

No interest, no time! Gendered constraints to museum visits in Flanders

Mullens, Francisca; Glorieux, Ignace

Published in:
Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure

DOI:
[10.1080/07053436.2019.1626036](https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2019.1626036)

Publication date:
2019

License:
CC BY-NC

Document Version:
Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Mullens, F., & Glorieux, I. (2019). No interest, no time! Gendered constraints to museum visits in Flanders. *Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure*, 42(2), 244-265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2019.1626036>

Copyright

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, without the prior written permission of the author(s) or other rights holders to whom publication rights have been transferred, unless permitted by a license attached to the publication (a Creative Commons license or other), or unless exceptions to copyright law apply.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document infringes your copyright or other rights, please contact openaccess@vub.be, with details of the nature of the infringement. We will investigate the claim and if justified, we will take the appropriate steps.

No interest, no time! Gendered constraints to museum visits in Flanders

Francisca Mullens & Ignace Glorieux

Abstract

This paper investigates why non-attendees of museums in Flanders (Belgium) do not visit and how these reasons for not attending are related to gender. The hierarchical constraints framework is applied to non-attendees using the 2014 Participation Survey (N = 2707). Both interested and non-interested non-attendees are included in the analyses. Findings reveal that interest constraints are the greatest barrier for museum visits for both women and men. However, men do report this type of constraint more than women. Women, on the other hand, report more interpersonal and structural constraints. Older women seem doubly disadvantaged regarding interpersonal constraints, and women with a lower subjective income are doubly disadvantaged for both interpersonal and structural constraints. This paper explains discrepancies in the experiences of constraints between different groups by the hierarchy of social privilege, referring to the role of socialization and culture in influencing people's preferences. Evaluating the constraint model in research regarding cultural participation, the paper proposes a clarification based on Parsons' action theory framework.

Introduction

Since the 1980s, research on leisure constraints has been developing rapidly within a leisure studies discourse. Constraints to leisure can be defined as 'anything that inhibits people's ability to participate in leisure activities, to spend more time doing so, to take advantage of leisure services, or to achieve a desired level of satisfaction' (Jackson, 1988; Jackson & Henderson, 1995, p. 31). In 1987 Crawford and Godbey (1987) constructed a conceptual framework for studying constraints in leisure participation. This framework was integrated into a hierarchical model a few years later (Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991). Ever since its inception, this model has been useful for researchers looking at leisure constraints, especially within tourism, sports, and outdoor recreation (e.g., Alexandris, Du, Funk, & Theodorakis, 2016; Kim, Lee, Kim, & Kim, 2015).

Within this growing body of literature regarding leisure constraints, many scholars have focused on women's experiences in leisure activities (e.g., Gao & Kerstetter, 2016; Henderson, 1994; Jackson & Henderson, 1995; Shaw, 1994) and the differences between women and men in their experiences of these constraints (e.g., Henderson & Allen, 1991; Searle & Jackson, 1985). Some of these studies did build on the (modified) framework of Crawford and Godbey (1987).

Only a few studies have studied cultural participation in the above-mentioned constraints framework with regards to gender differences. This paper will apply Crawford and Godbey's (1987) hierarchical constraint model of non-participants in museum visits in Flanders, using

the 2014 Participation Survey (PaS14) to investigate what constraints non-participants experience and if women and men experience the same constraints while visiting museums. Not interested non-participants, especially, are an interesting group to study as few studies have been done and we still know very little about them. As cultural participation comes with many benefits, it is important to understand why some people do not/cannot participate in these activities. Using Crawford and Godbey's (1987) model will lead to some critique and possible adaptations for future research. Gender will be used as a key variable in the analysis of constraints, next to other background variables such as age, educational level, income, children in the household, participation of their parents, job category, and employment status. The interaction between gender and other variables will also be considered to better understand perceived constraints, taking into account the wider (socio-demographic) context. While for many leisure activities women seem to be more constrained than men (fewer women are active in these activities), for cultural participation this seems to be the opposite. Women are overrepresented when it comes to participation in cultural activities (Bihagen & Katz-Gerro, 2000; Christin, 2012; Garlick, 2004). This makes the analysis of gendered constraints in cultural attendance even more interesting.

Theoretical background

Constraints to leisure

Before, constraints or barriers were seen as insurmountable obstacles intervening in the relationship between one's preferences and one's participation. Crawford and Godbey's (1987) model (and later Crawford et al., 1991) suggests, however, that constraints influence leisure behavior. This vision is clearly reflected in Jackson's (1991, 1997) revised definition of constraints to a more preferable one: 'factors that are assumed by researchers and perceived or experienced by individuals to limit the formation of leisure preferences and to inhibit or prohibit participation and enjoyment in leisure' (Jackson, 1991, p. 279; 1997, p. 461). According to Crawford and Godbey (1987) the relationship between leisure preferences and participation is affected by constraints in three ways: (1) intrapersonal constraints involve 'individual psychological states and attributes which interact with leisure preferences.' These intrapersonal constraints often take place before a preference for a certain activity has been developed, e.g., prior socialization, health issues, low self-confidence, stress, and interests; (2) interpersonal constraints are 'the result of interpersonal interaction or the relationship between individuals' characteristics' (p. 123). These barriers can affect one's preferences as well as one's participation. For example, couples will have an influence on each other's preferences for leisure activities. However, not finding a companion with whom to do an activity might interfere with the participation itself; (3) structural constraints intervene between preference and participation. Examples of these barriers include costs, time availability, geographical availability, season, etc. A year after Crawford and Godbey (1987), Henderson, Stalnaker, and Taylor (1988) introduced 'antecedent' and 'intervening' constraints. 'Antecedent' constraints affect people's leisure preferences and interests, whereas 'intervening' constraints affect participation in leisure activities. Here we find similarities with intrapersonal (antecedent) constraints on the one hand, and structural (intervening) constraints on the other hand. Interpersonal constraints can be both antecedent (friends have an influence on preferences) and intervening (not having companions with whom to go).

In their 1991 article, Crawford et al. (1991) combined their three constraint models into an integrated hierarchical model. They propose a sequential ordering of constraints where the intrapersonal constraints are the first to be confronted and are, therefore, the most fundamental ones, as they affect the preference to do an activity or not. Next, the interpersonal constraints will be confronted. Only after these two types of constraints have been overcome will structural constraints begin to play a role. Later, this unidirectional hierarchical model was modified by Jackson, Crawford, and Godbey (1993) by including feedback loops where 'anticipation of one or more insurmountable interpersonal or structural constraints may suppress the desire for participation' (p. 7) and motivation as interacting variables between constraints and participation (negotiation). Other research has also tested the hierarchical model and proposed that the negotiation of leisure constraints might not always operate in a hierarchical manner for all sub-populations (e.g., Hawkins, Peng, Hsieh, & Eklund, 1999).

This (modified) hierarchical model with regard to leisure constraints has proven to be useful for quantitative as well as qualitative research studying constraints and barriers to leisure activities (e.g., Arab-Moghaddam, Henderson, & Sheikholeslami, 2007; Scott, 1991). Many have developed categories of constraints according to their specific research domains (Godbey, Crawford, & Shen, 2010). This makes it hard to compare constraints over specific leisure contexts. However, lack of time and money (structural constraints) are found to be the most widely experienced constraints to leisure participation (Jackson, 2005). Many of the leisure constraint studies investigate only interested non-participants and participants, so no interest as a constraint, resulting from preferences and prior socialization, is automatically excluded as a possible barrier. However, one of the five core barriers in early research on constraints was interest (Goodale & Witt, 1989). Jackson (1990) indeed proposed (based on Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Henderson et al., 1988) to distinguish two groups of non-participants, the ones who do not want to participate (lack of interest) and those who do want to participate but are constrained from participation.

Constraints to participation in cultural activities

Although cultural participation is part of people's leisure repertoire, constraints to these specific cultural activities have not often been studied. Very little is known about the not interested non-attendees (van Eijck & Boele, 2018). Research on cultural participation has mostly focused on demographic profiles of non-attendees and attendees. These studies (e.g., d'Harnoncourt, 1991; Purhonen, Gronow, & Rahkonen, 2011) show that cultural participation is affected by gender, age, income, level of education, class, etc. Based on these results we can say that many groups are excluded from cultural participation. This exclusion is problematic if we think about the advantages cultural participation (cultural capital) has on individuals, such as higher educational attainment (Sullivan, 2001). Studying constraints can give more insight into the reasons why these people do not partake in activities such as visiting a museum, a theater play, etc., and how they could be persuaded to participate.

van Den Broek and de Rooij (2013) differentiated non-attendees for theater and concerts into two groups: interested non-attendees and not interested non-attendees. For interested non-participants, museum attendance seems to be most constrained by the cost of the ticket, lack of facilities, inconvenient location, and lack of time (Jun, Kyle, & O'Leary, 2008). The cost of a ticket also played a role in the perceptions and constraints of young people in theater visits.

For the youngest segments, this was even more of an issue (Taylor, Owen, & Withnall, 2000). However, with further analysis into the ticket pricing, Kolb (1997) found that money was not such a big factor after all. When university students were asked to rank important factors for attending, ticket price only came in tenth. Quality of the performance and entertainment were the two most important factors (Kolb, 1997). Like Jun et al. (2008), Blume-Kohout, Leonard, and Novak- Leonard (2015) found lack of time, difficulty getting to the venue, and cost to be the most important barriers for interested non-attendees in arts. However, this varied significantly for performances and exhibits. Lack of time and difficulty to get there (or disability) posed greater barriers for attending arts exhibits, while cost and lack of time were most important for attending performances. Lack of companion was found to be more important for performances than for exhibits (Blume-Kohout et al., 2015). van Den Broek and de Rooij (2013) found that for theater and concerts the most important reasons for not attending for interested non-attendees were that they just did not go to them or they preferred not to go alone. van Eijck and Boele (2018) concluded that for not interested non-attendees of the arts a lack of interest in or affinity with the cultural offer was the most important factor.

Constraints to attendance cannot be interpreted without considering the socio-demographic context of these constraints. Constraints are the starting point for further analysis of the meaning of constraints for different groups in society (Jackson & Henderson, 1995). Looking at constraints in their context has recently started to become more important (Henderson & Hickerson, 2007; Shaw & Henderson, 2005). These contexts refer to people's more individual characteristics, but also broader societal contexts may be considered. Based on Crawford and Godbey's model (1987), Jun et al. (2008) examined interested non-attendees for art museums and found that socio-demographic factors influence different constraint dimensions. Intrapersonal and structural constraints were influenced by income, while gender, age, and number of children in the household were more related to the interpersonal constraints. A research report of the US National Endowment of the arts (Blume-Kohout et al., 2015) found differences in perceived barriers according to socio-demographic factors. Lower-educated, lower-income and Black or African-American and Mexican-American, and people over age 45, were more likely to find the location difficult to get to. Lack of time was increasingly mentioned as education and income increased, and the cost barrier was least mentioned by people with high incomes. Based on the Flemish Participation Survey 2014 (the same data used for this paper), Beunen, Siongers, Willekens, Van Steen, and Lievens (2015) investigated constraints to theater visits and found that the interest constraint was more important for lower-educated respondents. Higher-educated respondents reported more financial and time constraints. This corresponds to a proposition of Crawford et al.'s (1991) model that social privilege has a powerful influence on what type of constraints are experienced (cf., Hawkins et al., 1999). Gender has also proved to be a significant factor in constraints.

Gendered leisure and constraints

A great amount of research has already pointed out differences in leisure time between women and men. Due to their higher commitment to housework, women on average have less leisure time than men (e.g., Chatzitheochari & Arber, 2011; Glorieux & Van Tienoven, 2016; Glorieux et al., 2015). Many studies also found differences in activities done by women and men. Some of these differences can be attributed to different leisure time experiences. Research has shown that women's leisure is more fragmented, interrupted, and associated with unpaid work, while men's leisure is qualitatively better (Bittman & Wajcman, 2000; Deem,

1988). Differences in leisure activities could also be associated with other gendered divisions, such as the private (female) vs. public (male) space (Cliff, 1993). This division was also formed by the different types of activities or preferences, possibly related to the status of culture women act upon (Collins, 1992). Building on this argument of the domestic division of leisure, Bennett et al. (2009) found a gender divide in cultural life going along the line of 'outward'-oriented and 'inward'-oriented activities. This public-private divide between men and women also takes place within the domestic realm (Bennett et al., 2009; Harrington, Dawson, & Bolla, 1992).

These differences in leisure time, experiences, and activities bring us to the subject of constraints. Women are generally more constrained in their leisure than men (Jackson & Henderson, 1995; Johnson, Bowker, & Cordell, 2001; Shaw, 1994). Time is most frequently reported as an 'objective' constraint, especially for full-time working mothers (Harrington et al., 1992). An ethic of care (Gilligan, 1982; Henderson & Allen, 1991) and lack of a sense of entitlement (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1991) might partially explain some of the subjective constraints women experience in their enjoyment of leisure (Harrington et al., 1992). While lack of money and economic factors can be a barrier for both women and men, these economic constraints affect women in a different way (Arab-Moghaddam et al., 2007). Studying outdoor recreation, Johnson et al. (2001) found non-participating women to have more financial constraints. How gender and class affect each other in consumption is not clear. However, Katz-Gerro (2006) 'advocates the importance of multiple social boundaries and emphasizes multidimensional bases of stratification' (p. 78). This is in line with the above demand for more context (Henderson & Hickerson, 2007; Shaw & Henderson, 2005). Katz-Gerro (2006) found between-country differences in sex and class interactions on highbrow cultural consumption. An advantage in cultural consumption was observed for women of the upper classes in the USA and West Germany, a lower cultural consumption score for women of the lower classes was observed in Sweden and Italy, and in Israel, no significant sex-by-class interaction effects were found.

As mentioned above, cultural activities are a special form of leisure as more women than men participate in these types of activities. From this we could conclude that women are less constrained in cultural activities than men. However, only a small part of the population participates in these activities, so here, education is the most important determinant. Therefore, some women and men do not visit museums, nor go to concerts or theater plays. Jun et al. (2008) found some interactive and pure gender effects in constraints for interested non-visitors of museums. Women with children under 18 reported less intrapersonal constraints than women without children under age 18. Men with four or more children noted more intrapersonal constraints than men without children and women with the same number of children. For interpersonal constraints, a pure gender effect was found, next to an age effect and an effect of children. Women, younger respondents, and people with children under 18 mentioned interpersonal constraints more often. For structural constraints, again an interactive effect of gender and children under 18 was found. Women and men with children reported more structural constraints than women and men without children, with women always reporting more than men, except for when there were four or more children in the household. Men in this situation experience more structural constraints than women in the same situation (Jun et al., 2008). Opposed to Jun et al. (2008), for visitor attractions (museums, zoos, and botanical gardens) Nowacki (2011) found women to have more intrapersonal

constraints, while men would report more interpersonal and structural constraints. Moore (1998) found men to report less interest in arts-related activities than women. Already in 2003, Jun stressed the importance of looking at a combination of variables, in her case gender and lifecycle, in better understanding perceived constraint measures for arts participation (Jun, 2003).

In this paper, we analyze why people do not visit museums and if we can identify different groups of non-visitors. As such, we want to have a clearer view on different types of barriers for cultural participation, how these interact and are influenced by different socio-demographic variables. Gender will be taken as a key variable for studying constraints to museum visits. Do women and men give other reasons for not visiting museums? How could we explain these differences? Gender in itself will probably not explain the whole difference. Keeping in mind the demand for more context (Henderson & Hickerson, 2007; Shaw & Henderson, 2005) and following Katz-Gerro (2006), this article will look at the interactive effects of class (subjective income, employment status, and job category), age, and children, with gender. Following Shaw (1994) and Jackson and Henderson (1995), we expect that gender itself will not be a constraint to leisure. Instead, the definition and experiences of one's gender in society will create situations that might be experienced as constraining (Jackson & Henderson, 1995). In contrast to earlier research done on the PaS14 data (Beunen et al., 2015), we use Crawford et al.'s (1991) hierarchical constraints model as a conceptual framework for these new analyses. This is in accordance with more recent studies on constraints to cultural activities (e.g., Boo, Carruthers, & Busser, 2014; Luckerhoff, Perreault, Garon, Lapointe, & Nguyễn-Duy, 2008; Nuijten, De Rooij, & Snoeckx, 2016). We will reflect on the usefulness of this model and suggest some adaptations to improve it for future research.

Data and methods

For this study, the Participation Survey of 2014 (PaS14) was used. In the survey, respondents were selected from a random sample of the Flemish population in Belgium aged 15 to 86 (N = 3949). Participants were questioned in a face-to-face interview in their homes. Information about their cultural, sports, and social participation, together with some background information, was gathered. For museums, theaters, and concerts, participants were asked if they had visited/attended at least one time in the past six months. If they had, more questions about their visit(s) were asked. If they had not attended or visited in the past six months, they were asked why they had not. Out of a list of 16 reasons for not attending, respondents were asked to choose at least two and a maximum of three reasons. The possible constraints for museums, concerts, and theater plays were the following:

- (1) I prefer to stay home
- (2) The entrance tickets are too expensive
- (3) The offer in my region is too small
- (4) There is no one to accompany me
- (5) It is difficult to find a babysitter
- (6) I do not feel at ease
- (7) A health problem or disability hinders me
- (8) I do not have time
- (9) The offer does not interest me
- (10) The place is often hard to access

- (11) The place is often in an unsafe neighborhood
- (12) I do not have enough information
- (13) There is a lack of public transportation
- (14) The hours do not fit
- (15) My parents do not allow me
- (16) It just does not interest me

Since museums, theaters, and concerts are all very specific venues, and probably other mechanisms for not attending are at play in each of them, we chose to not study them as one group. The PaS14 entails a lot of different forms of theater such as comedy, circus, etc., and very distinct musical genres in the categories of theater and concerts. While this is also true for museums, with museums of fine art as well as museums of history, etc., included, we chose constraints to museum visits as our research target. Museums in general have a specific connotation for people who do not visit. Museums are quite accessible in the sense that there is no time limit, people are flexible to come and go within the open hours, and this, throughout the whole day. Most museums have a wide range of open hours, while concerts and theater plays often take place during the evening. A museum can be visited alone or with someone, but is a more individual experience. However, museums are still seen as quite highbrow culture. Only non-attendees were considered in our analysis of constraints. Only these respondents were asked why they did not visit a museum. Of the 3949 respondents, 2707 (68.5%) were non-visitors.

Since we use Crawford and Godbey's (1987) hierarchical constraints model, constraints were grouped into intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints. As different studies and questionnaires all use different lists of constraints, the choice of what constraints belong to which group was decided by the authors, based on Crawford and Godbey's (1987) definitions. To get a better picture of what constraints are at play and since Godbey et al. (2010) advised using sub-dimensions for each category, intra- personal and structural constraints were split into several subcategories of constraints. Table 1 shows all these constraint categories and their proportions for women and men. These three categories and subcategories of constraints are the dependent variables and are further used in logistic regression models. Respondents had to choose more than one reason for not attending. Because we wanted to have a better picture on what constraints were chosen together and by whom, a latent class analysis (LCA) was conducted next through Latent Gold. LCA is a statistical technique in which, in this case, the non- participants are classified into mutually exclusive and exhaustive groups based on similar choices of constraints.

The independent variable of interest here is gender, controlling for age, educational level, children, arts participation of the parents, subjective income, job category, and employment status. First, a descriptive analysis of the percentages per constraint and constraint category is presented by gender. Secondly, logistic regression analyses are performed on women and men separately (a combined model of women and men was also estimated to investigate the effect of gender, but is not shown in the tables below), and lastly, the clusters of our latent class analysis are presented.

Results

Gender difference in intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints

The first notable finding is that 52.1% of women and only 47.9% of men belong to the non-participants of museums, whereas 51% of the overall population is female (analysis not shown here). This would be against our expectations, as we know that more women attend cultural activities than men. However, in our sample, museums of all kinds are included. This means that historic, scientific, and other museums, next to art museums, are included. Looking at contemporary art museums specifically, we see that more women than men have visited one (49.8% of women to 34.5% of men). Unfortunately, our constraint questions were asked about museums in general. As expected, lower- educated respondents and respondents whose parents did not participate in arts are overrepresented in the group of non-participants. Full-time working respondents, respondents with a higher (subjective) income, and (higher) service workers are underrepresented within the non-participants.

Looking at Table 1, we can see differences in the number of women and men reporting intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints. A greater percentage of men reported intrapersonal constraints. This higher percentage is mostly due to the difference in interest constraints with 13 percent points showing more men than women having reported one or more of these interest constraints. A higher percentage of women reported health constraints. For both women and men, intrapersonal constraints are the largest category of constraints, about 80% experiencing one or more of these barriers. On the other hand, women more often reported interpersonal and structural constraints. Time constraints are the most important barriers within the structural constraint category, although the difference between women and men regarding time constraints is not significant. The three main constraint categories (intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural) do show significant differences between men and women. On an item level, every interest constraint item and the time constraint item 'I do not have time' scored 30% or higher.

We now know that the majority of both women and men marked interest as one of the reasons for not attending a museum. Interpersonal constraints are less often given as reasons. Using logistic regression models, we examine if the above gender differences are explained by gender alone or if other variables might explain the differences between women and men.

Intrapersonal constraints

Analyses of the effect of different background variables on intrapersonal constraints (see Table 2) reveal a few differences between men and women. Age has a significant effect for women, not for men. Women in the age groups 35–54 and 55–64 are less likely to report intrapersonal constraints than women aged 15–34. Also, the effect of employment is only significant for women; nonworking (retired) women have a significantly higher chance of reporting intrapersonal constraints than full-time working women. Education, parents' participation, and job category have the same effect on both women and men. The direction of these effects is as expected; people with more cultural capital are less likely to have marked an intrapersonal constraint. Income and having children do not have an effect on intrapersonal constraints (after statistical controlling for the other variables in the model).

Looking at the subcategory of interest constraints in the combined model (not shown), we find a pure effect of gender with men being much more likely to report a lack of interest.

Investigating interest and health constraints for men and women separately (Table 3), we see that the differential effect of age and employment status only holds for the health constraint. Although the age effect is somewhat stronger among women, for both men and women age and retirement clearly affect reporting health constraints. Education, parents' participation, and job category, on the other hand, only have an effect on interest, not on the health constraint. Although these three variables point in the expected direction, education seems to have a more positive effect on the interests of women.

Interpersonal constraints

Only a small group of 330 out of 2707 respondents mentioned one of the three interpersonal constraints as a reason for not visiting a museum. Since this is a small group, the results of the logistic regressions must be interpreted with some caution. The models in Table 2 reveal age to have an effect both on women as well as on men; however, the effect seems to be reversed. Men aged 55 and older have a lower chance of reporting an interpersonal constraint. Women aged 65 and older have a greater chance of mentioning one of these constraints. Subjective income only significantly influences women, with women having a middle or higher subjective income being less likely to report an interpersonal constraint. Both female and male service workers are more likely to mention one of the interpersonal constraints, only for women the effect for higher service workers seems to be significant.

Structural constraints

The combined model on structural constraints (not shown) shows men having a significantly lower chance of reporting one of these barriers. Adding the interactions of gender with the income, employment status, and job categories, the effect has increased, but is no longer significant. The effect of subjective income and job category on mentioning structural constraints differs for women and men in the separate analyses (Table 2). Women with a higher subjective income have a lesser chance of reporting a structural constraint than women with a low subjective income, while income has no significant effect for men. Men working in service work have a greater chance of reporting structural constraints than manual working men, while for women this effect was not significant. Age only shows a significant negative effect for men aged 65 to 74, reporting fewer structural constraints. For both women and men, the higher educated have a higher chance of reporting structural constraints. Furthermore, nonworking (retired) men and women are less likely to report a structural constraint than full-time working men and women.

The structural constraints encompass four very different subcategories: time, financial, geographical, and informational constraints. Table 4 summarizes for men and women, separately, the significant positive or negative effect of every independent variable regarding the four subcategories of structural constraints. A positive effect (+) means that the higher/older/... group(s) have a higher chance of mentioning that type of constraint, while a negative effect (–) means that the higher/older/... group(s) have a smaller chance of mentioning that type of constraint. Age, job category, employment status, and income seem to have a greater influence on different structural constraints for women more than men. In general, older women mention more financial and geographical constraints than younger women. While working women cite less geographical constraints than non-working women, the higher job categories refer more often to geographical and informational constraints.

To summarize, we clearly see that the interest in visiting museums, the most important intrapersonal constraint, is mainly affected by what, in general, can be referred to as elements of cultural capital: education, parental participation, and job category. The effect of education on interest is, however, stronger for women than for men. Age and retirement positively affect the health constraint among men and women, although the effect of age on the health constraint is stronger among women. Age also hinders women's participation because of interpersonal constraints: older women refer more to the lack of company as a reason not to participate, among men this is just the opposite. Age, furthermore, negatively affects women's participation because of financial and geographical constraints, which is not the case among men. Lastly, women with a lower subjective income have a higher chance of reporting interpersonal and structural constraints, than their higher-earning counterparts.

Latent classes of constraints

Respondents who did not visit a museum had to report two or three constraints. Looking at each constraint category independently only tells us if one of these constraints was mentioned or not. This is only part of the story. We also analyzed which combinations were made. By executing a latent class analysis, we could discern four classes of constraints mentioned together: those with predominantly interest constraints (class 1); those with predominantly time constraints (class 2); those with interest and health concerns (class 3); and lastly, those with mostly geographical constraints (class 4). Only the first cluster of predominantly interest constraints consists of more men than women. The other three clusters include more women. Table 5 shows the total size of each class and the percentage of the class that mentioned each constraint category. Table 6 shows the composition of each class based on background variables.

Class 1: Interest constraints

The first class is by far the biggest cluster of all: 58.8% of the respondents belong to this cluster, and 99.9% of this cluster reported interest constraints. Furthermore, 32.5% also reported a time constraint. We could call this group the not interested non-attendees in analogy with van Den Broek and de Rooij (2013). As for gender, 56.8% of this cluster are male, while 43.2% are female. Almost 41% of this class have a diploma in higher secondary education and 54% are or were manual workers.

Class 2: Time constraints

Class 2 consists of 20.6% of the respondents, and 83.3% of this cluster mentioned a time constraint. This group is also partially constrained by other structural factors: 24.3% mentioned a geographical constraint, 18% reported the informational constraint, and 12.5% cited the financial constraint. In addition, 21.9% of this cluster also reported an interpersonal constraint. The cluster is made up of 59.9% of women and 40.1% of men. Strikingly, the two youngest age groups are overrepresented in this class. We also find the biggest percentage of higher-educated respondents (30.7%), respondents living with children (52.3%), respondents whose parents participated (44.4%), full-time working respondents (53.8%), and respondents with a job as a service worker or teacher (51.7%).

Class 3: Health and interest constraints

The health and interest constrained class constitutes 10.7% of the respondents, and 91% of this group reported a health constraint and 87.3% mentioned an interest constraint. Of this cluster,

Table 5

Table 6.

61.3% are female and 38.7% are male. As expected, about 70% of this class consist of respondents older than 65, and 92.4% are not working (probably retired). This group has had very little schooling, as 44.1% do not have a lower secondary education diploma. This class also consists of the highest percentage of respondents whose parents did not participate in the arts (83%), with the lowest subjective income (20%), and who had/have a job as manual worker (59.9%).

Class 4: Geographical (and interest) constraints

Class 4 is the smallest cluster and constitutes 9.98% of the respondents, of which 97% mentioned a geographical constraint and 51.9% mentioned an interest constraint, while 15.3% also reported a health constraint. This fourth cluster is the largest female cluster, with 64.8% women and 35.2% men, and the second-oldest cluster (after Class 3) with 32% being 65 or older. Although 68% are of working age, 62% of this cluster are not working. For the job category, this cluster is quite evenly distributed between manual worker and service worker/teacher (about 42%).

The four classes mirror our findings of the constraint categories and subcategories. The biggest class is the one with predominantly interest constraints, the not interested non-attendees. This is a group that is hard to tackle, because, according to Crawford et al. (1991), intrapersonal constraints are the first to be confronted and have to do with people's preferences. Preferences are hard to change (cf., Bourdieu, 1984). Moreover, Davies and Prentice (1995) suggested that non-participants expressing a lack of interest may be due to a rationalization of constraints rather than a true lack of interest. This conceals underlying constraints and motivations regarding behavior (Gilbert & Hudson, 2000). Most people are not aware of these antecedent constraints, so they are hard to identify (Auster, 2001; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1993). More than half (54.1%) of this interest cluster are/were manual workers and almost half (48.3%) were unemployed or retired. Women are under-represented in the interest cluster, while men are under-represented in all other clusters. This confirms the finding that women are more structurally (and interpersonally) constrained. Class 2 is the most structurally constrained one, with predominantly time constraints. This is also the youngest and highest-educated cluster of all, with a high percentage of full-time working people and more than half having one or more children in the household. People whose parents participated in the arts when they were younger are more likely to report constraints other than interest. This means they might have more interest in visiting a museum, but are constrained by other factors. The health-constrained class (class 3) is the oldest and least-educated cluster, and 92.4% are unemployed or retired. The older age of this cluster might explain the prevalence of the health constraint. The fourth and smallest class made up of respondents reporting mostly geographical constraints and some interest constraints, has the highest percentage of women (64.8%).

Conclusions and discussion

The data used for this paper allowed us to study non-visitors of museums. No interest was a possible constraint to visiting museums. Our results show that no interest was by far the most important reason for not visiting museums. This corresponds to other research done on constraints to cultural activities (Mercier, 2017; van Den Broek & de Rooij, 2013). The latent class analysis presents us with a class predominantly constrained by interest (intrapersonal) constraints. Following van den Broek and de Rooij's study (2013), we can call this group the not interested non-attendees. These not interested respondents belong mostly to the lower social classes and consequently are of lower social privilege. Our regression analysis also revealed that interest constraints are negatively affected by educational level, parental participation, and job category. Crawford et al. (1991) called this the hierarchy of social privilege. Museums are not a part of the world of the not interested group (Van Steen & Lievens, 2011) and they do not feel any affinity to museums (van Eijck & Boele, 2018). To be interested in an activity, one must feel a preference to do this. Preferences are formed through socialization (social class, cultural capital, etc.). To include this group in participation, the European Union proposes the initiative of 'cultural inclusion' (based on Kawashima, 2000) based on two approaches: educational activities and a better connection between supply and demand (European Union, 2012). Our latent class analysis also showed one clear group that was mostly structurally constrained by time. Only a small part of this class mentioned an interest constraint. These we could call the interested non-attendees. In line with the hierarchy of social privilege, this group was predominantly of higher social class and younger in age. This group has had the adequate socialization to form preferences in favor of cultural activities; however, they do experience higher-order constraints.

This paper's research focus was on the differences between women and men in perceived constraints to museum visits. While for both men and women intrapersonal (mainly interest) constraints were the most important reason for not visiting a museum, men reported this type of constraint significantly more than women. Women reported more interpersonal and structural constraints than men. The interpersonal and structural constraints of women mainly come to the forefront as women get older. Older women refer more to the lack of company (interpersonal constraint) as a reason for not going to a museum and age further negatively affects women's participation because of geographical and financial reasons (structural constraints). Also, the health constraint (intrapersonal constraint) becomes more manifest among women who are old and retired. So, it seems that age is a crucial factor that induces different constraints among women, but not so or less among men. For interpersonal constraints, the opposite seems true for men: the companion constraint is less salient as they get older. Women with a lower subjective income were disadvantaged when it comes to interpersonal and structural constraints. They have a greater chance of mentioning one of those constraints than women with a higher subjective income. Subjective income did not significantly affect men's chance of reporting these constraints. This shows the importance of investigating a combination of variables, rather than a single variable (Jun, 2003; Katz-Gerro, 2006). Women are not only more structurally and interpersonally constrained, women with a lower subjective income are doubly disadvantaged in these areas.

Answering the question of why there is some difference in the experience of constraints between women and men is a lot trickier because of the limitations of our data: the constraint

items were limited, there was no room to bring on new items, people had to choose two or three constraints, and there is no information with regard to motivations for possible participation. The proposition of the hierarchy of social privilege (Crawford et al., 1991) supposes that people with a higher social privilege experience lower levels of intrapersonal constraints. When we extrapolate this thought to the gender privilege, we find that those with a higher privilege, men, experience higher levels of intrapersonal constraints. Socialization and culture might, however, also be the key to understanding this opposition. As already mentioned, preferences and priorities are formed by our society and socialization. Culture distinguishes between groups of people and prescribes their 'typical' roles in our society through norms and values. Many people unconsciously appropriate (part of) this role, together with the assumptions, priorities, and preferences fitting this role. Women have historically been linked to the role of caretaker of the household, carrying the burden of housework and emotional labor (and consumption [cf., status, Collins, 1992]), and consequently, having less leisure time and being more constrained in leisure activities (e.g., Glorieux & Van Tienoven, 2016; Jackson & Henderson, 1995). Based on this line of thought, we would like to propose a clarification to the constraint model (Crawford et al., 1991). In the constraint model, socialization (social class, cultural capital, gender, etc.) and culture are mostly seen as influencing intrapersonal constraints and, as Auster (2001) rightly pointed out, in this model this constraint is located within the individual. It is not clear exactly how socialization and culture specifically influence people's motivations and constraints in leisure activities and cultural participation. Our clarification is based on Parsons' (1978) framework of the action theory (units of voluntaristic action) and aims to add the component of society. This framework makes us look at the constraint model in a less hierarchical manner (Hawkins et al., 1999).

Using the action theory framework, the demographic profile of non-visitors, which is very often analyzed in cultural participation research, gives us a first look at people's culture and socialization and can be linked to motivations and constraints. Intrapersonal constraints would fit within the framework's element of 'goals.' As such, we would not consider the health constraint as an intrapersonal constraint but a structural one. Goals are constituted by people's preferences and are influenced by socialization (cultural capital). Structural and interpersonal constraints fit within the situational context (means and conditions). This action theory framework adds the element of 'norms and values' to the model. These norms and values are related to socialization and culture (partially found within socio-demographic contexts), and are especially relevant for investigating gender. Norms and values are guidelines from knowledge, religion, rules, and expectations and influence what people consider as valuable or worth pursuing (goals) and the selection of means by which to attain them. Our study shows that more men than women report interest constraints and that components of cultural capital (education, job category, and parents' arts participation) do influence this type of constraint for both women and men. Women report significantly more structural and interpersonal constraints than men. Here, the element of norms and values might come into play. The situational context might overshadow interests and preferences when norms prescribe women to think about this (time, financial means, etc.) first and give priority to the situation (family, children, etc.) and not adjust their means to achieve a possible desired goal. This is in line with the ethics of care (Henderson & Allen, 1991) and a lack of a sense of entitlement (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1991). According to Shaw (1994), intervening (structural and interpersonal) constraints 'may also act as "antecedent" constraints, by reducing, inhibiting or limiting expressed preference for leisure activities' (p. 11) or as Jackson et al. put it:

'anticipation of one or more insurmountable interpersonal or structural constraints may suppress the desire for participation' (Jackson et al., 1993, p. 7). People with a high cultural capital are expected, again through these norms and values, to be interested in cultural activities (museums). They are less likely to mention an interest constraint, but more often mention the time constraint. In the latent class analysis, the interest and time constraints formed two separate groups of respondents, together constituting 79% of the non-participants. People in the class of time constraints almost never mentioned interest constraints. The time constraint group is the highest-educated, full-time working group with almost half mentioning that their parents participated in the arts. These people have a very high desire to participate that often conflicts with many other ambitions and a busy life (work, children, friends, leisure) (social privilege) (Glorieux, Laurijssen, & Minnen et al., 2010; Linder, 1970). The time constraint and interest interact; they cannot be considered independent factors. People who are not interested will not mention time as a reason for not participating. On the other hand, people who have a very big appetite for a specific activity will find the time to do so even at the cost of other activities. Marks (1977) pointed to the flexibility of time: time does not present itself to us as a prefabricated scarcity even in the modern setting. Like energy it is flexible, waxing abundant or scarce, slow or fast, expanded or contracted, depending upon very particular socio-cultural and personal circumstances. (Marks, 1977, p. 929)

As such, the experience of time scarcity might be more a function of values (what is worthwhile?) and norms (how much time do I spend on it?) than a structural barrier. Within this framework it is also important to understand that a combination of several socio-demographic variables is not just the sum of these single variables, but creates groups at the crossroad of these variables with different experiences and socialization.

Our study was limited to museum visits. It is very probable that studying other types of cultural participation (concerts, theater, movies, etc.) and other types of leisure will bring other constraints and other differences between and within women and men to the forefront. It is important to include non-participants in these studies. Since many of the leisure constraint studies investigate only interested non-participants and participants, therefore, no interest as a constraint, which results from preferences and prior socialization, is automatically excluded as possible barrier.

Not only to have a clearer view on interests, but also for conceptual reasons, we would advise a revised model in which the intrapersonal constraint would be limited to the interest to participate (preferences), and in which values and norms stand out better as factors that influence preferences and mediate between different constraints. This would be helpful to better understand gender and other differences in cultural participation. Like Jackson and Henderson (1995), we could carefully conclude that for women, constraints to museum visits are a function of cultural interpretations of gender (not of biological sex). A revised model could bring this aspect better to the fore. Future qualitative research can also deepen our understanding on how norms and values play a key role in the perception and negotiation of leisure constraints across different groups of the population.

References

- Alexandris, K., Du, J., Funk, D., & Theodorakis, N. D. (2016). Leisure constraints and the psychological continuum model: A study among recreational mountain skiers. *Leisure Studies*. doi:10.1080/02614367.2016.1263871
- Arab-Moghaddam, N., Henderson, K. A., & Sheikholeslami, R. (2007). Women's leisure and constraints to participation: Iranian perspectives. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 39(1), 109–126.
- Auster, C. J. (2001). Transcending potential antecedent leisure constraints: The case of women motorcycle operators. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 33(3), 272–298.
- Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E., Warde, A., Gayo-Cal, M., & Wright, D. (2009). *Class, culture, distinction*. London: Routledge.
- Beunen, S., Siongers, J., Willekens, M., Van Steen, A., & Lievens, J. (2015). Waar is het water (nog steeds) te diep? De evolutie van drempels voor theaterbezoek (naargelang opleidingsniveau). In J. Lievens, J. Siongers, & H. Waeghe (Eds.), *Participatie in Vlaanderen. Eerste analyses van de Participatiesurvey 2014* (pp. 107–131). Leuven: Acco.
- Bihagen, E., & Katz-Gerro, T. (2000). Culture consumption in Sweden: The stability of gender differences. *Poetics*, 27(5–6), 327–349.
- Bittman, M., & Wajcman, J. (2000). The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 165–189.
- Blume-Kohout, M., Leonard, S. R., & Novak-Leonard, J. (2015). *When going gets tough: Barriers and motivations affecting arts attendance*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Boo, S., Carruthers, C. P., & Busser, J. A. (2014). The constraints experienced and negotiation strategies attempted by nonparticipants of a festival event. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 31(2), 269–285.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chatzitheochari, S., & Arber, S. (2011). Identifying the third agers: An analysis of British retirees' leisure pursuits. *Social Research Online*, 16(4), 1–12.
- Christin, A. (2012). Gender and highbrow cultural participation in the United States. *Poetics*, 40(5), 423–443.
- Cliff, D. R. (1993). 'Under the wife's feet': Renegotiating gender divisions in early retirement. *The Sociological Review*, 41(1), 30–53.
- Collins, R. (1992). Women and the production of status cultures. In M. Lamont & M. Fournier (Eds.), *Cultivating differences: Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality* (pp. 152–186). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 9(2), 119–127.
- Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 13(4), 309–320.
- d'Hannoncourt, A. 1991. Panelist in 'The museum and the public'. In M. Feldstein (Ed.), *The economics of art museums* (Chapter 2, pp. 35–60). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davies, A., & Prentice, R. (1995). Conceptualizing the latent visitor to heritage attractions. *Tourism Management*, 16(7), 491–500.
- Deem, R. (1988). Feminism and leisure studies: Opening up new directions. In E. Wimbush & M. Talbot (Eds.), *Relative freedoms: Women and leisure* (pp. 5–32). Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- European Union. (2012). *A report on Policies and good practices in the public arts and in cultural institutions to promote better access to and wider participation in culture*. Brussels: EU.

- Gao, J., & Kerstetter, D. L. (2016). Using an intersectionality perspective to uncover older Chinese females' perceived travel constraints and negotiation strategies. *Tourism Management*, 55, 128–138.
- Garlick, S. (2004). Distinctly feminine: On the relationship between men and art. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 48, 108–125.
- Gilbert, D., & Hudson, S. (2000). Tourism demand constraints: A skiing participation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 906–925.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glorieux, I., De Korte, K., Van Tienoven, T. P., Minnen, J., Deyaert, J., Maszaros, E., ... Weenas, D. (2015). België geklokt. Resultaten van het Belgisch tijdsbestedingsonderzoek 2013 (TBO'13). Brussels: Vakgroep Sociologie, Onderzoeksgroep TOR.
- Glorieux, I., Laurijssen, I., Minnen, J., et al. (2010). In search of the harried leisure class in contemporary society: Time-use surveys and patterns of leisure time. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 33, 163–181.
- Glorieux, I., & Van Tienoven, T. P. (2016). *De organisatie en combinatie van arbeids- en gezinsverantwoordelijkheden bij vrouwen en mannen in België*. Brussels: Instituut voor de gelijkheid van vrouwen en mannen.
- Godbey, G., Crawford, D. W., & Shen, X. S. (2010). Assessing hierarchical leisure constraints theory after two decades. *Journal of Leisure Research* Copyright, 42(1), 111–134.
- Goodale, T. L., & Witt, P. A. (1989). Recreation non-participation and barriers to leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future* (pp. 421–449). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Harrington, M., Dawson, D., et Bolla, P. (1992). Objective and subjective constraints on women's enjoyment of leisure. *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure*, 15(1), 203–221.
- Hawkins, B. A., Peng, J., Hsieh, C., & Eklund, S. J. (1999). Leisure constraints: A replication and extension of construct development. *Leisure Sciences*, 21, 179–192.
- Henderson, K. A. (1994). Broadening an understanding of women, gender, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1), 1–7.
- Henderson, K. A., & Allen, K. R. (1991). The ethic of care: Leisure possibilities and constraints for women. *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure*, 14(1), 97–113.
- Henderson, K. A., & Bialeschki, M. (1993). Exploring an expanded model of women's leisure constraints. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 18(4), 229–252.
- Henderson, K. A., & Bialeschki, M. D. (1991). A sense of entitlement to leisure as constraint and empowerment for women. *Leisure Sciences*, 12, 51–65.
- Henderson, K. A., & Hickerson, B. (2007). Women and leisure: Premises and performances uncovered in an integrative review. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 39(4), 591–610.
- Henderson, K. A., Stalnaker, D., & Taylor, G. (1988). The relationship between barriers to recreation and gender-role personality traits for women. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(1), 69–80.
- Jackson, E. L. (1988). Leisure constraints: A survey of past research. *Leisure Sciences*, 10(3), 203–215.
- Jackson, E. L. (1990). Variations in the desire to begin a leisure activity: Evidence of antecedent constraints? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22, 55–70.
- Jackson, E. L. (1991). Leisure constraints/constrained leisure: Special issue introduction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 279–285.

- Jackson, E. L. (1997). In the eye of the beholder: A comment on Samdahl & Jekubovich (1997), 'A critique of leisure constraints: Comparative analyses and understandings.'. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29(4), 458–468.
- Jackson, E. L. (2005). Leisure constraints research: Overview of a developing theme in leisure studies. In E. L. Jackson (Ed.), *Constraints to leisure* (pp. 3–19). State College, PA: Venture.
- Jackson, E. L., Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 15(1), 1–11.
- Jackson, E. L., & Henderson, K. A. (1995). Gender-based analysis of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 17(1), 31–51.
- Johnson, C. Y., Bowker, J. M., & Cordell, H. K. (2001). Outdoor recreation constraints: An examination of race, gender, and rural dwelling. *Southern Rural Sociology*, 17, 111–133.
- Jun, J. (2003). Perceived constraints to art museums/galleries participation (Unpublished master's thesis). A&M University, Texas.
- Jun, J., Kyle, G. T., & O'Leary, J. T. (2008). Constraints to art museum attendance. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 26(1), 40–61.
- Katz-Gerro, T. (2006). Comparative evidence of inequality in cultural preferences gender, class, and family status. *Sociological Spectrum*, 26(1), 63–83.
- Kawashima, N. (2000). Beyond the division of attenders vs non-attenders: A study into audience development in policy and practice. Coventry: University of Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies.
- Kim, M. K., Lee, D., Kim, S., & Kim, M. (2015). Leisure constraints affecting experienced martial arts participants. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(9), 1063–1079.
- Kolb, B. M. (1997). Pricing as the key to attracting students to the performing arts. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 21(2), 139–146.
- Linder, S. B. (1970). *The harried leisure class*. New York: Columbia University.
- Luckerhoff, J., Perreault, S., Garon, R., Lapointe, M.-C., & Nguyễn-Duy, V. (2008). Visiting art museums: Adding values and constraints to socio-economic status. *Loisir et Societe/Society and Leisure*, 31(1), 69–85.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921–936.
- Mercier, G. K. (2017). Differential concerns: Perceived benefits and barriers to visitation from the mental models of museum visitors and non-visitors (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Washington, Seattle.
- Moore, J. (1998). Poverty and access to the arts: Inequalities in arts attendance. *Cultural Trends*, 8(31), 53–73.
- Nowacki, M. (2011). Constraints to visitor attractions attendance. *Ekonomicka Revue Cestovného Ruchu*, 44(4), 225–240.
- Nuijten, M., De Rooij, P., & Snoeckx, L. (2016). How do leisure constraints influence revisit intentions of music festival visitors? *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, 16, 123–135.
- Parsons, T. (1978). *Action theory and the human condition*. New York: Free Press.
- Purhonen, S., Gronow, J., & Rahkonen, K. (2011). Highbrow culture in Finland: Knowledge, taste and participation. *Acta Sociologica*, 54(4), 385–402.
- Scott, D. (1991). The problematic nature of participation in contract bridge: A qualitative study of group-related constraints. *Leisure Sciences*, 13(4), 321–336.
- Searle, M. S., & Jackson, E. L. (1985). Socioeconomic variations in perceived barriers to recreation participation among would-be participants. *Leisure Sciences*, 7(2), 227–249.

- Shaw, S. M. (1994). Gender, leisure, and constraints: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's Leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1), 8–22.
- Shaw, S. M., & Henderson, K. A. (2005). Gender analysis and leisure constraints: An uneasy alliance. In E. L. Jackson (Ed.), *Constraints to Leisure* (pp. 23–34). State College, PA: Venture.
- Sullivan, A. (2001). Cultural capital and educational attainment. *Sociology*, 35(4), 893–912.
- Taylor, P., Owen, E., & Withnall, S. (2000). Constraints on young people's use of the theatre: An empirical analysis using the 'how much? Project' at Sheffield theatres. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 7(2), 369–396.
- van Den Broek, A., & de Rooij, P. (2013). Wat beweegt het publiek? Interesse in en bezoek aan theaters en concertgebouwen. *Vrijetijdstudies*, 31(4), 41–53.
- van Eijck, C. J. M., & Boele, B. E. H. (2018). Van de canon en de mug: Een inventarisatie van inzichten rondom de culturele niet-bezoeker. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1765/114399>.
- Van Steen, A., & Lievens, J. (2011). Geen goesting: Over drempels en percepties van kunstparticipatie. In J. Lievens & H. Waeghe (Eds.), *Participatie in Vlaanderen. Eerste analyses van de Participatiesurvey 2009* (pp. 307–346). Leuven: Acco.

Table 1. Percentage of women and men reporting constraint categories (N=2707)

		Woman	Man	Sign.
Intrapersonal		77,40%	82,20%	**
Interest		63,40%	76,80%	***
	<i>I prefer to stay home</i>	31,20%	32,00%	-
	<i>The offer does not interest me</i>	32,00%	43,20%	-
	<i>It just does not interest me</i>	43,40%	52,60%	-
Health	<i>A health problem or disability hinders me</i>	15,20%	8,60%	***
Not at ease	<i>I do not feel at ease</i>	3,90%	3,60%	n.s.
Interpersonal		15,40%	8,90%	***
	<i>There is no one to accompany me</i>	11,50%	6,70%	-
	<i>It is difficult to find a babysitter</i>	4,10%	2,30%	-
	<i>My parents do not allow me</i>	0,10%	0,00%	-
Structural		56,00%	51,30%	*
Geographical		19,90%	14,60%	***
	<i>The offer in my region is too small</i>	10,80%	11,50%	-
	<i>The place is often hard to access</i>	4,80%	2,90%	-
	<i>The place is often in an unsafe neighborhood</i>	0,10%	0,50%	-
	<i>There is a lack of public transport</i>	2,10%	0,70%	-
Financial	<i>The entrance tickets are too expensive</i>	10,50%	5,70%	***
Time		41,10%	38,60%	n.s.
	<i>I do not have time</i>	30,60%	30,90%	-
	<i>The hours do not fit</i>	5,90%	6,40%	-
Information	<i>I do not have enough information</i>	13,70%	11,20%	*

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 2. Output of logistic regression for women and men separately for intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural constraints

	Intrapersonal				Interpersonal				Structural			
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men	
	B		B		B		B		B		B	
Age category (ref=15-34)												
35-54	-0,489	*	-0,227		-0,111		-0,354		0,179		0,058	
55-64	-0,776	**	-0,408		0,596		-0,955	*	0,424		-0,243	
65-74	-0,622		0,13		0,979	*	-1,074	*	-0,036		-0,68	*
75+	0,473		0,457		1,071	*	-1,132	*	-0,528		-0,613	
Educational level (ref= low or no education)												
<i>Lower secondary education</i>	-0,463		-0,517		0,212		-0,264		0,326		0,538	*
<i>Higher secondary education</i>	-0,727	*	-1,004	**	0,091		-0,153		0,618	**	0,732	**
<i>Higher education</i>	-1,209	**	-1,127	**	0,538		-0,355		1,141	***	1,129	***
Kids (ref=no)	-0,117		-0,161		0,247		0,419		0,048		0,064	
Arts participation parents (ref=no)	-0,614	***	-0,568	**	-0,073		0,346		0,191		0,174	
Subjective income (ref=low)												
<i>Middle</i>	0,159		0,029		-0,669	**	-0,286		-0,315		-0,289	
<i>High</i>	0,188		0,084		-1,117	***	-0,654		-0,647	**	-0,356	
Employment status (ref= fulltime work)												
<i>Parttime work</i>	0,142		0,173		0,03		0,809		-0,236		-0,337	
<i>Not-working (retired)</i>	0,613	*	0,028		-0,493		0,484		-0,824	***	-0,481	*
Job category (ref=manual worker)												
<i>Service worker</i>	-0,481	*	-0,688	**	0,737	**	1,089	***	0,242		0,347	*
<i>Higher service worker</i>	-0,67		-0,652		1,109	*	0,797		0,038		0,263	
<i>Independent entrepreneur</i>	-0,187		-0,222		-0,277		-1,055		0,4		0,377	

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 3. Output of logistic regression on women and men for the two subcategories of intrapersonal constraints: interest and health.

	Intrapersonal						
	<i>Interest</i>			<i>Health</i>			
	Women		Men	Women		Men	
	B		B	B		B	
Age category (ref=15-34)							
35-54	0,066		-0,055	1,487	*	1,847	*
55-64	-0,099		0,132	1,429	*	1,909	*
65-74	-0,235		0,365	2,172	**	2,228	*
75+	-0,195		0,671	3,23	***	2,723	**
Educational level (ref= low or no education)							
<i>Lower secondary education</i>	-0,586	*	-0,544	0,092		0,244	
<i>Higher secondary education</i>	-0,884	**	-0,739	0,08		0,075	
<i>Higher education</i>	-1,108	***	-0,764	-0,1		0,34	
Kids (ref=no)	-0,339		-0,362	0,362		-0,205	
Arts participation parents (ref=no)	-0,465	**	-0,818	0,178		0,141	
Subjective income (ref=low)							
<i>Middle</i>	0,008		0,51	-0,091		-0,236	
<i>High</i>	0,521	*	0,316	-0,247		-0,52	
Employment status (ref= fulltime work)							
<i>Parttime work</i>	0,064		0,039	-0,26		0,286	
<i>Not-working (retired)</i>	0,198		0,23	1,674	***	1,764	***
Job category (ref=manual worker)							
<i>Service worker</i>	-0,513	**	-0,797	0,361		-0,014	
<i>Higher service worker</i>	-0,188		-0,541	0,688		-0,571	
<i>Independent entrepreneur</i>	-0,466		-0,135	-0,415		-0,627	

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 4. The significant effects (+ positive or – negative) for each background variable on the different structural constraints for women and men.

	Woman	Man
Age		
<i>time</i>	-	
<i>financial</i>	+ & - ^o	
<i>geographical</i>	+	
<i>informational</i>	--	--
Education		
<i>time</i>	++	+
<i>financial</i>		
<i>geographical</i>		
<i>informational</i>	+	+
Children		
<i>time</i>	+	+
<i>financial</i>	-	
<i>geographical</i>		
<i>informational</i>		
Arts participation parents		
<i>time</i>		
<i>financial</i>		
<i>geographical</i>	+	+
<i>informational</i>		
Subjective income		
<i>time</i>		
<i>financial</i>	--	-
<i>geographical</i>		
<i>informational</i>		
Employment status		
<i>time</i>	--	--
<i>financial</i>		
<i>geographical</i>	-	
<i>informational</i>		
Job category		
<i>time</i>	+	+
<i>financial</i>		
<i>geographical</i>	+	
<i>informational</i>	+	

^o Women aged 35 to 54 have a higher chance of mentioning the financial constraint. Women aged 65 to 74 are much less likely to mention the financial constraint.

Table 5. Latent class analysis: four classes, their size and share in constraint categories in percentages (N=2707)

<i>CLASS</i>		1	2	3	4
CLASS SIZE		58,75	20,58	10,7	9,98
Interest constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	99,93	3,05	87,27	51,98
Health constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	6,75	4,42	90,96	15,26
Not at ease	<i>mentioned</i>	5,15	1,82	6,98	0,42
Interpersonal constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	8,35	21,9	12,08	11,01
Geographical constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	1,58	24,28	0,13	97,05
Time constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	32,53	83,31	4,87	0,41
Financial constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	6,75	12,51	4,05	7,53
Informational constraint	<i>mentioned</i>	9,65	18,06	0,02	17,66

Table 6. Percentage of non-visitors belonging to each class according to background

Class		1	2	3	4
Sex					
	<i>Woman</i>	43,20%	59,90%	61,30%	64,80%
	<i>Man</i>	56,80%	40,10%	38,70%	35,20%
Age					
	<i>15-34</i>	28,10%	37,20%	1,30%	20,80%
	<i>35-54</i>	33,30%	42,00%	14,30%	29,60%
	<i>55-64</i>	15,80%	10,20%	13,90%	17,60%
	<i>65-74</i>	11,60%	6,20%	22,00%	14,40%
	<i>75+</i>	11,20%	4,40%	48,40%	17,60%
Educational level					
	<i>No or low education</i>	24,00%	7,80%	44,10%	21,00%
	<i>Lower secondary education</i>	20,90%	12,10%	22,70%	20,50%
	<i>Higher secondary education</i>	40,70%	49,50%	24,10%	41,90%
	<i>Higher education</i>	14,40%	30,70%	9,10%	16,60%
Kids					
	<i>None</i>	64,50%	47,70%	85,10%	68,80%
	<i>1 or more</i>	35,50%	52,30%	14,90%	31,20%
Arts participation parents					
	<i>No</i>	75,50%	55,60%	83,00%	64,10%
	<i>Yes</i>	24,50%	44,40%	17,00%	35,90%
Subjective income					
	<i>Low</i>	11,30%	11,00%	20,00%	11,20%
	<i>Mid</i>	57,40%	53,40%	59,10%	52,60%
	<i>High</i>	31,30%	35,70%	20,90%	36,10%
Employment status					
	<i>Fulltime</i>	41,60%	53,80%	5,80%	28,40%
	<i>Part-time</i>	10,10%	18,20%	1,80%	9,60%
	<i>Not working</i>	48,30%	28,00%	92,40%	62,00%
Job category					
	<i>Manual worker</i>	54,10%	29,50%	59,90%	41,60%
	<i>Service worker/teacher</i>	29,70%	51,70%	24,30%	43,90%
	<i>Higher service worker</i>	3,90%	6,50%	2,80%	5,10%
	<i>Independent worker</i>	12,20%	12,40%	13,00%	9,30%