Used Internet: jazz	6.6%	6.0%	8.0%
Scrapbooking	6.4%	4.6%	5.1%
Used TV or radio: Other dance programs or shows	6.3%	7.4%	10.1%
Perform or practice singing	5.6%	6.1%	8.8%
Create visual art	5.4%	4.3%	8.4%
Community center	5.2%	4.0%	3.2%
Used TV or radio: Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	4.8%	4.1%	5.0%
Sing with other people	4.5%	4.4%	6.1%
Edited/remixed music	4.1%	1.4%	6.3%
Email, post, share: scrapbooking	4.1%	2.3%	1.9%
Create films/video	4.1%	1.9%	4.6%
Used Internet: Theater productions	3.8%	1.9%	2.4%
Email, post, share: film/video edited/remixed	3.7%	1.5%	4.4%
Email, post, share: visual art created	3.7%	2.4%	5.2%
Used Internet: Opera	3.6%	2.8%	2.8%
Subscribe to an arts or cultural organization	3.4%	5.0%	5.0%
Used mobile device/Internet to visual art	3.3%	2.2%	4.4%
Create or perform music	3.3%	4.1%	5.8%
Edited/remixed film/video	3.3%	1.4%	4.6%
Used Internet: Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	3.1%	3.1%	2.1%
Attend book club	2.7%	1.8%	2.7%
Email, post, share: poetry, short stories, or plays	2.5%	4.0%	4.0%
Perform or practice choral music/choir	2.5%	1.8%	2.5%
Live book reading/storytelling	2.5%	3.7%	4.4%
Used TV or radio: Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	2.4%	2.7%	3.8%
Acting	2.3%	1.1%	2.4%
Edited/remixed dance performances	2.2%	0.8%	0.9%
Used mobile device/Internet to create music	2.0%	0.9%	1.6%
Email, post, share: music created, performed edited/remixed	2.0%	0.8%	2.0%
Perform or practice musical or nonmusical play	2.0%	0.3%	0.8%
Perform or practice Latin, Spanish or salsa music	0.9%	0.7%	2.2%
Perform or practice jazz	0.2%	0.3%	1.0%
Email, post, share: dance performances created, performed edited/remixed	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Additional Tables

Appendix Table B. Rates of US Adult Arts Participation, by Nativity (2012)

	Total		Sig. Diff.	Marginal Difference in Rates
	US-Born	Foreign-Born		
N (unweighted)	30777	4958		
Proportions (weighted)	83.0%	17.0%		
Used TV or radio: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	43.7%	22.4%	***	21.3%
Read literature	46.1%	31.2%	***	14.9%
Own art	30.9%	16.1%	***	14.8%
Used the Internet at all	73.3%	59.8%	***	13.4%
Visit a craft or visual art fair	24.3%	13.2%	***	11.1%
Used handheld or mobile device	54.9%	44.6%	***	10.4%
Used Internet: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	36.5%	26.3%	***	10.2%
Go to the movies	60.9%	50.9%	***	10.0%
Visit a historic park or monument	25.6%	15.6%	***	10.0%
Visit an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	22.3%	13.5%	***	8.8%
Live musical play	16.6%	8.5%	***	8.1%
Mobile device: music	65.5%	57.5%	***	8.1%
Gardening for pleasure	40.0%	33.2%	***	6.8%
Email, post, share: photography	27.5%	21.7%	***	5.8%
Visit an art museum	22.0%	16.3%	***	5.6%
Email, post, share: photographs created/edited	16.3%	10.8%	***	5.5%
Purchase or acquire art	9.3%	4.1%	***	5.2%
Leatherwork, metalwork, woodwork	9.1%	4.0%	***	5.1%
Photo editing	13.9%	8.9%	***	5.0%
Mobile device: Novels, short stories, poetry or plays	30.9%	26.0%	**	4.9%
Create photos	13.1%	8.7%	***	4.4%
Live nonmusical play	9.0%	4.6%	***	4.4%
Play a musical instrument	12.8%	8.7%	***	4.1%
Live classical music	9.4%	5.8%	***	3.5%
Creative Writing	6.5%	3.0%	***	3.5%
Perform or practice singing	9.3%	5.9%	***	3.4%
Used TV or radio: Programs or information about books or writers	8.1%	4.7%	***	3.4%
Live jazz	8.7%	5.4%	***	3.2%
Weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting or sewing	13.7%	10.7%	***	3.0%
Used TV or radio: Classical music	12.2%	9.2%	***	3.0%
Sing with other people	7.3%	4.3%	***	3.0%
Donate to an arts or cultural organization	11.6%	8.8%	***	2.8%
Edited/remixed music	4.9%	2.1%	***	2.8%
Subscribe to an arts or cultural organization	7.2%	4.6%	***	2.6%
Email, post, share: music	21.7%	19.2%	*	2.5%
Used TV or radio: Theater productions	6.6%	4.3%	***	2.4%
Pottery, ceramics, jewelry	5.0%	2.6%	***	2.4%
Email, post, share: films or video	13.8%	11.6%	*	2.2%
Social dancing	31.9%	29.7%		2.2%
Used TV or radio: Jazz	9.9%	7.9%	**	2.0%
Used TV or radio: Programs or information about the visual arts	8.0%	6.0%	**	2.0%
Email, post, share: creative writing	3.2%	1.3%	***	1.9%
Attend book club	3.8%	2.0%	***	1.8%
Play a musical instrument with other people	5.4%	3.6%	***	1.8%
Scrapbooking	6.8%	5.1%	*	1.7%
Live dance (other than ballet)	5.9%	4.4%	**	1.4%
Mobile device: visual arts	15.0%	13.6%		1.4%
Create or perform music	5.3%	3.8%	*	1.4%
Used TV or radio: Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	4.0%	2.6%	**	1.4%
Used Internet: Jazz	7.5%	6.1%		1.4%
Create visual art	5.9%	4.6%		1.4%
Used TV or radio: Other dance programs or shows	8.6%	7.2%		1.3%
Teach art lessons or classes	1.9%	0.6%	***	1.3%
Perform or practice choral music/choir	3.1%	2.0%	*	1.1%
Perform or practice classical music	2.2%	1.1%	***	1.1%

(Continued) Appendix Table A. Rates of US Adult Arts Participation, by Nativity

Used Internet: Programs or information about books or writers	7.5%	6.6%		0.9%
Email, post, share: poetry, short stories, or plays	4.5%	3.6%		0.9%
Live book reading/storytelling	4.3%	3.4%		0.8%
Used Internet: Programs or information about the visual arts	5.9%	5.1%		0.8%
Live ballet	2.9%	2.1%	**	0.8%
Email, post, share: other visual art	5.7%	5.0%		0.7%
Email, post, share: visual art created	3.3%	2.7%		0.6%
Used Internet: Theater productions	3.1%	2.4%		0.6%
Used Internet: Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	6.6%	6.0%		0.6%
Email, post, share: music created, performed edited/remixed	1.6%	1.1%		0.6%
Perform or practice jazz	0.9%	0.3%	***	0.5%
Perform or practice dancing	5.2%	4.7%		0.5%
Create films/video	2.9%	2.5%		0.5%
Email, post, share: film/video edited/remixed	2.5%	2.0%		0.5%
Edited/remixed film/video	2.3%	1.9%		0.4%
Used mobile device/Internet to visual art	2.9%	2.5%		0.4%
Used mobile device/Internet to create music	1.5%	1.2%		0.3%
Perform or practice opera	0.3%	0.1%	**	0.2%
Live opera	2.2%	2.0%		0.2%
Create or perform dance	1.3%	1.2%		0.1%
Acting	1.4%	1.3%		0.1%
Perform or practice musical or nonmusical play	0.6%	0.7%		0.0%
Email, post, share: dance performances created, performed edited/remixed	0.2%	0.2%		0.0%
Perform or practice Latin, Spanish or salsa music	0.6%	0.7%		-0.1%
Used TV or radio: Opera	3.6%	3.7%		-0.2%
Edited/remixed dance performances	0.8%	1.2%		-0.4%
Used TV or radio: Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	3.8%	4.3%		-0.5%
Used a DVD, or CD player or record or tape player to access art	26.6%	27.1%		-0.6%
Email, post, share: scrapbooking	2.0%	2.8%		-0.7%
Used Internet: Opera	1.9%	3.1%		-1.1%
Email, post, share: dance	4.7%	5.9%		-1.2%
Used Internet: Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	1.5%	3.1%	**	-1.5%
Used Internet: Other dance programs or shows	2.8%	4.9%	**	-2.1%
Mobile device: theater or dance	6.0%	8.3%	*	-2.3%
Used Internet: Classical music	7.9%	10.3%	*	-2.4%
Live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	3.8%	11.0%	***	-7.1%
Used Internet: Latin, Spanish or salsa music	6.0%	17.6%	***	-11.6%
Used TV or radio: Latin, Spanish or salsa music	7.3%	26.4%	***	-19.1%

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Appendix Table C. Predictive Power of Immigrant-Generation for Arts Participation

	R-squared		R-squared
Used TV or radio: Latin, Spanish or salsa music	7.5%	Acting	0.1%
Used Internet: Latin, Spanish or salsa music	4.0%	Live dance (other than ballet)	0.1%
Used TV or radio: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	2.7%	Perform or practice dancing	0.1%
Live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	2.7%	Perform or practice choral music/choir	0.1%
Read literature	1.5%	Perform or practice jazz	0.1%
Own art	1.5%	Perform or practice opera	0.1%
Visit a craft or visual art fair	1.0%	Play a musical instrument with other people	0.1%
Visit a historic park or monument	0.8%	Weaving, crocheting, quilting, needlepoint, knitting or sewing	0.1%
Live musical play	0.7%	Live opera	0.1%
Visit an outdoor festival w/ performing artists	0.7%	Attend any Free Music, Theater, or Dance Performances	0.1%
Leatherwork, metalwork, woodwork	0.6%	Elementary, middle or high school	0.1%
Go to the movies	0.6%	Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	0.1%
Attend any other music, theater, or dance performance	0.6%	Used TV or radio: jazz	0.1%
Used Internet: Other music, such as rock, pop, country, folk, rap or hip-hop	0.6%	Used TV or radio: Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	0.1%
Used handheld or mobile device	0.6%	Used TV or radio: Theater productions	0.1%
Social dancing	0.6%	Used TV or radio: Other dance programs or shows	0.1%
Purchase or acquire art	0.5%	Used TV or radio: Programs or information about the visual arts	0.1%
Perform or practice Latin, Spanish or salsa music	0.4%	Used Internet: Programs or information about books or writers	0.1%
Gardening for pleasure	0.4%	Used Internet: None of the Above	0.1%
Mobile device: music	0.4%	Used Internet: Classical music	0.1%
Photo editing	0.4%	Used Internet: Opera	0.1%
Live nonmusical play	0.4%	Mobile device: theater or dance	0.1%
Visit an art museum	0.3%	Email, post, share: music	0.1%
Play a musical instrument	0.3%	Email, post, share: films or video	0.1%
College or University	0.3%	Create or perform music	0.1%
Restaurant, bar, nightclub, or coffee shop	0.3%	Create films/video	0.1%
Email, post, share: photography	0.3%	Used mobile device/Internet to visual art	0.1%
Edited/remixed music	0.3%	Email, post, share: visual art created	0.1%
Create photos	0.3%	Scrapbooking	0.1%
Email, post, share: photographs created/edited	0.3%	Live ballet	0.0%
Creative Writing	0.3%	Perform or practice musical or nonmusical play	0.0%
Attend book club	0.2%	Community center	0.0%
Live classical music	0.2%	Mobile device: visual arts	0.0%
Perform or practice classical music	0.2%	Used TV or radio: Opera	0.0%
Donate to an arts or cultural organization	0.2%	Used TV or radio: Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	0.0%
Live jazz	0.2%	Used a DVD, or CD player or record or tape player to access art	0.0%
Theater, concert hall, or auditorium	0.2%	Used Internet: jazz	0.0%
Art museum or gallery	0.2%	Used Internet: Books, short stories, or poetry read aloud	0.0%
Park or open-air facility	0.2%	Used Internet: Theater productions	0.0%
Used TV or radio: Programs or information about books or writers	0.2%	Email, post, share: dance	0.0%
Used TV or radio: Classical music	0.2%	Email, post, share: other visual art	0.0%
Used Internet: Ballet, modern or contemporary dance	0.2%	Email, post, share: poetry, short stories, or plays	0.0%
Used Internet: Other dance programs or shows	0.2%	Used mobile device/Internet to create music	0.0%
Used Internet: Programs or information about the visual arts	0.2%	Email, post, share: music created, performed edited/remixed	0.0%
Mobile device: Novels, short stories, poetry or plays	0.2%	Create or perform dance	0.0%
Email, post, share: None of the Above	0.2%	Edited/remixed dance performances	0.0%
Edited/remixed film/video	0.2%	Email, post, share: dance performances created, performed edited/remixed	0.0%
Email, post, share: film/video edited/remixed	0.2%	Email, post, share: scrapbooking	0.0%
Create visual art	0.2%	Live book reading/storytelling	0.0%
Email, post, share: creative writing	0.2%		
Pottery, ceramics, jewelry	0.2%		
Sing with other people	0.2%		
Perform or practice singing	0.2%		
Subscribe to an arts or cultural organization	0.2%		
Teach art lessons or classes	0.2%		

Source: Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2012

Appendix Table D. Continued Regression Results from Table 15 (Demographic Control Variables)

	Attend live jazz	Attend live classical music	Attend live opera	Attend live musical	Attend live non- musical play	Attend live ballet	Attend live dance (other than ballet)	Visit an art museum	Visit a crafts fair or visual arts festival	Visit...park /monume nt, ...bldgs/ neighborh oods...	Read Books	Read literature	Attend live Latin, Spanish or salsa music	Visit an outdoor festival [with] performin g artists
	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
HIGHEST LEVEL OF SCHOOL COMPLETED OR DEGREE RECEIVED (<HS omitted)														
Some high school	0.996 0.00	1.018*** 0.01	1.008*** 0.00	1.008 0.01	1.013*** 0.00	1.006*** 0.00	0.997 0.00	1.022*** 0.01	1.022** 0.01	1.01 0.01	1.064*** 0.01	1.075*** 0.01	1.021 0.01	0.99 0.01
High grad (GED)	1.017*** 0.00	1.025*** 0.00	1.006*** 0.00	1.027*** 0.01	1.018*** 0.00	1.007*** 0.00	1.003 0.00	1.043*** 0.01	1.068*** 0.01	1.047*** 0.01	1.154*** 0.01	1.153*** 0.01	1.025** 0.01	1.017 0.01
Some college	1.060*** 0.01	1.083*** 0.01	1.020*** 0.00	1.100*** 0.00	1.065*** 0.00	1.025*** 0.00	1.036*** 0.00	1.166*** 0.01	1.159*** 0.01	1.177*** 0.01	1.360*** 0.02	1.319*** 0.01	1.047*** 0.01	1.092*** 0.01
College graduate	1.123*** 0.01	1.176*** 0.01	1.044*** 0.00	1.222*** 0.01	1.149*** 0.01	1.051*** 0.00	1.058*** 0.01	1.364*** 0.01	1.250*** 0.01	1.303*** 0.01	1.539*** 0.02	1.470*** 0.02	1.067*** 0.01	1.163*** 0.02
Advanced degree	1.172*** 0.01	1.299*** 0.01	1.087*** 0.01	1.295*** 0.01	1.226*** 0.01	1.092*** 0.01	1.107*** 0.01	1.525*** 0.02	1.292*** 0.02	1.405*** 0.01	1.654*** 0.02	1.569*** 0.02	1.071*** 0.01	1.197*** 0.02
INCOME (<\$20k omitted)														
\$20-29k	0.999 0.00	0.999 0.00	1.004 0.00	1.005 0.01	1.002 0.00	1.001 0.00	0.998 0.00	1.005 0.01	1.018** 0.01	1.019*** 0.01	1.001 0.01	1.015 0.01	0.989* 0.01	1.016* 0.01
\$30-39k	1.017*** 0.01	1.016*** 0.01	1.003 0.00	1.021*** 0.01	1.017*** 0.00	1.007** 0.00	1.009* 0.00	1.029*** 0.01	1.062*** 0.01	1.047*** 0.01	1.023** 0.01	1.028** 0.01	0.999 0.01	1.030*** 0.01
\$40-49k	1.022*** 0.01	1.018*** 0.01	1.001 0.00	1.040*** 0.01	1.021*** 0.01	1.004 0.00	1.006 0.01	1.035*** 0.01	1.057*** 0.01	1.055*** 0.01	1.029** 0.01	1.033*** 0.01	0.997 0.01	1.037*** 0.01
\$50-59k	1.007 0.01	1.013* 0.01	1 0.00	1.044*** 0.01	1.016** 0.01	1.004 0.00	1.014*** 0.00	1.045*** 0.01	1.059*** 0.01	1.066*** 0.01	1.042*** 0.01	1.024** 0.01	1.001 0.01	1.035*** 0.01
\$60-74k	1.020*** 0.01	1.023*** 0.01	1.009** 0.00	1.068*** 0.01	1.028*** 0.01	1.015*** 0.00	1.018*** 0.01	1.069*** 0.01	1.095*** 0.01	1.106*** 0.01	1.058*** 0.01	1.049*** 0.01	1.001 0.01	1.064*** 0.02
\$75k+	1.043*** 0.01	1.042*** 0.01	1.011*** 0.00	1.122*** 0.01	1.062*** 0.01	1.015*** 0.00	1.027*** 0.00	1.123*** 0.01	1.112*** 0.01	1.157*** 0.01	1.092*** 0.01	1.080*** 0.01	1.007 0.01	1.080*** 0.01
Age	1 0.00	0.998*** 0.00	0.999*** 0.00	0.999 0.00	0.999** 0.00	1 0.00	1 0.00	0.999* 0.00	1.007*** 0.00	1.003*** 0.00	0.998*** 0.00	0.996*** 0.00	1 0.00	1.001 0.00
Age (squared)	1 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1.000* 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1 0.00	1 0.00	1 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1.000*** 0.00	1 0.00	1.000*** 0.00
RACE/ETHNICITY (White, NonHispanic omitted)														
African American, NonHispanic	1.042*** 0.01	0.960*** 0.00	0.991*** 0.00	0.957*** 0.01	0.978*** 0.00	0.987*** 0.00	0.996 0.00	0.932*** 0.01	0.894*** 0.01	0.901*** 0.01	0.916*** 0.01	0.926*** 0.01	1.002 0.00	0.957*** 0.01
Hispanic	1.005 0.01	0.980*** 0.00	0.996 0.00	0.983** 0.01	0.991 0.01	0.992* 0.00	1.011** 0.01	0.998 0.01	0.978*** 0.01	0.955*** 0.01	0.901*** 0.01	0.907*** 0.01	1.172*** 0.01	0.996 0.01
American Indian, NonHispanic	0.999 0.02	0.997 0.02	0.996 0.01	0.962** 0.02	0.988 0.02	0.980*** 0.00	1.011 0.01	1.003 0.03	1.028 0.03	0.99 0.03	0.976 0.03	1.001 0.04	1.015 0.01	1.096** 0.05
Asian/Pacific Islander, NonHispanic	0.967*** 0.01	0.953*** 0.01	0.980*** 0.01	0.943*** 0.01	0.950*** 0.01	0.971*** 0.01	0.989 0.01	0.966*** 0.01	0.897*** 0.01	0.920*** 0.01	0.894*** 0.01	0.887*** 0.02	0.974*** 0.01	0.947*** 0.02
2 or more races, NonHispanic	1.006 0.02	0.980* 0.01	1.013 0.01	0.987 0.02	0.979** 0.01	0.991 0.01	1.02 0.01	1.012 0.02	1.009 0.03	1.01 0.03	0.982 0.03	1.001 0.03	1.011 0.01	1.009 0.02
Male	0.995**	0.981***	0.992***	0.945***	0.970***	0.982***	0.979***	0.957***	0.904***	0.976***	0.843***	0.838***	0.995*	0.985***

Appendix Table E. Distribution of Demographic Characteristics within Imputed Legal Statuses

	Native Citizens	Naturalized Citizens	Non-Citizens, Legal					Non-Citizens, Undocumented				
Imputation	na	na	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Weighted Portion</i>	85.23%	6.78%	6.74%	6.70%	6.74%	6.68%	6.84%	1.25%	1.30%	1.25%	1.31%	1.15%
Year of Entry												
US Born	98.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Before 1950	0.1%	2.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1950-1959	0.3%	7.4%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1960-1964	0.1%	6.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1965-1969	0.2%	6.8%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1970-1974	0.2%	8.6%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1975-1979	0.2%	12.6%	4.9%	5.0%	4.9%	5.0%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1980-1981	0.0%	7.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.4%	2.6%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
1982-1983	0.1%	4.2%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%	0.6%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	0.6%
1984-1985	0.0%	5.9%	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	2.5%	2.3%	0.4%	1.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.7%
1986-1987	0.2%	4.8%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.8%	2.8%	2.0%	2.0%	2.3%	1.5%	1.6%
1988-1989	0.1%	5.3%	4.9%	4.6%	4.6%	4.7%	4.6%	3.4%	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%	5.5%
1990-1991	0.1%	6.3%	6.1%	6.5%	6.6%	6.6%	6.1%	6.2%	4.1%	3.6%	3.4%	6.4%
1992-1993	0.0%	5.6%	5.1%	5.4%	4.7%	4.7%	5.0%	6.1%	4.4%	8.0%	8.1%	6.8%
1994-1995	0.1%	4.4%	6.1%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.1%	3.3%	3.8%	3.4%	3.6%	3.1%
1996-1997	0.0%	4.5%	7.3%	7.2%	7.6%	6.9%	6.9%	9.5%	10.2%	8.1%	11.7%	12.4%
1998-1999	0.0%	2.6%	9.1%	9.7%	9.0%	9.1%	9.9%	15.4%	12.0%	16.1%	15.2%	11.1%
2000-2001	0.0%	2.5%	12.9%	12.8%	13.7%	13.1%	12.5%	12.2%	13.2%	8.2%	11.6%	14.5%
2002-2003	0.0%	0.8%	8.6%	8.0%	7.9%	8.9%	9.2%	13.3%	15.9%	16.9%	11.5%	10.2%
2004-2006	0.0%	0.5%	8.5%	8.5%	8.4%	8.5%	8.7%	13.4%	13.0%	13.7%	13.2%	12.3%
2007-2008	0.0%	0.7%	9.5%	9.5%	9.9%	9.5%	9.5%	14.5%	14.3%	12.3%	14.0%	14.9%
Education												
Some High school	12.6%	18.4%	35.6%	34.7%	34.4%	35.2%	34.7%	37.7%	42.3%	44.1%	39.4%	43.0%
HS Graduate	31.2%	27.2%	26.4%	25.8%	26.2%	25.7%	25.7%	18.2%	21.4%	19.2%	22.1%	21.5%
Some College	29.1%	20.4%	14.5%	14.7%	14.9%	14.6%	14.7%	15.5%	14.5%	13.0%	14.8%	14.0%
College	18.3%	22.0%	15.3%	15.8%	15.6%	15.9%	15.3%	13.0%	10.3%	11.3%	10.0%	12.8%
Graduate Degree	8.9%	12.1%	8.3%	9.0%	8.9%	8.6%	9.6%	15.6%	11.6%	12.4%	13.7%	8.8%
Income												
<\$20k	14.6%	15.1%	20.3%	20.0%	19.8%	20.2%	20.2%	18.3%	20.2%	21.3%	19.0%	19.0%
\$20-29k	11.0%	11.4%	18.3%	18.6%	18.0%	17.9%	17.7%	17.9%	16.0%	19.6%	20.1%	21.2%
\$30-39k	10.5%	12.5%	14.3%	13.8%	13.4%	14.6%	14.2%	15.2%	17.6%	19.9%	13.5%	15.9%
\$40-49k	9.6%	7.2%	9.0%	8.7%	9.6%	8.9%	8.8%	12.5%	13.9%	9.2%	12.9%	13.7%
\$50-59k	9.0%	7.8%	8.8%	8.8%	9.1%	8.4%	8.6%	6.3%	6.5%	4.5%	8.3%	7.1%
\$60-74k	11.8%	12.5%	7.8%	7.7%	7.8%	7.9%	8.1%	7.2%	7.7%	7.2%	6.9%	5.1%
\$75K+	33.5%	33.5%	21.5%	22.4%	22.3%	22.2%	22.4%	22.7%	18.2%	18.4%	19.4%	17.9%
Age												
<i>Mean</i>	46.66	50.56	40.88	41.00	40.86	40.96	40.68	34.68	34.26	34.78	34.54	35.32
Race/Ethnicity												
White, NonHispanic	77.8%	26.5%	15.4%	15.5%	15.7%	15.9%	15.5%	16.8%	16.0%	15.3%	14.4%	16.0%
Black, NonHispanic	11.8%	7.6%	6.1%	6.1%	5.6%	6.1%	6.2%	8.6%	8.9%	11.2%	8.7%	8.2%
Hispanic	7.2%	36.8%	58.5%	58.7%	58.7%	58.3%	57.5%	51.9%	51.1%	50.6%	53.0%	57.0%
Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific isla	1.2%	28.6%	19.9%	19.6%	19.9%	19.6%	20.6%	22.7%	24.0%	22.9%	24.0%	18.8%
Other, NonHispanic	2.1%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sex												
Female	52.4%	51.1%	49.0%	48.9%	48.8%	49.1%	48.0%	43.3%	43.9%	44.1%	42.7%	48.3%
Male	47.6%	48.9%	51.1%	51.1%	51.2%	50.9%	52.0%	56.7%	56.1%	55.9%	57.3%	51.7%

References

- Ahmed, B. and Robinson, J. G., 1994. Estimates of Emigration of the Foreign-Born Population: 1980-1990. In: US Census Bureau ed. *Population Division Working Papers No. 9*. Washington, DC.
- Alba, R. D. and Nee, V. 1997. Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review, Special Issue: Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans*, 31(4), 826-874.
- Alba, R. D. and Nee, V., 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alvarez, M., 2005. *There's Nothing Informal About It: Participatory arts within the cultural ecology of Silicon Valley*. San Jose, CA: Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley.
- American Social History Project and the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media, *Who Was Shut Out?: Immigration Quotas, 1925-1927* [online]. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University. Available from: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5078> [Accessed August 3 2016].
- AMS Planning and Research Corp, 1995. *A practical guide to arts participation research*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Azur, M. J., et al. 2011. Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations: What is it and how does it work? *International journal of methods in psychiatric research*, 20(1), 40-49.
- Bachmeier, J. D., Van Hook, J. and Bean, F. D. 2014. Can We Measure Immigrants' Legal Status? Lessons from Two US Surveys. *International Migration Review*, 48(2), 538-566.
- Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O. 2007. Determinants of Impact: Towards a Better Understanding of Encounters with the Arts. *Cultural Trends*, 16(3), 225-275.
- Bergonzi, L. and Smith, J., 1996. *Effects of Arts Education on Participation in the Arts*. Santa Ana, CA.
- Berkanovic, E. 1980. The Effect of Inadequate Language Translation on Hispanics' Responses to Health Surveys. *American Journal of Public Health*, 70(12), 1273-1276.
- Blume-Kohout, M. E., Leonard, S. R. and Novak-Leonard, J. L., 2015. *When going gets tough: barriers and motivations affecting arts attendance*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Brown, A. 2006. An architecture of value. *Grantmakers in the Arts*, (Winter), 18-25.
- Brown, A. S., Novak, J. L. and Kitchener, A., 2008. *Cultural engagement in California's Inland Regions*. San Francisco, CA: WolfBrown.
- Brown, J. E., 2001. There is No Word for Art. *Teaching Spirits: Understanding Native American Religious Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 61-82.
- Byrd, S. 2014. "The collective circle": Latino immigrant musicians and politics in Charlotte, North Carolina. *American Ethnologist*, 41(2), 246-260.
- Camarota, S. A. and Capizzano, J., 2004. *Assessing the Quality of Data Collected on the Foreign Born: An Evaluation of the American Community Survey (ACS)*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.
- Damico, A., 2013a. imputation functions.R. Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Damico, A., 2013b. regression creation.R. Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Davidov, E. and De Beuckelaer, A. 2010. How Harmful are Survey Translations? A Test with Schwartz's Human Values Instrument. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22(4), 485-510.
- Deardorff, K. E. and Blumerman, L. M., 2001. *Evaluating Components of International Migration: Estimates of the Foreign-Born Population by Migrant Status in 2000*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.
- DiMaggio, P. and Fernandez-Kelly, P., eds., 2010. *Arts in the Lives of Immigrant Communities in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. and Ostrower, F., 1992. *Race, ethnicity and participation in the arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Dimaggio, P. and Useem, M. 1978. Social Class and Arts Consumption: The Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America. *Theory & Society*, 5(2), 141.

- Farrell, B. and Medvedeva, M., 2010. *Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.
- Fernández-Kelly, P., 2010. A Howl to the Heavens: Art in the Life of First- and Second-Generation Cuban Americans. In: DiMaggio, P. and Fernandez-Kelly, P. eds. *Art in the Lives of Immigrant Communities in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 52-71.
- Fremstad, S. and Cox, L., 2004. *Covering New Americans: A Review of Federal and State Policies Related to Immigrants' Eligibility and Access to Publicly Funded Health Insurance*. Washington, DC: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Garfield, R. and Damico, A., 2013. *The Coverage Gap: Uninsured Poor Adults in States that Do Not Expand Medicaid, Technical Appendix B: Immigration Status Imputation*. Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Garfield, R., et al., 2016. *Kaiser Family Foundation ACA Eligibility Analysis, Technical Appendix B: Immigration Status Imputation*. Menlo Park, CA: The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Gibson, C. J. and Lenon, E., 1999. *Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-born Population of the United States: 1850-1990*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.
- Goldman, D. P., Smith, J. P. and Sood, N. 2005. Legal Status and Health Insurance Among Immigrants. *Health Affairs*, 24(6), 1640-1711.
- Gordon, M. M., 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greenberger, A., 2015. Tania Bruguera to Be First Artist-in-Residence for New York City Mayor's Office of Immigrant Affairs. *ARTnews*, 7/13/15, p.
- Hoefler, M., Rytina, N. and Baker, B., 2012. *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2011*. Washington, DC: Office of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security.
- Hoefler, M., Rytina, N. and Baker, B. C., 2008. *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2007*. Washington, DC: Office of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security.
- Ivey, B., 2008. *Arts, inc.: how greed and neglect have destroyed our cultural rights*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Iyengar, S., et al., 2012. *How Arts Works: The National Endowment for the Arts' Five-Year Research Agenda, with a System Map and Measurement Model*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Jones, M. O. 1971. The Concept of "Aesthetic" in the Traditional Arts. *Western Folklore*, 30(2), 77-104.
- Judson, D. H. and Swanson, D. A., 2011. *Estimating Characteristics of the Foreign-Born by Legal Status: An Evaluation of Data and Methods*. New York: Springer.
- Kasinitz, P., 2014. Immigrants, the Arts, and the "Second-Generation Advantage" in New York. In: Foner, N., et al. eds. *New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape*. New York: New York University Press, 263-286.
- Kasinitz, P., et al., eds., 2008. *Inheriting the City : The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kaushal, N. and Kaestner, R. 2005. Welfare reform and health insurance of immigrants. *Health Serv Res*, 40(3), 697-721.
- Keegan, C., 1987. *Public participation in classical ballet: a special analysis of the ballet data collected in the 1982 and 1985 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Kim, J. and Shin, H. 2006. Public health insurance enrollment among immigrants and nonimmigrants: findings from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 8(4), 303-311.
- Kreidler, J. 1996. Leverage lost: The nonprofit arts in the post-Ford era. *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society*, 26(2), 79.
- Kreidler, J. 2013. Modeling the future of US arts policy: Beyond supply-side pump-priming. *Cultural Trends*, 22(3-4), 145-155.

- Ku, L., 2006. *Why Immigrants Lack Adequate Access to Health Care and Health Insurance* [online]. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Available from: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/why-immigrants-lack-adequate-access-health-care-and-health-insurance> [Accessed August 3 2016].
- Ku, L. and Matani, S. 2001. Left Out: Immigrants' Access to Health Care and Insurance. *Health Affairs*, 20(1), 247-256.
- Lena, J. C. and Cornfield, D. B., 2008. Immigrant Arts Participation in Nashville. In: Ivey, S. T. a. B. ed. *Engaging Art: The Next Great Transformation of America's Cultural Life*. New York: Routledge, 147-169.
- Lena, J. C. and Lindemann, D. J. 2014. Who is an artist? New data for an old question. *Poetics*, 43, 70-85.
- Lopez, M. H. and Passel, J., 2015. The Nation's Immigration Laws, 1920 to Today. *Modern Immigration Wave Brings 59 Million to U.S., Driving Population Growth and Change Through 2065*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 18-22.
- Marcelli, E. A. and Ong, P. M., 2002. 2000 Census Coverage of Foreign-Born Mexicans in Los Angeles County: Implications for Demographic Analysis. *Annual meeting of the Population Association of America*. Atlanta, GA.
- Markusen, A. and Gadwa, A., 2010. *Creative Placemaking*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Martin, S. F., 2011. *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, K., Ondaatje, E. and Zakaras, L., 2001. *Guide to the Literature on Participation in the Art*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- McCarthy, K. F. and Jinnett, K., 2001. *A new framework for building arts participation*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- McCarthy, K. F., et al., 2004. *Gifts of the muse: reframing the debate about the benefits of the arts*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Migration Policy Institute Data Hub, 2017. *Immigrants Residing in the United States: Number and Share of Total U.S. Population, 1850-2014* [online]. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Available from: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/us-immigration-trends-history> [Accessed July 17 2017].
- Moriarty, P., 2004. *Immigrant Participatory Arts: An Insight into community-Building in Silicon Valley*. Silicon Valley, CA: Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley.
- Moriarty, P., 2008. *Participatory Arts: The stranger brings a gift*. San Francisco, CA: The San Francisco Foundation.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 1999. *Demographic characteristics of arts attendance: 1997*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 2009. *2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 2012. Survey of public participation in the arts 2012 [survey instrument]. Retrieved from <http://arts.gov/publications/additional-materials-related-to-2012-sppa>.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 2014a, June 2-3. *Measuring Cultural Engagement amid Confounding Variables: A Reality Check*, Washington, DC, National Endowment for the Arts.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 2014b. *How a Nation Engages with Art: Highlights from the 2012 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 2014c. Survey of Public Participation in the Arts 1982-2012 Combined File [United States]. In: National Endowment for the Arts ed. ICPSR35596-v1 ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- National Endowment for the Arts, 2016. *2017 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts* [online]. Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget. Available from: http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewDocument?ref_nbr=201601-3135-002 [Accessed 24 May 2016].
- Nichols, B., 2003. *Demographic characteristics of arts attendance: 2002*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.

- Novak-Leonard, J., *et al.*, 2014. *The changing landscape of arts participation: a synthesis of literature and expert interviews*. Chicago, IL: NORC.
- Novak-Leonard, J., *et al.*, 2015a. *California Survey of Arts & Cultural Participation: technical report*. Chicago, IL: NORC.
- Novak-Leonard, J. L., in press. Inside out: the role of audience research in cultural policy in the United States *In: Durrer, V., Miller, T. and O'Brien, D. eds. Routledge Companion to Cultural Policy*. Routledge.
- Novak-Leonard, J. L. and Brown, A., 2011. *Beyond attendance: a multi-modal understanding of arts participation*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Novak-Leonard, J. L., O'Malley, M. K. and Truong, E. 2015b. Minding the gap: elucidating the disconnect between arts participation metrics and arts engagement within immigrant communities *Cultural Trends*, 24(2), 112-121.
- Novak-Leonard, J. L., *et al.*, 2015c. *The cultural lives of Californians: insights from the California Survey of Arts & Cultural Participation*. Chicago, IL: NORC.
- Novak-Leonard, J. L., Wong, J. and English, N., 2015d. *A closer look at arts engagement in California: insights from the NEA's Survey of Public Participation in the Arts*. Chicago, IL: NORC.
- Orend, R., 1977. Developing research on the arts consumer. *Conference on Policy Related Studies of the National Endowment for the Arts*, December 1977 The Walters Art Museum.
- Orend, R. and Keegan, C., 1996. *Education and Arts Participation: A Study of Arts Socialization and Current Arts-Related Activities Using 1982 and 1992 SPPA Data*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society, 2015. *The Integration of Immigrants into American Society*. Washington, DC: National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine.
- Park, R. E. and Burgess, E., 1925. *The City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Passel, J. and Cohn, D. V., 2008. *United States Population Projections: 2005-2050*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Passel, J. and Cohn, D. V., 2009. *Mexican Immigrants: How Many Come? How Many Leave?*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Passel, J. and Cohn, D. V., 2011. *Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Passel, J., Hook, J. V. and Bean, F. D., 2006. *Narrative profile with adjoining tables of Unauthorized migrants and other immigrants, Based on census 2000: Characteristics and methods*.
- Passel, J. S. and Clark, R. L., 1997. How Many Naturalized Citizens Are There? An Assessment of Data Quality in the Decennial Census and CPS. *Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America*. Washington, DC.
- Passel, J. S., Cohn, D. V. and Gonzalez-Barrera, A., 2013. *Population Decline of Unauthorized Immigrants Stalls, May Have Reversed*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Passel, J. S., Van Hook, J. and Bean, F. D., 2004. *Estimates of the Legal and Unauthorized Foreign-Born Population for the United States and Selected States, Based on Census 2000*. Sabre Systems, Inc. .
- Perlmann, J. and Waldinger, R. 1997. Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present- A Reconsideration. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 893-922.
- Pettit, B. 2000. Resources for studying public participation in and attitudes towards the arts. *Poetics*, 27(5-6), 351-395.
- Pew Research Center, 2013a. *The Rise of Asian Americans*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Pew Research Center, 2013b. *Second-Generation Americans A Portrait of the Adult Children of Immigrants*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P. and Haller, W. 2009. The Adaptation of the Immigrant Second Generation in America: Theoretical Overview and Recent Evidence. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(7), 1077-1104.
- Portes, A. and Rivas, A. 2011. The Adaptation of Migrant Children. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 219-246.
- Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R. G., 2014. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Fourth Edition ed.: University of California Press.

- Portes, A. and Zhou, M. 1993. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. *The Annals*, 530(1), 74-96.
- Rabkin, N. and Hedberg, E. C., 2011. *Arts Education in America: What the Declines Mean for Arts Participation*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Ribar, D. C., 2012. *Immigrants' Time Use: A Survey of Methods and Evidence*. Bonn, Germany: Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit.
- Rife, M. L., et al., 2014. *Measuring cultural engagement: A quest for new terms, tools, and techniques*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Robinson, J. P., et al., 1987. *Survey of Public Participation in the Arts: project report*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Rodriguez, L. C., 2012. *From Chicano therapy to globalriology: Chicana/o popular culture and identity in late 20th and early 21st century Los Angeles*.
- Rosenstein, C., 2005. *Diversity and Participation in the Arts: Insights from the Bay Area*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Rumbaut, R. G., 1997. Ties That Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States. In: Booth, A., Crouter, A. C. and Landale, N. eds. *Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 3-46.
- Rumbaut, R. G. 2004. Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1160-1205.
- Schmidley, A. D. and Robinson, J. G., 1998. *How Well Does The Current Population Survey Measure The Foreign Born Population In The United States?* Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Schunck, R., 2014. *Immigrant Integration. Transnational Activities and Immigrant Integration in Germany*. New York: Springer.
- Silber, B. and Triplett, T., 2015. *A decade of arts engagement: findings from the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2002-2012*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Silva, F., Clark, T. and Cabaço, S. 2014. Culture on the Rise: How and Why Cultural Membership Promotes Democratic Politics. *International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society*, 27(3), 343-366.
- State Health Access Data Assistance Center, 2013. *State Estimates of the Low-income Uninsured Not Eligible for the ACA Medicaid Expansion* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis.
- Stern, M. J., 2011a, July 7. Cities and Their Citizens: Fostering Civic Engagement through the Arts. ed. *Presentation at the Future of the City: The Arts Symposium, Chicago, University of Chicago and National Endowment for the Arts*.
- Stern, M. J., 2011b. *Age and arts participation: A case against demographic destiny*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Stern, M. J. and Seifert, S. C., 2009. *Civic Engagement and the Arts: Issues of Conceptualization and Measurement*. Philadelphia: Social Impact of the Arts Project.
- Stern, M. J., Seifert, S. C. and Vitiello, D., 2008. *Migrants, Communities, and Culture*. New York: The Reinvestment Fund.
- Stern, M. J., Seifert, S. C. and Vitiello, D., 2010. Migrants and the Transformation of Philadelphia's Cultural Economy. In: DiMaggio, P. and Fernandez-Kelly, P. eds. *Art in the Lives of Immigrant Communities in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 23-51.
- Telles, E. E. and Ortiz, V., 2008. *Generations of exclusion : Mexican Americans, assimilation, and race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tepper, S. and Gao, Y., 2008. Engaging art: what counts? In: Tepper, S. J. and Ivey, B. eds. *Engaging Art*. New York: Routledge, 17-48.
- The White House Task Force on New Americans, 2015a. *Strengthening Communities by Welcoming All Residents: A Federal Strategic Action Plan on Immigrant & Refugee Integration* Washington, DC.
- The White House Task Force on New Americans, 2015b. *White House Task Force on New Americans: One-Year Progress Report*. Washington, DC.
- Toepler, S. 2013. Shifting cultural policy landscapes in the USA: what role for philanthropic foundations? *Cultural Trends*, 22(3-4), 167-179.

- Triplett, T., 2009. *2008 SPPA Public-Use Data File User's Guide: A Technical Research Manual*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Triplett, T., 2014. *2012 SPPA Public-Use Data File User's Guide: A Technical Research Manual*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Triplett, T. A., 2011. Results from the Pilot Study for the 2012 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2013a. Asians Fastest-Growing Race or Ethnic Group in 2012, Census Bureau Reports. Washington, DC.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2013b. *How Do We Know? America's Foreign Born in the Last 50 Years* [online]. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Available from: http://www.census.gov/library/infographics/foreign_born.html [Accessed August 2 2015].
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2013c. International Migration is Projected to Become Primary Driver of U.S. Population Growth for First Time in Nearly Two Centuries. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012. *Measuring cultural participation*. Montreal: UIS.
- United States General Accounting Office, 1998. *Immigration Statistics: Information Gaps, Quality Issues Limit Utility of Federal Data to Policymakers*.
- US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2013. *Path to U.S. Citizenship* [online]. Washington, DC. Available from: <https://www.uscis.gov/us-citizenship/citizenship-through-naturalization/path-us-citizenship> [Accessed July 24 2016].
- Van Hook, J. and Bachmeier, J. D. 2013. Citizenship Reporting in the American Community Survey. *Demographic Research*, 29(1), 1-32.
- Van Hook, J., *et al.* 2015. Can We Spin Straw Into Gold? An Evaluation of Immigrant Legal Status Imputation Approaches. *Demography*, 52(1), 329-354.
- Wali, A., Severson, R. and Longoni, M., 2002. *Informal Arts: Finding Cohesion, Capacity and Other Cultural Benefits in Unexpected Places*. Chicago: Chicago Center for Arts Policy at Columbia College.
- Warner, W. L. and Srole, L., 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Warren, R. and Passel, J. S. 1987. A Count of the Uncountable: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 United States Census. *Demography*, 24(3), 375-393.
- Warren, R. and Peck, J. M. 1980. Foreign-Born Emigration from the United States: 1960 to 1970. *Demography*, 17(1), 71-84.
- Waters, M. C., *et al.* 2010. Segmented Assimilation Revisited: Types of Acculturation and Socioeconomic Mobility in Young Adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(7), 1168-1193.
- Wei-Jue, H., *et al.* 2015. Transnational Leisure Experience of Second-Generation Immigrants. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 47(1), 102-124.
- Welch, V. and Kim, Y., 2010. Race/ethnicity and arts participation: findings from the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts. Chicago, IL: NORC.
- Willis, G. B., 1999. Cognitive Interviewing: A "How To" Guide. ed. *1999 Meeting of the American Statistical Association*, 1999.
- Wolgin, P. E., 2011. Beyond National Origins: The Development of Modern Immigration Policymaking, 1948-1968.
- Zhou, M. 1997. Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *The International Migration Review*, 31(4), 975-1008.
- Zong, J. and Batalova, J., 2015. *Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States* [online]. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Available from: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states> [Accessed August 2 2015].