Review of Economic Analysis 15 (2023) 97-125 1973-3909/2023097

Cultural Integration of First-Generation Immigrants: Evidence from European Union Countries

ELEFTHERIOS GIOVANIS
Izmir Bakircay University *

SACIT HADI AKDEDE
Izmir Bakircay University

In this study, we aim to explore and compare the frequency of attendance and the reasons for non-attendance to cultural activities between natives and first-generation immigrants in thirteen European countries. The empirical analysis relies on data from the special module on cultural participation in the European Union-Income and Living Conditions Survey (EU-SILC) in 2015. We apply the Probit and multinomial Probit models. This study contributes to the literature by exploring the determinants of cultural participation and comparing the frequency of participation in cultural activities between natives and first-generation immigrants. Furthermore, the study explores the reasons for non-participation in cultural activities, highlighting potential differences between countries and between the European Union (EU) and non-EU migrants. The results highlight that social interactions depend on several factors related mainly to the country of destination and employment opportunities and individual factors related to the migrant, including demographic and economic characteristics and the length of residence in the host country. The findings show that the length of residence of immigrants in the host countries is positively correlated with a higher frequency of attendance, indicating that cultural participation can be, by its nature, a long-term process or "experienced" activity. The findings also show that in most cases, migrants do not attend the cultural activities we explore because of financial constraints and not due to lack of interest. Thus, this highlights that the economic integration of migrants could be the primary driver of cultural participation and integration.

* This paper has been produced benefiting from the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action 2236 Co-Funded Brain Circulation Scheme2 (CoCirculation2) of TÜBİTAK (Project No: 119C017), which has been funded under the FP7-PEOPLE-2011-COFUND call of the 7th Framework Programme. The author is grateful for the financial support received. However, the entire responsibility of the paper belongs to the owner of the paper. The financial support received from the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) does not mean that the context of the paper is approved in a scientific sense by TÜBİTAK. This study is based on data from Eurostat, EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions in 2015 and the Module on Social and cultural participation and Material deprivation. The authors are grateful to EUROSTAT for providing the data. The responsibility for all conclusions drawn from the data lies entirely with the authors.

Keywords: Cultural Integration; Discrete Choice Models; First-Generation Immigrants; International Migration; Integration; Multiculturalism

JEL Classifications: F22, J15, Z10

1 Introduction

In many Western societies, cultural identity and diversity concepts are at the forefront of the political debate. The discussion in Europe is stimulated by increasing political pressures in many countries associated with increasing immigration flows from as diverse areas as the Eastern European countries following the European Union enlargement in 2004 and 2007, Syria escaping from the civil war started in 2011, and some countries of the Middle East and Africa fleeing the violent conflicts. Sociologists have been studying immigrants' socio-cultural integration patterns at least since the late 19th century. Current research on specific countries provides insights about the phenomena and their drivers, and due to increasing numbers of first-generation immigrants, and even of second and third-generation, the weight of research on outcomes over the long-run period is growing (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Heath et al., 2008; Crul et al., 2010, 2012).

The first aim of this study is to compare the frequency of participation in cultural activities between natives and first-generation immigrants. These activities include: Going to the cinema, live performances, and Visiting cultural sites. The second aim is to explore the reasons for non-attendance and their determinants. Because of data availability, the relevant information required, and space limitations, we will limit our analysis to households from 13 European countries. The data are derived from the European Union Survey on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) in 2015, where a specific module on socio-cultural participation was conducted. According to the structure of the outcomes explored, we apply discrete choice models, particularly the Probit and multinomial Probit models.

While the determinants of participation in social and cultural activities have been extensively explored, few studies have examined the main drivers of migrants' participation (Bertacchini et al., 2022). To the best of our knowledge, this study contributes to the previous literature by comparing the frequency of attendance to cultural activities between natives and the European Union (EU) and non-EU first-generation migrants, as well as investigating the main reasons for non-attendance. The findings reveal that migrants, even though they may show more interest than natives, report that they cannot afford to attend specific activities.

This study is motivated by the fact that previous studies have focused less on a key and essential feature of human socialisation and integration: the degree to which migrants participate in diverse social and cultural activities in host societies. The inclusion of the goal to "leave no one behind" in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda has elevated migrant integration to a central place on the global agenda. Thus, promoting interaction between natives

and migrants, not only in the labour market but also in the cultural sphere, will improve mutual understanding and help eliminate racial prejudice and ethnic barriers. Social inclusion is the complete socio-cultural, economic, and political engagement of migrants in their host communities. Among the indicators of effective integration of migrants are a reduction in the wage gap and an improvement in living standards, education, employment, health, and social inclusion, such as participation in social, cultural, and political activities.

Therefore, while integration in the civic, political, and socio-economic arenas are significant outcomes, the cultural engagement of migrants is worthy of research since it may improve well-being and foster social inclusion (Birman, 2011; Docquier et al., 2014; Giovanis et al., 2021; Giovanis, 2021). Studies found that artistic practices and cultural activities can positively affect the physical and mental well-being of different populations, including migrants. These activities help to reduce depression and anxiety, promote feelings of belonging, raise positive emotions and self-esteem, and help to mitigate the effects of health inequalities that put disadvantaged groups at a higher risk of developing health conditions (Clini et al., 2019; Gordon-Nesbitt and Howarth, 2020; Salgado and Patuzzi, 2022).

Multiple types of funding to promote migrant integration are available on a European level. The largest pool of funds is called the Structural Funds, and it is used to advance the European Union's goal of "economic and social cohesion". Cultural integration remains significant as a stated policy goal and a targeted outcome for projects working with migrants (European Commission, 2007). For instance, the act entitled "Contribution to Good Governance concerning the integration of immigrants and reception of asylum seekers"- which was adopted by members of Eurocities, a network that includes more than 200 large cities in 38 European countries- aims to promote integration for non-EU migrants. Actions include the migrants' involvement in design and implementation that affect their quality of life and promoting access for migrants to the city's cultural facilities and participation in cultural life (European Commission, 2007). Along with this fund, other important resources include the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF), the Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI) programme, and Europe for Citizens, which promote the successful social and cultural integration of non-EU migrants[1].

Improving integration outcomes for migrants, strengthening social cohesion in local communities, and making cultural institutions more relevant, vibrant, and sustainable are just some of the potential outcomes of increasing the inclusion of migrants in arts and cultural activities (McGregor and Ragab, 2016; Salgado and Patuzzi, 2022). As measured by the Migrant Integration Policy Evaluation Index (MIPEX), the integration of migrants in Europe is improved as they enjoy more opportunities than obstacles[2]. However, the integration policies

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/funds-available-eu-level_en

[2] https://www.mipex.eu/

do not fully succeed in providing non-EU migrants equal opportunities, so the outcomes are not entirely favourable (McGregor and Ragab, 2016; Giovanis and Akdede, 2021).

Moreover, the participation of non-EU and non-European migrants is significantly lower compared to EU migrants. For instance, 54 per cent of non-EU migrants participated in cultural activities in 2015, 10 percentage points less than the EU migrants and natives (Eurostat, 2019a). However, cultural participation can vary significantly depending on the type of cultural event. Research shows that migrant and minority groups in Europe are less likely to participate in "high culture" and more likely to participate in popular cultural activities like cinema, pop concerts and festivals (Le and Fujimoto, 2010; Mandel, 2019). Therefore, another motivation of the study is to examine the frequency and the type of cultural participation for EU and non-EU migrants.

The remainder of this study is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses the theoretical framework and the hypotheses tested. Section 3 presents the data and the main regression specifications applied in the empirical analysis. In section 4, we report the empirical results, and in section 5, we discuss the main concluding remarks.

2 Theoretical Framework

Extensive literature in economics and sociology has theoretically and empirically investigated the determinants of socio-cultural participation. From the economic perspective, studies have mainly explored the effects of factors such as labour market conditions, prices, social class and employment status, financial resources, and education level on cultural attendance (Stigler and Becker, 1977; Gray, 2003; Akdede and Ogus Binatli, 2017). The sociological approach provides an understanding of the distinction between the consumption of cultural products and services that differ among social groups (Levine, 1988). This includes differences by age, gender, occupational status, and educational level groups. In his novel and influential work, Bourdieu (1984, 1987) argues that cultural consumption and social class are strongly related in complex ways. Different social classes use their choice of cultural preferences and practices to distinguish themselves from each other, recognise peers, and reproduce their economic, political, and cultural privileges. Consequently, members of a social elite, such as professionals, highly educated and wealthy people, are more likely to participate in highbrow cultural activities, such as attendance to theatre and visits to museums and historical and cultural sites, and to do so more frequently than members of other social classes.

Immigrants can have a set of different characteristics that are relevant for explaining particular preferences, social behaviour and choices. They also face numerous and specific constraints upon their arrival in the host countries, including lack of language skills, lack of financial and time resources, uncertainty about the length of residence in the destination country, and direct barriers to access to other areas of social life, such as social networks, employment opportunities, political activities, and voting rights. In addition, immigrants have

been exposed to another culture either in their country of origin or by interacting with ethnic communities and families. Culture determines expectations and values and thus affects the confidence of individuals, attitudes towards risk and social perceptions and their perspective on culture, family ties, gender roles, and political participation (Bisin et al., 2008).

As discussed in the introduction, the social, political, economic and cultural integration of migrants in European countries has been improved. However, the integration was not equally successful between EU and non-EU migrants. The first aim of this study is to compare the frequency of participation in cultural activities among natives and migrants, as well as between EU and non-EU migrants. Furthermore, we aim to examine the reasons for non-attendance, such as financial constraints and lack of interest.

The second aim is to explore the factors of participation in cultural activities. We classify the individual and household factors into four key sets. The first set is the ***demographic***, which includes gender, age, and marital status. Earlier studies found women are more likely to participate in highbrow leisure and cultural activities, such as visits to museums (Bennett et al., 2013; Coulangeon, 2013). On the other hand, education positively affects men's participation in cultural activities more than women, while women present higher cultural consumption in younger age groups (Christin, 2012).

While engagement in cultural activities may improve mental health (Cuypers et al., 2012), studies show that age, long-standing illnesses, and disability are significant barriers to cultural participation (Lefrancois et al., 1997; Bukov et al., 2002; Wilkie et al., 2007). This finding is also relevant to widowed people, as the majority, especially females who outnumber their male counterparts by a significant margin, are old-aged people experiencing compromised mobility and health problems (Holm et al., 2019; Perrig-Chiello, 2019). On the other hand, other studies show that age can positively correlate with cultural participation, particularly regarding visits to cultural and historical sites (Davies, 2005). Based on the literature, the first hypothesis tested in this study is:

H1: Married people are more likely to participate less frequently in cultural activities, while the role of age is ambiguous, depending on the respondent's health conditions.

The second set is the ***Human Capital***, which includes the education attainment, health conditions, and the migrants' length of residence in the host country. As we have discussed, poor health conditions, long-standing illnesses, and disabilities are significant barriers to cultural participation. We should notice that for the health conditions variable, we get the predicted values derived from the factor analysis using the Activities of Daily Living (ADL) and the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL) (see for more detail, Lawton and Brody, 1969; Katz et al., 1970). Based on the structure of the variables, a higher value implies worse health conditions.

According to earlier studies, education related to higher professional and managerial positions and higher social classes will positively influence cultural participation (Bourdieu, 1987; Davies, 2005; Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016). Moreover, previous studies show that the migrants' length of residence in the host country positively influences social inclusion and cultural participation (Chiswick and Miller, 1996; Lazear, 1999; Millán-Franco et al., 2019; Monteiro, 2021). However, one limitation is that the relationship between the length of residence in the host country and cultural participation is assumed to remain constant and equal for all immigrant groups throughout the entire process. The inability to identify the migrant's country of origin makes it impossible to distinguish the impact of the length of residence on cultural participation in the migrants' country of origin. Nevertheless, the length of residence can be an essential factor in the migrants' economic integration. If migrants come to EU countries with relative disadvantages, such as low education skills and less working experience, we should expect that economic integration can be a long process. For instance, Chiswick (1978) estimated that immigrants in the USA would reach earnings parity with native workers after staying 10 to 15 years in the country.

The third set is the ***Economic-Financial Capital***, which includes household income, employment status, house tenure, and material deprivation. According to the studies by Bourdieu (1984, 1987) and Falk and Katz-Gerro (2016), wealthy, educated and employed people in high professional classes are more likely to participate in cultural activities and do so more frequently. For the material deprivation, based on the data availability, we consider financial burden characteristics at the household level and area quality characteristics, such as the *capacity to afford paying for a one-week annual holiday away from home, capacity to afford a meal with meat, chicken, fish (or vegetarian equivalent) every second day; Arrears on utility bills; Ability to make ends meet; Financial burden of the total housing cost; Problems with the dwelling: too dark, not enough light; Noise from neighbours or the street; Pollution, grime or other environmental problems and crime, violence or vandalism in the area*. These variables take a value of 1 if the households report financial constraints and issues with the noise, crime and air pollution in the area and 0 otherwise- no financial constraints and quality problems in the area. The index is estimated using factor analysis, as in the case of health conditions, and a higher value implies higher levels of material deprivation. Following the discussion so far, the second hypothesis explored is:

H2: Highly educated, wealthy, and healthy people employed in higher managerial and professional occupations, and migrants who stay longer in the host country, are more likely to participate more frequently in cultural activities.

The fourth set is the ***Social Capital*** first definition of which dates back to 1916 by Hanifan (1961), who refers to social capital as the intangible assets that count for most of people's daily

lives, such as fellowship and social intercourse among individuals, friends and families who make up a social unit. Other scholars have rediscovered and reinvented the term social capital (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). While there is a widening acknowledgement of the term, there are still inconsistencies in the term's conceptualisation. Following the definition of the term employed in the earlier studies and based on the available data, we use the following ordered variables to proxy for the social capital: *frequency of practice of artistic activities, frequency of getting together with friends, and frequency of communication via social media*. The questions in the EU-SILC answer as *Daily, Every week, Several times a month (but not every week), Once a month, At least once a year,* and *Never*.

Socialising with friends can positively correlate with attendance in cultural activities and frequency. A study by the National Endowment for the Arts (2015), using national US data, found that 73 per cent of the participants identified the opportunity to socialise with friends as the top motivator for attending arts events and cultural activities. Communication via social media is another platform of engagement and socialisation with friends and social networks. A study by Neustar (2018) reveals that social media can be used to promote and advertise cultural events, such as theatrical plays and films. This finding is also supported by the study by Kuo and Tang (2014), who found a strong relationship between Facebook experience and leisure activities. In particular, people who spend more time on Facebook have more friends, share more photos, and spend more time on sports and recreational activities. However, people who spend more time on Facebook also spend less time on intellectual activities, such as reading. The last variable we employ in the empirical work is the frequency of practice in artistic activities, which includes playing an instrument, composing music, singing, dancing, photographing, drawing, painting and writing poems and stories. While we recognise that practising artistic activities may not imply higher socialisation with friends, we argue people engaged in artistic activities are more likely to participate in cultural activities, which is supported by findings in earlier studies (Walker et al., 2003; Oskala et al., 2009; Smyth, 2016). Thus, the third hypothesis is:

H3: People participating more in social capital activities are more likely to participate in cultural-related activities.

The first set of estimates includes a Probit model to explore the frequency of participation. The dependent variable takes a value of 0 if the respondent has not participated in a cultural activity over the past 12 months or has participated at most three times and a value of 1 if (s)he has participated in a specific cultural activity more than three times. For the second set of estimates, we employ the multinomial Probit model to explore the reasons for non-attendance, where the dependent variables answer to: c*annot afford it; lack of interest; no cinema, live performance or cultural sites nearby*, and *for other reasons*. In this case, we also test hypotheses H_1-H_3. More specifically, wealthy, highly educated, and employed people are less likely to

report that they cannot afford a particular cultural activity or to answer that they have no interest. For the remaining individual characteristics, the expected results vary. For instance, people with poor health conditions are more likely to be unable to afford attendance to cultural activities, given their physical and mental conditions and the potential financial constraints due to long-standing illness and impairments. Probit and Logit models assume different distributions based on different conditions (Long and Freese, 2004). However, we report only the estimates derived from the Probit models, as the marginal effects found are very close between the Probit and Logit models.

3 Data and Methodology

3.1 Data

The empirical work uses data from the European Union Survey of Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) in 2015. We did not employ the special module in 2006. The reason is that it does not comply with the requirements of our aim because of the unavailability of the variables employed in the empirical work. Moreover, we prefer to use the most recent data available.

The EU-SILC is a nationally representative survey of individuals and households. It has become the reference source for comparative statistics on living standards, income distribution, and social exclusion in the EU (Eurostat, 2019b). The framework involves a stratified random sample of individuals aged 16 or older drawn from population registers. The sampling stratification relies on geographical criteria, such as municipality or county, and the degree of urbanisation. The probability of selection is proportional to the number of individuals or households (Eurostat, 2019b).

Based on the data availability, we explore households in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK. The reason we explore Northern and Western European countries, such as Germany, France, the UK, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland, is that they have received the largest average number of migrants over the decade 2000-2020 (Betz and Simpson 2013; IOM, 2019; Giovanis, 2021). Furthermore, countries such as France, Germany, Switzerland, and the UK are some of the top countries sending remittances abroad from migrants (IOM, 2019). For several decades, the foreign-born population has been increasing in countries such as Demark, Finland and Sweden. In particular, the share of the foreign-born population is 8-8.5 per cent in Demark and Finland and reached 9.5 per cent in Finland in 2021[3] and reached 16 per cent of the Swedish population in 2013, placing Sweden among the OECD countries with the highest foreign-born population (Farchy and Liebig, 2014).

[3] https://www.oecd.org/migration/integration-indicators-2012/keyindicatorsbycountry/name,218321,en.htm; https://www.stat.fi/tup/maahanmuutto/maahanmuuttajat-vaestossa_en.html

Spain, Italy and France are the other three countries receiving a large number of migrants. This is particularly the case of increasing migration flows from Northern African countries, including Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and Libya, from the 1980s until nowadays. Furthermore, the number of migrants increased from other African countries, such as Nigeria, Eritrea and Somalia. The number of refugee influxes increased in 2011 because of the civil war in Syria and the rise of the "Islamic State" in 2013, and countries such as Spain and Italy were the main recipients (Song and Bing, 2016). Overall, the countries we explore have been some of the top destinations for migrants in the last decade (IOM, 2019).

We explore the following categorical cultural participation variables: *going to the cinema, going to live performances, and visits to cultural sites* answering to *At most three times*, *more than three times*, *no-cannot afford it*, *no-lack of interest*, *no-no cinema, live performance or cultural sites nearby* and *no-for other reasons*. These variables refer to the last 12 months. Since they include both frequencies and nominal categories, it is not possible to apply one particular method to capture the variations in both frequencies and nominal categories. Hence, we consider the frequency in a Probit model using a dichotomous variable. For the reasons for non-attendance, we estimate the multinomial Probit regression. Furthermore, the base category is the *no-for other reasons*. This answer does not offer us any particular insights, as we cannot identify the reason for not attending the cultural activities. For the empirical analysis, we have used the software STATA 15.0.

While attending cinema is pretty straightforward, going to live performances include attending concerts, operas, theatrical plays, ballet and dance performances. Street performances such as music and theatrical plays are included if they are organised. Thus, if the respondent was passing randomly by an artist playing an instrument in the street is omitted. Furthermore, live sports events are not included. Regarding the cultural sites, visits to museums, art galleries, archaeological sites and historical monuments are included. Moreover, only visits with the purpose of the respondent becoming acquainted with the historical or cultural content of the site are considered.[4]

In Table 1, we report the descriptive statistics of the main outcomes explored. Regarding attendance at the cinema, based on the *Kruskal-Wallis Rank* test, there is a significant difference in participation between natives and first-generation immigrants. In particular, in the first column of the results, we report the *Kruskal-Wallis Rank* test comparing the frequency of participation in the three cultural activities explored between the natives and the EU immigrants. Similarly, in the second column, we report the *Kruskal-Wallis Rank* test to compare

[4] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/1012329/6071326/2015_Module_Participation_material_deprivation.pdf

the frequency of cultural participation between the EU and non-EU immigrants. In the third column, we test the differences in frequency between the natives and non-EU immigrants.

We observe that natives participate more frequently than EU and non-EU migrants. An exception is the activity of attendance at the cinema, where based on the *Kruskal-Wallis Rank* test and its *p-value*, we accept the null hypothesis and found no difference in the frequency of the specific activity between natives and EU immigrants. For instance, 28.05 per cent of the EU immigrants have participated more than three times, which is very close to the percentage of natives at 29.78 per cent. Also, the attendance of natives and EU immigrants is very similar, respectively, at 20.54 and 20.82 per cent. In contrast, 25.23 per cent of non-EU immigrants participate more than three times, and 15.67 per cent have participated at most three times.

At the same time, a higher proportion of first-generation immigrants report that they cannot afford to attend these activities. This finding is particularly the case for non-EU immigrants. For instance, considering attendance at the cinema, 6.72 of natives and 9.67 of EU immigrants cannot afford the specific activity. In contrast, 16 per cent of non-EU immigrants, almost double the proportion of EU immigrants, cannot afford to attend the cinema. The proportion is also higher in the other two cultural activities, where 7.98 and 11.61 per cent, respectively, of natives and EU immigrants cannot afford the participation in live performances, and 18.63 per cent of non-EU immigrants cannot afford this activity.

Therefore, the integration is related to insufficient economic resources rather than the willingness or lack of interest to participate. This argument may also be supported by the proportions of the answer *no-lack of interest*. We observe that the proportions of natives and immigrants reporting that they do not participate in cultural activities because of a lack of interest are very similar. For instance, 21.36 per cent of natives do not attend because of a lack of interest, while the respective proportions for the EU and non-EU immigrants are 19.77 and 21.57 per cent. Thus, there is no difference between natives and non-EU immigrants, while a lower proportion of EU immigrants do not attend the cinema because of a lack of interest. We derive the same concluding remark in the other two cultural activities, and especially in the activity of visits to cultural sites, 20.88 per cent of the EU immigrants report non-attendance because of lack of interest, which is lower than 22.34 per cent for the natives and the 22.86 per cent of the non-EU immigrants.

In the summary statistics in Table 1, we need to control for confounders that may influence cultural participation. Furthermore, we do not present the summary statistics for those confounders due to space limitations, but we report them and discuss the results in the next section.

Table 1. Summary Statistics

	Natives	EU immigrants	Non-EU immigrants
Going to Cinema			
At most 3 times	29.78	28.05	25.23
More than 3 times	20.54	20.82	15.67
No - cannot afford it	6.72	9.67	16.00
No - lack of interest	21.36	19.77	21.57
No - no cinema nearby	3.12	2.91	2.10
No - other reason	18.48	18.78	19.43
Kruskal-Wallis Rank Chi-Square test	Between Natives and EU Immigrants 0.804 [0.3698]	Between EU and non-EU Immigrants 27.390 [0.0001]	Between natives and non-EU Immigrants 87.005 [0.000]
Going to Live Performances			
At most 3 times	30.90	25.54	21.29
More than 3 times	17.98	19.67	11.32
No - cannot afford it	7.98	11.61	18.63
No - lack of interest	20.88	21.19	23.80
No - no live performances nearby	3.10	3.30	2.53
No - other reason	19.16	18.69	22.43
Kruskal-Wallis Rank Chi-Square test	Between Natives and EU Immigrants 14.916 [0.0002]	Between EU and non-EU Immigrants 120.931 [0.000]	Between natives and non-EU Immigrants 475.051 [0.000]
Visits to Cultural Sites			
At most 3 times	29.14	27.85	24.56
More than 3 times	18.72	22.05	14.14
No - cannot afford it	6.03	8.86	15.10
No - lack of interest	22.34	20.88	22.86
No – no cultural sites nearby	3.17	3.02	2.28
No - other reason	20.60	17.34	21.06
Kruskal-Wallis Rank Chi-Square test	Between Natives and EU Immigrants 23.378 [0.0001]	Between EU and non-EU Immigrants 91.814 [0.000]	Between natives and non-EU Immigrants 73.531 [0.000]

p-values within square brackets.

While the categories of *cannot afford* and *lack of interest* are explicitly clear, we briefly describe the third main reason for non-attendance is that there is no cinema, live performances or cultural sites nearby. In particular, according to Eurostat (2019b), the term "nearby"[5] does not have to be realised only in terms of physical distance but also in terms of accessibility. For instance, if a cinema, theatre, museum or cultural site is located 10 kilometres from the respondent's dwelling but is easily accessible by public transport, it should be considered nearby. Finally, for the last category, which is non-attendance for other reasons, we do not

[5] https://www.gesis.org/en/missy/metadata/EU-SILC/;https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/1012329/6071326/2015_Module_Participation_material_deprivation.pdf

further present or discuss the estimates because they do not reveal any additional valuable information since the EU-SILCS does not record the details of this answer.

3.2 Methodology

The regression model to be estimated for the attendance in cultural participation activities is:

$$CP_{i,r} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 EUM_{i,r} + \beta_2 NEUM_{i,r} + \beta' \mathbf{Z}_{i,r} + \varepsilon_{i,r} \quad (1)$$

where *CP* indicates the cultural participation of individual *i* in the Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics (NUTS) 1 or NUTS-2 level *r*. *EUM* is a dummy variable taking a value of 1 if the respondent is an EU migrant and 0 otherwise. In contrast, the variable *NEUM* takes a value of 1 if the respondent is a non-EU migrant and 0 otherwise. As we have described in the previous section, the outcome *CP* takes a value of 0 if the respondent has not participated or has participated at most three times in the particular cultural activity explored over the last 12 months and a value of 1 if the respondent participated more than three times in the last 12 months. Following the discussion in the theoretical framework, vector **Z** includes various individual and household demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Moreover, we include area-NUTS-1 level dummies that allow us to control for unobserved characteristics at the area level[6]. As discussed in the data section, we will implement the Probit model for regression (1) and the frequency of attendance in cultural activities. Regarding the reasons for non-attendance, we will repeat the regression estimates (1) by applying the multinomial Probit model (for more technical details on these methods, see Greene and Hensher, 2010).

We should note that we will compare natives with first-generation immigrants, while second or even third-generation immigrants are included in the sample of the native population. The reason for following this approach is that we do not have adequate information in the EU-SILC to identify the country of birth of the respondent's parents. While we have information only for the parents of the same household as the respondent, we prefer not to use only this sample. This setting could be helpful for exploring the cultural integration of second-generation immigrants and comparing it with natives and first-generation immigrants. Still, we prefer to identify them as natives. The main reason is that we would otherwise create a significant selection bias by drastically reducing the number of observations. Furthermore, other respondents, whose parents' country of birth is unavailable, can be defined as second-generation immigrants, but

[6] We should highlight that we have also clustered the standard errors at the individual level as a robustness check since unobserved characteristics at the individual level, such as personality traits and genetics, may be present. The differences noticed in the standard errors clustering between NUTS-1 and individual level are trivial. Furthermore, for some countries in our sample, we include country dummy variables since no information is recorded at the NUTS-1 level. These countries are Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands and Switzerland.

due to the lack of this particular information, we may wrongly identify them as natives. Hence, we include all the respondents born in the host country as natives.

4 Empirical Results

4.1 Frequency of Cultural Participation

In Table 2, we report the Probit estimates. In all cases, we find a negative sign of the estimated coefficients for the EU and non-EU immigrants, implying that they participate less frequently than natives. More specifically, as discussed in the methodology section, the dependent variable takes a value of 1 for a participation of more than three times in the past 12 months and 0 for a participation of at most three times or non-participation. However, we see that the marginal effects for the non-EU immigrants are higher and almost double the coefficients of the EU immigrants. Therefore, considering the negative sign, non-EU immigrants participate less frequently, which is also consistent with the summary statistics in Table 1.

Regarding the demographics set and hypothesis H1, we find differences across gender where women are more likely to participate more frequently in all three cultural activities explored. Age presents a non-linear relationship with the frequency of cultural participation. In particular, age has an inverted U-shaped curve where initial increases in age are associated with a higher frequency of cultural participation. After a turning point, age is negatively related. However, the turning points vary by cultural activity, which is 26 years old for going to the cinema, 31 years of age for participation in live performances and 47 years old for visits to cultural sites.

Concerning marital status, we observe that married people participate less frequently than single people in all countries explored. One explanation is that married people may have less available time, and this could be especially the case of working couples with childcare responsibilities and possibly, in some cases caring for elderly family members. Also, divorced respondents attended more than three times at the cinema and cultural sites, but there is no difference between them and singles attending live performances. Separated attend more frequently the cinema. Widows are less likely to participate in the cinema and live performances. The reason could be that widowed people are usually old, where age is negatively related to health. They may also face financial constraints due to the loss of the partner, especially if the spouse is the primary breadwinner. Women are also mainly the windowed, where in our sample, 78.22 per cent are women. We could have included the interaction terms of income, age and marital status to offer more insights.

Table 2. Probit Model

Variables	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites
EU Immigrant	-0.0118* (0.0064)	-0.0491*** (0.0082)	-0.0224*** (0.0079)
Non-EU Immigrant)	-0.0326*** (0.0058)	-0.0844*** (0.0084)	-0.0476*** (0.0094)
Gender (Female)	0.0561*** (0.0128)	0.0370*** (0.0029)	0.0107*** (0.0029)
Age	0.0048*** (0.0009)	0.0025*** (0.0006)	0.0038*** (0.0008)
Age Squared	-0.00009*** (8.70e-06)	-0.00004*** (6.91e-06)	-0.00004*** (6.70e-06)
Log of Household Income	0.0192*** (0.0032)	0.0178*** (0.0021)	0.0200*** (0.0032)
Material Deprivation	-0.0209** (0.0097)	-0.0278*** (0.0023)	-0.0229*** (0.0021)
Employment Status (reference Category Employee working full-time)			
Employee working part-time	-0.0087* (0.0047)	-0.0084** (0.0035)	-0.0027 (0.0034)
Self-employed working full-time	-0.0047 (0.0057)	-0.0063 (0.0068)	-0.0155*** (0.0047)
Self-employed working part-time	-0.0134 (0.0117)	-0.0162 (0.0129)	-0.0146 (0.0101)
Unemployed	-0.0302*** (0.0062)	-0.0531*** (0.0074)	-0.0563*** (0.0071)
Student	0.0159 (0.0106)	0.0217*** (0.0066)	0.0515*** (0.0086)
Retired	-0.0051 (0.0194)	-0.0086 (0.0060)	-0.0023 (0.0053)
Disabled	-0.0667*** (0.0086)	-0.0539*** (0.0081)	-0.0628*** (0.0092)
Homemaker	-0.0269*** (0.0074)	-0.0364*** (0.0059)	-0.0288*** (0.0054)
House Tenure (Reference Category-Outright owner)			
Owner paying mortgage	0.0091** (0.0043)	-0.0009 (0.0042)	-0.0035 (0.0037)
Tenant	-0.0226*** (0.0053)	-0.0260*** (0.0046)	-0.0250*** (0.0050)
Accommodation is rented at a reduced rate	-0.0171** (0.0070)	-0.0352*** (0.0078)	-0.0307*** (0.0073)
Accommodation is provided free	-0.0106 (0.0087)	-0.0058 (0.0103)	-0.0179* (0.0099)
Health conditions	-0.0210*** (0.0029)	-0.0121*** (0.0025)	-0.0233*** (0.0021)
Marital status (reference category-Single)			
Married	-0.0378*** (0.0048)	-0.0218*** (0.0056)	-0.0241*** (0.0042)
Separated	0.0237*** (0.0079)	-0.0131 (0.0104)	-0.0016 (0.0091)
Widowed	-0.0397*** (0.0075)	-0.0210*** (0.0061)	-0.0008 (0.0063)
Divorced	0.0302*** (0.0056)	0.0084 (0.0069)	0.0125** (0.0061)

Table 2 (continued)

Variables	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites
Education Level (Reference category-Pre-primary education			
Primary education	0.0924*** (0.0199)	0.0815*** (0.0153)	0.0846*** (0.0127)
Lower Secondary Education	0.1669*** (0.0232)	0.1482*** (0.0143)	0.1451*** (0.0111)
Upper Secondary Education	0.1731*** (0.0249)	0.1728*** (0.0232)	0.1572*** (0.0211)
Post-secondary non-tertiary education	0.1960*** (0.0241)	0.1924*** (0.0231)	0.1940*** (0.0107)
First stage of tertiary education	0.2458*** (0.0478)	0.2061*** (0.0278)	0.2158*** (0.0198)
Second stage of tertiary education	0.2136*** (0.0246)	0.2054*** (0.0154)	0.2119*** (0.0121)
Frequency of getting together with friends (Reference category-Daily)			
Every week	0.0070 (0.0077)	-0.0065 (0.0085)	-0.0028 (0.0088)
Several times a month (not every week)	-0.0071 (0.0100)	-0.0038 (0.0110)	-0.0029 (0.0106)
Once a month	-0.0171* (0.0091)	-0.0181* (0.0102)	-0.0119 (0.0107)
At least once a year	-0.0287*** (0.0103)	-0.0507*** (0.0116)	-0.0338*** (0.0118)
Never	-0.1440*** (0.0152)	-0.1554*** (0.0118)	-0.1484*** (0.0131)
Communication via social media (Reference category-Daily)			
Every week	0.0154*** (0.0054)	0.0031 (0.0055)	0.0113** (0.0050)
Several times a month (not every week)	0.0182** (0.0072)	0.0010 (0.0072)	0.0021 (0.0082)
Once a month	0.0071 (0.0081)	-0.0047 (0.0075)	-0.0077 (0.0071)
At least once a year	0.0072 (0.0101)	-0.0120* (0.0069)	-0.0027 (0.0094)
Never	-0.0400*** (0.0072)	-0.0392*** (0.0069)	-0.0268*** (0.0068)
Practice of Artistic Activities (Reference category-Daily)			
Every week	-0.0093 (0.0165)	0.0040 (0.0164)	0.0101 (0.0065)
Several times a month (not every week)	-0.0124 (0.0169)	-0.0155 (0.0152)	-0.0113 (0.0171)
Once a month	-0.0227 (0.0549)	-0.0156 (0.0205)	-0.0090 (0.0183)
At least once a year	-0.0057 (0.0174)	-0.0251 (0.0192)	-0.0081 (0.0177)
Never	-0.0436** (0.0179)	-0.0319 (0.0231)	-0.0707*** (0.0211)
No. observations	160,592	160,592	160,592
Wald Chi-Square	9,043.25 [0.000]	7,659.12 [0.000]	7,895.43 [0.000]

Marginal effects of coefficients, clustered standard errors at NUTS-1 level within brackets, p-values within square brackets, ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level.

Regarding hypothesis H2 and the human capital set, we find that disabled respondents are less likely to participate, which can be due to mental and physical health limitations. Higher education level is generally positively associated with the frequency of attendance. This finding is expected, as education level is positively related to a high income, and high levels of education provide more labour opportunities and higher earning potential, and educated people are more likely to show interest in those activities.

The third set includes the economic-financial capital factors. Regarding employment status, we find that most students participate more often than all other categories of employment status, except for attendance at the cinema. In contrast, the results for the employees and self-employed vary. In most cases, the disabled and homemakers participate less frequently. As we have highlighted earlier, health conditions are one of the main drivers of participation in leisure, socio-cultural and recreational activities since these people face various barriers due to poor physical and mental health. Homemakers may participate less frequently, given that they are married, and as we have found earlier, married people with children have limited time allocated to cultural participation activities.

Household income and material deprivation are positively and negatively related to the respondent's probability of attending the cultural activities explored. This result is expected as a lower income and a higher level of material deprivation implies financial constraints. Even though we cannot control the price of the cultural activities we explore, an intriguing subject for future research could be investigating the demand, supply and prices of cinema, theatre, and attendance to museums and cultural sites. Those who own the house property with a mortgage, tenants and those who rent the house at a reduced price or the house is provided for free are less likely to attend the cultural activities.

The final set of control variables includes social capital, mainly the frequency of getting together with friends, communication via social media and practising artistic activities. Overall, the frequency of the social capital factors is positively related to the frequency of attendance in the three cultural activities explored.

4.2 Non-Participation in Cultural Activities

In Table 3, we report the estimates of the multinomial Probit to explore the primary reasons for non-attendance in the cultural activities explored. We find significant differences between natives and immigrants regarding the financial limitations as the reason for non-attendance to the cinema. Furthermore, according to the magnitude of the estimated coefficients, the marginal effects for non-EU migrants are more than double that of EU migrants, indicating the probability of non-attendance in the cultural activities explored because of financial constraints and difficulties in affording them is higher for non-EU migrants.

We find no difference in the preferences between EU and non-EU migrants regarding lack of interest in all three cultural activities. In contrast, the negative signs of the estimated coefficients for immigrants imply that they are less likely to report a lack of interest. Therefore, the findings show that EU and non-EU migrants are more interested in the cultural activities we explore than natives, and the main reason for non-attendance is financial constraints. An exception is the visits to cultural sites where we find no differences in preference or interests between natives and EU immigrants.

Also, in Table 3, we report the estimated coefficients of the control variables for attendance in cultural activities. Overall, we find differences in gender regarding financial limitations, where women are more likely to report that they cannot afford this activity. Age presents a quadratic relationship, where a negative sign in the linear term implies younger people are more likely to face financial constraints. However, people face fewer financial limitations after a turning point, which ranges between 23 years old for cinema and 37 to 33 for attendance at live performances and visits to cultural sites. We may further explain this finding by the fact that older people are mainly employed and wealthier compared to respondents belonging to the younger age groups. As expected, income and material deprivation are respectively negatively and positively related to the probability of the respondents reporting that they cannot afford to attend the cinema. Social capital, expressed by the frequency of getting together with friends, communication via social media and practising artistic activities, has an overall significant effect. In particular, those who rarely meet or never get together with friends, rarely communicate through social media, and do not practice or rarely practice artistic activities are more likely to face financial limitations. This finding may indicate that respondents in these countries who are involved in those activities are wealthier.

Regarding the second category, we observe that women are less likely to not attend cultural activities because of a lack of interest. Overall, wealthier, employed respondents, students, educated people, and those with poor health conditions are less likely to report that lack of interest is the main reason for non-attending cinema and the other cultural activities explored. This finding indicates that people belonging to low-income groups may exhibit a lack of interest because they face financial limitations, which also explains that they cannot afford to participate in cultural activities. Furthermore, disabled and people with poor health conditions show more interest in cultural activities, but financial constraints are the main reason for non-attending rather than lack of interest. This could result from financial limitations and the degree of accessibility to cultural-related events and activities. Thus, the results may highlight the potential discrepancies in cultural participation for the unemployed, poor and people with impairments, as in the case of the immigrants we explore in the main text of this study.

Table 3. Multinomial Probit Model

CATEGORY 1: NO - CANNOT AFFORD IT	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites	CATEGORY 1: NO - CANNOT AFFORD IT	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites
EU Immigrant	0.0220***	0.0306***	0.0408***	**Education Level**			
	(0.0052)	(0.0054)	(0.0048)				
Non-EU Immigrant	0.0619***	0.0705***	0.0786***	Primary education	-0.0055	-0.0780	-0.0021
	(0.0035)	(0.0035)	(0.0032)		(0.0057)	(0.01032)	(0.0053)
Gender (Female)	0.0367***	0.0587***	0.0294***	Lower Secondary Education	-0.0180***	-0.0090	-0.0009
	(0.0022)	(0.0023)	(0.0021)		(0.0059)	(0.0065)	(0.0052)
Age	0.0033***	0.0098***	0.0086***	Upper Secondary Education	-0.0305*	-0.0147**	-0.0158***
	(0.0004)	(0.0042)	(0.0004)		(0.0161)	(0.0063)	(0.0056)
Age Squared	- 7.3e-05***	-0.00013	-0.00010	Post-secondary non-tertiary education	-0.0229***	-0.0068	-0.0233***
	(4.26e-06)	(4.15e-06)	(3.77e-06)		(0.0076)	(0.0067)	(0.0070)
Log of Household Income	-0.0498***	-0.0553***	-0.0447***	First stage of tertiary education	-0.3691***	-0.1026	-0.0209*
	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0016)		(0.0362)	(0.1184)	(0.0117)
Material Deprivation	0.0940***	0.0927***	0.0762***	Second stage of tertiary education	-0.0309***	-0.0275**	-0.0174***
	(0.0012)	(0.0013)	(0.0012)		(0.0063)	(0.0116)	(0.0060)
Employment Status				**Frequency of getting together with friends**			
Employee working part-time	0.0268***	0.0487***	0.0279***	Every week	-0.0240***	-0.0147***	0.0112***
	(0.0063)	(0.0043)	(0.0039)		(0.0036)	(0.0037)	(0.0033)
Self-employed working full-time	-0.0244***	-0.0367***	-0.0254***	Several times a month (not every week)	-0.0251***	-0.0046	0.0076**
	(0.0055)	(0.0058)	(0.0053)		(0.0040)	(0.0042)	(0.0037)
Self-employed working part-time	0.0056	0.0258**	0.0138	Once a month	0.0153***	0.0362***	0.0263***
	(0.0108)	(0.0109)	(0.0104)		(0.0043)	(0.0045)	(0.0041)
Unemployed	0.0853***	0.0887***	0.0717***	At least once a year	0.0290***	0.0405***	0.0391***
	(0.0039)	(0.0039)	(0.0035)		(0.0047)	(0.0051)	(0.0045)
Student	0.0470***	0.0172***	0.0185***	Never	0.0775***	0.0812***	0.0726***
	(0.0077)	(0.0061)	(0.056)		(0.0053)	(0.0058)	(0.0051)
Retired	-0.0620***	-0.0466***	-0.0424***	**Communication via social media**			
	(0.0038)	(0.00041)	(0.0038)				
Disabled	0.0160***	0.0310***	0.0184***	Every week	0.0168***	0.0164***	0.0161***
	(0.0055)	(0.0059)	(0.0054)		(0.0042)	(0.0042)	(0.0038)
Homemaker	0.0119***	0.0235***	0.0124***	Several times a month (not every week)	0.0263***	0.0336***	0.0304***
	(0.0041)	(0.0043)	(0.0039)		(0.0064)	(0.0064)	(0.0058)
House Tenure				Once a month	0.0048	0.0240***	0.0186***
					(0.0083)	(0.0082)	(0.0074)
Owner paying mortgage	0.0472***	0.0536***	0.0303***	At least once a year	0.0197**	0.0295***	0.0277***
	(0.0031)	(0.0032)	(0.0029)		(0.0096)	(0.0097)	(0.0091)
Tenant	0.0619***	0.0693***	0.0466***	Never	0.0288***	0.0301***	0.0352***
	(0.0030)	(0.0031)	(0.0029)		(0.0033)	(0.0033)	(0.0030)
Accommodation is rented at a reduced rate	0.0610***	0.0611***	0.0358***	**Practice of Artistic Activities**			
	(0.0040)	(0.0042)	(0.0038)				
Accommodation is provided free	0.0332***	0.0268***	0.0203**	Every week	0.0352***	-0.0269***	-0.0311***
	(0.0054)	(0.0057)	(0.0049)		(0.0066)	(0.0069)	(0.0064)
Health conditions	0.0014*	0.0092***	0.0078***	Several times a month (not every week)	-0.0298***	-0.0113	-0.0259***
	(0.00075)	(0.0014)	(0.0013)		(0.0075)	(0.0077)	(0.0073)
Marital status				Once a month	-0.0258***	-0.0232***	-0.0241***
					(0.0082)	(0.0085)	(0.0079)
Married	0.0108***	0.0281***	0.0377***	At least once a year	0.0385***	-0.0075	-0.0388***
	(0.0030)	(0.0031)	(0.0028)		(0.0086)	(0.0084)	(0.0081)
Separated	0.0343***	0.0621***	0.0517***	Never	0.0413***	0.0106*	0.0294***
	(0.0048)	(0.0072)	(0.0064)		(0.0054)	(0.0057)	(0.0021)
Widowed	0.0337***	0.0669***	-0.0574***				
	(0.0043)	(0.0145)	(0.0051)				
Divorced	-0.0343***	-0.0172***	-0.0028				
	(0.0048)	(0.0053)	(0.0047)				

Table 3 (Cont.) Multinomial Probit Model

CATEGORY 2: NO – LACK OF INTEREST	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites	CATEGORY 2: NO – LACK OF INTEREST	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites
EU Immigrant	-0.0224***	-0.0131*	-0.0083	**Education Level**			
	(0.0082)	(0.0078)	(0.0082)				
Non-EU Immigrant	-0.0186***	-0.0402***	-0.0449***	Primary education	0.1039***	0.0655***	0.0766***
	(0.0065)	(0.0059)	(0.0064)		(0.0096)	(0.0096)	(0.0095)
Gender (Female)	-0.0908***	-0.1188***	-0.0785***	Lower Secondary Education	0.1243***	0.0757***	0.0326***
	(0.0031)	(0.0030)	(0.0031)		(0.0094)	(0.0094)	(0.0028)
Age	-0.0068***	-0.0052***	-0.0054***	Upper Secondary Education	0.1297***	0.0433***	-0.0443
	(0.0006)	(0.0005)	(0.0005)		(0.0097)	(0.0097)	(0.1016)
Age Squared	-6.3e-05	0.000051***	0.0004	Post-secondary non-tertiary education	-0.2164**	-0.4158***	-0.0698***
	(6.02e-06)	(0.0005)	(4.85e-06)		(0.0284)	(0.1328)	(0.0181)
Log of Household Income	0.0198***	0.0210***	0.0267***	First stage of tertiary education	-0.2026***	-0.1795***	-0.1935***
	(0.0030)	(0.0028)	(0.0028)		(0.0550)	(0.0418)	(0.0406)
Material Deprivation	-0.0818***	-0.0680***	-0.0601***	Second stage of tertiary education	-0.0848***	-0.0057	-0.0158
	(0.0024)	(0.0023)	(0.0023)		(0.0101)	(0.0101)	(0.0102)
Employment Status				**Frequency of getting together with friends**			
Employee working part-time	0.0231***	0.0036	0.0229***	Every week	0.0348***	0.0198***	0.0229***
	(0.0072)	(0.0067)	(0.0065)		(0.0053)	(0.0049)	(0.0047)
Self-employed working full-time	-0.0355***	-0.0166**	-0.0243***	Several times a month (not every week)	0.0245***	-0.0101*	0.0033
	(0.0077)	(0.0073)	(0.0074)		(0.0058)	(0.0054)	(0.0054)
Self-employed working part-time	0.0414**	0.0077	0.0238	Once a month	0.0012	-0.0254***	-0.0084
	(0.0165)	(0.0168)	(0.0171)		(0.0063)	(0.0061)	(0.0061)
Unemployed	-0.0270***	-0.0295***	-0.0136**	At least once a year	-0.0209***	-0.0301***	-0.0319***
	(0.0081)	(0.0069)	(0.0068)		(0.0072)	(0.0071)	(0.0072)
Student	-0.0112	-0.0026	0.0028	Never	-0.1051	-0.0967***	-0.0836***
	(0.0141)	(0.0085)	(0.0066)		(0.0088)	(0.0086)	(0.0086)
Retired	0.0858***	0.0411***	0.0251***	**Communication via social media**			
	(0.0051)	(0.0053)	(0.0053)				
Disabled	-0.0227**	-0.0428***	-0.0214**	Every week	0.0433***	-0.0500***	-0.0696***
	(0.0102)	(0.0102)	(0.0101)		(0.0066)	(0.0057)	(0.0057)
Homemaker	-0.0096	-0.0368***	-0.0169***	Several times a month (not every week)	0.0567***	-0.0744***	-0.0877***
	(0.0066)	(0.0065)	(0.0064)		(0.0099)	(0.0092)	(0.0092)
House Tenure				Once a month	-0.0322***	-0.0633***	-0.0545***
					(0.0120)	(0.0116)	(0.0114)
Owner paying mortgage	0.0082**	0.0012	0.0347***	At least once a year	0.0543***	-0.0921***	-0.116***
	(0.0045)	(0.0044)	(0.0043)		(0.0145)	(0.0141)	(0.0145)
Tenant	0.0145***	0.0173***	0.0465***	Never	-0.0439***	-0.0459***	-0.0710***
	(0.0050)	(0.0048)	(0.0048)		(0.0048)	(0.0045)	(0.0045)
Accommodation is rented at a reduced rate	0.0181**	0.0557***	0.0837***	**Practice of Artistic Activities**			
	(0.0072)	(0.0069)	(0.0068)				
Accommodation is provided free	0.0269***	-0.0290***	-0.0219***	Every week	0.0207**	0.0261***	0.0193**
	(0.0088)	(0.0086)	(0.0054)		(0.0082)	(0.0088)	(0.0090)
Health conditions	-0.0362**	0.0434***	-0.0481***	Several times a month (not every week)	0.0033	-0.0025	-0.0043
	(0.0021)	(0.0021)	(0.0021)		(0.0094)	(0.0101)	(0.0103)
Marital status				Once a month	0.0229**	0.0458***	0.0506***
					(0.0104)	(0.0109)	(0.0118)
Married	0.0033	-0.0481***	-0.0635***	At least once a year	0.0055	-0.0114	0.0207*
	(0.0048)	(0.0043)	(0.0043)		(0.0107)	(0.0101)	(0.0113)
Separated	-0.0158	-0.0503***	-0.0421***	Never	-0.0479***	0.0291***	0.0230***
	(0.0140)	(0.0128)	(0.0127)		(0.0071)	(0.0075)	(0.0077)
Widowed	0.0203***	-0.0927***	-0.1023***				
	(0.0068)	(0.0071)	(0.0069)				
Divorced	0.0148*	-0.0599***	-0.0524***				
	(0.0076)	(0.0075)	(0.0074)				

Table 3 (Cont.) Multinomial Probit Model

CATEGORY 3: NO – NO EVENT NEARBY	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites	CATEGORY 3: NO – NO EVENT NEARBY	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites
EU Immigrant	-0.0005	0.0019	0.0024	**Education Level**			
	(0.0407)	(0.0037)	(0.0039)				
Non-EU Immigrant	-0.0218***	0.0211***	-0.0217***	Primary education	0.0143***	0.0348***	0.0312***
	(0.0038)	(0.0031)	(0.0035)		(0.0047)	(0.0052)	(0.0058)
Gender (Female)	0.0114***	0.0121***	0.0092***	Lower Secondary Education	0.0247***	0.0371***	0.0503***
	(0.0015)	(0.0015)	(0.0015)		(0.0046)	(0.0053)	(0.0057)
Age	0.0008**	0.0003*	0.0008*	Upper Secondary Education	0.0118*	0.0419***	0.0606***
	(0.0004)	(0.0002)	(0.00043)		(0.0060)	(0.0172)	(0.0058)
Age Squared	-1.19e-06	4.04e-06	5.07e-06	Post-secondary non-tertiary education	0.0316***	0.0436***	0.0771***
	(3.12e-06)	(3.45e-06)	(3.99e-06)		(0.0089)	(0.0126)	(0.0121)
Log of Household Income	-0.0104***	-0.0024**	-0.0058***	First stage of tertiary education	0.1269**	0.1193***	0.1092***
	(0.0012)	(0.0012)	(0.0012)		(0.0552)	(0.0318)	(0.0355)
Material Deprivation	-0.0123***	-0.0132***	-0.0083***	Second stage of tertiary education	0.0189***	0.0377***	0.0511***
	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)		(0.0051)	(0.0054)	(0.0061)
Employment Status				**Frequency of getting together with friends**			
Employee working part-time	0.0051	0.0061*	0.0042	Every week	-0.0085***	0.0041	0.0048**
	(0.0041)	(0.0033)	(0.0033)		(0.0024)	(0.0210)	(0.0024)
Self-employed working full-time	0.0244***	0.0097***	0.0071**	Several times a month (not every week)	-0.0186**	-0.0011	0.0036
	(0.0037)	(0.0034)	(0.0035)		(0.0027)	(0.0026)	(0.0027)
Self-employed working part-time	0.0062	-0.0026	-0.0167*	Once a month	-0.0182***	-0.0062**	0.0034
	(0.0088)	(0.0088)	(0.0099)		(0.0030)	(0.0030)	(0.0030)
Unemployed	0.0132***	0.0056	-0.0048	At least once a year	-0.0195***	-0.0064*	-0.0058
	(0.0039)	(0.0034)	(0.0035)		(0.0034)	(0.0034)	(0.0035)
Student	0.0014	0.0010	-0.0054	Never	-0.0291***	-0.0212***	-0.0101**
	(0.0078)	(0.0045)	(0.0044)		(0.0043)	(0.0044)	(0.0043)
Retired	0.0245***	0.0225***	0.0242***	**Communication via social media**			
	(0.0027)	(0.0025)	(0.0027)				
Disabled	0.0233***	0.0131***	0.0095**	Every week	0.0049	0.0018	0.0113***
	(0.0047)	(0.0048)	(0.0048)		(0.0034)	(0.0028)	(0.0028)
Homemaker	0.0152**	0.0124***	0.0121***	Several times a month (not every week)	0.0111***	0.0071*	0.0081*
	(0.0034)	(0.0031)	(0.0032)		(0.0048)	(0.0042)	(0.0044)
House Tenure				Once a month	0.0065	-0.0014	0.0136**
					(0.0060)	(0.0056)	(0.0052)
Owner paying mortgage	-0.0136***	0.0030	-0.0046**	At least once a year	0.0024	0.0078	0.0104
	(0.0023)	(0.0021)	(0.0021)		(0.0075)	(0.0064)	(0.0067)
Tenant	-0.0136***	-0.0179***	-0.0117***	Never	0.0050**	-0.0037*	0.0048**
	(0.0023)	(0.0024)	(0.0024)		(0.0024)	(0.0022)	(0.0023)
Accommodation is rented at a reduced rate	-0.0371***	-0.0131***	-0.0009	**Practice of Artistic Activities**			
	(0.0029)	(0.0034)	(0.0031)				
Accommodation is provided free	-0.0096***	0.0042	0.0073**	Every week	-0.0025	-0.0011	0.0084*
	(0.0034)	(0.0037)	(0.0036)		(0.0036)	(0.0037)	(0.0044)
Health conditions	0.0036***	0.0028	0.0008	Several times a month (not every week)	0.0027	0.0050	0.0130***
	(0.0009)	(0.0057)	(0.0009)		(0.0042)	(0.0042)	(0.0047)
Marital status				Once a month	-0.0022	0.0035	0.0084*
					(0.0047)	(0.0046)	(0.0044)
Married	-0.0055**	-0.0036*	-0.0041**	At least once a year	0.0037	0.0056	0.0116***
	(0.0023)	(0.0021)	(0.0021)		(0.0047)	(0.0046)	(0.0048)
Separated	-0.0056	-0.0033	-0.0071	Never	-0.0180***	-0.0239***	-0.0166***
	(0.0037)	(0.0060)	(0.0062)		(0.0031)	(0.0032)	(0.0034)
Widowed	-0.0035	-0.0036	-0.0013	No. observations	81,576	86,550	87,719
	(0.0032)	(0.0043)	(0.0032)				
Divorced	-0.0056	-0.0035	-0.0017	Wald Chi-Square	19,339.64	13,038.06	24,478.56
	(0.0037)	(0.0036)	(0.0035)		[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]

Marginal effects of coefficients, clustered standard errors at NUTS-1 level within brackets, p-values within square brackets, ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level

Overall, our findings are consistent with earlier studies, as the higher an individual's social class, educational attainment, and household income are, the more likely the respondent will attend the cultural activities explored more frequently (Davies, 2005; Schuster, 2007). Furthermore, those without children are also among those who participate more frequently in cultural activities, which is supported by our findings (Davies, 2005). However, the extent to which cultural participation determinants differ across countries remains an open question. For instance, according to Coulangeon (2005), the education level may play a less critical role in countries with a relatively high proportion of post-secondary education, as our results show.

4.3 Length of Residence

In Table 4, we report the Probit estimates for the frequency of participation and consider only the first-generation immigrants[7]. We include only the main variables of interest, the migration status and the length of residence, while the concluding remarks derived from the control variables are the same as those reported in Table 2. The results confirm the previous findings, where non-EU migrants participate less frequently than EU migrants. In particular, the negative sign of the estimated coefficient in the three cultural activities explored implies that non-EU immigrants are less likely to participate more than three times compared to EU migrants. In other words, non-EU immigrants are more likely to participate at most three times, or they do not participate at all. Also, the results support the assumptions of the theoretical framework where the length of residence is positively correlated with a higher frequency of participation in cultural activities. This result is consistent with earlier studies' findings, which found that migrants' length of residence in the host country positively influences social inclusion and cultural participation (Chiswick and Miller, 1996; Lazear, 1999; Millán-Franco et al., 2019; Monteiro, 2021).

Similarly, in panels A-C of Table 5, we report the marginal effects of the multinomial Probit model using the migrant status and the length of residence. We find that non-EU immigrants are more likely to report they cannot afford to attend the cinema and live performances. In contrast, we find no difference between EU and non-EU immigrants visiting cultural sites. One possible explanation could be that access to some cultural sites is free, while attendance at the cinema and live performances require payment. While we do not have this information, it would be interesting to explore this case. Furthermore, the price of tickets is another critical determinant of participation. It is also interesting that the length of residence is not significantly correlated with the ability to afford a cultural activity.

[7] We should note that our estimates do not include Belgium and Germany, as the EU-SILC survey does not provide the year the respondents moved to the country.

Table 4. Probit Estimates for Length of Residence

Variables	DV: Going to Cinema	DV: Going to Live Performances	DV: Visits to Cultural Sites
Non-EU Immigrant	-0.0157** (0.0075)	-0.0298*** (0.0069)	-0.0193*** (0.0073)
Length of Residence	0.0022*** (0.0003)	0.0017*** (0.0003)	0.0012*** (0.0003)
No. observations	15,452	15,452	1,831
Wald Chi-Square	874.53 [0.000]	988.99 [0.000]	1,012.35 [0.000]

Marginal effects of coefficients, clustered standard errors at NUTS-1 level within brackets, p-values within square brackets, *** and ** indicate significance at 1% and 5% level

Table 5. Multinomial Probit Estimates for Length of Residence

Panel A: Going to Cinema			
Variables	**Cannot Afford It**	**Lack of Interest**	**No Cinema Nearby**
Non-EU Immigrant	0.1508*** (0.0567)	0.0472 (0.0507)	-0.1911** (0.0794)
Length of Residence	0.0085 (0.0202)	0.0033* (0.0017)	0.0005 (0.0026)
No. observations	8,795		
Wald Chi-Square	631.67 [0.000]		
Panel B: Going to Live Performances			
Variables	**Cannot Afford It**	**Lack of Interest**	**No Live Performance Nearby**
Non-EU Immigrant	0.1057** (0.0511)	0.0072 (0.0468)	-0.2312*** (0.0708)
Length of Residence	0.0013 (0.0019)	0.0021 (0.0017)	0.0004 (0.0026)
No. observations	8,872		
Wald Chi-Square	606.52 [0.000]		
Panel C: Visits to Cultural Sites			
Variables	**Cannot Afford It**	**Lack of Interest**	**No Cultural Site Nearby**
Non-EU Immigrant	0.0572 (0.0552)	0.0322 (0.0490)	-0.2131*** (0.0762)
Length of Residence	-0.0023 (0.0021)	0.0009 (0.0018)	0.0011 (0.0027)
No. observations	8,763		
Wald Chi-Square	617.87 [0.000]		

Marginal effects of coefficients, clustered standard errors at NUTS-1 level within brackets, p-values within square brackets, *** and ** indicate significance at 1% and 5% level

Regarding the *lack of interest* as the main reason for non-attendance, we find an insignificant relationship between the length of residence and the specific reason for non-attendance, indicating that additional years of residence in the host country are not associated with an increasing interest in cultural activities. An exception is the activity of attendance at the cinema,

where first-generation immigrants living longer in these countries are less likely to report that they do not participate because of a lack of interest. On the other hand, we find no difference between EU and non-EU immigrants. Thus, lack of interest is not determined by the migrant status or whether the migrants come from an EU or non-EU country.

Regarding the last category, we find no correlation between the length of residence and whether there is a cinema, live performance or a cultural site nearby. However, we observe that non-EU immigrants are less likely to report that they do not attend the cultural activities explored than the EU immigrants because there are no related facilities and events nearby. However, our data do not allow us to further investigate the exact characteristics of their area. Thus, we cannot conclude whether these areas are more deprived. In other words, households living in sub-urban areas that may provide a high quality of life can also be areas with fewer cultural activities.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, we attempted to compare the participation in cultural activities between natives-second-generation migrants and first-generation migrants. The main findings show that natives and EU migrants participate more in the activities explored in most cases than non-EU immigrants. The main reason non-EU immigrants either participate less or do not participate is financial barriers, as in most cases, non-EU migrant respondents are more likely to report that they cannot afford to attend these activities. However, in most cultural activities, there is no difference among natives, EU and non-EU migrants in terms of lack of interest in the particular cultural activities.

Thus, one of the main limitations of integration is not the willingness and desire to participate or the lack of interest, but it is rather constrained by limited financial resources. Therefore, policymakers should consider the potential earning inequalities between natives and immigrants that prohibit them from participating in cultural-related activities. This result is further supported by the fact that the respondents are less likely to report that the main reason for non-attendance is that related cultural activities are unavailable nearby. Hence, the results reveal the importance of economic integration since we find that in many cases, migrants, especially those from non-EU countries, cannot afford attendance to the activities explored. This finding is also supported by the significant positive correlation between income and participation, implying that wealthier households participate more frequently in cultural activities.

The study has attempted to add to the literature by exploring the cultural participation in 13 European countries and comparing the frequency of participation between natives, EU and non-EU migrants, using a rich set of control variables and micro-level data from the EU-SILC. Moreover, the study contributes to the literature by emphasising the importance of financial

barriers to cultural participation in cultural activities and highlighting that migrants, in some cases, may show higher levels of interest than natives do.

Sometimes, the integration issues are attributed mainly to immigrants. Still, our study shows that integration and social cohesion rely on the efforts of immigrants and recipient communities since financial resources and income inequalities make it more difficult for immigrants to afford cultural activities, especially non-EU immigrants. Therefore, potential discrimination and inequalities in labour outcomes are obstacles to the cultural integration of first-generation immigrants. No simple solution can be found to tackle social cohesion and integration. Mainstream policies and programmes should pay specific attention to the particular barriers and differences among the various immigrant groups. An important matter guiding integration policies is how efforts are oriented to specific migrants' needs through relevant and target programmes or to create an inclusive society for all.

In recent years, the governance of integration across Europe has moved towards "mainstreaming integration", adapting mainstream services to meet the entire population's needs and responding to a whole range of society's diversities, not only immigrants. This implies that migration, as one of several vectors of difference, including gender, age, and disability, must adapt to rather than be treated as a particular group with specific needs. This strategy will help build a more inclusive society and enhance integration outcomes (Gidley and Jensen, 2014). It is also a much less politically sensitive solution, as resources targeting specific communities will promote discontent in times of scarce resources and reinforce immigrant groups as "problematic" communities. On the other hand, the mainstream approaches can be equally weak, as there is a risk of overlooking other vulnerable groups, for instance, female family migrants (Oliver, 2013). Targeted strategies, in comparison, could be more cost-effective and more efficient than adapting existing services, for example, by concentrating professional facilitators and experts in a specially designed facility and making it easier for migrants to get to a defined place and time. More targeted approaches can also promote contact and understanding of the service provision.

However, the study has drawbacks. First, the empirical analysis relies on cross-sectional data, as the cultural participation variables were available only in 2015. Panel data offer the advantage of following the same individual across a period, which is related to the main aim of this paper since integration is, by its nature, a dynamic and long-term process. Moreover, panel data analysis can help investigate the role of other factors in cultural integration, such as employment status, income, wealth and education, that change over time. Therefore, following this limitation, the analysis does not allow the establishment of causal inference, but the results show merely associations.

Second, the study has explored and compared only natives and first-generation immigrants. In contrast, second and third-generation immigrants have been included in the natives' sample because we cannot identify them, as discussed in the methodology section. Hence, in line with

this, an important limitation of the study is that the information about the racial and ethnic background of both native and migrant respondents is unavailable. It would be interesting and, at the same time, helpful to explore whether ethnic background influences the integration of immigrants, which would potentially provide insights and advice on migration-relevant policies. Nevertheless, earlier studies suggest that while first-generation immigrants differ from the native-born along various dimensions, such as citizenship and language, these differences almost disappear between natives and second-generation immigrants concerning citizenship, language, income, and employment status (Aleksynska and Algan, 2010).

References

Ai, C. and Norton, E. C. (2003) Interaction terms in logit and probit models", *Economics letters* 80(1): 123-129.

Akdede, S. H. and Ogus Binatli, A. (2017) Analysis of Attendance in Turkish State Theatres: Evidence of the Veblen Effect? *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 35(2): 230-246.

Aleksynska, M. and Algan, Y. (2010) Assimilation and integration of immigrants in Europe. IZA Discussion Paper No. 5185, Bonn, Germany.

Bennett, T., Bustamante, M.; Frow, J. (2013) The Australian space of lifestyles in comparative perspective. *Journal of Sociology* 49(2-3): 224-255.

Bertacchini, E., Venturini, A. and Zotti, R. (2022) Drivers of cultural participation of immigrants: evidence from an Italian survey. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 46(1): 57-100.

Betz, W.; Simpson, N. B. (2013) The effects of international migration on the well-being of native populations in Europe. *IZA Journal of Migration* 2(1): 1-21.

Birman, D. (2011) Migration and well-being: Beyond the macrosystem. *Psychosocial Intervention* 20(3): 339-342.

Bisin, A., Patacchini, E., Verdier, T. and Zenou, Y. (2008) Are Muslim immigrants different in terms of cultural integration? *Journal of the European Economic Association* 6(2-3): 445-456.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1987) What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 32(1): 1-18.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992), *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago press.

Bukov, A., Maas, I. and Lampert, T. (2002) Social participation in very old age: Cross-sectional and longitudinal findings from BASE. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 57(6): 510-517.

Chiswick, B.R. (1978) The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men. *Journal of Political Economy* 86(5): 897-921.

Chiswick, B. R. and Miller, P. W. (1996). Ethnic networks and language proficiency among immigrants. *Journal of Population Economics*, 9(1): 19-35.

Christin, A. (2012) Gender and highbrow cultural participation in the United States. *Poetics* 40(5): 423-443.

Clini, C., Thomson, L. J. and Chatterjee, H. J. (2019). Assessing the impact of artistic and cultural activities on the health and well-being of forcibly displaced people using participatory action research. *BMJ open*, 9(2): e025465.

Coleman, J.S. (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (Supplement): 95-120.

Coulangeon, P. (2005) Educational attainment and participation in 'highbrow culture. A comparative approach in the European Union. Paris: Observatoire Sociologique du Changement, OSC, Sciences Po.

Coulangeon, P. (2013) Changing policies, challenging theories and persisting inequalities: Social disparities in cultural participation in France from 1981 to 2008 *Poetics* 41(2): 177-209.

Crul, M. and Schneider, J. (2010) Comparative Integration Context Theory: Participation and Belonging in New Diverse European Cities *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(7): 1249-1268.

Crul, M., Schneider, J. and Lelie, F. (2012) *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the Integration Context Matter?* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Cuypers, K., Krokstad, S., Holmen, T. L., Knudtsen, M. S., Bygren, L. O. and Holmen, J. (2012) Patterns of receptive and creative cultural activities and their association with perceived health, anxiety, depression and satisfaction with life among adults: the HUNT study, Norway. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 66(8): 698-703.

Davies, S. (2005) Still popular: Museums and their visitors 1994-2004 *Cultural Trends* 14(1): 67-105.

Docquier, F., Peri, G. and Ruyssen, I. (2014) The Cross-Country Determinants of Potential and Actual Migration. *International Migration Review* 48(S1): S37-S99.

European Commission (2007). Handbook on Integration for policy-makers and practitioners. 2nd Edition, https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/library-document/handbook-integration-policy-makers-and-practitioners-2nd-edition_en

Eurostat (2019a). Culture Statistics – 2019 Edition. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-statistical-books/-/ks-01-19-712

Eurostat (2019b) Methodological Guidelines and Description of EU-SILC Target Variables. https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/e9a5d1ad-f5c7-4b80-bdc9 1ce34ec828eb/DOCSILC065%20operation%202018_V5.pdf

Falk, M. and Katz-Gerro, T. (2016) Cultural participation in Europe: Can we identify common determinants? *Journal of Cultural Economics* 40(2): 127-162.

Farchy, E. and Liebig, T. (2014) Finding the way: A discussion of the Swedish migrant integration system. OECD, Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs. International Migration Division, Paris France.

Gidley, B. and Jensen, O. (2014) The Politics of Mainstreaming, Immigrant Integration Policies: Case study of the United Kingdom UPSTREAM. Accessed online at: [https://projectupstream.wordpress.com/publications/]

Giovanis, E. (2021) Participation in socio-cultural activities and subjective well-being of natives and migrants: Evidence from Germany and the UK. *International Review of Economics* 68(4): 423-463.

Giovanis, E. and Akdede, S. H. (2021). Integration Policies in Spain and Sweden: Do They Matter for Migrants' Economic Integration and Socio-Cultural Participation? *Sage Open*, 11(4), 21582440211054476.

Giovanis, E., Akdede, S. H. and Ozdamar, O. (2021). Impact of the EU Blue Card programme on cultural participation and subjective well-being of migrants in Germany. *PLOS One* 16(7): e0253952.

Gordon-Nesbitt, R. and Howarth, A. (2020). The arts and the social determinants of health: findings from an inquiry conducted by the United Kingdom All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing. *Arts & health*, 12(1): 1-22.

Gray, C. M. (2003), *Participation*. A handbook of cultural economics, 356. https://www.elgaronline.com/view/1840643382.00052.xml

Greene, W. H. and Hensher, D. A. (2010) *Modeling ordered choices: A primer*. Cambridge University Press.

Hanifan, L. J. (1916) The rural school community center *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67(1): 130-138.

Heath, A. F., Rothon, C. and Kilpi, E. (2008) The second generation in Western Europe: Education, unemployment, and occupational attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34(1): 211-235.

Holm, A. L., Berland, A. K. and Severinsson, E. (2019) Factors that influence the health of older widows and widowers-A systematic review of quantitative research *Nursing Open* 6(2): 591-611.

IOM (2019). World Migration Report 2020. International Organization for Migration, Geneva, Switzerland, https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2020.pdf.

Katz, S., Down, T.D., Cash, H.R. and Grotz, R.C. (1970) Progress in the development of the index of ADL. *The Gerontologist* 10(1): 20-30.

Kearns, A. and Whitley, E. (2015) Getting there? The effects of functional factors, time and place on the social integration of migrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(13): 2105-2129.

Kuo, T. and H.-L. Tang (2014) Relationships among personality traits, Facebook usages, and leisure activities - A case of Taiwanese college students *Computers in Human Behavior* Vol 31, pp. 13-19

Lawton, M. P. and Brody, E. M. (1969) Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. *The gerontologist* 49(3/1): 179-186.

Lazear, E. P. (1999). Culture and language. *Journal of political Economy* 107(6): S95-S126.

Le, H. and Fujimoto, Y. (2010). Motivators and barriers of ethnic groups to engage in arts performance. Paper presented at the 24th Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM). https://www.anzam.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf-manager/765_ANZAM2010-030.PDF

Lefrancois, R., Leclerc, G. and Poulin, N. (1997) Predictors of activity involvement among older adults *Activities, Adaptation & Aging* 22(4): 15-29.

Levine, L. W. (1988), *Highbrow/Lowbrow: the emergence of cultural hierarchy in America*. Harvard University Press.

Long, S. J. and Freese, J. (2014) *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata*. Texas: Stata Press.

Mandel, B. R. (2019). Can audience development promote social diversity in German public arts institutions? *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 49(2): 121-135.

McGregor, E. and Ragab, N. (2016). The Role of Culture and the Arts in the Integration of Refugees and Migrants. European Expert Network on Culture and Audiovisual (EENCA). United Nations University - Maastricht Economic and Social Research Institute on Innovation and Technology (UNU-MERIT). https://www.merit.unu.edu/publications/uploads/1473335881.pdf

Millán-Franco, M., Gómez-Jacinto, L., Hombrados-Mendieta, I., González-Castro, F. and García-Cid, A. (2019) The effect of length of residence and geographical origin on the social inclusion of immigrants. *Psychosocial Intervention* 28(3): 119-130.

Monteiro, S. (2021) Cultural Assimilation: Learning and Sorting. *Review of Economic Analysis*, 13(2): 115-156.

National Endowment for the Arts (2015), *2015 Annual Report*. https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2015%20Annual%20Report.pdf

Neustar (2018) Do Movie Marketing Budgets Need a Digital Reboot? Facebook-commissioned study of 70 major studio film releases of various genres in 2016 in US. https://ns-cdn.neustar.biz/creative_services/biz/neustar/www/resources/whitepapers/marketing/neustar-movie-marketing-budgets-whitepaper.pdf?_ga=2.182409319.1174341792.1601821567-1042504086.1601821567

Oliver, C. (2013) The Impacts of Restrictions and Entitlements on the Integration of Family Migrants: Comparative Report. IMPACIM. Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.

University of Oxford https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/PR-2013-IMPACIM_Comparative.pdf

Perrig-Chiello, P. (2019) Widowhood. In *Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population Aging*, Gu, D. and Dupre, M. (Eds.), Springer, Cham.

Portes, A., and Rumbaut, R. G. (2001) *Legacies*. *The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Salgado, L. and Patuzzi, L. (2022). Promoting the Inclusion of Europe's Migrants and Minorities in Arts and Culture. Migration Policy Institute (MPI). Washington D.C. USA.

Schuster, J. M. (2007) Participation studies and cross-national comparison: proliferation, prudence, and possibility *Cultural trends* 16(2): 99-196.

Stigler, G. J. and Becker, G. S. (1977) De gustibus non est disputandum *The American Economic Review* 67(2): 76-90.

Wilkie, R., Peat, G., Thomas, E. and Croft, P. (2007) Factors associated with participation restriction in community-dwelling adults aged 50 years and over. *Quality of Life Research* 16(7): 1147-1156.