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Executive Summary

This document reports on an investigation for the William Penn Foundation of the role that nonprofit arts and culture play in Philadelphia’s immigrant communities—that is, Puerto Rican and foreign-born residents and their families, including children born in the U.S. Findings are based on a pilot study conducted during the spring and summer of 2010 by Mark Stern and Susan Seifert of the University of Pennsylvania Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP) in collaboration with the Stockton Rush Bartol Foundation.

The study centered on the concept of arts-based social inclusion—the idea that a set of artists and cultural organizations are consciously using the arts as a way to improve the life circumstances of new Philadelphians and integrate them into community life. The findings suggest that the concept is grounded—both as a practice strategy and a policy dilemma. The key question is, as posed by an interviewee: “How can immigrants both retain their identity and enter the larger society? How can we use the arts to do that?”

As a context for the study, the research team conducted an online survey of Philadelphia-based nonprofit arts and cultural organizations. Findings, based on 114 respondents (38% of survey sample), are presented in Section 1. Only about 20 organizations reported working with immigrants as part of their core mission. Although cultural organizations are generally aware of immigrants residing in Philadelphia, they have little precise knowledge of who they are or where they live. Organizations express general interest in working with immigrants but do not take active efforts to engage these communities. Few present programs specially designed for immigrants; pursue collaborations to connect with these communities; employ immigrants or contract with immigrant artists. Multi-disciplinary and visual arts organizations and the informal sector reported a higher rate of involvement with immigrants. Overall, organizations did not demonstrate a deep knowledge of barriers to immigrant participation.

The changing presence of the foreign-born in Philadelphia, examined in Section 3, is also an important context for the study. For several decades after reform of immigration law in the 1960s, Philadelphia’s foreign-born population remained relatively small. Since the 1990s, however, the profile has changed with a rapid influx of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. In the last several years—as the slow economy reduced the flow of immigrants—the composition of the region’s foreign-born has again changed, as immigrants and refugees from Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Eastern Europe have increased sharply. Although people who work with immigrants are keenly aware of this changing profile, most Philadelphians are not. City
residents, the cultural sector, and to some extent public and private leaders—are facing a cultural lag in which their understanding of immigrant Philadelphia has not kept pace with the rate of change.

Meanwhile, a small set of cultural organizations and artists are working to develop a set of organizational visions, including alternatives to conventional nonprofit models, as ways to engage immigrants and families. The research team—based on interviews with 26 people affiliated with 20 organizations and a focus group with the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians—developed a five-part typology of arts-based social inclusion work. Section 4 describes these five distinct approaches to practice:

- **cultural space and creative expression**—creating places, opportunities, and media through which immigrants can explore identity, fears, and visions;
- **community organizing and the arts**—using the arts as a vehicle to engage and mobilize immigrant communities and connect them with other resources;
- **community-based institutional networks**—sustaining working relationships with arts and cultural, social service, and community development organizations serving immigrant communities;
- **school-based cultural programming**—developing in-school arts programs for elementary and secondary students as a critical point of intervention; and
- **culturally-sensitive social service**—integrating the social work concept of culturally competent service into an organization’s functioning as a starting point for linking the arts with immigrant-serving programs.

The implications discussed in Section 5 address two cross-cutting themes that emerged from the interviews with practitioners. First, the organizations strategically positioned to engage immigrants are those created by immigrants themselves. However, these groups repeatedly run up against conventional notions of organizational structure and capacity, pushing them to lose the organic linkage of the arts as part of an integrated approach to meeting the needs and aspirations of immigrants. The report proposes building the collective capacity of a cohort of arts-based social inclusion groups through a pilot grant-making and technical assistance program.

Second, a focus on immigrant “needs” tends to devalue the importance of processes of culture and identity formation in the successful pursuit of immigrant social inclusion. Shifting the frame from economic need to immigrant capabilities—the ability to lead a fulfilling life—highlights the critical role that the arts and culture play in social inclusion. The report proposes an evaluation framework based on the capabilities approach, a European model of addressing social disadvantage and opportunities for change.
“Great Colossus”
Emma Lazarus, 1883

1. Introduction and Context for the Study

In 2010, Mark Stern and Susan Seifert collaborated with the Stockton Rush Bartol Foundation on a project to investigate the role that arts and culture play in Philadelphia’s immigrant communities. The project was centered on the concept of “arts-based social inclusion”—the idea that a set of artists and organizations are working to use culture as a means of to improve the life circumstances of new Philadelphians by integrating them more fully in all aspects of community life. The project has confirmed that social inclusion is a productive perspective with which to make sense of this work. In a variety of settings, we have found artists and cultural organizations self-consciously using the arts for this purpose.

In Section 3 of this report, we examine the changing presence of the foreign-born in Philadelphia. For several decades after the reform of immigration law in the 1960s, Philadelphia’s foreign-born population remained relatively small. Since the 1990s, however, the profile has changed with a rapid influx of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. In the last several years—as the slow economy reduced the flow of in-migrants—the composition of Philadelphia’s foreign-born has again changed, as immigrants and refugees from Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Eastern Europe have increased sharply.

The changing demography of the foreign-born is an important element of the context for this report. Although those who work with immigrants are keenly aware of this changing profile, most Philadelphians are not. The city residents and to some extent its leaders—are facing a cultural lag in which their
understanding of immigrant Philadelphia has not kept pace with the rate of change.

Arts-based social inclusion is not a single entity. Indeed, as discussed in Section 4, we have found five distinct approaches to this work. A core set of arts and cultural practitioners view creation of cultural space within which the foreign-born and their children can explore their identity, visions, and fears as the primary means of using the arts to address issues of exclusion. A number of arts practitioners borrow strategies from community organizing as their mode of operation, using the arts as a vehicle to engage and mobilize immigrant communities. Development of institutional networks is a critical strategy whereby cultural and social service providers work in partnership to serve immigrants. For some cultural practitioners, the focus is on schools as a critical point of intervention—a perspective that gained urgency and support after the eruption of ethnic violence at South Philadelphia High School in December 2009. Finally, immigrant-serving practitioners draw on social work ideas of culturally-sensitive social service as a starting point for linking the arts to more conventional approaches to provide aid to immigrants. These five models—creation of cultural space, community organizing, institutional networks, school-based intervention, and culturally-sensitive social service—provide a typology for making sense of existing efforts to engage immigrants through the arts.

Two cross-cutting themes have emerged from our interviews with practitioners. First, arts-based social inclusion allows us to widen the lens we use to understand the immigrant experience. In particular, rather than seeing immigrants’ challenges as primarily economic—finding a job and housing, a cultural perspective provides a broader, multi-dimensional way of thinking about the process of social inclusion. Second, as practitioners have developed five models of arts-based social inclusion work, they have repeatedly run up against conventional notions about organizational structure and capacity.

First, the discussion of immigrant “needs” has tended to devalue the importance of processes of culture and identity formation in the successful pursuit of immigrant social inclusion. Our work suggests that, rather than focusing on economic needs, we should shift to a discussion of immigrants’ capabilities—their ability to lead a fulfilling life—and how those capabilities can be enhanced. By shifting this frame, we can see more clearly the critical role that arts and culture play in social inclusion. In Section 4 we explore this theme as part of our discussion of the practice typology, and in Section 6 we propose development of an evaluation framework based on the “capabilities approach” to welfare and well-being.
Second, the organizations strategically positioned to engage immigrants in arts-based social inclusion work are those that are created by immigrants themselves. Yet, because of pressure from mainstream institutions—including the role of philanthropic and public funders—these institutions are forced into an organizational mold that forces them either to become exclusively an arts organization or to jettison their arts and cultural work. This “either-or” pressure has pushed organizations in a number of instances to lose the organic linkage of arts, culture, and other aspects of immigrants’ life-experience that were the strength of these organizations.

In place of a “one-jacket-fits-all” mode of conventional nonprofit organizations, our interviewees have pursued a variety of counter-models. The report articulates these alternative organizational visions in a five-part typology: cultural space and creative expression, community organizing and the arts, community-based institutional networks, school-based cultural programming, and culturally-sensitive social service.

**A Nation of Immigrants**

It is often said that the United States is a nation of immigrants. Yet, the assumption behind this assertion—that the nation has consistently welcomed newcomers and encouraged their integration into American society and culture—is far from self-evident. In fact, the United States has long oscillated between cosmopolitanism and provincialism when it comes to immigration. For every expression of welcome—like Emma Lazarus’s “Great Colossus”—we find a series of nativist riots, political movements, and racial profiling of immigrants and their children.

More accurately, perhaps, we can say that both impulses—inclusion and exclusion—have often been finely balanced throughout American history with sometimes one or the other momentarily seizing the upper hand. And because those attracted to either pole do not reflect political divisions on other issues, the swings from inclusion to exclusion and back again are often sudden and unpredictable.

In 2010, American is at a particularly perilous and toxic moment in this history. Over the past decade, 10 million immigrants have obtained legal permanent status and another half-million refugees have settled in the US. Over the same period, roughly a half-million unauthorized immigrants have entered the US. The current immigration wave, which began with the liberalization of immigration law in the 1960s, is the first immigrant cohort to be composed primarily of Hispanic and non-white migrants. As a result, it not only has
altered the balance of US-born and foreign-born residents but the racial composition of the country as well.

Sentiments in favor of immigrant restriction have built steadily since the 1980s leading to a series of acts focused on border security, expedited deportation, and employer sanctions. Yet, efforts to enact comprehensive immigration reform that would provide a path to citizenship for millions of undocumented residents have so far failed to pass Congress. Furthermore, the recession of 2008—even as it slowed the movement of immigrants to the US—appeared to spark a new round of anti-immigrant agitation.

**The Philadelphia Context: Immigrants and Community Diversity**

We heard many references to September 11, 2001 as a threshold, a catalyst for changing priorities or taking action, although the fundamental tensions are not new. Anti-immigrant sentiment is the climate of everyday life for Philadelphia’s foreign-born residents and their families, ranging from misunderstanding and misinformation; to prejudice, discrimination, and racism; to hostility and violence. Among the most vulnerable newcomers, fear and isolation—even from one’s own compatriots—are also features of everyday life. For the most disadvantaged, social interaction outside of one’s family is scarce in what is experienced as an individualized culture and alien environment.

**Inter-group and intra-group diversity**

As we have noted, the ethnic violence at South Philadelphia High School in December 2009 increased attention to the variety of immigrant groups who now call South Philadelphia their home and the increasing tension between these groups and longer-term residents. Yet, too often, “South Philadelphia High” was seen as an isolated incident. For many immigrants, however, the processes of marginalization and violence have many antecedents. As far back as the 1960s, “Chinese American kids across the city were being assaulted in schools and on the streets.” Indeed, much of the opposition to the Vine Street Expressway during the 1970s centered on the proposed demolition of Holy Redeemer Church and School, which was seen as a safe space by many Asian parents and students.

Indeed, a focus on the tensions between Asian- and African Americans can over-simplify the complexity of ethnic tensions. The problems of smaller groups—like the Bhutanese refugees who arrived in Philadelphia in 2009—can easily be lost:

Bhutanese refugees, who began to arrive in the U.S. in the fall of 2009, don’t fit with either group and have suffered a unique isolation. Neither group knew
how to treat them, but they got caught up in the fray nonetheless. The case manager for the families told the story of a 17-year-old. Newly enrolled at South Philly High last fall, she was “befriended” by a group of girls. She was very excited and came to us to tell us that she had friends. This was a huge thing for her. At the end of the week they took her off-site and beat her to a pulp. So now she doesn’t trust anyone.

The city’s Latino community has diversified as well, as the predominantly Puerto Rican neighborhoods of North Philadelphia and the Northeast have become home to Dominicans, Mexicans, and other Latin Americans. Yet, these new groups settling in North Philadelphia, where Spanish is a common language, have generally not suffered the kinds of targeted harassment reported in South Philadelphia. Newcomers and U.S.-born share, according to some of our interviewees, the day-to-day realities associated with underemployment, lack of places to play, and the random gunshots triggered by a drug economy.

Here, in this neighborhood, it’s not one set of kids v. another. The issues are neighborhood issues [not native v immigrant or black v white]. Here the big challenge is that the kids are surrounded by so much chaos. For them to even be kids is the bigger issue, even understanding how to play with each other. They don’t know how to play. Everything always ends up in a fight, in violence, in aggression, in cursing—the little guys too, not just the older kids—a five- or six-year-old will curse you out in a second.

Relationships between African immigrants—who often have settled in predominantly black sections of West and Southwest Philadelphia—have a complicated and often tense relationship with longer-term African American residents. One interviewee tried to explain what it is like to land in Philadelphia from another part of the world.

For an African immigrant—[whether PhD or refugee]—navigating Philadelphia is like being a brawny Caucasian male alone with his backpack in the Amazon who realizes that he has never fought a snake … Philadelphia feels like a jungle, unfriendly and unfamiliar. You think every one that passes is a snake. … The police are constantly stopping you: “Who are you? What is your name? Do you have your license with you?!” That’s the level of intimidation that we have to deal with. What do we tell our kids? “Every thing you see out there is out to get you. Be careful or we will lose you!”

Yet, the diversity within immigrant and ethnic groups adds an additional level of complexity to the social inclusion process. While individual ethnic groups present their own unique ecology, the issue of generational tension cuts across all groups.

Philadelphia’s Arab American community, an under-appreciated example, is diverse on every dimension—nationality, ethnic identity, religion, socio-
economic status, and urban and suburban settlement patterns. Beyond family
gatherings, social gatherings usually occur around religious-based institutions
(church, mosque) or nationality lines (e.g., Egyptian, Iraqi). “There is no way
for Arab Americans to come together typically in any setting.”

Still, at the center of all immigrant communities are inter-generational dynamics.
The children of immigrants tend to have a uniquely intense family experience.
Many “feel part of amazing, cohesive, caring, multi-generational families.”
Immigrant parents (“the sacrifice generation”) devote their lives to the care
and education of their children. But the children often bear adult responsibility—
at home translating documents, in the public sphere interpreting and even
making decisions—which in turn can be disempowering for the parents. Foreign-
born parents “see their kids as hope, as the vehicle for their family’s
assimilation.” But acculturation—the exchange of cultural features between
groups through continuous first-hand contact—is an ongoing touchstone of
tension between the generations.

The promise of immigrant arts and culture
Given the seriousness of current attacks—both figurative and literal—on the
foreign-born, one might see a project focused on immigrant arts and culture as
beside the point. With weighty issues of jobs, deportation, and hate
dominating the immigrant story, why should we pay attention to painters,
dancers, and musicians?

Our answer is simple. To move beyond the contemporary immigrant dilemma
will require both policy and grassroots efforts. Whatever the eventual actions
of the federal government to bring migration law in line with migration realities,
those policy changes will be effective only if they are accompanied by local,
face-to-face efforts to overcome the chasm that has opened between residents
born in the US and those born abroad. Our interviewees’ modest efforts to
engage immigrants through their arts and culture provide a concrete example
of what those efforts must look like.

A comparison the United States and Canada provides a dramatic example of
how the combination of policy and grassroots activity can make a critical
difference. Sociologist Irene Bloemraad discovered that over the past half
century, the proportion of foreign-born residents who attain citizenship in the
two countries has diverged. Where four-out-of-five foreign-born residents used
to be a citizen in both countries, today the US citizenship rate is half that of
Canada. To explain this divergence, Bloemraad looked at the ways in which
public policy support grassroots integration efforts. In Canada, she found
national initiatives to involve immigrants in the political, social, and cultural life of the nation, while in the US she found virtually no such efforts.

Bloemraad argues that a combination of public policy and grassroots activity—what she calls *structured mobilization*—is critical to the process of immigrant incorporation. Bloemraad shows how public policy in Canada has worked with a variety of agents—ranging from political parties, community leaders, and ethnic organizations to engage immigrants in a variety of civic activity. Her conclusion is that one-sided approaches that focus only on policy or only on civic engagement are less effective than ones that combine both approaches.

Source: Bloemraad 2006.
This report focuses on one aspect of this broader process. It asks if deliberate actions by cultural organizations and artists can make a difference in the processes of including immigrants in the broader community and how policy—initiated either by government or philanthropy—might make this work more effective.

Appreciating the diversity within Philadelphia’s immigrant communities is a necessary backdrop to understanding the missions, visions, and strategies—as well as barriers and constraints—of arts organization founders, directors, and artists. The complexity of immigrant and host communities carries over to conceptualizing the goals and strategies of policy intervention.

The goal of this study was to explore arts-based social inclusion. The findings have provided us with a fuller understanding of the dimensions of immigrant social exclusion as well as guidelines for policy development. We found that the concept of immigrant integration, in particular, does not resonate with arts practitioners. Although for immigrant policy-makers, the term implies a two-way social process—in contrast to previous assimilation and melting pot models,
some practitioners perceive it as an implied one-way process in which immigrants only are expected to change.

The concepts of social inclusion and social exclusion are used in the United Kingdom and the European Community to characterize “contemporary forms of social disadvantage” that marginalize particular social groups.

Social exclusion is a multidimensional process of progressive social rupture, detaching groups and individuals from social relations and institutions and preventing them from full participation in the normal, normatively prescribed activities of the society in which they live. (Silver 2007)

Because it sees exclusion as an active process, social inclusion implies that the burden for overcoming exclusion rests with mainstream institutions, that it is not simply a result of deficits that burden the excluded group. Moreover, the social inclusion concept does not differentiate immigrants from other social groups that are marginalized by a given society.

Our findings suggest that the concept of arts-based social inclusion is grounded—both as a policy dilemma and a practice strategy. According to interviewees, the central tension within foreign-born communities in the U.S. is identity v. integration or, in an immigrant’s view, “culture v. assimilation.” As posed by an artist-educator: “How can immigrants both retain their identity and enter the larger society? How can we use the arts to do that?” A founder was clear about their group’s mission and strength: “The best way to bridge groups is through the arts. ... To bring together diverse groups, start with the arts.”

We found that a core group of practitioners and artists working with Puerto Rican and foreign-born communities in Philadelphia, using a variety of perspectives and approaches, validate the arts as a vehicle to overcome processes of social exclusion.
Context for the Study

Our focus on arts-based social inclusion grows out a number of contextual realities of the Philadelphia cultural sector. First, we know that immigrants—while culturally engaged—are generally disconnected from established arts and cultural organizations. Second, we know that the cultural sector, while sympathetic to the needs of the city’s immigrants, has relatively little knowledge of Philadelphia’s immigrant communities and has not given priority to immigrant outreach.

Engaged but disconnected

Immigrants are often highly engaged in cultural expression that is central to their identity, but they are less likely to take advantage of established cultural organizations.

This pattern of high engagement and low participation showed up in a survey that the Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP) undertook in collaboration with Alan Brown and Associates in two low-income sections of metropolitan Philadelphia during 2005. It discovered that residents were heavily involved in creative activities ranging from doing arts with children to painting and writing to handicrafts. Indeed, across a wide range of informal creative activities, immigrants were often more involved than US-born respondents. The average immigrant had been involved in 3.2 creative activities in the past year, significantly more than the figure for US-born respondents (2.8).

When we turned to organized cultural activities, however, it was a different story. Where 56 percent of US-born respondents had attended a concert in the previous year, only 25 percent of immigrants had. Two-thirds of US-born residents had attended a music, dance, or theatre performance, but only two-fifths of immigrants had. Overall, immigrants had attended just over half as many cultural activities at a formal institution as those born in the United States.

Immigrant artists, too, were more likely to engage in informal cultural settings. The informal cultural sector (including unincorporated groups and public settings) was the venue for just over 11 percent of the cultural projects included in a SIAP survey of metropolitan Philadelphia artists. Yet, 25 percent of immigrant cultural projects were in the informal sector, including festivals, performances in public places, and less formal settings.
Finally, formal cultural participation in immigrant neighborhoods is significantly lower than in similar non-immigrant neighborhoods. This conclusion is based on the analysis of detailed participation records of roughly 75 cultural organizations in the Philadelphia metropolitan area. Although masked to some extent by the clustering of many immigrants in Center City—the part of the region with the highest levels of formal cultural participation, neighborhoods with a significant concentration of immigrants have lower formal cultural participation than similar neighborhoods without immigrants.

Taken together, what we know about the cultural engagement of artists and residents suggested that immigrants are deeply involved in culture, especially in informal social settings. But this involvement does not easily translate into higher rates of formal cultural participation. As a result immigrant artists and participants often create their own institutions and venues at the edge of the established arts scene. In doing so, they have shifted the balance between the nonprofit cultural sector and the commercial and informal sectors.
Cultural participation index (100=metro average) 2007, block groups in which foreign-born compose ten percent or more of the population, metropolitan Philadelphia

Source: Social Impact of the Arts Project

**Interest and inaction**

Immigrants’ engagement in informal culture is complemented by the tepid response of mainstream cultural institutions to the region’s new residents. This information is drawn from a survey of Philadelphia’s cultural institutions conducted by SIAP in collaboration with the Stockton Rush Bartol Foundation during the summer of 2010. The one hundred responses to the survey led the research team to two major conclusions.

First, although cultural organizations are generally aware that there are immigrants in the city, they have little precise knowledge of who they are and where they live. Survey respondents generally were aware that there are immigrants living in the metropolitan area, although they were less certain about their presence in the immediate neighborhood in which their organization was based.
A large majority of respondents—87 percent—indicated that they were aware of immigrant communities in their service area (generally defined as the metropolitan area). However, when asked about specific immigrant groups, they showed less awareness of the presence of immigrant residents, especially in their immediate neighborhood. Eighty percent of respondents identified at least one immigrant group in their service area, with Puerto Ricans, other Latin Americans, and East Asians as those most frequently identified. However, only a quarter of respondents identified any immigrant group in their immediate neighborhood, with other Latin Americans and Southeast Asians as those most frequently mentioned (14 percent). Even organizations based in neighborhoods with a high concentration of immigrants were unlikely to identify any groups in their immediate neighborhood.

These findings suggest that the respondents taken as a group were not particularly aware of a local presence of foreign-born populations. They had a general sense that some Latino and Asian groups were present in the metropolitan area but did not identify a set of groups present in the zip code in which their organization was located.

Second, cultural organizations have a general interest in working with immigrants, but the survey provided relatively little evidence that this interest turns into active efforts to engage immigrant communities.

The most general question on the survey asked if the respondent’s organization “currently work with immigrants.” Sixty percent of respondents answered that they did work with immigrants. There appeared to be some significant differences related to discipline. Those reporting multiple disciplines and visual arts organizations were more than 70 percent likely to report working with immigrants while dance, theatre, and music groups were less than 50 percent likely.

In order to delve more deeply into immigrant involvement, the survey included questions about whether specific immigrant groups attended events or took classes or workshops. The survey also asked about whether the organizations had mounted special programs or developed partnerships to engage

---

1 These findings are open to alternative interpretations based on the wording of the survey. The survey asked about “immigrant communities” that were present in their service area. It is possible that respondents interpreted this to mean a particular level of aggregation of specific immigrant groups, rather than simply a number of individual immigrants. At the same time, the survey asked about the presence of immigrant communities in the organization’s neighborhood. It is possible that respondents used a definition of neighborhood that was significantly smaller than a zip code—our smallest geographic identifier.
immigrant residents. About half of respondents reported that some immigrants attended the organization’s events or took classes or workshops. However, when asked about affirmative efforts to reach out to immigrants, the numbers were smaller. Only 24 percent reported special programs for a particular group and 30 percent reported partnership efforts.

These numbers actually overstate the general cultural community’s response to immigrants. About 20 of the organizations that responded to the survey reported that working with immigrants was part of their core mission. As we would expect, virtually all of these organizations reported that immigrants attended events and took classes and workshops. In addition, 67 percent of these organizations reported special programs directed at immigrant groups and 76 percent reported developing partnerships. Among the other organizations that responded to the survey, less than 40 percent reported immigrant attendance at programs, classes, and workshops. Only 14 percent reported special immigrant-directed programs and 20 percent developing partnerships to achieve broader involvement.

Taken together, these research findings suggest that the relationship of immigrants to the cultural life of Philadelphia is characterized by unrealized potential. Immigrants are culturally engaged—although not through established organizations—and the cultural community is interested in immigrants but unable to translate these sentiments into much action. Initiatives to use the arts as a means of social inclusion, then, could serve as a catalyst. They could introduce immigrants to forms of cultural engagement that are outside of their current lives, and they could goad the cultural community into undertaking more affirmative efforts to engage immigrants.

This report presents the results of a pilot study to document arts-based social inclusion work. It is based on interviews with 26 individuals involved in this work. As a result, the methods we used to arrive at our conclusions may be as important as our—necessarily—preliminary conclusions.

The study was undertaken as a collaboration of Mark Stern and Susan Seifert of the University of Pennsylvania Social Impact of the Arts Project and the Stockton Rush Bartol Foundation. Stern and Seifert were responsible for the design of the study, conducting interviews of key informants, analysis of data, and drafting the report. Beth Feldman Brandt, Executive Director, and Michelle Ortiz, Administrator, of the Bartol Foundation were responsible for planning and implementing the survey of cultural organizations discussed in this Introduction. Feldman Brandt and Ortiz consulted with Stern and Seifert in identifying key informants, drawing implications, and reviewing the report.
2. Data and Methods

As we have noted, conducting research on immigrants poses a unique set of challenges. Indeed, during the course of this project, these challenges became greater as a variety of attacks on immigrants, government “sting” operations, and national political mobilization increased the level of fear and suspicion among immigrants and those who work with them. Therefore, we believe that one of the major contributions of this project is the methodology we used for conducting the core research. In that sense, this project could be viewed as a pilot effort for a more authoritative study.

Parameters of the study

The core activity of this reconnaissance project was to explore existing connections between cultural organizations and immigrant communities in Philadelphia. The primary data-gathering task was to identify and uncover programs and artists at work using the arts to engage foreign-born residents and their families living in Philadelphia neighborhoods.

By foreign-born residents, we refer to all immigrants and refugees living in Philadelphia, regardless of their legal status. To understand Philadelphia’s Latino community, we have included migrants, Puerto Rican-born residents, and their families as part of our communities of concern. By families we mean to include all foreign-born adults and their children, whether or not they are born in the United States. Second generation refers to the children of immigrants born in the U.S., while the 1.5-generation refers to children born in their parents’ home country but raised in the United States.

Referral-driven interviews

Because of the discovery nature of this reconnaissance project—to uncover programs, projects, and artists that are unfamiliar to or “below the radar” of the mainstream nonprofit cultural sector—the research team devised a referral-driven, key informant, in-person interview data collection strategy. Key informants are defined as individuals—either organizational contacts or artists—who have direct experience reaching out to and/or developing arts or cultural programs for foreign-born residents or their families. Artists who are immigrants, second generation, or artists who work with immigrants are all potential informants—the more connections to immigrant communities, the better.

For interviews with practitioners, organizational contacts and artists, the research team developed the following protocol guidelines.
• Do you see engaging immigrant communities as central to your work as an artist/as an arts organization? If yes, why do you seek to engage immigrant communities? What are your program/project goals? Are these connected to a broader mission? If no, how do immigrant communities fit into your work?

• With what ethnic groups/communities/neighborhoods are you currently working or seeking to work? How would you characterize the groups?

• In your experience, with respect to engaging immigrants, what kinds of programs and strategies have been most successful? Who comes to your programs? Why do they come? Does location/space matter? What are the features of an effective program?

• In your experience, what kinds of programs and strategies have not been effective? What are the barriers to connecting with immigrants? How can these be overcome? Does location/space matter?

• Do you collaborate with other community-based or immigrant-serving organizations? What partnerships have worked well? What kinds of collaborations have not been successful?

• What new directions would you like to pursue? With particular programs, partners, communities, or artists? What challenges and opportunities do you see?

• A primary purpose of this study is to uncover existing community programs and artists working with immigrants in Philadelphia neighborhoods. Can you suggest a couple of people whom we might interview? Why would this person be a good informant? Would you be willing to make the introduction?

During the spring and summer of 2010, the research team conducted in-person interviews with 26 people affiliated with 20 cultural organizations. In addition to the interviews, the team conducted a focus group with four staff members of the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians, a resource center for all immigrants to the region. All individuals and organizations participating in the study are listed in the Appendix.

The interviews provided the research team with a pathway into four pan-ethnic communities with significant representation in the city of Philadelphia: Latinos and Latin Americans; Asians and Asian Americans; Arabs, Muslims, and Arab Americans; and Africans and African Americans. Members of these widely diverse communities have settled in neighborhoods throughout the region, including significant concentrations in South, West, and North Philadelphia.
Cultural organization survey

During the summer of 2010, the research team conducted a survey of cultural organizations based in the city of Philadelphia to identify their current knowledge of Philadelphia’s immigrant communities and their efforts to engage immigrants in their program.

The survey was conducted via the Internet using Survey Monkey. Respondents were drawn from a list of organizational leaders and contacts maintained by the Philadelphia Cultural Fund and supplemented by a list of organizations provided the Stockton Rush Bartol Foundation. The invitation to the survey was sent to 304 individual (deliverable) email addresses. A total of 126 responses were received to the survey. However, twelve of these were determined to be duplicates, leaving a total of 114 valid responses, a response rate of 38 percent.

As with any survey, non-response bias—the fact that the members of the sample who did not respond would provide different answers than those who did—is a significant interpretive problem. It seems logical to assume that non-respondents were less concerned with immigrant issues and did less to attract immigrants than respondents. Therefore, the findings in this report should be seen as providing the upper limit in terms of nonprofit immigrant engagement.

The survey was intended to solicit information about organizations’ work with Puerto Ricans and foreign-born residents. Typically, the questionnaire used the term “immigrant,” although this term does not strictly apply to American citizens who were born in Puerto Rico.

The survey instrument had four parts. The first part asked about the respondent’s knowledge of the presence of different immigrant groups in their service area and in their immediate neighborhood. This was followed by a section on the organization’s work with immigrants, including whether specific groups attended programs, took classes or workshops, whether the organization had mounted special programs directed at particular groups, and whether they had developed partnerships to expand immigrant engagement. The third section of the instrument included questions about future plans of the organization to engage immigrants. The final section included questions about the organization, including its disciplinary focus, programs, and budget size.

Community demographic profiles

Using Philadelphia data from the 2000 decennial census and the American Community Survey, the team prepared a profile of immigrants in Philadelphia. The American Community Survey is an annual study conducted by the Bureau of the Census. It includes approximately one-percent of the US population.
each year. Although a very large sample, for individual communities or metropolitan areas, researchers typically combine several years in order to increase the statistical power of the analysis. For this analysis, we compared the 5 percent sample of the 2000 census to an ACS file that included the results from 2005 - 2008, in essence a 4 percent sample for those years.

Our analysis included an examination of the demographic and socio-economic profile of immigrants. It also included a geographic analysis of the foreign-born, although this was constrained by the limited information on geography included in the public-use microdata from the ACS. Specifically, the smallest geographic unit is the public-use microdata unit (PUMA). The city of Philadelphia, for example, includes 11 PUMA’s each with an average population size of about 135,000 residents. Although these units can be used for some geographic analyses, they do not allow the precision that census block groups or census tracts permit.

**Public-use microdata areas (PUMA’s), metropolitan Philadelphia**

Source: Ruggles et al 2010.
Conclusion

When the research team was planning the current project, we had several hunches about the challenge of undertaking a research project on immigrant arts. We knew that we would need to pay particular attention to issues of language and confidentiality if the study were to be successful. The project developed a chain-referral method and a means of building trust with our respondents and thereby to widen our access to organizations and artists. The research team sees refining this method as one of the major contributions of this project.

When we planned the project, the research team anticipated that our interviewees would cluster in particular neighborhoods. As the research progressed, however, we discovered that this was not the case. Instead, our interview referrals were more likely to follow ethnic community lines than geography.
3. The Changing Profile of Metropolitan Philadelphia’s Immigrant Communities

One barrier faced by those wishing to understand the cultural life of Philadelphia’s immigrants and efforts to use culture as a means of social inclusion is the pace of change in those communities in recent years. Our cognitive images of the city—although they usually include Puerto Ricans and Chinese—generally do not make room for Albanians, Dominicans, or Haitians. Yet, these and other groups now make up an increasing share of the region’s population. Understanding arts-based social inclusion requires that we understand the scope and composition of Philadelphia’s recent immigrants.

Between 2000 and 2005, Philadelphia experienced an upsurge in the presence of immigrants in the metropolitan area. The joint Brookings/Penn publication suggested that Philadelphia was a “re-emerging” immigrant gateway (Singer et al 2008). However, the coming of recession later in the decade, combined with increased enforcement efforts by federal immigration officials, appear to have slowed this re-emergence.

Since the mid-2000s, Philadelphia’s immigrant community has been marked by both change and stagnation. Overall, the proportion of immigrants (and the US-born children of immigrants) has hardly changed at all. At the same time, several nationality groups that were virtually absent in 2000 are now among the largest foreign-born groups in the population. Furthermore, while the entire population has had to deal with the economic crisis that began in 2007, immigrants have experienced this crisis in different ways.

Overall change in immigrant population

Between 2000 and 2005, the foreign-born population of metropolitan Philadelphia jumped from 7.5 to 9.5 percent. Philadelphia’s foreign-born population jumped from 9.4 to 12.2 percent, Camden and its environs’ from 8.8 to 12.5 percent, and the rest of the metropolitan area from 6.5 to 8.3 percent. The proportion of the population that was born in Puerto Rico or other US possessions actually fell in both Philadelphia and the suburbs but jumped from 10 to 12 percent in Camden and its surrounding communities. Yet, after 2005, the rise in the foreign-born population stopped. Between 2005 and 2008, the change in the metropolitan area rates and Philadelphia’s foreign-born percentage remained flat. The increase in the suburban rate—
8.1 percent in 2006 to 8.7 percent in 2008—was the only change that was statistically significant.²

**Percent of population born in foreign countries or US possessions, by metropolitan status, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US possessions</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US possessions</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden and environs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US possessions</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US possessions</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.

To some extent, the stagnation in Philadelphia’s foreign-born population reflected national trends. According to the American Community Survey, the proportion of the US population that was foreign born increased only from 13.1 to 13.3 percent between 2005 and 2008. This translated into a cumulative increase in the number of foreign-born residents of just over 2.7 million foreign-born residents. Yet, using data on respondent’s place of residence the previous year, the number who reporting living abroad fell each year from 2005 to 2008, suggesting a tapering off of immigration even before the recession took hold. In metropolitan Philadelphia, the foreign-born population declined between 2005 and 2006 and again between 2007 and 2008. Cumulatively, the foreign born population in 2008 was about 8 thousand less than it had been in 2005. The number of foreign-born Philadelphians who had lived abroad the previous year also fell in two of the three years.

² Because of the lack of change between 2005 and 2008, for the remainder of the paper, we will contrast 2000 with the combined data for 2005-2008. This approach also provides a 4 percent sample of the area in these years that can be compared to the 5 percent sample in 2000.
Data on foreign-born are sometimes misleading because they omit children of the foreign-born. If we include children under the age of 18 living in a household headed by someone born outside the United States, we get a more accurate picture of this population. These data suggest that the percent foreign-born and their children jumped by 2.4 percent between 2000 and 2005 and then may have increased modestly because of the increase in the suburbs between 2005 and 2008.

Percent of population living in households with a foreign-born head, by metropolitan status, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside US</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside US</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden and environs</td>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside US</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro area</td>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside US</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.

Although total immigration stagnated between 2005 and 2008, the composition of the immigrant population has continued to change. Comparing the 2005-06 data with that from 2007-08, the fastest growing groups were Dominicans, whose population increased by 6,754; Puerto Ricans, who increased by nearly five thousand; and Pakistanis, who increased by 3,842. Several groups who had barely been represented in the region in 2000 also recorded significant increases, including residents born in Albania, Sierra Leone, and Egypt.
Fastest growing foreign-born groups, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2005-06 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>8,909</td>
<td>15,663</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>68,667</td>
<td>59,721</td>
<td>64,583</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>9,486</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>8,647</td>
<td>11,475</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>8,765</td>
<td>11,591</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>6,827</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kampuchea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>31,625</td>
<td>34,128</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>315.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt/United Arab Rep.</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>127.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>4,493</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5,221</td>
<td>3,898</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>9,304</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.

Over the same time, the largest immigrant groups in the city in 2005-06 generally did not continue to expand. Although the Puerto Rican and Mexican populations increased, those from India, China, Korea, and Vietnam, either held steady or declined.
Change in size of largest foreign-born groups, metropolitan Philadelphia 2005-06 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>Change 2005-06 to 2007-08</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrants</td>
<td>449,348</td>
<td>535,468</td>
<td>557,931</td>
<td>22,463</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>68,667</td>
<td>59,721</td>
<td>64,583</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>28,619</td>
<td>47,047</td>
<td>47,394</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>31,625</td>
<td>34,128</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17,563</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>28,797</td>
<td>-101</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>16,792</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>22,843</td>
<td>-1,657</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>19,659</td>
<td>23,520</td>
<td>22,227</td>
<td>-1,293</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>21,043</td>
<td>19,415</td>
<td>18,116</td>
<td>-1,299</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19,988</td>
<td>15,497</td>
<td>14,748</td>
<td>-749</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>12,165</td>
<td>14,641</td>
<td>14,413</td>
<td>-228</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>15,506</td>
<td>14,530</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>-1,879</td>
<td>-12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>12,982</td>
<td>12,881</td>
<td>11,308</td>
<td>-1,573</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>8,136</td>
<td>10,148</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>-1,413</td>
<td>-13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.

If we examine regional groups, rather than individual nationalities, we find that Europe has remained the largest sending region for the entire metropolitan area, although its share of all foreign-born decreased from 34 percent in 2000 to 26 percent by 2005-08. The remaining Western Hemisphere (minus Canada and Mexico) was the second largest group; its share increased from 16 to 19 percent. These were followed by East and South Asia, each representing between 12 and 13 percent of the foreign-born population. The sharpest decline in representation was Southeast Asia, which represented 12 percent of the foreign-born population in 2000, but only 10 percent in 2005-08.

The city and suburbs had different foreign-born population dynamics. In the city, other Western Hemisphere groups—in particular, Dominicans and Haitians—supplanted Europeans as the largest regional group. Although Southeast Asians’ share declined, they remained the third largest group, followed by East Asians, among whom a decline in Koreans was offset by an increase in Chinese. In suburban Philadelphia, the other Western Hemisphere share increased, but Europeans and East Asians remained larger. Most notable in the suburbs was the increase in South Asians whose share increased from 11 percent of foreign-born in 2000 to 15 percent in 2007-08.³

³ Camden and some surrounding suburbs are excluded from this analysis because their city/suburban status is not identified. However, the data suggest that this area, too, was going through a reshuffling of its foreign-born population, even as the proportion foreign-born increased between 2000 and 2005 and
**Percent of foreign-born population, by region and metropolitan status, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Asia</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asia</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Asia</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.

The Brooking/Penn report noted that a distinctive feature of contemporary immigration is the high proportion of immigrants living in suburbs instead of central cities. In 2000, four major groups—Canadians, Mexicans, South Asians, and West Asians—were over-represented in the suburbs. At the other end of the distribution, other Western Hemisphere residents, Africans, and Southeast Asians were the only groups significantly under-represented in the suburbs.

**Percent of population living in suburbs, by place of birth, 2000-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Asia</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asia</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Asia</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All foreign born</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

then stabilized. In fact, the ACS estimate for foreign-born in this area fell from 12.1 to 10.4 between 2005-06 and 2007-08, but the confidence intervals for each of these was approximately 1.4 percent, so we cannot say for sure that this decline reflected changes in the population. Other Western Hemisphere residents—particularly Dominicans (24 percent)—made up 42 percent of all foreign-born residents in 2007-08, while the Mexican share increased from 11 to 19 percent between 2000 and 2007-08.
Immigrant concentrations in metropolitan Philadelphia

Immigrant enclaves—the concentration of particular ethnic groups in certain neighborhoods—have been an important dimension of American urban life for two centuries. Yet, as the data on immigrant suburbanization make clear, the nature of immigrant concentrations has changed over time as a result of the transformation of work, residential environments, and transportation systems.

Unfortunately, our most recent data on smaller geographic units date from the 2000 census. At the beginning of the century, the metropolitan area had a number of immigrant concentrations. In the city of Philadelphia, Center City, South Philadelphia, and a band of neighborhoods stretching from Olney through the far Northeast were the major immigrant areas. In the suburbs, Norristown and Lansdale in Montgomery County and Bensalem in Bucks County had the largest concentrations.

Foreign-born as percent of population, metropolitan Philadelphia block groups, 2000

The best available geographic data (more recent small area data are scheduled for release in early 2011) are aggregated to public use microdata areas (PUMA), a rather large geographic unit that conforms to the census bureau’s confidentiality requirements. The following map shows the same data at the PUMA level. Obviously, this geography obscures many immigrant concentrations. Only the PUMA that includes parts of the lower Northeast captures a zone of consistently high immigrant density.
The benefit of these data, however, is that they allow us—at least obscurely—to examine change between 2000 and 2008. By 2005-08, the proportion of suburbs with foreign-born representation over 10 percent had expanded significantly.

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.
Finally, we can use the micro-data to examine change in immigrant concentrations over the period. Again, the lower Northeast stood out with the most rapid increase in its foreign-born concentration. However, sections of Montgomery, Bucks, and Delaware counties in Pennsylvania and Burlington and Camden counties in New Jersey also had increases of over 3 percentage points.

Obviously, a fuller analysis must await the American Community Survey data scheduled for release in a few months. In the meantime, these findings are important not just because they suggest what future analysis will discover, but because the geography of immigration is tightly connected to immigrants’ socio-economic status. We will return to this connection, but we first must examine the structure of income inequality among immigrants.

Change in percent foreign-born, metro Philadelphia PUMA, 2000 to 2005-08

![Map of Change in percent foreign-born, metro Philadelphia PUMA, 2000 to 2005-08](image)

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.
Social and economic standing

Many commentators have noted that contemporary immigrants’ social and economic standing is characterized by dualism: foreign-born workers tend to concentrate at both the top and the bottom of economic hierarchies. In Philadelphia, this weighting is most evident in immigrants’ educational and occupational status. However, because immigrants often have trouble translating their educational credentials into income, their income distribution is closer to that of the rest of the population.

Socio-economic status: education

The diversity of today’s immigrants is captured by data on their educational achievement. At one extreme, more than 30 percent of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have less than a 9th grade education (although this figure declined since 2000 for both groups). At the other extreme, many other foreign-born groups have an extremely high proportion of persons holding advanced degrees relative to the U.S.-born population. In 2005-08, more than twenty percent of Canadians, East Asians, South Asians, and West Asians reported having a graduate degree.

Educational attainment, residents over the age of 25, by place of birth, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000 and 2005-08

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010
Occupational structure

In 2000, immigrants were concentrated at the extremes of the occupational structure. They were more likely than US-born workers to work as professionals; but they were also more likely to work in service, operative, fabricators, and laboring jobs. The increase in immigration to Philadelphia since 2005 was accompanied by a slight decline in the overall occupational status of foreign-born workers. In 2000, the foreign born were slightly overrepresented in professional and managerial occupations—33 percent compared to 32 percent of the entire workforce, but by the mid-2000s, only 31 percent of foreign-born workers were in this category. Service occupations made up for this decline. The proportion of foreign-born workers in service occupations increased from 15 to 20 percent between 2000 and 2005-08, well above the increase for the general population.

Occupational status, by place of birth, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000 and 2005-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US born</th>
<th>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Total labor force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers and professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, sales, and administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners, Agricultural workers</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, craft, and repair workers</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, fabricators, and laborers</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total labor force</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010
The occupational stratification of nationality groups noted by the Penn/Brookings report persisted through the middle of the decade. Canadians, Europeans, and East and South Asians were much more likely than U.S.-born workers to hold professional and managerial occupations. Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and other Western Hemisphere-born residents were concentrated in service occupations. Mexicans’ concentration in gardening and agriculture work declined somewhat between 2000 and 2005-08. These groups and Southeast Asians were more likely to work as operatives, fabricators, and laborers than other groups in the population.

**Artists’ occupations**

The proportion of immigrant workers who reported an artist occupation fell from 1.3 to 1.1 percent between 2000 and 2005-08, slightly below that for all nationality groups (1.5 to 1.4 percent). Europeans constituted 37 percent of all immigrant artists in 2000 and 27 percent in 2005-08. East Asians and other Western Hemisphere artists represented 13-15 percent of all migrant artists in each year. All of these numbers, however, are based on relatively small sample sizes.

Immigrant artists do not appear to predominate in any particular disciplines. The only occupational category in which their representation exceeds that for the entire labor force is the catch-all category—art/entertainment performers and related. This combined with their representation among musicians and composers suggests that immigrant artists are more likely than not to be performing artists. Again, the numbers are relatively small, so we should use caution in drawing conclusions.
Artists’ occupations, by place of birth, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers and authors</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician or composer</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors, directors, producers</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art makers: painters, sculptors,</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craft-artists, and print-makers</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographers</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancers</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/entertainment performers and</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors and reporters</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire labor force</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010

One challenge for immigrants has been to translate their educational credentials and occupational standing into jobs and income. In order to estimate this earnings gap, we conducted a regression of personal income with education, age, labor force status, and gender as predictors. We then used the residuals of the predicted income of persons over the age of 25 to estimate the difference between groups’ average income and what we would predict it to be based on these factors. All of the major groups except Canadians experienced a large earnings gap. African immigrants experienced a penalty of over 10 thousand dollars in their earnings, while East and South Asians’ gaps were between 5 and 10 thousand dollars respectively. The groups with the smallest earning gaps—that is, the best fit between educational credentials and occupational standing—were Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and Europeans.
The income gap was not felt within all occupational strata. Foreign-born professionals and sales and technical workers appear to earn roughly the same salaries as US-born workers in those categories. In other occupational categories, however, foreign-born workers face a distinct disadvantage. For example, foreign-born professionals and managers’ personal income in 2005-08—$70,940—was roughly the same as that of their US-born counterparts ($70,677). Among production, craft, and repair workers, however, foreign-born workers ($33,533) earned considerably less than US-born workers ($44,179).
### Average personal income, by place of birth and occupational category, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2005-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>US born</th>
<th>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgr and Prof</td>
<td>70,677</td>
<td>65,064</td>
<td>70,940</td>
<td>70,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech sales adm support</td>
<td>39,577</td>
<td>30,207</td>
<td>39,174</td>
<td>39,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22,937</td>
<td>23,819</td>
<td>21,485</td>
<td>22,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners, Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>28,768</td>
<td>17,848</td>
<td>20,926</td>
<td>26,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod craft repair</td>
<td>44,179</td>
<td>29,791</td>
<td>35,684</td>
<td>43,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives Fabricators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>31,769</td>
<td>26,313</td>
<td>25,530</td>
<td>30,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48,016</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>33,753</td>
<td>46,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47,581</td>
<td>33,722</td>
<td>42,999</td>
<td>46,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010

### Income inequality

Two elements of economic standing are important to grasp. Average incomes provide a sense of how the group is doing overall. However, averages can sometimes be misleading when there is a high level of income inequality within a group. In some cases, a particular average income could be a product of a large middle class population, while at other times it could be the result of a clustering of workers at the two extremes.

**Group rankings.** Four immigrant groups—Canadians, Europeans, South Asians, and West Asians—reported average incomes that are above the figures of the US born population. At the other extreme, three groups reported average figures that are much below the US born figure: Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, other Western Hemisphere (Dominicans and Haitians) all had incomes well below those of US residents. East Asians, Southeast Asians, and Africans all had income scores in the 80-90th percentile making them the predominant “middle class” groups.

There were some changes in economic standing over time. As the Mexican community grew between 2000 and 2005-08, its relative income fell from 56 to 47 percent of the population average. Other Western Hemisphere residents experienced a less severe decline, from 73 to 69 percent. Europeans moved from somewhat above average to somewhat below average in the family or household measures, although they remained above average in terms of personal income. Finally, Southeast Asians experienced an increase in their
relative income, moving from roughly 80 to 90 percent of the metropolitan area average.

**Median family income, by place of birth, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family income (heads)</th>
<th>Median Income (dollars)</th>
<th>Index (Population average =100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2005-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>57,984</td>
<td>69,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>26,544</td>
<td>33,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>78,962</td>
<td>93,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>31,737</td>
<td>32,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>46,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>58,593</td>
<td>65,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Asia</td>
<td>51,963</td>
<td>62,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asia</td>
<td>45,683</td>
<td>60,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Asia</td>
<td>71,565</td>
<td>86,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>71,262</td>
<td>79,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>47,667</td>
<td>55,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>76,752</td>
<td>94,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,119</td>
<td>67,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculatin using Ruggles et al 2010

**Income distribution.** At the same time, the total foreign-born population’s income distribution became more equal between 2000 and 2008. The proportion in the middle 60 percent of the family income distribution rose from 57.5 to 59.7 percent while the share in the bottom and top 20 percent declined. The sharpest declines among lower-income families were for Asian groups. The proportion of South Asians in the bottom fifth of the income distribution already low in 2000 at 13 percent—fell to 10.3 percent by 2005-08. A more modest decline was recorded by each of the three other regional Asian groups. In contrast, the proportion of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans within the bottom twenty percent increased. The increase was particularly pronounced among Puerto Ricans whose representation in the bottom twenty percent increased from 48 to 50 percent.

Asians stood out as well among high-income families. South Asians and West Asians were the only groups to record substantial increases in their representation among high-income families. Most other groups’ share fell as their share in the middle of the income distribution increased.
Distribution of family income, by place of birth, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lowest 20 percent</th>
<th>Middle 60 percent</th>
<th>Top 20 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 08</td>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>2000 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All foreign-born</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Asia</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asia</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Asia</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.

The economic/locational nexus

As with most Americans, immigrants’ economic standing is related to their residential environment. What is more, there is a significant body of research that supports the notion that these environments impart important advantages and disadvantages to their residents.

We have limited information on the geography of residents—i.e., PUMAs—so we can go only so far in examining this issue for immigrants. Here we classify PUMAs by their location—City of Philadelphia, Camden and environs, and suburbs—and by their economic status—high, middle, and low-income. The resulting map looks like this.
Foreign-born residents exhibited striking diversity in residential environments. They were actually over-represented in each type of metropolitan area that we tracked except the most common. Where less than two percent of US born residents lived in Center City, the proportion of foreign-born in that district ranged from 3.8 percent in 2000 to 3.3 percent in 2005-08. Foreign-born representation was even more striking in the city’s middle- and low-income areas, where their proportion was 20 to 50 percent greater than US born residents. Large numbers of the foreign born lived, as well, in high-income suburbs, although by 2005-08 their representation there was roughly the same as that of US born residents.

At the same time, immigrants were less likely to reside in middle-income suburbs. In 2005-08, where 58 percent of US born residents lived in these sections of the metropolitan area, only 48 percent of the foreign-born did so.
Percent of population, by place of birth, income and metropolitan status, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US born</th>
<th>Puerto Rico and other US possessions</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-middle income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-low income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden and environs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs-upper income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs-middle income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-08</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010

In most cases, immigrants were concentrated where we would expect based on their average economic standing. Twenty-six percent of South Asians lived in high-income suburbs, compared to only 16 percent of US born residents, while about half of Puerto Ricans and over 40 percent of Southeast Asians lived in low-income city neighborhoods. Camden, the poorest section of the metropolitan area, had high concentrations of Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, other Western Hemisphere groups, and Southeast Asians.

Yet there were some striking differences. Mexicans, who were among the poorest immigrant groups, were much more likely to live in Center City and much more likely to live in middle-income suburbs than US-born residents. East Asians were concentrated in Center City and in upper-income suburbs.
Percent of population, by place of birth, income and metropolitan status, metropolitan Philadelphia, 2005-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Center City</th>
<th>City-mid income</th>
<th>City-low income</th>
<th>Camden and environs</th>
<th>Suburbs-upper income</th>
<th>Suburbs-middle income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico and other US</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western Hemisphere</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Asia</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asia</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Asia</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculation using Ruggles et al 2010.
Conclusion

Is Philadelphia a re-emerging immigrant gateway? Certainly compared to the metropolitan area of the 1990s, Philadelphia’s foreign-born community is large and dynamic. Yet, as with the nation as a whole, economic hard-times have combined with what seems to be an increasingly hostile environment to hold down a new wave of immigration.

At the same time, the contemporary immigrant community differs from that of even a few years ago. Some groups—like the Dominicans, Haitians, and Albanians—have grown into sizable presences in the metropolitan area, while many of the larger groups have either stabilized or declined. Most importantly, perhaps, the overall increase in the foreign-born population since 2000 means that more neighborhoods around the metropolitan area are now home to sizable, visible immigrant concentrations. While we must await the 2005-09 American Community Survey data to gain a more precise sense of where these concentrations are, it is clear that many of the older immigrant enclaves have continued to grow as new ones have come into being.

The basic socio-economic profile of the foreign-born has remained fairly stable over the past few years. Immigrants are more likely to be concentrated at the top and the bottom of the educational and occupational hierarchies, even as their incomes lag behind those of US-born residents with similar credentials. Much of this inequality is a function of group differences, with Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and Mexicans concentrated at the bottom of the socio-economic hierarchy and Europeans and Asians more likely to concentrate at the top. At the same time, economic inequality has a spatial dimension. For the most part, high- and low-income immigrants are likely to live in areas of the metropolitan area that reflect their economic status.

Whatever the short-term changes, what is clear is that the foreign-born population has become a significant part of the metropolitan area’s social and cultural landscape. Whether immigration increases in the next few years (as is likely) or does not, the recent growth in the foreign-born population presents the metropolitan area with challenges and opportunities with which it must grapple in the coming years.
4. Arts-based Social Inclusion—A Typology

The study uncovered a range of organizational models and program strategies with which local artists and cultural organizations are involved. Based on these findings, we have proposed a typology of arts-based social inclusion that describes five types of practice:

- cultural space and creative expression;
- community organizing and the arts;
- community-based institutional networks;
- school-based cultural programming; and
- culturally-sensitive social service.

Most immigrant-serving arts and cultural organizations are involved in multiple modes of practice. Of the five-part practice field, two modes lead with culture and the arts as a way to engage immigrants—cultural space and creative expression and school-based cultural programming. These strategies stem from a primary mission to engage immigrants—usually in the context of the wider community—through arts learning, cultural practice, and creative expression. Three modes are based on community-led strategies that use the arts to engage immigrants—community organizing, institutional networks, and culturally-sensitive social service. These strategies feature a holistic approach to serving immigrants—that is, the program attempts to meet an integrated set of needs and aspirations of newcomers and families.

Section 4 is a descriptive report of findings based on interviews and a focus group discussion with people working with Puerto Rican and foreign-born communities in Philadelphia. (See the Appendix for listing of study participants.) The five-part typology is the research team’s attempt to develop a grounded theory based on the narratives of practitioners. For each of the five practice modes listed above, we explore three topics: conceptualizing social inclusion, building immigrant capabilities, and practitioner challenges.
Cultural Space and Creative Expression

Conceptualizing social inclusion

Community arts organizations and artists with a mission to serve ethnic identity or foreign-born communities were the core group of practitioners interviewed for this study. Cultural space and creative expression describes the range of arts-based social inclusion activities undertaken by these organizations:

- **participatory groups**—creation of social space and opportunities to share cultural practice and celebrate heritage collectively;
- **elders and master artists**—preservation of cultural heritage, cultural education, and support of traditional artists and artisans; and
- **youth and emerging artists**—opportunity for creative expression, training in the arts, and support of young and emerging artists.

The variety of mission and programs reflect the intra-group diversity characteristic of immigrant communities, in particular, social class and generational differences. An immigrant’s social class reflects his or her education and occupational status attained before emigration, while generational barriers—a universal phenomenon, of course—are exacerbated during the process of resettlement in the U.S. These factors influence an individual’s relative interest in festive celebrations, mastery of classical traditions, eclectic expressionism, or contemporary global culture.

A number of programs and artists are geared to immigrants at a particular life-cycle stage—teenagers, adults, or seniors—which helps address life-cycle and generational differences in adaptation to new environments. While many groups have no formal institutional networks, most have developed an informal network of social service and professional referrals and supporting interpreter or translator services as needed.

**Social space and participatory groups**

“The arts are a comfort space for an immigrant—to be able to be in touch with his or her own culture and the arts of his or her own background.” This simple observation appears to hold true for the foreign-born regardless of social class, occupational standing, or length of residency in the U.S. The “mother tongue” too holds a special place in one’s heart.

The founder of Al-Bustan Seeds of Culture, an Arab and Muslim, wanted to create a place where young people can gain “a sense of their identity and culture in a setting where they can mix with people from all walks of life. In reality, that is what you can get in America, people of such diverse
backgrounds coming together around some common interest or physically coming together in a common space.”

Participatory opportunities for immigrant adults are often neglected. A popular program is Raices Culturales’ monthly tertulia, a social gathering, named for the tertulias that spouted up in Spain during the Franco era. The Spanish would meet in different café settings, moving from café to café to keep their meeting place secret. Since 2007, on the last Friday of the month, Raices converts its studio into Café Encuentros for a lecture and discussion on a cultural topic in Spanish followed by an open mike for individuals or groups who would like to share their talents.

People who come to tertulias come for a reason. They need that connection to their culture. I’ve seen grown people cry because you are portraying their true culture. I’ve seen the elderly come up here, so thankful that we have something that represents their culture.

“We never know who is going to come around. We always have different people, depending on the topic, always a different crowd.”

Taller Puertorriqueno has a full program of multi-cultural enrichment, sociability, and “honest dialogue” including gallery openings, Meet the Authors Series, Books and Crafts Fair, and annual Arturo Schomberg Symposium. In partnership with HACE CDC and Raices, Taller sponsors an outdoor Second Friday event from May to December, Veredas Cultural en el Centro de Oro.

Casa de Venezuela was started 2004 as a social group to bring Venezuelans together to support the culture, traditions, arts, and history of Venezuela—and to leave politics on the side, an increasingly divisive topic. They are now a registered nonprofit corporation with an active board of directors and volunteer program committee. The group runs two big programs a year: Venezuelan Expressions, a performance art program during Hispanic Heritage Month to showcase their own local music and traditional dance groups and Venezuelan talent from throughout the region; and Dialago 365, a collective art exhibit of Latin American artists in the spring.

Immigrant interest in participatory culture takes a variety of forms, including Russian community theater in the Northeast, Argentine tango dancing studios, music and dance ensembles, as well as parades and festivals. Neighborhood festivals include Feria del Barrio near 5th and Lehigh in North Philadelphia (in its 27th year) and San Mateo Carnaval, near 7th and Washington in South Philadelphia (in its 4th year). Downtown at Penn’s Landing, from May to
September, PECO runs its Multicultural Series of “outdoor festivals that celebrate cultural traditions from across the globe.”

**Elders and master artists, cultural education, folk arts documentation**

What is important to immigrant communities about art is “not protection but salvaging their own artistic traditions and practices, which parents and grandparents feel that their children and grandchildren are losing. They don’t know who ‘we’ are anymore.”

The Philadelphia Folklore Project started in 1987 as “just a handful of folklorists” with a focus on fieldwork: “… paying attention to who cared about local culture (and why), talking to folk artists, getting to know people and groups working to keep culture alive and vital in our neighborhoods.” Staff maintain archives of community-based local arts and culture, keep an online database of folk and traditional artists in Philadelphia neighborhoods; and provide technical assistance for artists, educators, and community groups. In fall 2009 Folklore started a pilot program, the Community Folklife Documentation Workshop, to support community members to do ethnographic and folk arts documentation in their communities and curate their own exhibitions. Two Palestinian-American women, for example, have trained to interview local immigrants as well as Palestinians living in the West Bank about the making and meaning of their traditional tatreez embroidery.

Folklore has contributed to the field of folk arts education, which involves programming with a mix of immigrant and local-born artists. Over the years they have run folk arts programs and workshops, co-sponsored founding of a folk arts-based public charter school (FACTS), and support “community based folk arts conversations.” Folk arts conversations bring together people with different histories but similar passions.

Bringing together, trying to create enriching, catalytic conversations with people who are trying to do the same kind of quirky minority art that most folks don’t value anyway. That’s one of the first ways that people bond—caring about something that most people don’t take seriously. All want to teach their traditions to the next generation.

An African folk artist and teacher recently founded Camara Arts: A Keeper of Tradition “to serve as a conduit for African cultural arts expression and education.” She envisions a community cultural center with an African-centered program open to the community but with a particular draw for African Americans and first-generation Africans. What they have in common, she believes, is no sense of cultural heritage. Under development is a rites of
passage program that would bring in elders from many African traditions to engage with adolescents about strategies for solving everyday problems like the need to belong, to grow up, and to change.

Folklore and other groups have suggested a formal apprenticeship model for transmission of cultural heritage and practice. Fleisher Art Memorial runs a classical Cambodian dance class on Saturdays taught by a Cambodian refugee and trained classical dancer. The dancer uses an apprenticeship model, where he is master teacher, which is part of the tradition. “This is how we teach each other. This is how we learn about our cultural history.”

Folk arts education is of particular importance where a traditional culture is in danger of loss due to transplantation of a people or extinction due to cultural imperialism. Kulu Mele African Dance & Drum Ensemble, founded in 1969, was a part of the “African cultural renaissance in Philadelphia.” The group is led by African American drummers and dancers who have pursued study of “African and African Diasporan music, culture, and art forms” for five decades. Ollin Yoliztli Calmecac—translated as “school of blood moving in the heart”—was founded in 2003 by two Mexicans, a self-taught multidisciplinary artist and a traditional artist and scholar of ancient Mexican culture and languages. Ollin’s mission is to investigate and raise awareness of the Mexicayotl culture in Mexico, which predates the arrival of the Spanish, and to preserve and present traditional Aztec dance and drumming. The majority of Mexicans who have migrated to Philadelphia since 2000, according to our interviewees, are indigenous people from the highlands of Puebla who speak an Aztec language called Nahuatl.

More commonly, cultural organizations are formed to serve as booking agents or presenting groups for immigrant or traditional artists, musicians, dancers, and performing groups. Raices has a roster of 150 to 200 artists and performing groups for which it finds clients and negotiates contracts. “That’s our bread and butter.”

This is ideal. Performers are preserving their culture, at the same time making some money, and at the same time educating the public about the different Latin American countries. They don’t all eat hot salsa. And salsa is for dancing in some countries. And the tortilla in Spain is not the same tortilla as in Mexico.

All immigrant communities want to preserve their cultural traditions and pass them on to their children. Most groups offer cultural programming for school-aged children—ranging from a few weeks in the summer to a year-round after-school and summer camp program. Groups are trying different formats: Casa de Venezuela has piloted Art-Spanish workshops: learn Spanish through the arts or learn the arts through Spanish. This summer Al-Bustan, in partnership
with University of the Arts, piloted a five-day Arab music course for adults—especially music teachers, instrumentalists and vocalists, and music enthusiasts—culminating in a performance.

Youth and emerging artists

A number of organizations have focused on engaging and retaining first- and second-generation teens. “To engage immigrants, work with their kids.” Asian Arts Initiative (AAI) has been notable for its efforts to engage Asian youth in cultural production. Over the past several years, as it has set down roots in its new home in Chinatown North, AAI has mounted a variety of programs focused on newly-arrived Asian youth. Its Teen Lounge program has worked with Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation (PCDC) and the Cambodian Association of Greater Philadelphia (CAGP) to incorporate immigrant Chinese and Cambodians into its summer program on occasion during the school year. In the spring of 2010, AAI provided the space for a video residency. The resulting video wove together the stories of a number of recent immigrants to provide a tableau of the challenges and aspirations of the young artists. AAI has emphasized performance arts and other participatory formats as a means of engaging youth. A regular open-mike series, hosted by the performance artists, Yellow Rage, provides a space within which young people can both socialize and gain experience as emerging artists.

Al-Bustan is committed to school-based, after school, and summer camp programs for high school kids where they can explore issues like identity and migration, stereotypes and the media, and civic roles in the larger society. Fleisher Art Memorial’s Teen Lounge students, already a mix of home- and public-school kids, have been asked to welcome Burmese and Bhutanese refugees. Taller’s Youth Arts Program is a portfolio-building program that helps prepare and encourage students to apply to art school or college. “Teens will incorporate whatever they have in their insides into their work.

Building immigrant capability

To engage people in the arts, says an interviewee, the guiding principle is “you are an artist.” He explained that for many immigrants, in their home country, art-making was a part of daily life.

“I do believe that everyone is an artist because I know that for a fact. I am an immigrant. I come from a Mayan family. We weave and make a lot of things, as part of the living. We sell our crafts but never see ourselves as artists or crafts people. As little kids, we didn’t have toys, so we had to make our own toys. My father used to build things for us. That’s how you develop your own skills. I never studied, but I consider myself an art-maker.”
The Bhutanese women, for example, even on their first visit to Fleisher displayed an avid interest in learning arts. “They just enjoy making things. These women are definitely crafters.” Some noted that art-making can be validating for an immigrant who on most days feels needy and vulnerable. “Despite all the difficulties my family may be having, I do have traditions, I do have a heritage, I do have something to offer.”

The role of the teaching artist, therefore, is facilitator—a medium by which immigrants and their children can access their culture and make it their own. As one teaching artist explained:

It’s important when doing art-making that it be first person—you choose to represent your experience the way you choose to represent your experience. It’s not filtered through a third party—a social worker or an artist. You are the artist. The teaching artist is a facilitator, a technical consultant.

The El Viaje artists were successful in that “we created a path where the families were able to speak.” The creative process triggers the memory and encourages story-telling. Projects that encourage collective memory and story-telling, in particular, help people communicate and connect with one another.

The media arts—film and video—appear to be a particularly accessible medium for the young and people with limited English “to get their story out.” Community screenings of documentaries produced as part of an art studio—such as the El Viaje project screenings at The Rotunda and Casa Monarca—provide opportunities to share hidden experiences with engaged audiences.

Some forms of art-making are particularly conducive to connecting across time and cultures. A number of informants cited poetry and storytelling as connecting with oral, collective, and classical traditions (for example, Islam). Indeed, the matriarchs of Al-Aqsa Islamic Society—who don’t speak English and were openly skeptical of the MasterPeace public art project—surprised everyone at the culminating event with a request for a women’s inter-faith poetry writing workshop. (Unfortunately, there was no funding for the project, so it never happened.) Al-Bustan, which trains students in classical Arabic and Islam, articulates the dynamic relationship of culture to art-making:

Culture is a dynamic process. ... Culture is not just a backpack of things from an old time and place that your parents came from or grandparents came from. But culture here is a dynamic thing and you can be active participants in making this culture. So you as Arab-American living in the US, what do you see? We give them the tools ... to get them thinking critically. ... How do you respond? Create your own film or video or write your own poetry or make your own drama. ... Tell your own story.
A next step is to build a cadre of artists within each immigrant community, as articulated by the El Viaje artists. Through their studio project with Mexican families, they were able to identify artists—"though they will shy away from that word"—and artisans in the community. "We cannot do everything for every project. But we can identify people who can create that change and provide them with the skills needed to do these projects in their communities. It’s about them taking the initiative, [about] nurturing their community as artists."

**Practitioner challenges**

Full participation in US civil society is as important to immigrants as economic participation and prosperity. The nonprofit sector opens new opportunities for these communities as well as new systems to comprehend and master. Technical assistance and support for incorporation, strategic planning, and training by Pennsylvania Council on the Arts and area philanthropists have been invaluable for emerging cultural groups and artists. Still, buy-in to the concept of a nonprofit organization is slow. For many, their home countries are clouded by political corruption. Venezuelans, for example, have not forgotten that the Red Cross stole $5 million. Others, like Mexican indigenous peoples, for example, have endured centuries of bad deals by New Spain and the Catholic Church, the United States, and the Mexican government. "So people are skeptical about nonprofits."

Within immigrant communities, established institutions have benefited newcomers and artists. Taller Puertorriqueno, for example, has served as an incubator, technical assistant, and facility and program partner for numerous emerging artists and small cultural groups serving particular or pan-Latino communities (including Raices Culturales Latinoamericanas, Casa Dominicana, Casa de Venezuela, Artistas y Musicos Latino Americanos AMLA, Semilla Arts Initiative, Las Gallas, and Naylamp Street and Puppet Theater). Raices provides technical assistance to Casa de Venezuela and Accion Colombia and serves as an agent for the artists and performing groups on its roster.

The Latino cultural community is exploring options for collaboration on facilities. Taller is underway in the planning of a new Latino community cultural center near 5th and Lehigh in North Philadelphia. Raices currently rents the second floor of a rundown building. Casa de Venezuela and Accion Colombia have no permanent home. Casa Monarca owns a renovated building in South Philadelphia but has no operating funds. Ideally for Taller, to share overhead expenses in the planned new facility, groups without permanent space could be tenants as resident companies or lease space on a part-time basis. "But that is not realistic ... It’s complicated because everyone is in a different stage of development with respect to organization and capacity. There are a lot of
smaller groups with no capacity to raise money.” Meanwhile, Raices, Casa Venezuela, and Accion Colombia are exploring a facility plan for sharing of physical space as well as administrative resources.

Probably the most consistent drain on the immigrant-serving cultural community is “collaboration” with mainstream cultural programs—be they regional institutions, university-based, or resource organizations. “Whenever the focus is on diverse communities, everyone wants to collaborate with us. But how many come with money to put on the table?” Some institutions will call on an ethnic-community serving group ostensibly to collaborate but in reality to beef up a grant proposal. “They use our name and our numbers, but nothing happens after that.” When they get the grant, they have no budget to bring school groups to the exhibit, for example, or for “our artists” to program. Others will ask a group to write a letter of support and, when they get the grant, count on “the community partner” to organize the program—with no resources.

Everybody wants collaborations. Yet collaborations take a long time and effort. People who are asked to collaborate should be compensated for the amount of time and effort put in it. ... [A collaboration] reduces their costs because it extracts our time and resources to get accomplished. That is never compensated ... there is an unmeasured and priced cost. If you want to continue to ask people to collaborate, the real cost has to be included. Whatever the grant, the applicant needs to include 10 percent—or whatever the actual administrative cost—for the group that is going to help the applicant produce the program.

“Foundations should know that [collaboration] taxes the human capital of these organizations to an enormous level.”

At the same time, established ethnic-community arts organizations seek partnerships that nurture the capacity of small and emerging groups and artists in their service community. Community partnerships, however, often highlight the plight of the fiscal conduit. “Whoever controls the purse is always the bad guy.” Even if a collaboration appears equitable, the differential power in the relationship perpetuates tensions.

What to do? Figure out the appropriate amount to give to collaborators directly. Newer groups, if they have the capacity, go out and get the money, and bingo they do it. But if [small and emerging groups] are going to ask to collaborate, at least a portion of the money [should go] to them directly and [be] a part of the work that they are doing. That would then support their growth, stability, and capacity building—and their appreciation for what the partner is doing and for what the collaboration is.
Invariably, given resource-poor organizations serving resource-poor communities, tensions arise over political access, voice, and allocation.

Why wouldn’t there be tensions within [our] community? We are competing for the same resources. It’s unrealistic to think otherwise. There are limited resources and different ways of seeing issues. Why would we be uniform? But when you have an opportunity for people to collaborate—especially when the product is something that provides benefit to all involved—then people work together and collaborate.

Cultural leaders, by and large, are devoted to bridging differences within immigrant communities as well as connecting with the mainstream. Certainly the common sentiment was “what unites us is greater that what divides us.”

The structure of philanthropy is challenging for these practitioners and often exacerbates intra-community tensions. Once a group is incorporated, there are many other requirements before it may be competitive for grants. Most funders require a physical presence and paid staff. In effect, a group needs private or personal funds—as well as sweat equity—to get foundation support. Casa de Venezuela, for example, has raised as much as $45,000 through annual fees by family members. “But we had to do everything ... Volunteers are making a huge contribution through their labor. We would have to pay a lot of money if that were paid labor.”

The scarcity and distribution of resources is a particular hardship for independent artists and unincorporated groups. Naylamp Street and Puppet Theater, which operated out of Taller for six years, is a poignant example. Naylamp was a participatory theater group, producing plays based on different Latin American cultures, which grew steadily and attracted people of all ages from all over the city. For several years they were able to operate on a $22,000 budget, virtually all-volunteer labor, and donated theater and storage space. However, the strain on its volunteer professionals and, finally, the loss of storage and rehearsal space—despite its popularity—determined its closure. “No one wanted to lose Naylamp. Everybody loved those stilt-walkers.” As the founder sadly recounted, “We had to close it for lack of support. I could not stimulate others to help for free.”

Cultural organizers and artists have invested considerable professional time and personal resources to do the careful outreach and network building necessary to seed programs that serve Philadelphia’s foreign-born communities. Within the Mexican community alone, with Ollin, the El Viaje project, and Casa Monarca—despite considerable infrastructure investment and grant-maker recognition—face uncertain futures.
The artists are ultimately the key to engaging immigrant communities. However, the system devalues these professionals. People call for artists but are surprisingly unwilling to pay. They get underpaid, undependable work. “Artists are artists. They’re doing it for the passion. ... But business is business, and my artists have to pay rent just like the rest of us.”
Community Organizing and the Arts

Conceptualizing social inclusion

Community organizing refers to a variety of strategies used to mobilize community residents. Social planning, social action, and community development efforts can all be seen as elements of community organizing. The use of the arts and culture as a community organizing strategy in immigrant communities dates at least to the early 20th century when it was central to the work of settlement houses.

In our scan of contemporary Philadelphia, we encountered a variety of examples of the arts and culture central to community organizing efforts. Culture often provides a starting point for resident engagement, leading to involvement with other issues. At the same time, more directed social action increasingly incorporates culture into its mobilization strategy, for example, when demonstrations against the proposed casino near Chinatown featured dragon dancers.

The founder-director of Asian Americans United (AAU), at a spring 2010 Bread and Roses town meeting in North Philadelphia, described AAU’s incorporation of the arts into its mobilization efforts. The intellectual foundation of this approach is what AAU terms the “Human Right to Culture”:

> We know that for communities to be whole, we need places and times where people can linger, interact and engage with each other in meaningful ways. Festivals are times when the powerless become powerful – when families and community members take over the streets and when “ordinary people” have the chance to be part of art making and tradition making. We recognize that for our children to have roots, for our families to have a feeling of community, and for our elderly to embrace memories and discover the power of passing on traditions, we must continually fight for time and space to celebrate. AAU’s folk arts programs and festivals were created out of recognition of this need and the power of bringing people together to honor, celebrate, and remember.⁴

As mentioned earlier, AAU was instrumental to the founding of FACTS. The annual Mid-Autumn Festival staged by AAU, an important cultural event, carries a clear message of political assertion:

> Every year, thousands of people gather under the full moon to celebrate the Mid-Autumn Festival in Philadelphia’s Chinatown. Closing down 10th Street, people gather to reclaim old traditions and establish new ones, and in so

doing, assert their right to exist as a community. AAU’s Mid-Autumn Festival creates a time when people come together in an expression of community pride and collective responsibility. Youth give a day of service, restaurants donate food, artists offer their talents, businesses and organizations chip in money – hundreds of people work together to make the festival our own.

AAU’s core mission is to build leadership in Asian American communities with a focus on “education for liberation” and the mentoring of youth.

Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation (PCDC) has a community organizer on staff to do outreach—that is, identify issues important to Chinatown residents, workers, and businesses and connect them with the resources they need to address the problem. “PCDC wants to know what’s going on in the community and how we can help.” The organizer sees his job as informal everyday interactions within the Chinese community and the arts as part of the wider net of resources with which to connect people.

I live in this community. I speak the language. I know a lot of people. I hand wave a lot of people. Getting to know people enough so that when something happens, they know who to come to.

When there is an issue—[e.g., nightclubs in Chinatown]—we organize a meeting and invite people [from the City and other agencies] and inform people so they know their rights and give them the tools. Then they can decide what to do.

Organizational networks are customized issue by issue, although they sometimes overlap. Partners include: AAU, Boat People SOS (Vietnamese), Victim Witness Services, Cambodian Association, Nationalities Service Center, HIAS and Council Migration Service of Philadelphia, PA Immigrant and Citizens Coalition. PCDC’s community organizer, who mentored while still in high school, runs Teen Club and from time to time brings the group to Asian Arts Initiative’s Teen Lounge. He values working with AAI to open up opportunities for immigrant students.

As an immigrant, I know that immigrant students have very limited resources. When I was a teenager, after school I went home—eat, sleep, school, home—that was it. I wasn’t exposed to anything else. What AAI does is expose teenagers to other opportunities—painting, photography, break dance, poetry, art … Teenagers are exploring their interests and their future. So it’s important that we work with different art programs.

The PCDC Teen Club, in turn, helped recruit Mandarin-speaking students for AAI’s spring 2010 video-making workshop. The organizer works with Chinatown tenants and workers—not just the teens—on multiple levels. First he helps them with what they need (such as financial aid or food stamps) and then
he tries to “plant seeds in people’s minds” to get them to think about the bigger picture. “Why do you think that you can’t get this help from other places?”

The Nationalities Service Center goal for refugee families that resettle in Philadelphia—“to connect them wholly to the community”—is broader than the housing-job-school requirements specified by the government contracts that support the work. For the Bhutanese, NSC determined personal safety to be a necessity of life. “To have these families resettled in a place where they must once again have that fear is just not acceptable.” NSC staff is working to enable the Bhutanese families, living near Mifflin and Jackson, to function within their South Philadelphia neighborhood. Several local connections are underway or in the works:

- Fleisher Art Memorial—enrollment in teen lounge and start-up of women’s knitting circle (discussed above) began as a way to address the immediate issue of teen safety and evolved as a way to address the loneliness and isolation of the women. “When we saw how happy they were just to go to Fleisher, that’s the enrichment part—which has been largely serendipitous.”

- Lower Moyamensing Civic Association—involving the women in neighborhood clean-ups and monthly Safety Walks “so people know they are there, can say ‘hi’ when they see them, these are not just immigrants who don’t speak English, so don’t beat them up or steal their money.”

- Neighborhood Bike Works—plan to sponsor one family a week to get a free bike, assuming resolution of liability issues. South Philadelphia is flat but spread out so a perfect place to use a bike.

- Community garden—grant proposals pending for start-up garden from Philadelphia Parks and Recreation, Pennsylvania Horticultural Society (Philadelphia Green), and Weaver’s Way Cooperative (Urban Farmer). A visit to a Hindu Temple in far North Philadelphia revealed how hungry the families were for flowers and gardens.

The NSC plan is to make the introductions and support the families during their start-up phase. “These organizations will connect them. These are resourceful people. They will find the connections from here.”

Groups who work with predominantly rural migrants highlight a challenge around personal security. Many see Philadelphia as “a concrete jungle” and long for the green and beauty of their homelands. Efforts to link the arts, culture, and community gardening provide a way for these migrants to feel safer and socially connected. The most celebrated effort in this regard is the work of the Norris Square Neighborhood Project’s Grupo Motivos, a self-organized group of Puerto Rican women living in West Kensington. Semilla
Arts Initiative, a new group started by a couple of Latino artists, has begun a series of community beautification projects in North Philadelphia’s barrio.

The women of Grupo Motivos began in the early 1990s to reclaim Norris Square Park from “needle park” to urban green. The women have led establishment of six community gardens that feature vegetables and flowers representing Puerto Rican and African cultures. To educate the second and third generations about their mixed heritage, Grupo Motivos runs environmental education and cooking workshops. In one garden they have built a replica of a 1940s Puerto Rican rural home, La Casita, furnished with artifacts from that era. In another they have built an African village with stucco huts, an outdoor kitchen, a market stand, and “an amazing Story Telling Room.” Grupo Motivos has been effective at leading collaboration with regional organizations: the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society (Philadelphia Green), an invaluable source of technical assistance; the Philadelphia Museum of Art, for a summer youth arts program; and the Philadelphia Mural Arts Program, to commission Cuban painter Salvador Gonzalez for the striking “Butterflies of the Caribbean” mural for El Batey garden.

Semilla Arts Initiative—the seed of change—uses art-making and gardening to “reclaim vital spaces” and as a vehicle of community transformation. Their approach is to start a project, something visible to the community, while building relationships in the neighborhood “that are actually the key to the work.” What Semilla is not about is making projections and plans for the future, writing proposals, and waiting for grants. The idea is to do something. “That’s why it’s called an initiative.” The hardest part is to start with nothing.

Things happen that attract people to help you, attract situations to grow. ... Other people start seeing it, other people get interested in it, things start happening. There are a lot of resources out there. It’s a matter of joining different resources, and then it’s easy.

Their goal is to build community capacity for change. The first step is to stop and reverse “a community cycle of not understanding.”

That’s the thing about this neighborhood. It’s a cycle of not understanding how to fight, of things falling apart, of too much of an acceptance and a dependency on someone from outside to save us.

The Initiative began with a project at 5th and Dauphin (the oldest handball court in Philadelphia), where the artists were hired to paint a mural. The adjacent site was an abandoned playground with rusted and broken equipment but kids still playing on it. Parents’ interest in the site “sprouted action that involved the whole community.” A new project at 4th and Somerset
began in May 2009 with Community Day to clear an abandoned lot directly across the street from the brand new Julia de Burgos Elementary School. Public art and horticultural work continued this summer, resulting in a neighborhood park called Semilla Children’s Garden. Another community garden is underway, in partnership with Norris Square Civic Association, at Hunter and Howard Streets—near newly built Hunter Homes and across from another new school. The concept is to use the garden to build community with the new neighbors and the new school:

- We’re creating a model to integrate community arts and community service ...
- Home is not just from the classroom to the bedroom—it’s everywhere in between. ... We’re trying to get teachers and kids to understand what their voice is and what community is.

Semilla Arts Initiative—like the El Viaje Project—is an extension of the founders’ personal work as studio artists. For artist-activists, art is about transformation—of oneself, one’s neighborhood, one’s community.

- As artists we are exposed to many things that sometimes people in the community are not. We see how powerful creating something can influence change. ... You don’t just consider yourself an artist because you’re a painter. Art has to be about something more. ... It’s about creating something that is going to make an impact. That’s what makes it exciting, worthwhile.

Conventional forms of public art—with outsider artists—can also be a medium for community organizing. The Arts & Spirituality Center, working in partnership with community groups in neighborhoods around the city, uses the arts to bridge divides of faith and culture. “In every public art project, the people are involved and participate. The artists relinquish the process and the design—that’s what heats things up, but also what makes it work.”

In 2003 Arts & Spirituality invited Al Aqsa Islamic Society mosque and school to be part of its new MasterPeace program. Al Aqsa chose to do a mural, with the Mural Arts Program, as a way to improve their relationship with their Kensington South neighbors and “lift up the beauty of our faith as we know it, not as it’s being defined.” The artistic team involved a Jewish muralist, a Catholic artist, a Lebanese artist, and a Muslim architect student; community partners involved neighborhood associations, schools, and churches. The final Doorways to Peace Mural has three parts: a mosaic façade in traditional Islamic design; a painting on the back with an inter-faith design; and a tile panel encircling the building with the 99 names of God in Arabic and English. Al Aqsa, which occupies a converted furniture factory at Germantown Ave and Jefferson—stands proud and visible in the community. A girl told her mother: “Now Al Aqsa is as beautiful on the outside as it is on the inside.”
Public art can stimulate dialogue that connects a community—often isolated or stigmatized—with the broader urban populace. Asian Arts Initiative sponsored an exhibition from April to August 2009 called Chinatown In/flux: Future Landscapes with site-specific installations in neighborhood locations intended to “catalyze community-wide imagination and present a positive vision for Chinatown’s future.” Raices, Taller, and HACE CDC produced a film about the barrio called El Centro de Oro: The Golden Center—screened in spring 2010 as part of Scribe Video Center’s Precious Places Community History Project—to showcase the cultural vitality and sustainability of the Latino community.

Building immigrant capabilities

A majority of immigrants want to become Americans, they want to be self-sufficient—“economic self sufficiency is it for them.” A basic part of building immigrant capabilities is connecting them with opportunities to develop the social skills required to put them on the path to self-sufficiency.

One suggestion was that neighborhood associations could serve as welcome centers—offering conversational English and hospitality services that would introduce newcomers to food markets, places to shop, foods to eat, how to take a bus. “They have no clue where to go, what to do. Simple things are big concerns for them.” As implied by a trained community organizer, all residents can help build the social networks that support fellow neighbors in need.

I think community organizing could be done in our everyday life. ... If you are part of a community, you are already doing organizing. It’s more than that, but that’s the first step.

Sometimes community-organizing takes on an economic development dimension. For example, the Bhutanese women in the Fleisher knitting circle had been active needle-workers during their years in refugee camps. Because of the initiative of the NSC facilitator, the program was able to leverage resources—donated sewing machines, yarn, and a local distributor—as well as impart basic English language and business skills. Immigrant seniors, according to one interviewee, also have the potential to generate supplemental income. “Seniors hate senior centers.” Many would welcome an opportunity to join workshops “to create objects—through the arts, crafts, or manual labor—that can be sold in local markets. They can make pots, pans, utensils, pencils, tables, desks, chairs—all kinds of stuff.”

 Participatory neighborhood projects and community spaces enhance personal security and build social connections. Semilla Children’s Garden has become a neighborhood park as well as community garden, thanks to a set of tables and benches and an open door policy. The artists are actively encouraging anyone
interested—a group, a family—to arrange an informal or organized activity or just come out and have lunch or talk. One day they had a cooking class. Another day a musician from Raíces Culturales, a block down the street, put up the tent and gave a cuatro lesson. “We even have live music!”

The fence is up but the garden is totally open, you can go in anytime and see what’s growing. Plus this is something new ... this garden spouted really fast ... So people stop, ask questions, we invite them in, give them some tomatoes—anything to get some kind of contact, to make them feel welcome. Neighbors as well as people from different places are coming. Drivers-by are stopping all the time. The [brightly painted] shed was put up at the end of June and has attracted attention. People are asking, “When did this happen?”

The neighborhood is gradually taking ownership of what only a year ago was an anomic site—a gigantic abandoned lot—across from an elementary school.

The area not fenced in is amazing—the area is respected. We’ve had to leave a lot of material out here during construction, sort of a test to see what happens. Everything is exactly where we left them. Sometimes [in the dark] if we leave tools, a neighbor picks them up ... and returns them to us.

A key role of the arts in immigrant communities is as a channel for political voice. For many Latino organizations, the graphic and mural arts traditions have been a vehicle for political expression. Over the years, murals have become an important element of the built environment of many Philadelphia neighborhoods. Increasingly, film and video have become important media for political voice. The AAI video workshop allowed its young participants not only to develop skills in using video but also to reflect on past struggles of the Asian American community and their place within those. Making a video of the El Viaje Project took the art-making and story-telling process to another level. “Families became conscious of the power of expression of their work.” The artists want the El Viaje Project to support change—not just within the Mexican community but also among immigrant groups all around the city—Dominicans, Cambodians, Haitians—who have made such a journey to the US.

Practitioner challenges

Community artists and activists are generally resourceful people skilled at scanning the environment to see “the vast amount of underused resources that can be brought together productively.” One interviewee observed that facility management, not facility shortage, is a barrier to engaging immigrants and other community residents in the arts.

There are plenty of buildings, plenty of spaces for the arts—in senior centers, recreation centers, community centers, and arts centers. There are gorgeous spaces all over the city—well-lit spaces, kilns, and all kinds of space—although
sometimes you have to look under the rocks. The problem is not a shortage but a closing off of spaces by administrators—the people running the centers. We need to open up community spaces so that they are used as intended. We need extended hours so that spaces are open late for arts use by communities.  

These artists see themselves as the liaison between the organization and the community. At the same time, they need spaces and facilities to connect with communities. “Artists need a home. But a house is not a home.”

Community organizers and artists who operate within and between organizations have difficulty getting recognition and support for developing models and opportunities to incubate new concepts. A few examples:

- **Semilla Arts Initiative** would like to develop the Children’s Garden as a resource for Julia de Burgos Elementary School, across the street. Despite doing a nature arts workshop at the school in June 2010, with funding through Taller Puertorriqueno, the school administration remains unresponsive.

- **NSC** would like to build on the model developed for the Bhutanese where community integration and participatory art-making—supported by basic language, socialization, and business skills—has facilitated resettlement. The pilot was possible because the Bhutanese were 100 percent employed (the men take any job—picking mushrooms, chopping lettuce). All have housing, pay rent, and kids in school. “We had to begin with a community that was ready. So now the question is how can we expand this to other people ... With the Bhutanese, we have a core group.”

- **Grupo Motivos** has dreamed of combining their gardening, craft, and culinary arts to expand the “cultural, social, educational, and economic opportunities” they can offer to the Kensington community. Their vision is to renovate the building adjacent to Las Parcelas garden to house a women’s center, a catering business, and café.

The case of Norris Square Neighborhood Project is notable. Its integration of culture with gardening and greening, community education, and political action makes it difficult to classify in the standard categories of nonprofit organizations. Its Grupo Motivos, despite numerous gardening awards and international recognition from environmental and women’s groups, remains a grassroots group in which issues of cultural preservation and social justice are central. As “a community-driven, bilingual learning center,” NSNP is a model with particular appeal to migrant communities though it looks neither like an immigrant-serving nor a community arts organization.
Another challenge is how to start-up an organization intended to be a self-sustaining group, like a cooperative or a collective, rather than a tax-exempt organization dependent on government or philanthropy. One interviewee envisions starting a group for older Latino immigrants. “Among older adults, there is a vast resource of skills that they have learned and used for living—agriculture, carpentry, construction, wood-making,” His idea is a community organization with minimal structure and three program elements:

- basic English language training for seniors, with a focus on conversational and interaction skills, not getting a GED;
- workshops in arts and crafts-making that build on seniors’ vocational skills with training in use of new tools and technology; and
- a market to sell the things produced in the workshops, which could supplement their retirement income (so they can go to cultural events).

The concept is based on community-generated projects in Central America with no external support referred to as La Olla Commun. “These are working people. They have a lot of life. … I want to do something that helps these people be who they are.”
Community-focused Institutional Networks

Conceptualizing social inclusion

A number of community-based arts organizations have developed institutional networks with social service or ethnic-serving organizations as a way to expand their access to Puerto Rican and foreign-born communities. Immigrant-serving organizations, in turn, are interested in arts programs to expand opportunities for their constituencies. All providers are seeking to reduce entry barriers, attract newcomers who may otherwise be wary of their organization, and broaden participation in their programs.

Multi-service and neighborhood-based approaches to improving the lives of the urban poor and the resettling of immigrants echo the settlement house movement started by social reformers in the late 19th century and the mutual aid associations started by ethnic communities during the last several decades. At the turn of the 20th century—before the rise of the nonprofit sector with its bureaucratization, specialization, and professionalization—philanthropists and social workers experimented with broadband and accessible social, cultural, and educational opportunities for newcomers to U.S. cities.

Taller Puertorriqueno has been a hub in a network of programs serving the barrio and the regional Latino community since its founding in 1974 as a Puerto Rican graphic arts workshop. Ten years ago Taller started working with the Delaware Valley Chapter of the Alzheimer’s Association (AA) to develop an art program for Latino seniors. The AA’s new multi-cultural director had identified the arts as vehicle for outreach to the Latino community and to use a program developed in California and Colorado for people with early-onset dementia called Memories in the Making (MiM). In Colorado AA chapters partner with assisted living facilities to serve US-born residents and run MiM as part of an activities program. By contrast, the Philadelphia AA planned to partner with a local arts center to do a bilingual program serving area Latino residents. “So we approached Taller Puertorriqueno because they are a well-established organization in the heart of the community.”

Taller agreed and helped AA form an advisory committee with other local agencies that provide legal, medical, social, and immigration services for the Latino community. “Partnership with Taller allowed us to form the network, and then we really took off.” Taller developed a curriculum based on the MiM concept of watercolor technique and minimal structure; planned recruitment of artists; coordinated facilities and transportation—all in support AA’s Multi-Cultural Program mission:
We applied [MiM] as palliative program for Spanish–speaking individuals. Palliative means sugar-coated. Because of language and cultural barriers, Latinos and immigrants have difficulty to access services. So, if you want to be successful with those populations, you have to sugar-coat it. Knowing that the Latino community has a rich cultural heritage and a vast use of art to express themselves—because of those two principles—we say this can work.

By joining MiM the families become aware of the range of services available from AA as well as other organizations. “We are like an anchor organization. We refer families to [other] services—we are the friendly organization.”

In part, through the influence of the multi-cultural program, AA has expanded its vision of the role of the arts for its service community of 300,000 families in the region: “Enhancing quality of life and preserving self-identity is an essential component of good Alzheimer’s disease and dementia care.” In partnership with ArtReach, AA offers all families a full cultural calendar. “The families love it. Often caregivers are the most stressed and burnt out. It’s a respite for them. They can attend with their loved-one and go to a movie or performance as often as two or three times a week. The cost is $1 - $2 a ticket.” All AA staff and volunteers are involved in the program.

For groups that seek to work with Asian immigrant communities, the lack of a common language—in contrast to Latin American communities—is a challenge. For the Asian Arts Initiative (AAI), the primary barrier to working directly with immigrants is language. Last year AAI organized a neighborhood meeting on the future of Chinatown with simultaneous English-Mandarin-Cantonese translation to elicit feedback on Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation’s (PCDC) Neighborhood Plan. For an exhibit of photographs of 26 ethnic minorities in southwest China, “We Are Tiger Dragon People,” AAI prepared English and Chinese text labels and press releases. Because no staff speaks or writes Mandarin or Cantonese, AAI relies on volunteers, who are invaluable as translators but unreliable about press deadlines.

AAI’s primary strategy for reaching immigrant communities is through their children. However, for immigrants who arrive in the U.S. as teenagers (or even as pre-teens), lack of English-language skills remains a significant barrier—an additional motivation for AAI to develop links with other Asian-serving organizations. Over the past two years, AAI’s youth coordinator has been building relationships with her counterparts at PCDC and CAGP. Now for PCDC and CAGP youth, as well as AAI teens, the Asian Arts Initiative gallery/teen club (at 12th & Vine in Chinatown) provides another local safe space.

Immigrant-founded organizations invariably cultivate a social service network. Juntos/La Casa de los Soles—a transnational social service linkage group
serving Mexicans in South Philadelphia—started in 2002 as a volunteer project with Women Organized Against Rape and based at St Thomas Aquinas Church (18th & Morris). News coverage of Juntos’ opening and Call For Volunteers alerted many Philadelphians that a Mexican community had sprouted up in South Philadelphia. By attracting Mexican artists and other professionals from throughout the region, Juntos indirectly spun off cultural services for the community—including a bilingual day care center at Epiphany School, Ollin Yoliztli Calmecac, several Aztec dance troupes, and Casa Monarca. Currently, Juntos—with the Houston Community Center, where they are now based, and the Khmer Buddhist Humanitarian Association—offers free introductory English classes five days a week. Juntos and the Media Mobilizing Project—in a project called Our City Our Voices: Immigrant Newscasts in the Digital Age—are training immigrants to film and produce documentaries about their “lived realities.”

Established community-based organizations—“a place where the community goes and feels comfortable”—are a necessary node to engage immigrants with the arts. A local safe space is especially important to connect with newly arrived and/or low-income groups. The El Viaje artists for example, identified three South Philadelphia spaces with which they had connections and where Mexican families were already going: St Thomas Aquinas Catholic Church, for religious services and the Spanish Ministry; Epiphany School bilingual Head Start day care program; and Juntos/La Casa de los Soles, for legal and social services, training programs, and advocacy. Eventually, they artists were able to recruit families to participate in a studio art project whereby through art-making parents recall and share stories of their journey—El Viaje—from Puebla, Mexico to Philadelphia, USA.

The El Viaje Project highlights the importance of trusted intermediaries in connecting with immigrants. Fleisher Art Memorial in late 2008 (with a Wallace Foundation grant) began research, in anticipation of program development, to identify and engage “newly arrived peoples” in southeast Philadelphia. Fleisher hired a research manager and a Chicago-based firm to study neighborhood groups under-represented at Fleisher (Southeast Asians, Mexicans, and African Americans). Fleisher’s access to these communities—even for research and outreach—was made possible by its local institutional networks, notably the Southeast Philadelphia Collaborative, a social service consortium, and two mutual assistance associations, Southeast Asian Mutual Assistant Associations Coalition (SEAMAAC) and the Cambodian Association of Great Philadelphia (CAGP). “We have relationships in the making for ten to thirteen years that are coming to fruition.”
Fleisher’s experience as arts partner in the Collaborative, as well as having a Cambodian court dancer and refugee on faculty, opened the door to a new partnership. In the fall of 2009, the Nationalities Service Center (NSC) approached Fleisher about how the arts could support resettlement of Bhutanese and Burmese families in South Philadelphia. They chose Fleisher’s Teen Lounge as a way to engage the Burmese and Bhutanese youth, freshly-arrived foreign-born teens who are alternately ignored and targeted by fellow high school students. Discussion with parents (through an interpreter) at an orientation session led to the start-up of a Bhutanese women’s Knitting Circle at Fleisher held at the same time as Teen Lounge. All could travel to the center together and allay mothers’ fears for the safety of their teens if they walk alone or wait for a bus.

Interviewees pointed to the long-term nature of developing trust not only with marginal communities and artists, especially immigrants, but with the organizations that serve them. “A lot of this work is around building relationships, and relationships take time.” The Philadelphia Folklore Project has developed relationships over 20 years with the Cambodian community, the Africans in West Philadelphia, and Chinatown. For over ten years, Fleisher Art Memorial has been placing resident artists at member agencies of the Collaborative. “We did not just stop by in an American Western way and say, “We need some Cambodians. Can you get some for us?!” (In fact, according to the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians, this is a typical type of request from local arts organizations.) Both Folklore and Fleisher noted that the problem with support for this kind of work is the need to justify funding based on short-term outcomes although the outreach work may not come to fruition for four or five years. “This work is relational, not transactional.”

**Building immigrant capabilities**

For newly arrived immigrants, the arts and culture—and quality of life concerns generally—are not high on the hierarchy of needs. Getting a house, finding a job, and enrolling in school are top priorities. But, as a refugee worker observed, social and economic needs can work interdependently:

> That is all we are contracted to do [house, job, school] ... not helping them as human beings to feel connected to a community. Refugees are lonely and ... scared for safety. At a point where the basic needs are met, you can start to address issues like loneliness. ... Not all communities are ready; some are still struggling to get food on the table. But if they have time [for the arts], it certainly would help our victims of trauma and torture ... help them get to the point where they can get a job, get more relaxed, and start working through some of their anxieties.
She went on to describe the therapeutic qualities of art-making, in the context of the knitting circle, that enhance a person’s social connections and even language acquisition.

[W] hen you’re knitting, it is proven that the alpha-beta waves in your brain are more calming, which contributes to learning ... Knitting [with friends] is the perfect setting to learn English. There are so many tasks at hand involved in assimilating to a new culture that it’s overwhelming.

For refugee women, while the chance to socialize increases confidence, “empowerment” comes from seeing that they are wanted, that people care enough to form a group and come every week; that their work is being praised—now even some stores sell it; and that they can organize a festival.

Many Latino seniors are not bilingual and are isolated. “That’s what happens with an immigrant community. The old people live on an island and never really integrate into the culture ... They are living in a different culture—within their culture.” Many have arrived within the last 10 years. They sent their kids here as young adults to make a better life. Often the birth of a grandchild is catalyst for their arrival. “When you first arrive, it’s exciting, you’re coming to see your kids. ... Then, a lot of people get depressed ... They feel very strange, they are older, they don’t want to speak the language. Their children are already adjusted to the culture. They feel lost.”

So when they come to the center and see other Latinos, [or] find another person from Columbia, it is good for them. When we offer this [art] workshop, we know that they enjoy themselves. [It’s] a good way to keep their mind busy, trying new things, being more creative. Some of them are drawing every day, they bring in every kind of paper. Definitely we know it’s extremely important to them. We talk to them about different issues, not about the world, but what’s going on with them, so they can be more stimulated. Somebody understands them. We make them laugh. With the combination of things, it works.

Even immigrants who arrived here years ago as young adults to work and raise families can find themselves living on a cultural island.

Can you believe that sometimes with groups of Latino [seniors] in North Philly, when we take them to Center City, it’s the first time in their lives? They’ve never been downtown. They worked in the factories in North Philly, lived their lives there, and never stepped out beyond Kensington, beyond Lehigh. Isn’t that something? It’s tragic, but it’s real.

A story about the MiM program at a Juniata Park senior center “says a lot about how powerful the arts [can be] for an immigrant.” No one at the center, where everyone speaks Spanish or English only, could communicate with a Chinese man who came alone to sit every day and didn’t even play bingo.
Staff finally invited the man—though he suffered no dementia—to join the program.

Through his paintings, which were about his homeland, he opened a window for everybody. By the end of the program he was volunteering in the kitchen. Everybody wanted to learn more from this man—his name, what he was doing—and he even started English classes. It was incredible, amazing.

The MiM coordinator observed: “The more I do this program in [non-Latino] communities, I see that art is a language for people who have lost the ability to express themselves, lost verbal communication. You can see that art is a form of expression.”

Practitioner challenges

Partner organizations that develop cross-sector networks to engage immigrants have several features in common: a mission-driven interest in immigrant communities; cultural competence—that is, all staff are culturally sensitive to engaging a given immigrant group or groups; and resourceful and responsive staff who are actively engaged (sometimes on a personal level) with both the arts and the immigrant community.

Typically, in a social service setting, arts or cultural programming are not part of contract- or grant-supported services. The Nationalities Service liaison for the Fleisher collaboration, for example, is a VISTA housing specialist supported by a Stimulus Grant. The specialist’s primary job is to support case managers assigned to refugee families to secure housing, extra income for rent, and help negotiate with landlords. After addressing their housing problems, she is free to explore other services for the families. At this point there is no grant support for the Fleisher-NSC collaboration.

Inter-agency teamwork and community focus are essential. Refugees and immigrants are responsive to arts programming but a good fit needs customized attention and care—especially at the outset. Fleisher and NSC attribute much success to joint orientation sessions—with participating teens and their parents, in-house staff briefings, on-site observation, and regular program evaluation team meetings. The team had to address, for example, a bigger-than-anticipated gap in age-related socialization. Compared to their 14-year-old US counterparts, the Bhutanese teens—used to refugee camp culture—were loud and unruly and had poor work habits associated with art-making and clean-up.

Artists in social service settings are part of the professional team but that is not always reflected in the budget. AA, for example, does not budget fees for artists working in MiM, although Taller provides small stipends for the artists.
AA recruits volunteer artists from local art schools with varied success. Generally, artists who can afford to volunteer are not bilingual; and bilingual artists—especially immigrants—cannot afford to volunteer. AA’s full-time multicultural coordinator, however, “does phenomenal outreach”; provides free, local training for artists re dementia and post-training support; observes classes and meets regularly with the artists; and works with Taller between sessions to evaluate and “refresh” the program to keep people coming back.

Funders of MiM have an unrealistic expectation that the program should be self-sustaining. Their model is AA’s Denver chapter, which raised nearly half a million dollars by selling artwork at auction. However, while Denver has “a strong and complex structure for marketing and development,” Philadelphia has a strong art program serving a largely low-income community with limited administrative resources. MiM has received occasional support for transportation and exhibits from the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging but not enough to keep from threatening closure. Last year MiM ran only three-month (formerly 10-month) programs at four centers and dropped the closing ceremony. Despite funder enthusiasm and two Latino senior centers on the waiting list, continuing funding for the program remains uncertain.

Given the geographic dispersal of immigrant communities, transportation is high on the list of logistical challenges—always an issue for arts programs in low-income families. Many immigrants don’t own cars or have one driver only (who drives to work). Even where a program is within walking distance or transit accessible, newcomers living in Philadelphia’s many neighborhoods that tolerate immigrant harassment fear for their personal safety—and that of their family and friends. So programs typically have to arrange transportation and/or escort services. Due to transportation issues (taxis are too expensive, vans entail insurance liability), Taller takes the MiM program to senior centers, which requires hiring an artist for each center. Ideally, they would bring seniors to Taller, which would make the program more cost effective.

Language barriers are formidable and, by and large, immigrant-serving arts programs need bilingual staff or—at the minimum—interpreters and, ideally, bi-cultural and/or immigrant artists. Engaging Asians, in particular, is difficult because of the number of languages spoken and the shortage of bilingual speakers.
School-based Cultural Education

Conceptualizing social inclusion

School-based cultural programs are a way to improve educational access to immigrant communities, to teach traditional arts disciplines and cultural traditions, and—ideally—a way to introduce the broader community to diverse cultures and peoples. Cultural or religious traditions can be validated inside school walls and help abate the “otherness” that is the personal experience of an immigrant child.

As we have noted, schools have often been the flashpoint for inter-group conflicts. At the same time, schools provide ready access to a variety of groups that would otherwise be difficult to engage. Historically, the public education’s extensive system for funding educational and social services provided opportunity for nonprofits to find support for programs. Due to budget constraints in recent years, however, the school district no longer has designated funds for arts education or extracurricular arts programs. Funding for nonprofits comes largely from private sources; the few groups with school district contracts must renegotiate annually.

Thus schools’ benefits are balanced by a set of limitations. The bureaucratic structure of public education places a significant burden on those who wish to try innovative approaches. Other priorities—for example, the need to raise test scores—can easily overshadow broader goals. Finally, school-community relations are often weak, raising questions about whether work in the school setting can have spillover effects beyond the institution’s walls or gates.

Artists’ residencies in public schools enable foreign and US-born school children to learn together about common forms of creative expression in the context of diverse cultures, regions, and histories of the world. Taller Puertorriqueno is its sixth year with Visitenos, a program that invites school children to come visit Taller and the barrio for a workshop and tour. However, during the past two years, few schools were able to visit. So Taller now does in-school residencies in North and South Philadelphia schools with high immigrant enrollment and, where possible, hire immigrant artists. Spring 2010 workshop themes included the ecosystem, our planet’s health; the meaning of art and how art influences our world; and history of the music and dance of Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic.

Several cultural programs emerged in response to the aftermath of September 11, 2001. The Arts & Spirituality Center’s poetry workshop program was started by a freelance Jewish artist and educator inspired to take her poetry residencies to Muslim communities after 9-11 “because of hearing so many
prejudiced comments about Muslims.” The program, now a curriculum called We the Poets, is run in public and private schools throughout the region. “[Poetry] is a wonderful tool to use to help children to explore their identity, their culture, their family, their ancestry … and get to know others who are not like them.” Al-Bustan Seeds of Culture, which started in 2002 as a summer camp in Arabic language and culture, has expanded to a year-round in- and after-school program offering classes in Arabic percussion, art, poetry, storytelling, and folk dance for elementary and high school schools. The in-school goal is to raise cross-cultural awareness of the history and culture of Arabs and Arab Americans. The public school programs have also been critical for Al-Bustan founders to recruit more-recent and lower-income Arabs—“families not as assimilated or established [or] still struggling economically”—to its weekend programs in West Philadelphia and summer day camp at Chestnut Hill. “Going out of their neighborhood is really big there.”

Private or public charter schools can provide an educational alternative for immigrant families and other ethnic or culturally-specific groups. For many years Catholic parochial schools provided an alternative to the public school system for immigrant children—including the Irish, Italians, Latin Americans and Chinese. Al-Aqsa Islamic Society in South Kensington, founded in 1989 by an Arab Palestinian family, is the city’s largest Arab American mosque and school. While on the weekend, the mosque serves mostly Arab-Americans of diverse national backgrounds; the day school serves 15 different cultural groups (50% African American and 50% from Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and the Middle East.) A MasterPeace project with Al-Aqsa, initiated by the Arts & Spirituality Center, involved a series of curricular and public art works designed by the mosque with neighboring institutions—to respond to and in spite of “a lot of barriers and fears from within and from without.” Two projects were successfully completed—the Al-Aqsa Quilt Project and the Doorways to Peace Mural—“but we took a long time with them.”

Folk Arts and Cultural Treasures School (FACTS), a K-8 charter school in Chinatown North, opened in 2005 after ten years of planning by the Philadelphia Folklore Project and Asians American United. Folklore has contributed to the field of folk arts education and brought that experience to development of the FACTS curriculum. Folk arts education involves programming with a mix of locally-born and immigrant artists. “People who grew up in villages where people did things as part of everyday life can have conversations with people who have spent decades studying traditions that they know about only as stage traditions.” FACTS serves a diverse student
body of Asian Americans, African Americans, Latinos, and whites. The goal is to represent all its students’ cultures in the curriculum.

FACTS has been successful in attaining federal funds, through the Pennsylvania Department of Education, to provide facilities and support for a Migrant Education Program. The families of children in the summer 2010 program were refugees from Thailand, Burma, Laos, Nepal, Bhutan, Indonesia, China, and Cambodia who had arrived in the U.S. from several months to several years ago. Parents work as agricultural workers and in meat-packing plants. The language of the program was English, challenging for most of the children. Fleisher, an active program partner, provided an artist in residence who worked with the kids to make animation videos and was one of the few sites that agreed to receive the children for a field trip. The core program was arts education, including creative writing. Summer staff is school teachers and artists who, a volunteer observed, “care deeply about the children and talk to them in a way that they know someone cares about them.”

In September 2010 the arts are among the new resources devoted to the “troubled” South Philadelphia High School. The Asian Arts Initiative (AAI) has received a grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Education to start an after-school arts program with workshops in dance, poetry, drumming, and other art forms. AAI’s concept is to involve both immigrant and non-immigrant youth, both English-speaking and non-English-speaking youth. They are experienced at working with diverse groups and in the use of the arts to bring different peoples together. (Members of AAI’s Teen Lounge in Chinatown are a mix of Asian-American and African-American teens.) New classes this fall will include Chinese as a second language. Project Bridging Cultures, an in-school help center run by the Welcoming Center, has expanded “to connect immigrant and native-born youth to resources that help them succeed in high school and beyond.”

We work with students who come from all over the world. Our main countries of origin are the United States, China, Vietnam, Mexico, Burma, Guinea, and the Ivory Coast. Visit us in Room 217B … All South Philadelphia High School students are welcome to visit our classroom.

As interpreted by one interviewee, the South Philadelphia High violence was “not really a cultural clash but a school district failure”—a failure by the public to meet the needs of all the students, which contributed to a jealously between groups. “Ironically, the non-English speakers had more voice.”
Building immigrant capabilities

Artists doing in-school residencies can offer school children the opportunity for unstructured work and creative problem-solving that are not afforded by national and state standards that guide classroom teacher curricula.

How do you engage kids in the arts? Treat them like the little people that they are. No condescension. Low construct. Present an idea. Make the material available. The project can morph as the kids shape the project. ... Kids tell me ‘we hate school.’ Even their art teachers structure projects with no opportunity for input or flair on the part of the kids. Even with math you need to let the kids do problem solving. ... 

Through its in-school residencies, Taller has observed the value of immigrant artists working directly with public school children—the mix of US-born, first generation, and foreign-born children growing up in Philadelphia neighborhoods—in providing an outlet for emotion and expression.

Because they have experienced difficult times, [immigrant] artists have more to say to the children ... If these kids hear someone who understands what they are going through, it's much more beneficial for them, they will get the point. All the different art forms—for example, theater—are so good for the children. You can see different situations, you have to talk, you have to express yourself, you expose your anger or whatever feelings you have.

An important goal for Arts & Spirituality’s We the Poets program is “honoring and recognizing each other from different communities.” They partners school groups with different cultural or socio-economic profiles:

So we have a weekly poetry club between Al Aqsa’s Muslim students and La Salle Academy, three blocks away, with all Latino and African American kids from South Kensington. Buddy partners get together once a week to work on poems. William Penn Charter School ... partners with Quba Institute, a mosque in West Philly, the oldest masjid in the city, with a few Egyptians and Mid-Easterners, but mostly African American Muslims.

The director believes that poetry—“to read your poems, to share your poems, to work with a partner in a poetry workshop, to have your stuff published and go out and read together”—is truly “a humanistic, democratic thing to do.”

On interviewee mused about the importance of the arts to inclusion and that inclusion is about the need for everybody to adjust and to work together. “[W]e all need to do this work... [I]f we include everybody, then that is going to be beneficial for everybody, because the kids are going to learn, ... [and] to be more involved in this society, and they are going to do well. But it we start isolating them for any reason, we are never going to grow.”
Practitioner challenges

Community arts organizations and teaching artists citywide are eager to work in Philadelphia schools “to break cultural barriers through the arts.” However, even with funding for a workshop or project, they often lack support by school administrators and classroom teachers. Generally, there is a need to build relationships school-by-school with community arts groups, between classroom teachers and teaching artists, and within schools to build “a community of colleagues” that support the arts as a vehicle to educational access and social inclusion.

Indeed, the need for cultural education, cross-cultural understanding, and opportunities for creative expression for Philadelphia school children—across the board—is growing as our community demographics are changing. An interviewee who attended Furness High School in South Philadelphia from 2001-05 described how tolerance for immigrant harassment was part of the school culture.

From my first day at school, it was non-stop violence against recent immigrants. ... Going to school administrators was not helpful. Going to the police was not helpful. Parents were not helpful either. Parents still don’t know how to respond. They are new to this country and do not know the educational system. They don’t speak the language. Often parents tell the kids, ‘Drop out, if you can’t handle it. Drop out, get a job.’ ... Eventually, when immigrant students fought back, it escalated into targeting all Asians, all Mexicans, and all Latino students—no longer just the new immigrant kids.

Apparently, school culture can change. On a visit to Furness last year, things looked a lot better. “The principal and vice-principals take violence seriously. People report everything. When people report, they act. It’s as simple as that. ... In this building, this is not OK. Adults intervene when minor incidents occur. That is enough to stop major incidents. Prevention is the key.” The findings of this study suggest that in-school and after-school arts and cultural programming at Furness could help promote cross-cultural respect and understanding.
Culturally-sensitive Social Service

Conceptualizing social inclusion

Since at least the 1980s, social work and related fields have developed the concept of culturally competent service provision (Lum 2008). Originally focused on work with African Americans, the concept has gained new importance with the increase in the foreign-born population. Although the concept of cultural competency can apply to individuals or organizations, here we focus on the integration of cultural perspectives into an organization’s functioning.

The African Cultural Alliance of North America Inc. (ACANA), based in southwest Philadelphia, has taken the lead in developing the concept of culturally-sensitive social service. ACANA was founded in 1999 with a mission to promote and support the artists and cultures of African and Caribbean immigrant communities in Philadelphia. However, they soon noticed “a cultural disconnect” by mainstream organizations serving African immigrants. “Because of that disconnect, we saw ourselves trying to fill a void that mainstream social service providers could not provide—not for any discriminatory reasons but for lack of cultural competence.”

ACANA retooled to provide social services and community development as well as support for the artists and cultures of immigrants from all African nations in Philadelphia. ACANA uses culture to integrate a Western with an African approach to service delivery. “How we try to bridge our relationship with mainstream culture is that we stand right in between and look both ways.”

A Western model is designed to provide services to the poor and help to the defenseless. An African model must consider the needs of a man with a doctorate or masters’ degree or who works for IBM. Is he poor? No, he’s not, but he is vulnerable—vulnerable to a system that is so vast that he cannot understand, he needs somebody who has mastered the system. He doesn’t know how to unify with his family. So he’s needy, even though he’s a professional.

ACANA attempts to validate both sets of values. Because they receive foundation grants, they have developed intake, data collection, and evaluation systems. At the same time, the office (on Chester Ave near 56th St.) functions as an open house where people come by without an appointment and talk with staff—even the CEO—about urgent business or a confidential concern. “If you sit around the reception room, folks keep coming. ... They feel very much at home here.”
ACANA believes that its culturally-sensitive service model is applicable to any newcomers group, any migrating people who have settled for ten years or less in their new social environment. The challenge is to support the foreign-born who are trying both to assimilate and to maintain cultural distinction. The children will be the real test of the model. “The younger generation tends to quickly absorb—they don’t preserve—while the older generation holds on.” ACANA leadership would like to do a formal evaluation of the effectiveness of culturally-sensitive service on immigrant acculturation.

Building immigrant capabilities

On its community development front, ACANA is working to facilitate cross-cultural sensitivity and bridge the relationship between the African-born immigrants and African-Americans residing in its southwest Philadelphia neighborhood. In order to maintain cultural distinction, they believe, immigrants need to develop sensitivity to the host community and its culture.

So we will be conducting workshops to tell our folks ... [Y] ou can’t build a mosque in a community where people wake up in the morning and have to deal with your screaming at 4 AM at the top of your voice. ...

We will tell the Muslim that we’ve found a place for your mosque. But let’s go where it’s not an ordinary neighborhood. By you putting your mosque here, you send the message that you are coming and you are taking over. You will encounter resistance from those who have lived there for all their lives. ...

We are working on both aspects all of the time. Don’t fight me for working to preserve the way that my parents brought me up. Don’t come from India and think that you can change my neighborhood just because you invested $50,000 in that home. ... At the same time, no vigilante can come to spray paint my house because I have a different dress code.

America is a place with many opportunities and many conflicting social values. “Everyone is pushed to tolerate values they don’t appreciate.”

ACANA’s overarching philosophy toward the community is “leadership, mindset, and vision.” When ACANA began to buy properties on the block, its primarily African American neighbors resisted “those Africans.” But ACANA has opened its programs—including food bank, job referral, and health screening services—to the community. After school and weekend programs are open to neighborhood children.

Who comes to the recording studio? Everybody. On Sundays when you come here, you will see a huge African-American group practicing their dance. You will see Africans on the other side practicing their dance. It’s a unique relationship.
Now if you are visiting ACANA, “no one will bother you. [The neighbors] themselves have created a sense of ownership.” No longer are they “those Africans.”

**Practitioner challenges**

The culturally-sensitive model is challenged by shifting intra-group tensions. The use of an African or Chinese cultural template may serve as a means of engaging older immigrants, but younger members of the group—whether born in the US or abroad—may be less willing to accept or identify with it. By the same token, this approach may be more useful with very recent migrants than for those who have spent a longer time in the United States.

More broadly, the culturally-sensitive model is challenged by the complexity of immigrant communities. A pan-African organization is a good conduit for assimilation into the US nonprofit world of service and philanthropy. However, from the point of view of cultural identity, Africa is a continent with 53 countries and many more peoples. As the Welcoming Center observed, “people are especially tone-deaf about Africa.” Likewise, Latin-American, Asian-American, and Arab-American are pan-cultural identities, adopted by people willing to recreate themselves to simplify integration into U.S. society. Even terms like “Mexican” and “Russian” mask multiple cultural and linguistic identities.

ACANA, even as a pan-African organization, struggles to gain the respect of mainstream immigrant-serving organizations. “Our biggest problem is that mainstream providers keep telling us how this kind of work should be done. This makes collaboration difficult in that collaborators “try to absorb your identity into their model of service delivery.”

An institutionalized source of cultural insensitivity is the US Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS). By using across-the-board definitions for family, for example, the government identifies many African cases as fraudulent. For Africans the word child refers not only to one’s biological children but also to all cousins living in the household. Also, polygamy is practiced throughout Africa. So, when an African man reports that he has 25 children, his émigré wife does not know whether to report that she has four children (which is true) or 25 children (which is not believable). Although “there is no assumption of uniformity of culture,” US government forms do not accommodate socio-cultural differences. ACANA is advocating with USCIS for clarity of these issues, not to alter US immigration law or social service provision law, but to ensure that their constituency is recognized by the system.
Conclusion

A number of cultural providers serve ethnic-identity communities with a citywide or regional focus, reflecting the dispersal of ethnic and immigrant communities. Founders articulate a broad socio-cultural mission and describe integrated social networks—including artists, activists, educators, and other professionals—as the cornerstone of their organization’s start-up and modus operandi. The concept of arts-based social inclusion and the typology of practice described above is the research team’s overlay on an incipient field of practice.

This small study suggests the potential of the arts and culture to build individual and group capabilities among immigrants as well as inclusive capabilities among our “host” communities. One of our interviewees suggested that community arts programs provide “an alternative space for citizenship education.” For all ethnic and national minorities, opportunities for voice, inclusion, civic engagement, and activism are central concerns. In Philadelphia a small but committed group of arts and community practitioners are working to build a set of culturally sensitive programs and designated cultural space where newcomers can learn about “the American way of life”; where U.S.-born Philadelphians can learn about the rest of the world; and where dialogue, debate, and dissention can happen and contribute to a pluralistic civil society.
5. Implications—Building Capacity of the Arts to Advance Immigrant Social Inclusion

With the turn of the 21st century, metropolitan Philadelphia has re-emerged as an immigrant gateway. The new millennium has greeted Philadelphia with the opportunity to stabilize its population, revitalize neighborhoods, and increase cultural diversity. Though we won’t know in full until release of new census data in 2011, it is clear that throughout the 2000s our foreign-born populace has continued to grow, diversify, and disperse. Successful inclusion of these newcomers into the city’s neighborhoods, local institutions, and regional economy is important to the welfare and well-being of all Philadelphians. Surprising, given the scale and complexity of our changing social landscape, local government and philanthropy have not focused policy or planning to this gigantic task.

In this study, we have used a concept of arts-based social inclusion to guide an investigation of existing assets and innovative strategies to engage immigrant communities in Philadelphia. We have found that in fact there is a mode of practice that can be described as arts-based social inclusion, and that culture and the arts are central to immigrant capability. A small group of under-resourced organizations, programs, and projects are engaged in arts and cultural activities with Puerto Rican and foreign-born residents and their families with a commitment to foster their ability to function and thrive in their new home. Given the challenges and opportunities presented by the region’s changing demography, the lack of resources devoted to this task, and the potential direct and spillover benefits of these grassroots groups—we propose that local philanthropy and government take initiative to build the capacity of practitioners of arts-based social inclusion.

This report presents findings of a pilot study to document arts-based social inclusion work in the city of Philadelphia based on in-person interviews with practitioners. The concepts and methods we used to guide the fieldwork may be as important as our—necessarily—preliminary conclusions. The results of an online survey of nonprofit cultural organizations to determine the scope of current programs linking immigrants with the arts, presented in Section 1, provided a context for the qualitative data collection. In Section 5, we discuss an agenda that we believe is supported by the study:

1—outreach within immigrant communities and practitioner dialogue;
2—pilot grant-making and technical assistance program; and
3—evaluation of pilot program to determine whether it is effective in increasing immigrants’ ability to function and thrive in the US.
The proposed evaluation framework is based on the capabilities approach, a model for addressing social disadvantage and opportunities for change. The European Union has begun to use the approach to go “beyond the GDP” to measure individual well-being and social progress as well as economic performance. The capabilities approach could be useful for design of outreach, grant-making and technical assistance as well as for assessment of the value of arts and cultural programs to immigrant communities.

**Outreach within Immigrant Communities and Practitioner Dialogue**

This pilot study proved invaluable to begin to inventory cultural organizations and artists currently working with immigrant communities and the kinds of engagement strategies in use and under consideration. The findings and methodology set the stage for further fieldwork within the city’s cultural sector and immigrant communities. We suggest two steps: one, outreach and reconnaissance within immigrant communities to pursue leads and address gaps identified by this report; and, two, dissemination of research and dialogue among practitioners.

**Outreach and reconnaissance**

This report provides a foundation for further outreach and reconnaissance within Philadelphia’s immigrant communities as well as for dialogue among practitioners (actual and would-be). The study has made the following contributions to this endeavor: a pilot test of a respondent-driven interview methodology (also called snowball sampling), developed as a way to learn about hidden populations that are difficult to access; a profile of Philadelphia’s changing immigrant communities, 2000-08; a descriptive typology of arts-based social inclusion; and an evaluation framework based on the broadly-applicable capabilities approach. Here are suggested avenues for outreach and further reconnaissance:

1. Immigrant communities—Given the geography of contemporary foreign-born communities, we found that respondent-driven sampling leads to an ethnic community-driven study, not a neighborhood-driven study, as originally envisioned. The research team interviewed practitioners working with four communities: Latin-American, Asian-American, Arab-American, and African and Caribbean. Additional communities merit attention, including the fastest growing groups—Haitians, Dominicans, and Albanians; Russians (republics of former U.S.S.R and Jews), largely in the Northeast; and South Asians in West Philadelphia and Upper Darby.

The current study focused on cultural programs and artists working with
each of these communities. The next phase would be to pursue referrals to mutual assistance associations (MAAs) and other CBOs (social service, community development organizations, community media) that connect with the arts.

(2) Mainstream cultural organizations with social inclusion mission—identify cultural practitioners with cross-cultural or social equity mission, starting with the survey respondents willing to talk with researchers (see below). Conduct an inventory of resources, services, facilities of interest or use to immigrants or immigrant-serving programs—as a basis for outreach or collaboration.

(3) Other key institutions with immigrant constituencies—notably, Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians (multi-service agency for regional immigrant communities); School District of Philadelphia (e.g., Immigrant Parent Coordinator and new Director of Multilingual Curriculum and Programs); and Community College of Philadelphia (English as a Second Language, ESL: Community Education).

(4) Related research and methods—Philadelphia Folklore Project (folk arts resources, folk and traditional artists directory), Fleisher Art Memorial (Manager of Research and Community Engagement Strategies); Welcoming Center (Director of Outreach and Program Evaluation).

Dissemination and dialogue
As a context for study, the research team conducted an on-line survey of nonprofit arts and cultural organizations based in the city of Philadelphia. A number of findings from the survey are notable:

- Although cultural organizations are generally aware that there are immigrants residing in Philadelphia, they have little precise knowledge of who they are or where they live.

- Cultural organizations express a general interest in working with immigrants, but this interest does not translate into active efforts to engage these communities. Few organizations present programs specially designed for immigrants or pursue collaborations to connect with these communities.

- Many organizations do not employ immigrants as members of their staff or contract with immigrant artists. Overall, organizations did not demonstrate a deep knowledge of barriers to participation by immigrants.

- Multidisciplinary and visual arts organizations—typically community-based facilities—have a higher rate of involvement with immigrants. The informal cultural sector also appears to be an environment in which immigrants engage in creative work and connect with their community.
• About 20 organizations reported that working with immigrants is part of their core mission. Virtually all of these organizations report immigrant engagement in programs and events as well as special programming and partnerships to broaden involvement.

• Many organizations indicated a willingness to talk with researchers about their work with immigrant communities.

Fieldwork and interview data, in the context of survey findings, set the stage for dissemination of research and dialogue among cultural practitioners. Cultural practitioners and artists currently working with immigrant communities have a reserve of experience and expertise largely absent from the mainstream nonprofit cultural sector. This core group could be a catalyst to stimulate the untapped potential of the cultural sector to engage these newcomer communities for whom culture and the arts are central. We suggest set-up of a data center for the cultural community with links to research and other resources on Philadelphia area immigrant communities. We see two levels of dialogue within the cultural sector:

(1) *For the cultural sector at large*—informational meeting and discussion of relevant research; and inclusion of the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians in information dissemination and dialogue.

(2) *For mission-driven groups working with immigrant communities*—convening of cultural practitioners engaged in arts-based social inclusion; and a cross-sector convening of practitioners within the cultural sector and other community-based, immigrant-serving organizations.

This core group—mission-driven programs working with immigrant communities—would be the focus of the pilot grant-making and technical assistance program proposed below. These organizations have the experience and community connections that make them a potential resource for the cultural sector at large. However, given their serious staff and budget limitations, an investment in capacity building—with a reconsideration of its conventional definition—would be necessary to enable this core group to expand use of the arts to engage immigrant communities.
Grant-making and Technical Assistance

Cross-sector disconnect—loss of holistic models

Foreign- and U.S.-born ethnic and national identity groups—regardless of longevity in Philadelphia, socio-economic status, or life-cycle stage—all value social opportunities to engage, showcase, and celebrate their heritage, culture, and the arts. Reflecting the centrality of culture to their communities, founders of immigrant-serving organizations typically launch with a socio-political-cultural mission that is integrated with basic educational, economic, and social services accessible at a neighborhood-based community center. Historically the neighborhood settlement house and, in recent decades, the ethnic-specific mutual assistance association follow the model of a multi-service community and cultural center.

In the 1980s, cultural programs serving immigrants were run mostly by mutual assistance associations (MAAs), which were eligible to receive funding through the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts via folk and traditional arts programs. With PCA reorganization in the mid-1990s, report our interviewees, many MAAs were “frozen out” of the process. While a few organizations continue to benefit from a program for “preserving diverse cultures,” a majority of folk, traditional, and ethnic arts groups no longer receive PCA funding.

In addition to trends in arts grant-making, the dominant business models in philanthropy and the nonprofit sector have shaped the organizational structure of immigrant-serving organizations. Thus the pattern over time has been for professionalization and specialization of services, often with cultural services curtailed or splintered into a separate organization. Within the cultural sector, foundation support and technical assistance tend to focus on organizational development—that is, strategic planning, professional staff and board, and office space—rather than community engagement. Even for an entry-level grant a new group is typically expected to have in place a full organizational structure.

While there are funding streams to help ethnic-based community organizations present arts programs, MAAs face a constant struggle to respond to the many needs and demands of their constituencies. Agencies forced to choose between social services and the arts, drop the arts. The nonprofit sector does not know what to do with integrated systems—a painter who also does video, let alone a CDC that also does cultural service. “Anyone with a holistic approach has to be immensely creative and stubborn to not lose culture because it’s always being understood as frivolous and really easy to give up. Then people wonder about violence!”
Capacity-building reconsidered

An alternative funding strategy would be a capacity-building program for cultural groups and artists working with immigrants based on a holistic, community-based approach. Rather than conventional capacity building that focuses on organizational development, grant-making and technical assistance would be focused on community capacity-building. That is to say, what is the collective service capacity of this community and how can that be strengthened?

The outreach fieldwork would identify a cohort of practitioners currently engaged in arts-based social inclusion work. The convening of these mission-driven practitioners could then lead to development of a grant-making and technical assistance program to support this work. Generally these groups are operating with low resources and high strain. Isolation and competition, as we have seen with the community arts sector as a whole, are symptoms of the gap between demand for services and resources available to respond.

Program objectives would be: (1) identify, value, and support groups doing this work; (2) connect diverse groups engaged with the same communities in mutually-reinforcing ways; (3) enable this cohort to serve as a resource for the broader community; and (4) prepare and support artists for work in multicultural settings.

Build a cohort. Identify a cohort of practitioners, consult them with respect to capacity-building objectives, and provide flexible support to meet those objectives. What are your priorities over the next three years—expand current programs, collaborate across service community, or collaborate with regional cultural organizations? Where do you want to go? What do you need? What’s it going to get you? What are the benefits and costs of this strategy?

Build collective capacity within the cohort. The goal here is to make each group an effective part of a community network. Horizontal networks are necessary to connect out to cultural and community organizations (including artists and informal arts, schools, and CBOs). These relationships can facilitate peer learning and technical assistance as well as infrastructure, outreach, and resource sharing.

Vertical networks are necessary to connect up to regional and resource institutions (including foundations, public agencies, universities). One approach might be to identify intermediaries—that is, established community cultural organizations with the capacity and willingness to function as a liaison between community-based groups and resource institutions (including foundations). An intermediary could serve as a conduit for re-granting and technical assistance.
A broadened definition of fundability—e.g., grant eligibility, contract eligibility, fiscal conduit, and fiscal agent—would increase flexibility of support.

**Build cohort capacity as regional resource.** Develop modes whereby experienced practitioners can educate and position mainstream groups that want to connect with immigrant communities. Develop systems and support that facilitates resource sharing among community-based, resource organizations, and regional institutions.

**Develop training and employment services to facilitate artists and immigrants working in multi-cultural settings.** Artists are critical agents that connect organizations with communities as well as other resources. Many artists are interested but unprepared to work in multi-cultural settings; foreign-born and first-generation artists are interested in work with arts organizations but are unconnected. With respect to professional development, the Asian Arts Initiative is a leader in the field with its Artists in Communities Training (ACT) Program. As an immigrant resource center with employment and employer services, the Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians is an excellent model.

**From cultural sensitivity to cultural pluralism**

The context for this alternative capacity-building model would be cultural sensitivity—that is, the need for philanthropy and the nonprofit sector to appreciate the intra-group diversity (social class, religion, ethnicity, nationality) and complexity within immigrant communities. In short, we propose a capacity-building program that is community-centered, not organization-centered, and that is working toward a goal of cultural pluralism.
Capabilities Approach as Evaluation Framework

If funders are to invest in efforts to reduce immigrants’ social exclusion through artists and arts organizations, they will need to develop a strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of those investments. In the case of social inclusion work, evaluation presents a particular challenge because the goals of social inclusion are so wide-ranging.

Evaluators use a variety of terms to describe their indicators of success. The Foundation has defined its evaluation framework as having two components:

- **Outputs** are the major products and/or the substantial and completed processes that will be created to reach outcomes. They are the anticipated accomplishments funded through the grant, and they are directly under the grantee's control. The outputs occur “in order to achieve” an intended outcome.

- **Outcomes** are the desired change(s) or results that the proposed project will eventually accomplish. They follow from the outputs and identify the anticipated change that is the goal of the grant.\(^5\)

Outputs will typically be defined by a specific project. Outcomes—the desired changes associated with the project—would focus on the goal of reducing social exclusion. To operationalize this goal, however, social inclusion would need to be defined with greater precision.

The discussion of immigrant “needs” has tended to devalue the importance of processes of culture and identity formation in the successful pursuit of social inclusion. The arts connect individuals with communities. Cultural and creative processes facilitate identity formation, community formation, and cross-community bridging—important concerns for Philadelphia’s foreign-born communities.

Taking a deficit approach to social groups is not unique to immigrants. Through most of our history, we have defined marginal social groups by what they lack and have therefore defined the purpose of policy as filling these deficits. Historically, culture has been perceived to be one of these deficits. From the immigrants of the late 19th century to the African American “underclass” of the 1990s, policy makers have defined their task as replacing a dysfunctional indigenous culture with one that serves mainstream interests.

---

\(^5\) From the William Penn Foundation Grant Center, How to Apply, at: [www.williampennfoundation.org/info-url3887/info-url_show.htm?doc_id=227112](http://www.williampennfoundation.org/info-url3887/info-url_show.htm?doc_id=227112).
Although there is a wide-ranging literature on social exclusion, the research team has been impressed with recent European work on the topic. Although generally ignored by North American policy, this literature provides the basis for viewing social exclusion in its fullest context and providing direction in moving from broad theoretical concepts to specific strategies for charting change over time.

The European discussion of social inclusion has been closely identified with the capabilities approach associated with the work of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. At its core, the capabilities approach defines poverty and exclusion as a lack of freedom to be and do. It focuses on individuals’ and groups’ ability to function as full members of society and the variety of barriers that prevent participation. As such, it moves beyond limited economic definitions of exclusion (for example, those that focus exclusively on work and income) to examine the range of institutional barriers that prevent full engagement.

In a recent report, Eurostat—the European Union’s statistical office—proposed the following definition of social exclusion: “Social exclusion relates to being unable to enjoy levels of participation that most of society takes for granted.” The report goes on to note:

Social exclusion is multi-dimensional in that it encompasses income poverty, unemployment, access to education, information, childcare and health facilities, living conditions, as well as social participation. It is multi-layered insofar as the causes of exclusion can be at the national, community, household or individual level.

A similar approach to the issue was adopted by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress (Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi 2009). It explicitly draws on the capability approach, which it defines in the following way:

[The capability approach] conceives a person’s life as a combination of various

---

6 Among scholars engaged with the capability approach, there has been an intramural dispute over whether one should specify a particular list of capabilities, or leave that specification open (to be defined differently in different social and political contexts). Nussbaum has argued in favor of “the list,” while Sen has resisted. This dispute has also influenced how participants specify the approach. Scholars who side with Sen (no list) tend to call it the capability approach while those who favor the list use the term “capabilities approach.” However, the Stiglitz/Sen/Fitoussi Commission may represent some thawing of this dispute, because it uses the plural form even though Sen is a co-author.
“doings and beings” (functionings) and of his or her freedom to choose among these functionings (capabilities). Some of these capabilities may be quite elementary, such as being adequately nourished and escaping premature mortality, while others may be more complex, such as having the literacy required to participate actively in political life. The foundations of the capability approach, which has strong roots in philosophical notions of social justice, reflect a focus on human ends and on respecting the individual’s ability to pursue and realise the goals that he or she values; a rejection of the economic model of individuals acting to maximise their self-interest heedless of relationships and emotions; an emphasis on the complementarities between various capabilities; and a recognition of human diversity, which draws attention to the role played by ethical principles in the design of the “good” society (Stiglitz, Sen, Fitoussi 2009: 42).

The Stiglitz/Sen/Fitoussi report defines eight types of capabilities that should form the basis of judging well-being.

To define what well-being means, a multidimensional definition has to be used. Based on academic research and a number of concrete initiatives developed around the world, the Commission has identified the following key dimension that should be taken into account. At least in principle, these dimensions should be considered simultaneously:

- Material living standards (income, consumption and wealth);
- Health
- Education
- Personal activities including work
- Political voice and governance
- Social connections and relationships
- Environment (present and future conditions)
- Insecurity, of an economic as well as a physical nature.

The capabilities approach provides a concrete way of understanding processes of social inclusion and exclusion. To the extent that individuals and groups can enjoy these basic capabilities, they enjoy social inclusion and to the extent they cannot, they are excluded.

Our interviewees suggested a number of ways in which the process of social inclusion is advanced through the arts. In the projects investigated, the arts were used in a number of ways to improve the health, education, personal activities, political voice, social connections, and security of immigrants and their families. These provide the immediate locus within which immigrant artistic engagement advances capabilities.

Immigrants face a host of immediate needs as they make a life for themselves in a new social context. Getting a place to live, securing employment, and
raising their children provide a compelling set of challenges. Yet, a focus only on these basic needs marginalizes the role that the arts and culture can play in developing the capabilities of immigrants and their communities.

Our interviewees provided a variety of examples of how art-making and cultural participation among immigrants contribute to building their individual and group capabilities. Many of these could form the basis for hypotheses that could be tested in the evaluation of future grant-making and technical assistance programs. Some of these are obvious and broadly acknowledged, like the arts’ contribution to education and social connections. Others are less obvious, like the arts’ contribution to health, political voice, work, environment, and security.

As the findings summarized in Section 4 make clear, most all the arts programs contribute to building social connections. For many immigrants, social isolation is a serious barrier to social integration. Although immigrants are rarely totally alone in the world, many—because of too many jobs, mistrust, and insecurity—see their routine social interactions restricted to a relatively small family or kinship group. Even the South Philadelphia Mexicans, virtually all from the village and some even related, had not met each other until the El Viaje Project. Isolation can be particularly acute in the case of refugees who often arrive in a new social environment that they did not choose. The work of the Memories in the Making program in ameliorating the social isolation of elderly Latino immigrants or FACTS’s Migrant Education Program socializing Southeast and South Asian refugee children provide examples of the arts’ contribution to building social connections.

Virtually all of the programs studied include education components to enhance participants’ understanding and skills. Language skill-building ranges from conversational English and Arts-Spanish to formal study of Arabic or Chinese. Writing and reading literacy skills is feature of artists’ residencies in poetry, creative writing, and journalism workshops. One interviewee is developing a curriculum in conversational English, business, and social interaction skills as well as pre- and post-tests to track progress. Moreover, at a time when schools often narrow their definition of education to the ability to pass standardized math and reading tests, programs like Norris Square Neighborhood Project’s combination of culture, horticulture, and environmental education make a lasting contribution to these communities. Developing methods to test these contributions to capabilities over time should be an element of future arts programs for immigrant communities.

An evaluation would be more challenged by less obvious ways that our
interviewees hypothesized important impacts of their work. Over the past decade, several studies have sought to demonstrate the statistical association of health and social contact, while others have explored the relationship between the arts and trauma. Certainly, our interviewees discussed ways in which the arts can improve mental health by expanding social connections and reduce risk of physical abuse through socialization. The arts can also help connect immigrants with health care services—as a palliative, in the case of Memories in the Making bringing families into the Alzheimers’ network; or as a tool to educate providers about health issues (depression, alcoholism, abuse), as with viewing of the El Viaje video by Puentes de Salud, a South Philadelphia clinic.

Central to the work of many interviewees is voice—both explicitly political or not. At the most basic level, the arts are central to the preservation and articulation of ethnic identities, which are often devalued or attacked. Al Bustan Seeds of Culture and the Asian Art Initiative run video workshops to enable immigrant teens to articulate for a community audience their struggles for social citizenship. The El Viaje artists want to use the arts “to give the community a voice and a space to tell their stories”—to enable parents to articulate the travails and emotions of the trauma of migration for themselves and their children as well as a wider community.

It is easy to forget that art is work. As a potential source of income and employment, the arts can provide immigrants with opportunities to participate in the economy. Among interviewees—though not among arts organizations as a whole—groups look to employ, contract, or book immigrant as teaching artists, resident artists, or performers. Taller Puertorriqueno’s Youth Arts Program is a portfolio-building program for teens interested in the graphic arts. Ollin Yoliztli Calmecac apprentices Aztec dance troupes, some of which operate as free-lance performers. The parent group organized by Nationalities Service Center at Fleisher Art Memorial evolved as a way for the women in the group to sell their needlework in local shops, a strategy that might work for other immigrant women who lack skills for entering the labor force.

What some now call “creative place-making” provides a basis for hypothesizing about how investments in arts-based social inclusion might improve the environmental capabilities of neighborhood residents. In recent years, the use of the arts and culture to animate and revitalize neighborhoods has gained increased attention as a redevelopment strategy. Although much of this work has focused on trendy, emerging neighborhoods, similar processes can be observed in less-trendy immigrant quarters. We see the work of Norris Square Neighborhood Project in revitalizing a park and series of vacant lots in
South Kensington; the development of Latino commercial corridor, El Bloque de Oro, along 5th Street north of Lehigh, and the more recent land reclamation work underway by Semilla Arts Initiative along the residential streets of the barrio.

Associated with this environmental capability is the necessity of personal security for oneself, one’s family members, and one’s friends. Many of the immigrant practitioners with whom we spoke reported living in insecure, often hostile environments and recounted personal experiences ranging from physical attacks that resulted in emergency room trips to the targeting of foreign-born taxi drivers by a parking authority/ICE “sting” operation in 2010. A number of interviewees described their programs both as a literal safe space and as an enhanced sense of personal and group security. Indeed, for many “newly arrived peoples” to Philadelphia, personal security is a precondition for building all other capabilities. Certainly tracking these perceptions over time would be a fundamental element of an evaluation framework.

As we have noted, Philadelphia’s policy and planning community, itself, is suffering from a type of “cultural lag.” Its image of the city’s population has not caught up with the immigrant wave of the past decade. Until it does, our response to the needs of immigrants and the social conflicts that frequently occur between new and old Philadelphians will continue to be partial, splintered, and ineffective. As the incident at South Philadelphia High shows, the city’s leaders have typically been reactive. If that remains our stance, it may carry consequences not only for immigrants but as well for the civic and economic health of the entire region.
Appendix. Participants in the Study

Africa Cultural Alliance of North America (ACANA)
Voffee Jabateh, Chief Executive Officer
5530 Chester Ave, Philadelphia, PA 19143

Al-Bustan Seeds of Culture
Hazami Sayed, Founder, Executive Director
526 South 46th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19143
Resource organization dedicated to educating youth in Arabic language, arts, and culture; promotes cross-cultural awareness and exchange among residents of Arab and non-Arab heritage. Citywide, regional. Founded 2002.

Alzheimer’s Association of Delaware Valley
Raul Mux, Multi-Cultural Outreach Director, Memories in the Making
399 Market St, Suite 102, Philadelphia, PA 19106
Downtown center providing regional services and programs for people with dementia and their families; supports education, advocacy and research. Multicultural Program started in 1998 for outreach to African-American, Latino and Asian communities.

Arts and Spirituality Center
Rev. Susan Teegen-Case, Founder, Executive Director
Dr. Cathleen Cohen, Creative Director, poet and visual artist
3723 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104

Asian Arts Initiative
Gayle Isa, Founder, Executive Director
Toni Dang, Program Associate
1219 Vine Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107

Casa de Venezuela (Delaware Valley)
Emilio Buitrago, President
P.O. Box 42877, Philadelphia, PA 19101
Casa Monarca  
Dalia O’Gorman, Co-Director  
1148 South 17th St, Philadelphia, PA 19146  
Community center providing cultural and arts programming and social services for Mexican immigrants. South Philadelphia. Founded 2009.

Drueuding Center/Project Rainbow  
Sarai Perkowski, Volunteer Services & Administrative Coordinator, teaching artist  
413 W Master St, Philadelphia, PA 19122  
Drueuding offers comprehensive services for homeless women and children. Perkowski’s participation in study was as free-lance teaching artist in Latino community, including Memories in the Making program of the Alzheimer’s Assn.

El Viaje: The Journey  
Nora Hiriart Litz, Midwives Collective, visual artist  
Michelle Angela Ortiz, mixed-media artist, muralist, community arts educator  
Midwives Collective & Gallery, 1241 Carpenter St, Philadelphia, PA 19147  

FACTS Migrant Education Summer Program  
Meghna Chandra, volunteer  
Folk Arts - Cultural Treasures Charter School (FACTS)  
1023 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123  
c/o Migrant Education Philadelphia (MEP), 2029 S. 8th St., Philadelphia, PA 19148  

Kulu Mele African Dance and Drum Ensemble  
Angela Watson, dancer. Camara Arts: Keepers of Tradition, founder.  
6417 N 13th St, Philadelphia PA 19126  
Kulu Mele preserves, presents, and builds upon the dance and music of African and the African Diaspora. Regional. Founded 1969.  
Camara Arts, an emerging organization, is dedicated to preserving the healing arts and cultural traditions of West Africa.
Nationalities Services Center
Jennifer Ralston, VISTA housing specialist
1216 Arch St, 4th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107
Downtown immigrant service center and refugee resettlement agency.
Regional. Founded 1921.

Ollin Yoliztli Calmecac
Francisco Javier Hernandez Carbajal aka Brujo de la Mancha,
visual and performing artist, art teacher, multicultural consultant
Roberto Franco Totokani, master of Mexicayotl culture, visiting artist
1521 N. Hancock St, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Office: 5236 Chester Ave, Philadelphia, PA 19143
Resource organization dedicated to investigating and raising awareness of Mexicayotl culture of pre-Columbian Mexico; preserve and present ancient Aztec music and dance. Citywide, regional. Founded 2003.

Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation (PCDC)
Xu Lin, Community Organizer
301-305 North 9th St, Philadelphia, PA 19107
Multiservice community center engaged in community advocacy, neighborhood planning, and housing development for Chinatown and regional Chinese community.

Philadelphia Folklore Project
Debora Kodish, Founder/Director
735 South 50th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19143
Community-based arts center that documents, supports, and presents the folk arts and culture of Philadelphia neighborhoods. West Philadelphia, regional. Founded 1987.

Raices Culturales Latinoamericanas
Veronica Castillo-Pérez, Executive Director
2757 North 5th Street, 2nd Floor Rear, PO Box 60662, Philadelphia, PA 19133

Samuel S. Fels Fund
Helen Cunningham, Executive Director
1616 Walnut St, Suite 800, Philadelphia, PA 19103
Foundation providing grants and technical assistance to local organizations—including mutual assistance associations and ethnic community-based organizations—in the categories of arts and humanities, community programs, education and health.
Citywide. Founded 1935.
Samuel S. Fleisher Art Memorial
Magda Martinez, Director of Arts Education and Community Engagement, poet
719 Catharine St., Philadelphia, PA 19147
Community-based arts center and visual arts school.
Southeast Philadelphia, regional. Founded as Graphic Sketch Club in 1898.

Semilla Arts Initiative
Betsy Casanas, artist and educator
Pedro Ospina, artist and educator
Semilla Children’s Garden, N 4th St. & Somerset St., Philadelphia, PA 19133
Artists’ initiative using the arts and community collaboration to reclaim and beautify neighborhood spaces as a means of empowering local residents.

Taller Puertorriqueno
Carmen Febo San Miguel, MD, Executive Director
Dora Viacava, Outreach Coordinator
2721 N 5th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19133

Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians
Focus group participants:
Amanda Bergson-Shilcock, Director of Outreach and Program Evaluation
Yana Chernov, Director of Employment Placement
Frances Heron, Lead Vocational ESL Teacher
Sara Hutcheson, Advocate and Case Manager
1617 John F Kennedy Blvd, 13th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19103
Resource and employment center for immigrants new to Pennsylvania.
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