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1. Introduction

Twenty-fifteen marks the sixth year that the Urban Studies program has taught its required urban research methods course with a focus on studying a particular community. Beginning last year, I have organized my section of the course around completing a draft of a community study. In 2014, the class studied Point Breeze, and this year we studied Mantua and Powelton in West Philadelphia.

I see these studies as part of a series of studies of rapid neighborhood change. Of course, every neighborhood is always changing. However, in recent years, a variety of scholarly and policy concerns have centered on the speed with which many neighborhoods in cities like Philadelphia have been transformed. The increasing number of middle- and high-income individuals and households that choose to live in cities (aka gentrification), the expanding number of immigrants and their impact on racial and ethnic composition, and the continuing effects of the recession of 2007-09 have all brought a variety of strains into view.

In Mantua and Powelton, many of these dynamics were present, although in a novel form. Powelton Village became a diverse, middle- or high-income neighborhood several decades ago, while Mantua for most of the recent past has been an archetypal ghetto—overwhelming African American and poor or working class. Elijah Anderson’s book Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community (University of Chicago Press 1990) provided a portrait of the two neighborhoods during the 1980s and was an important starting point for the class’s study of the neighborhoods.

The source of rapid neighborhood change in these neighborhoods was the growth of one of Philadelphia’s leading “industries”—higher education. During the urban renewal era, Penn’s interest in having room to expand and the founding of University City Science Center led to significant displacement in Powelton. Recently, the expansion of Drexel University has posed the greatest challenge to the neighborhoods. The building boom around Drexel’s campus has changed the scale of Powelton’s built environment dramatically and accelerated the conversion of the neighborhood’s large Victorians into apartment houses. Mantua has experienced its own building boom, but instead of high-rise dorms and offices, the boom in Mantua has been in student housing. As one Drexel official noted, Mantua is experiencing “studentification.”

The report is organized around the major units of the course. During the first weeks of the semester, we explore historical sources, including manuscript censuses and newspapers. During the remainder of February and March, the students use census data and the PHMC Community Health Survey to learn to use data to make an argument. After Spring break, the course focused on qualitative methods, and the students designed and administered interviews to a variety of groups within the neighborhood. Students wrote papers at the end of each unit. Then in the final weeks of the semester, groups of students synthesized the papers for each unit. Thus, the
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entire class in a sense shares authorship for the report. I have listed the members of the synthesis group in charge of each topic at the beginning of the chapters.

The organization (or disorganization) of the final report also created a challenge around references. For the most part, I asked the students to cite the first round of papers if they used a particular finding. Including those in this document did not seem to make sense, so the paper has few specific citations. I have included the course syllabus at the end of the report to show the readings that informed the research.
2. Perspectives on Neighborhood History

Introduction

This chapter reports on research conducted via primary historical documents. Its aim is to understand the founding of Mantua, how it grew thereafter, the changes the neighborhood has undergone, and the contemporary issues it faces. While this is a very broad task, the nature of historical documents allows us to paint a portrait of the neighborhood that encompasses its whole history, not just a few years or decades. Our major findings indicate that Mantua was founded as a planned development in 1809. Through the 1800s, Mantua grew steadily, and by the early 1900s it became a dense, working-class urban neighborhood. The area experienced troubles prior to World War II, and in the post-war era many of the original white residents left the city and were replaced predominantly by African Americans. Subsequent decades saw the rise of urban renewal projects, typified by Mantua Hall, a public housing high-rise. Despite efforts to confront its urban ills, Mantua faced many difficulties in the 1970s and 1980s, and it continues to struggle today; not unlike other urban, largely African American neighborhoods with working class histories. The story of Mantua has its ebbs and flows amidst the constant tides of physical and demographic change, and our analysis aims to accurately depict these historical developments.

Data and Methods

The data in this section comes from three primary historical sources: a collection of maps compiled by the Greater Philadelphia GeoHistory Network, US Censuses between 1880 and 1940, and newspaper articles collected online. Our methodology was to synthesize these sources, reported on by students in their papers, and to craft a narrative of the history of Mantua. The historical methodology allows us to reach much farther back into Mantua’s history, even identifying its founder; however, we are limited on conclusions we can draw, especially in regards to contemporary neighborhood change, due to the lack of quantitative evidence.

The Early Years of Mantua Village

Based on the brief history from Simpson’s paper, the early years of Mantua will be divided into three parts: the ferry years, the floating bridge years, and the arrival of permanent bridges. By examining primary historical sources, namely an 1808 map of Philadelphia and a number of 18th and 19th century newspaper articles and advertisements, it can be seen that Mantua was a somewhat planned development
starting in 1809. The neighborhood grew due to an advantageous transportation location and private and public investment in this access.

Mantua got its start with the arrival of ferries to the Schuylkill River shores on the far west side of Philadelphia. At that time, West Philadelphia was called Blockley, and was not a part of the city. In fact, it was a rural suburb of the bustling downtown. By the early 19th century, shown in the 1808 atlas, there were three ferry routes across the river: the Upper, Middle, and Lower Ferries. The Lower was known as Grey's Ferry, still a term used today for the neighborhood and its major street; the Middle is now Market Street, and the Upper is now Spring Garden Street, which is the southern border to Mantua. The Upper Ferry actually began long before this 1808 map, as it was mentioned as far back as 1754 in the Pennsylvania Gazette. Instead of serving Mantua, which was not yet established, the Upper Ferry served the Welsh immigrants of Merion and Haverford. The demand for the ferry came about due to the creation of the Lancaster Turnpike in 1730, which cut a diagonal across Blockley Township and connected Philadelphia and Lancaster PA with a fast, navigable road. Eventually, traffic mounted on the road and encouraged the creation of a floating bridge by the ferry owner, named Ashton, in 1785.

While the floating bridge was still referred to as the Upper Ferry on the 1808 map, possibly due to its propensity to wash away during storms and thus necessitating a ferry again, it certainly allowed for a more efficient river crossing and thus more traffic to cross into Blockley on a daily basis. With this came the formation of Mantua Village, which was previously just rural land. The only development, as seen on the 1808 map, was farms, such as the Powelton Estate and the Peters Bull Farm. The area around Market St., extending to around 50th St., was then known as Hamilton and had been gridded out on the map, but there was no development in the virtual grid at that time.

February 18th, 1809 saw the start of a change to this. On this day, Richard Peters, presumably the owner of Peters Bull Farm seen on the 1808 map, ran an add in Poulson's American Daily Advertiser to market land for sale in “Mantua Village” on the west bank of the Schuylkill. This advertisement heralded Mantua’s location "on the route leading to the Upper Ferry" and a mile from the western abutment of the "Schuylkill permanent," the Market Street Bridge. Based on this evidence, it seems Mantua Village was a planned suburban development by the owner of the nearby farm, Richard Peters. This is largely because “Mantua” or “Mantua Village” was first written in print in an advertisement paper and had not appeared in any other Philadelphia newspaper before this time.

Given the new development in Mantua after 1809, there became a need for a more permanent bridge across the river at the spot of the original Upper Ferry—largely due to the fact that the floating bridge was washed out a few times. The new structure, the Spring Garden Street Bridge, was a landmark achievement for the city of Philadelphia and was completed in 1812. A feat of modern engineering, the chord of its arch was larger than any other in the world. Not only a landmark and crucial to Mantua’s development, the bridge served a great commercial function as it allowed West
Philadelphia farmers to bring their cattle in more efficiently to the butchers on Spring Garden St. in North Philadelphia. With its suburban location and position near the landmark bridge, Mantua Village was advertised in 1820 as the perfect place for a summer home outside of the city. Unfortunately, the great bridge burned in 1838 and was replaced with a wire bridge afterward.

Over the next fifty years, Mantua continued to grow in population. By the time of an 1862 map, Mantua had been fully divided into city blocks. However, the Mantua of 1862 was still being filled in, as it lacked development over a number of these blocks. This would be largely filled in by the time of the 1895 map.

**Mantua Growing Up: Becoming an Urban Neighborhood**

Mantua and the surrounding West Philadelphia area rapidly developed from 1890-1940, and it was during this time that neighborhood boundaries became distinct, both physically and demographically. Sources paint an evolving, yet constant picture of Mantua, an area undergoing considerable physical change with a relatively stable demographic identity.

The neighborhood had just escaped its rural shell by 1890, and land speculation was nearly complete. Mantua was already a residential haven at this point, a bastion of its identity that has not changed to the present day. It was dominated by white, working class families, assertions supported by the 1880 and 1890 censuses. Although the neighborhood was predominantly working class, there was a wide disparity in occupation, with lawyers and professionals among the sea of blue-collar workers in Mantua. European immigrants were prominent, coming predominantly from the British Isles, “usually males marrying into second generation American families”. Few African-Americans lived in pre-Great Migration Mantua; most were boarders and servants, with several families as well.

Comparing Mantua with Powelton Village further illustrates Mantua’s working class nature. Both areas had an “abundance of public schools and churches”; interestingly, Mantua housed cattle breeding as well. However, the clear neighborhood boundary along Spring Garden Street as seen in Bromley’s 1895 Philadelphia Atlas presents a divided urban landscape, with higher-density, row home-dominated Mantua appearing less affluent than its southerly neighbor with larger plots. Mantua’s dense, working class development was buttressed by the railroad, running along the area’s northern and eastern extremes. The assumption that its residents were less well off than other areas is supported by the presence of the House of the Good Shepherd on 35th and Fairmount, which provided social services to unwed mothers. With these observations in mind, it can be assumed that at the dawn of the 20th century Mantua had a clear working class residential identity, supported by its land use and its residents’ characteristics.
Changes in the next several decades were subtle, but had massive implications in future years. By 1910, Mantua’s process of becoming an urban, working class neighborhood had been complete. Areas that were once low density had been fully developed, with strips of row homes constructed upon previously subdivided city blocks. Observations from the 1920 census support this characterization of the neighborhood as well. Although the area remained overwhelmingly white, it seemed those with more professional and higher-earning occupations had left Mantua. Railroad workers, meat cutters, and carpenters lined the 3900 block of Fairmont Avenue, for example, and renters’ presence in the area had increased significantly.

These trends directly led to disinvestment and negative neighborhood perception, which came to fruition in the 1930’s. Despite prior rapid development, Mantua’s location bordering the railroad left it in a position not favorable for residential neighborhoods. A 1934 appraisal map by J.M. Brewer showed redlining in Mantua, which was given a letter grade of D that demonstrated its undesirability. The poor rating for the neighborhood implied its properties were worth very little, and this accelerated disinvestment in the area in future years. Vacancies increased from 1910 to 1942, with empty lots actually replacing buildings on the 3500 blocks of Rockland and Spring Garden, as well as the 3600 block of Haverford. By 1942, many plots had been converted into service stations or garages, contributing to the neighborhood’s undesirable industrial blend.

Postwar Neighborhood Change

During the decades of 1940 to 1970 the Mantua and Powelton neighborhoods experienced interesting developments connected to larger shifts in Philadelphia and America as a whole. The earlier part of the period shows post-World War II boom and migration to the suburbs that then caused vacancies and low-income housing in later years. Changes in household income had a direct effect on the type of buildings, community services, and retail in the area. First we will discuss developments in the racial composition in some small pockets of Mantua and Powelton that are representative of larger racial shifts in Philadelphia, and then we will address the changes in home structure and types of services offered in the area.

The block encompassed by Wallace St., 36th St., Fairmount Ave. and 35th St. was once comprised entirely of white families, according to a news article, and by the late 1960s/early 1970s, was almost, if not entirely, African American. This shift from white to black households was a frequent occurrence over the time period. From the 1940 census, we see that Fairmount Avenue between North 37th and North 38th Streets was all white families born in Pennsylvania, with a few single people or boarders in houses, but no black residents. Just one street over from Fairmount, the block of Melon Street between North 37th St. and North 38th St. was nearly all African Americans with job titles like “helper” and “cook”, differing from jobs like “blacksmith” or “shopkeeper” held by neighboring whites. As the years passed, black families began to live in the
homes previously held by whites on that block. The change in the neighborhood’s racial composition is most likely due to the “white flight” caused by government policies that made it easier for families to move to the suburbs. The policies were really only a benefit to white families of the time, as most of the opportunities were withheld from African Americans.

There are two transformations we have tracked from Mantua’s establishment: the shift from a rural suburb in the 1800s to a true urban neighborhood in the early 1900s, and the demographic change from primarily white to black. The first transformation is evident from maps and census data. By the time of the 1942 WPA map, the area between 35th St., 36th St., Powelton Avenue, and Wallace Street became extremely crowded compared to just a few decades before, with over fifty houses per block and mainly row homes for residences.

The once primarily white middle- and middle-low income Mantua neighborhood had become largely African American by the 1960s. Though census manuscript data is not available beyond 1940, this racial shift is implied by comments made about the undesirable Mantua “ghetto,” as compared to other higher quality Philadelphia public housing projects that served white residents. Specifically, the House of Good Shepherd, which had served predominantly white residents, had been replaced by Mantua Hall public housing project, which housed mostly African American residents. According to a Philadelphia Tribune newspaper article written in 1960, Mantua Hall was a Philadelphia Housing Authority high-rise project intended to “provide modern living” to nearly 500 people. It can be seen on the 1962 City Planning map, occupying a larger plot of land than the House of the Good Shepherd did.

When looking directly at the change in the white population from the censuses, there is a decrease each decade. In 1940, the census tracts included in the Mantua and Powelton area all have between 65% and 75%, and two tracts with 45%. This means that Mantua/Powelton was still had a majority white population in 1940. In 1950, all of the tracts drop below 50% except for 0024F (formally 24F) which remained 58% white; other tracts had white populations in the teens. The 1960 census shows that 4 of the 7 tracts had white populations below 10%, 0024I at 20%, and 0024F at 48%, bringing all tracts below 50%. Finally, the 1970 census shows that the 4 out of 7 that had dropped below 10% in previous census were now all below 5%. Tracts 90 and 91 (formally 0024I and 0024F) saw an increase in white populations, jumping to 34% and 68% respectively. This significant increase in two small areas, compared to the large decreases in others, could possibly be a result of gentrification by students and academics.

Through primary historical documents including census data, maps, and newspapers spanning from the late 19th century until present day, we are able to see distinct changes in the Mantua neighborhood. In the beginning Mantua was a rural suburb outside of Philadelphia that experienced an increased population as a result of immigration and people moving close to the city to find work in booming industrial trades. Over the middle of the 20th century, Mantua shifted from a population of immigrants and white families in freestanding homes to a segregated neighborhood.
living in row homes, and then on to its current status as a lower income neighborhood almost entirely occupied by African Americans.

1970 to Present Day

Mantua Hall’s quality devolved in the decades following its construction in 1960, and by 1984 people who were eligible for residency – senior citizens and the handicapped – did not want to move in.

Despite widespread homelessness and the government’s public housing initiative, the vacancy problem that began in Philadelphia in the 1930s continued into the following decades. By 1982 there were an estimated 50,000 abandoned houses in Philadelphia. With widespread vacancy came the presence of squatters and the debate over squatters’ rights. In the 1970s and 80s it seems that squatters were not only looking for free lodging, but also sought to make a political statement through exercising their “birthright” to housing. Mantua squatters were members of a community they called People for Peace and Justice, and many of them – according to the journalist’s ethnographic details – practiced the hippie lifestyle. The battle over squatting rights escalated in 1978 with the infamous shootout between the African American-led MOVE group (a militant organization that denounced bureaucracy) and city officials. Besides squatting and the MOVE group, other social ills grew in the neighborhood. Crime and violence persisted, including a suspected act of arson in 1987. The destructive fire started from inside a vacant row home and destroyed and damaged several homes. Further deepening these issues was the negligent response from government and community organizations attempting to remedy the situation in Mantua. An example of this was the Mantua Community Planners, who were commissioned to repair vacant properties, construct neighborhood agencies, help residents find social services, and run a job-training program at the time. It was accused in 1987 of embezzlement and poor bookkeeping, and it drained city money without producing positive impacts for the neighborhood.

Another mounting tension of the 1980s was caused by university expansion. The opposition to Drexel and Penn-led development was characterized by a bitter and drawn-out dispute between Powelton residents versus developers who sought to build an upscale restaurant in the neighborhood. On one hand, the increasing Penn and Drexel presence enticed outside investors to the neighborhood. On the other hand, community leaders like Herman Wrice, “a longtime organizer of youth programs”, were advocating on behalf of residential family values.

The primary reason for anti-gentrification sentiment in Powelton was that there is a history of displacement. Many longtime residents believed that the massive displacement that took place in the 1960s undermined the neighborhood’s tight knit civic fabric. From the perspective of displaced residents, Powelton had once had a sense of sociability and camaraderie, with block parties, caroling, gospel groups, and cookouts.
An article published in November 1988 described formerly displaced Powelton residents planning reunions to reconnect and reminisce.

Many lamented the breakdown of moral cohesion in the Mantua neighborhood, but there was, however, positive community work happening in Mantua in the 1980s, including anti-graffiti and anti-drug community groups. Additionally, McAlpin Playground became a drug-free social gathering point of the African American community. Young aspiring neighborhood DJs started hosting dance parties at the playground, where everyone could “listen to the latest musical hits and boogie to the beat.” This became such an important part of the community, that when the city tried to shut it down, they fought to keep the tradition alive, adjusting their hours and noise level. Not only was McAlpin Playground an important social gathering point, but it also likely facilitated the maturation of older black mentors in the community. Anderson explains that Mantua was missing the stabilizing influence of the black middle class. There was a shortage of role models for black youths, although occasionally older black community members – called, “old heads,” – filled this role. The youth that started the dancing tradition at the park likely became “old head” role models in the community as they grew up. One of the founders, Ernest “Ernie Ern” Torrance, for example, was just 14 years old when he started the tradition “to give neighborhood youths something to do during hot summers.” In the eight years that passed since he started the tradition, he became a respected DJ at nightclubs in the area, and seemed to be gaining some wealth and social capital. In the article, he said, “I want to be someone that the kids around here can look up to so that they can see that they can do good things with their life.”

Although there were positive influences in Mantua throughout its history, some of the ingrained issues, such as vacancy and squatting, were not fixed over time. By the late 1990s, it seems the squatting issue in Mantua had persisted. An article written in 1999 demonstrates that squatters were no longer just hippie communal living musicians, but rather homeless families. At the time, the Philadelphia Housing Authority had been evicting 50 to 60 squatter families each year. According to an article published in April 1995, the situation in Mantua was grim overall at the time. The local drug war was tragic, with 17 murders yet that year, and schools – understaffed and overrun with children – were unequipped to help.

With the turn of the century, city officials took action in response to the remaining widespread vacancy problem in Mantua. In 2003, “one-third of all lots and buildings in Mantua (were) vacant, compared with about 10 percent citywide.” According to the article, the cause of vacancy was that the Mantua population aged and eventually died, without anybody to take over their homes. In 2003, Mayor Street’s anti-blight program – called the Neighborhood Transformation Initiative – included the demolition of 111 Mantua properties and the creation of the Philadelphia Green program, which sought to strategically create beautiful green spaces in the neighborhood to increase appeal. Many community members, however, were skeptical that the city would actually follow through on its promise to rebuild bulldozed buildings and revitalize the neighborhood.
In 2010, 7 years after the start of Street’s initiatives, there were 445 vacant properties in Mantua, and of the inhabited homes, 62.6% were renter-occupied. More than half of the homes were family households, but most of them were not married-couple families, but more commonly female headed with no husband present. The demographic shift in Mantua discussed earlier from white to primarily African American has remained to the present day. In 2010 87.3% of Mantua’s population was African American.

The long history of vacancy and demolition in Mantua has continued, with Mantua Hall knocked down in 2011, making space for a new low-rise mixed income apartment complex, called Mantua Square. This area expanded to include Mt. Vernon Manor, previously a Section 8 housing development. Recently it has become apparent that repeated demolition and rebuilding has taken a psychological toll on Mantua’s residents, and they have tried to find ways to cope. In 2014, longtime residents held a “funeral” for the demolishing of a vacant run-down row home, draping it in flowers, singing gospel songs, and presenting eulogies regarding the “colorful life before it was knocked down.” The article states that the row house was “seen as a symbol of urban blight,” but the community’s response appears to say otherwise. Positive community involvement that marks Mantua’s difficult history has not disappeared. Today, McAlpin Playground remains an important community center. Renamed the Miles Mack Playground, after community leader Miles Mack was shot there in 2008, the playground now boasts a recreation center, a ballfield, a sports field and three basketball courts.

Conclusion

The history of Mantua shares a common narrative with many other urban American neighborhoods. It was established with excitement and hope for a prosperous future, and soon after bustled with blue-collar workers and European immigrants. However, hyper-dense development and the departure of professionals led to disinvestment and increasingly negative neighborhood perceptions, accelerating Mantua’s future decline. There then followed a dramatic racial shift from primarily white to black residents. Public housing projects were racially segregated and unequal in quality. As they deteriorated, they were bulldozed. Widespread vacancy became a serious issue from the 1930s to the present day. Violence and crime devastated the neighborhood. A repetitive cycle of demolition and rebuilding left its mark on the built environment and the psyche of its residents.

Yet, in the midst of the many challenges Mantua residents have faced throughout the neighborhood’s history, community leaders of all ages have strived to create a positive, unified atmosphere and retain what they remember of Mantua’s past. Thus, many believe that the increasing university influence and gentrification undermines Mantua’s social/moral cohesion and vibrant community life of its history. It will be interesting to see how this next wave of development and change affects the Mantua neighborhood in the future, for better or for worse.
3. Aggregate Analysis Since 1960

Introduction

This chapter uses aggregate census data to describe the ways that the Mantua and Powelton neighborhoods have changed since 1960. The topics examined in this paper are educational attainment, income and poverty, family and household structure and employment, crime and incarnation, and housing. We will provide and discuss statistics that show trends and differences between both neighborhoods to give a better understanding of how Mantua and Powelton changed in some ways and remained the same in other ways.

Data & Methods

For the aggregate data analysis assignment this semester, each group gathered statistics to substantiate their report using Social Explorer, an online database. With Social Explorer, groups acquired information relevant to their specific report topic from census data from the years 1960, 1980, 2000, and the 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimate. In the case of the report covering poverty and income, the relevant statistical data was not fully available in the 1960 census, thus the report covers census statistics beginning in 1980. In addition, groups used Social Explorer’s mapping program to illustrate their statistical findings across neighborhoods and census tracts. Each group then formulated a report that discussed and analyzed their findings. In this paper, as mentioned in the introduction, we have examined said reports and synthesized their findings, focusing on the key information and analysis, into a cohesive overview of neighborhood change in Powelton and Mantua over time.

Findings

Demographics

The neighborhood of Mantua in northwest Philadelphia has evolved from a home of those African American migrants of the Great Migration to a community of young adults (21%) and a declining black population (from 94% to 83% between 2000 and 2010). Due to its proximity to Drexel University, University City and Fairmount Park, rapid neighborhood change has begun, concerning the existing, primarily African American residents. Due to white flight between 1940 and 1960, the number of white residents of Mantua dropped significantly while the number of black residents grew. However, after 1950, Philadelphia as a whole lost residents to the suburbs, from both black and white neighborhoods. At the end of the twentieth century, Mantua was a largely African American neighborhood that followed this trend, experiencing an unmistakable population loss. This decrease in population should not be attributed solely to white
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flight as it occurred in all types of neighborhoods. It was more likely a combination of intangible causes, such as residents’ preferences for safer, well-maintained neighborhoods.

By 2000, 94% of the 6,900 residents of Mantua were black. However, by 2010 rapid neighborhood change began due to the pressures of the growing universities and student population. Furthermore, the number of black residents has declined while the number of white residents has inclined (seen in chart below). Most notably is the spike in young adults (18-24 years old), as the number nearly doubled from 2000 to 2010 (seen in the graph below).

![Age Demographics](image)

**Education**

Education is an important part of any neighborhood because it can measure success, and make residents more knowledgeable when dealing with health, and allow for attainment of better jobs and higher salaries. Education should always be considered when trying to understand and learn about an urban area. Both neighborhoods had similar educational attainment throughout.

Educational attainment was divided by census years (1960, 1980, 2000, and 2013). For each year, data was compiled on the differences between Mantua and Powelton as well as the city of Philadelphia. In Mantua and Powelton, educational attainment increased with time and more residents started to obtain their high school diplomas and head off to college. Race also played a major role in the changes in Mantua and Powelton, giving these neighborhoods a higher percentage of nonwhites over time, particularly African Americans.

Overall, Powelton consistently has higher achievement than Mantua. Women were slightly more likely to drop out before high school graduation but a larger percentage of women had college degrees in Mantua and Powelton than men. 2000 was the next time education was measured by gender, and the data showed similar findings: women had higher achievement, but Mantua women still had lower rates than Powelton men.
Over the decades, Powelton has seen a greater increase in residents attending college than Mantua. This is most likely due to an influx of students from Drexel University and the accessibility to higher educational institutions near the neighborhood. The comparison of Mantua and Powelton to the rest of Philadelphia, in terms of educational attainment, has remained fairly consistent: Powelton achieved higher than the city average, and Mantua scores lower in most categories. In 1960, 12% of Powelton was enrolled in college and in the 1980 census, less than 10% of Mantua citizens attended college, and nearly 45% of Powelton, compared to Philadelphia’s 20%. In 2000, the census measured that 38% of Mantua and 23.20% of Powelton did not complete high school or some equivalent, compared to Philadelphia’s 28.80%. 2013 showed more of the same, with Mantua having a higher high school dropout rate than the city and Powelton having a lower rate.

**Income & Poverty**

From 1980 to 2013, median household income in both Mantua and Powelton decreased overall. The following values are in 2013 dollars and have been adjusted for inflation. In 1980, average median household income in Mantua was $21,044 and $24,138 in Powelton. In 2000, the average median household incomes in Mantua and Powelton were $21,448 and $21,877, respectively. Lastly, according to the 2013 five-year estimate, average median household income for Mantua was $17,087 and was $16,410 for Powelton. The decrease over the years in median household income in Powelton is potentially due to the influx of Drexel students living in the neighborhood.

Data from the 1980 census reveals that over half of Mantua’s population, 54.4%, lived in poverty. Powelton, by contrast, had 31.1% of its population living below the poverty level.

Additionally, according to the 1980 census, both neighborhoods’ poverty rates were higher than that of Philadelphia County as a whole, where 20.6% of the population was below the poverty level. Census data from the year 2000 shows changes in poverty rates from that of 1980, with poverty increasing in Powelton and Philadelphia County, but decreasing in Mantua relative to 1980. The percentage of Mantua’s population living in poverty decreased by almost ten percent, to 45.1%, whereas Powelton’s impoverished population jumped to 60.0%, which is essentially double its 1980 percentage. It is possible that a portion of this increase in poverty in Powelton is a result of an increase in the number of students living in the area, many of whom end up classified as poor. The 2009-2013 5-Year Estimate shows that the size of Mantua’s impoverished population increased greatly from 2000, to 76.6%, after having decreased between 1980 and 2000. Powelton also experienced another rise in poverty since 2000 and had a poverty rate of 70.7% as of 2013. Overall, from 1980 to 2013, census data consistently shows Mantua and Powelton to be poorer than the rest of Philadelphia.

In 1980, whites in Powelton and Mantua as well as in Philadelphia County tended to be less poor than minority populations, with 31.9% of whites in Powelton and 41% in
Mantua living below the poverty level. Again, it is possible that students in the area contributed to these percentages. An exception at this time was that 26.7% of Powelton’s African American population was in poverty, a lower percentage than its white population. For the most part, substantial increases in poverty occurred between 1980 and 2000. Whites in both Powelton and Mantua, for instance, were poorer in 2000 relative to 1980. This was particularly evident in Mantua, where the percentage of impoverished whites jumped from 41% to 71.8%. According to the 2013 5-Year Estimate, Mantua and Powelton both remain poorer than the rest of Philadelphia County. Whites still tended to be less poor than minority populations, but as of 2013, Powelton whites were wealthier than Mantua whites, while the opposite was the case in 2000. Poverty levels of African Americans increased in both Mantua and Powelton between 2000 and 2013.3

Family and Household Structure

According to the 1960 census information, almost all married couples in Mantua and Powelton lived in their own homes. In addition, over half of married households having children under 18 did as well. By 1980, the influence of students from Drexel University was much more prevalent than it was previously as 56.3% of the Powelton population reside in single person households. In addition, a significant number of single mother households have cropped up in Mantua by this point, numbers which are not mirrored in Powelton. The trends of more Drexel students moving into Powelton continued, as represented by the data from the 2000 census. 75.72% of Powelton households did not have children and the average household size of Powelton is 1.85 versus 2.75 average household size in Mantua. By 2010, the vast majority of Powelton residents lived in non-family households, which starkly contrasts with Mantua where the majority of residents still lived in family households. In Mantua, the percentage of family households that are led by single females is still extremely high and many times higher than the percentage of family households led by single men.

Employment:

On average, the data showed much higher average employment rates in Powelton than in Mantua. Unemployment generally has fluctuated from a low of 12.2% in 2013 to a peak of 20.1% in 2000 of the labor force. Most notable across the censuses were the differences in employment between men and women, whites and nonwhites, and the overall labor force participation rate in Mantua and Powelton. Employment rates in Mantua, for men and women have been significantly lower than for Powelton in every census. Another general trend observed in both Mantua and Powelton is that in 1980, there were significantly more men employed than women and this remained stagnant until 2000 when more and more women joined the workforce, thus causing male employment rates to drop substantially. By 2013, both groups’ numbers decreased due
to the economic recession of 2008, with women in Mantua employment levels dropping more than three times as much as men in Mantua. Fewer African-Americans live in Powelton, only 18% in 2013, yet account for 30% of the neighborhoods unemployed residents.

Overall, for Mantua and Powelton, the overwhelming majority of unemployed residents are African American. The number of jobs has held fairly constant from 1980 to 2013 in Mantua and Powelton yet labor force participation rates in Mantua and Powelton have significantly decreased over the past 30 years.

Crime and Incarceration:

The amount of crime in a neighborhood is an extremely important determinant in the security and happiness of residents. Since 2000, Powelton and Mantua have experienced sizable decreases in crime rate. In 2006, the crime rate in Mantua area was 77.73 per 1000 residents, while in Powelton it was 81.83. Both experienced an extreme decrease in just one year, with rates dropping to 60.9 and 57.5 crimes per 1000 residents respectively in 2007. Although the numbers did increase slightly in 2008, they have generally continued this downward trend in recent years, with the 2014 crime rate at 55.9 per 1000 residents in Mantua and 54.9 per 1000 residents in Powelton. As the chart shows, these statistics follow a similar trend to Philadelphia as a whole, although Powelton and Mantua have slightly more crime than the city-wide averages. Since the decrease in crime generally follows the trends of the rest of the city, it is unlikely that factors specific to Powelton and Mantua caused this change, rather that these neighborhoods were affected by factors that decreased crime nationwide.

Another result of the crime in Mantua and Powelton is incarceration rates, which have a huge effect on the neighborhood’s population. Young African American men are being imprisoned at unprecedented rates across the country, and this trend is noticeable in
Powelton and Mantua through a sizeable population gap that occurs in young African Americans. For example, in 2010, there were 220 African American women aged 25-29 living in Mantua, while there were only 126 African American males in that same age group. Overall, Mantua African American females ages 20-35 most noticeably outnumber their male counterparts. In total, there were 597 more African American females than there were African American males in Mantua in 2010. This stunning population gap is much less prominent in Powelton, especially Census Tract 90, where there were generally less African American females than males. Thus, the incarceration phenomenon seems to have the greatest effect on Mantua, and be less impactful in Powelton, which has a higher-income population.

**Housing**

The housing stock in Powelton and Mantua shows two very distinct neighborhoods whose characteristics have become more disparate over time. In terms of housing, a common theme seems to be that Mantua closely follows the trends of Philadelphia as a whole, while Powelton consistently exceeds them.

In terms of physical structure of the housing stock, in 1960, both neighborhoods can be described as having “older, more deteriorated and more crowded” housing than in Philadelphia as a whole. Until recent large-scale new construction, the neighborhood maintained buildings of older and more run-down quality.

Home values have also consistently shown the most discrepancy between the two neighborhoods. Since 1940, Powelton’s housing stock has been of higher value than Mantua’s, and has experienced unprecedented growth in the last decade. The difference in housing value in the two neighborhoods has become more pronounced over time: by 2013, Powelton’s values are 3-4x higher than Mantua’s. In 2011, the
Reinvestment Fund’s Market Value Analysis of Philadelphia categorized almost all of Mantua as “Distressed” while Powelton was a mixture of mostly “Transitional” and “Steady.” The image below shows this graphically.

In terms of vacancy, Powelton and Mantua have generally followed similar trends, with their rates of vacancy around 12% in 1960, when Philadelphia as a whole was just 5.1%. Both these neighborhoods and the city as a whole experienced an increase of vacancy until the 1980s. However, as the city’s vacancy rate has continued to grow, Powelton and Mantua have experienced a drastic decrease in vacancy between 1980 and 2000, and then an increase between 2000 and 2013, when more than 1 in 4 housing units were vacant in Mantua.

Renters have always made up the bulk of the Mantua and Powelton population. However, Mantua is generally more owner-occupied than Powelton, and has maintained this since 1940, when Mantua was 22% owner-occupied, and Powelton was just 15%. However, even in 1940, Powelton and Mantua had a much lower rate of owner-occupation than the city as a whole (which had a rate of 39%). This trend has continued, and both neighborhoods have become more renter-oriented in recent years with the influx of transient student residents.

In summary, the neighborhoods have shared a similar rate of vacancy and physical building makeup since 1960, and generally follow the same trends in terms of owner-occupation, although Mantua has maintained more owners than Powelton. The most striking housing statistics for these neighborhoods concern housing value: they show that Powelton has consistently maintained more valuable housing stock than Mantua and the city as a whole.

Conclusion

In whole, the aggregated analysis data indicates a common trend of gentrification or rapid neighborhood change of Powelton. The growth of Drexel University and University City especially in the 21st century has led to an influx of students, developers, and businesses. While Powelton and Mantua were very similar in terms of educational attainment, income, poverty, household structure, employment, crime, incarnation and housing, from 1960-80, the two neighborhoods diverge as Powelton has more recently been subjected to rapid neighborhood change. In the last decade, change in the physical environment of Powelton represents the change in residents’ demographics and class. Though Mantua serves as an alternative for pushed out locals of Powelton, as Drexel continues to grow, so will the pressure it exerts on both of these neighborhoods.
4. Community Health

Introduction

The previous chapter on rapid neighborhood change in Powelton and Mantua used census data in order to examine the economic and racial compositions of the neighborhoods as they compare to the rest of the City of Philadelphia. The purpose of this chapter is to examine Mantua and Powelton in a third manner—through community health. “Community health” refers to a wide variety of variables that describe both physical and social health within a neighborhood. In order to analyze community health, we will use quantitative data gathered by the Philadelphia Health Management Corporation’s (PHMC) Community Health Survey database, which includes survey data from 2008-2012. Our data consists of an extract of this database and includes topics such as: community engagement, neighborhood perceptions, barriers to health care, current health status, nutrition, and health insurance. The extract that we used contains twenty-four (24) dependent variables each of which can be categorized into the seven groups previously mentioned. Additionally, the extract contains eighteen (18) independent variables and fifteen (15) neighborhood characteristics that can be used to analyze more detailed patterns regarding community health in the respective geographic areas. By performing statistical analyses using these variables, we can make comparisons between Mantua, Powelton, and the City of Philadelphia as a whole with regard to community health. In a broader sense, our analyses can be used to see if these variables portray the relationship between Powelton, Mantua, and Philadelphia similarly to how Elijah Anderson wrote about them in 1990.

Data and Methods

The first part of our analysis uses descriptive statistics to examine the distribution of values for each of the dependent variables in the City of Philadelphia as a whole. Depending on the type of dependent variables, different measures of central tendency were measured—mean (interval variables), median (ordinal variables), or mode (nominal variable). These frequencies were then compared in Philadelphia, Powelton, and Mantua.

Because the Community Health Survey is a sample survey, meaning it only includes a random sample of residents in each of the geographic areas, we next used inferential statistics to apply the sample measures of central tendency for the full population in Philadelphia, Mantua, and Powelton respectively. In other words, we sought to discover the likelihood that the relationship between measures of central tendency for a
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dependent variable in each geographic areas will actually be found in the entire populations. In order to do this, we used either t-tests or crosstabs to determine if the differences between the two areas were/were not statistically significant.

Third, we analyzed the relationship between our dependent variables and distinct independent variables and neighborhood characteristics. This was done to determine if certain groups carry distinctive profiles with regard to the dependent variable being explored. For each, we measured the strength of the relationship between the variables using either

- Gamma—which suggests that knowing the independent variable would reduce your error in guessing the outcome of the dependent variable;
- Eta-square—which suggests that knowing the independent variable reduces mistakes in guessing the outcome of the dependent variable; or
- Correlation—which measures the proportional reduction of error in knowing the independent variable when guessing the outcome of the dependent variable.

Here, we will discuss these findings as they relate to the City of Philadelphia as a whole. We then measured statistical significance for these relationships.

Limitations

Although the use of the PHMC Community Health Survey was useful in identifying possible trends that could later be used to inform our interview protocols, we were ultimately unable to draw many conclusions from the data due to their being such a small sample size in Mantua and Powelton. For most of our dependent variables, there was a sample size of just over 100 in Mantua and Powelton combined. The small sample size affected our findings in the sense that we were unable to find statistical significance on most topics when comparing the overall status of Mantua and Powelton residents with that of the rest of Philadelphia. This means that, although we were able to compare frequencies for each variable, we were not able to state that it would be likely we would find those same relationships between those same areas in the actual populations. Therefore, for the analysis that follows, we can assume that our relationships are not statistically significant except where otherwise stated.

Findings

Community Engagement
The overall community health of the neighborhood can be assessed using the resident’s engagement within the neighborhood, with each other and with community organizations. These variables were examined using the questions (1) The percent of neighbors who report having worked together with neighbors in past? (Q86 on the PHMC Survey) and (2) Number of organizations which neighborhood members reported being active? (Q82 on the PHMC Survey). These variables were compared in conjunction with resident’s age, reported health and race and were studied by neighborhood, Greater Powelton and Greater Mantua.

In Philadelphia, participation in neighborhood organizations is reportedly low, with neighbor-to-neighbor collaboration more likely. Over half (54.7%) of residents citywide do not participate in any community organizations, which is statistically significant. Those who do are in just a few organizations, with the average being 0.84 groups. Only .1% of residents report participating in 12 or more organizations. However, 68.4% of neighbors reported having worked together.

There is a very clear association throughout the city that as a resident’s health decreases or as their age increases, so does their community participation. People in excellent health participate in 1 group each on average, while the residents of the poorest health participate in ½ a group each, or about 1 group for every 2 people. Table 1 shows the clear relationship between health and the community volunteerism.

This relation is similar to that of age and interaction between neighbors. The youngest residents, aged 18-39, reported “Yes” over three times more than those aged over 75.
People aged 40-49 were half as likely to have been actively involved in their communities, either through neighborly cooperation or civic group participation.

In addition, Philadelphia showed statistically significant correlation between a resident’s race and the number of organizations they participate in. White residents report more participation than black residents, with white residents averaging 0.95, black residents averaging 0.80 organizations; Latinos and Asians were lower, reporting 0.68 and 0.53 on average respectively. When reviewing the statistics of race, we have to be very careful and cognizant about how we interpret the data and what inferences we draw. It is obvious that race does not determine community participation, so we have to try to understand why community participation differs by race. While this impossible based on this data, some hypotheses could be that social capital has be suppressed from building in neighborhoods of certain races, that the number of groups may be smaller but participation in each may be equally or larger (i.e. number of hours spent a week in community activities could be constant), or that community engagement is less organized in some communities (e.g. informal networking could be more prevalent in Latino neighborhoods).

Community and social engagement was higher overall in Powelton than in Mantua. Powelton had a higher percentage of residents who were engaged within their community; the average number of organizations a Powelton resident volunteered in was 1.11 compared to 0.98 in Mantua and only 46.2% of Powelton residents do not participate in any organizations, compared to more than half of Mantua residents (58%). Powelton also reported higher organizational involvement than Philadelphia as a whole. Mantua’s average number of groups was higher than Philadelphia, but the city as a whole reported slightly more people who worked with at least one organization. Mantua residents had less interaction with their neighbors (57%) than both Powelton (81%) and Philadelphia (68%). Overall, the highest numbers of social inactivity, in comparison to both Powelton and Philadelphia, were found in Mantua.

In both neighborhoods, young people were generally more engaged in their neighborhoods, as well as the white residents. Young people aged 18 to 39 were twice as likely as those aged 40 to 49 to have participated in community organizations and have worked with their neighbors; this likelihood mirrors that of Philadelphia as a whole. In Philadelphia, white residents participated in the most number of community organizations. Within the Mantua population, only one resident was white, so no conclusion could be formed in that neighborhood. However, in Powelton, participation trends followed that of Philadelphia, with white residents having higher participation rates than blacks.

Counter to Philadelphia trends, those who reported poor health were actually more involved in the Mantua and Powelton communities. In the city as a whole, trends show that as residents report worse health, their community involvement declines. However, in both Powelton and Mantua, there was actually a high concentration of residents who reported poor health that also reported high levels of community participation. Those of poor health worked with an average of 1.96 and 1.84 organizations in Powelton and
Mantua respectively, a number that steadily decreased to 0.77 and 0.85 for those with excellent health.

There were a few outlying interesting results in Mantua. This neighborhood had a uniquely large number of residents who were engaged in 12 or more organization (1.6%), while no people in Powelton participate in more than 5 groups. In addition, Mantua’s older residents were more likely to be engaged in their community, with those 60-74 years old reporting just as much community engagement as those 18-39 in the community.

Community engagement can be assessed in various ways and can be influenced by a variety of factors. Powelton residents were generally much more involved with organizations in their neighborhood and collaborated with their neighbors at higher rates; however, those featured in these numbers were generally healthier and younger. In Mantua, however, you see that though less of the population were engaged in their community, those who did were highly involved, participating in more than 12 organizations. In addition, it is likely that these are the older residents of the neighborhood, who were engaged counter to their reported health constraints. Therefore, we cannot conclude that engagement in each neighborhood was less or more, but rather that each neighborhood interacted with its neighborhood in different ways, likely influenced by other historical and economic factors as referenced in our analysis of race and community engagement.

**Neighborhood Perceptions**

A second significant factor in overall community health is residents’ perception of their neighborhood. This was assessed using four independent variables, which consisted of responses to the following four statements: “neighbors are willing to help each other” (variable Q85 in the PHMC survey); “I feel I belong in my neighborhood” (Q87); “people in the neighborhood can be trusted” (Q88); and “neighbors have ever worked with each other” (Q86). For the first three questions, respondents gave a ranking of 1 to 5, ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”; for the fourth questions, respondents gave either a yes or no. These variables were compared with the dependent variables of respondent’s age and gender. The variables were analyzed for the combined Mantua and Powelton region and for Philadelphia in general.

Between the two samples, Powelton-Mantua residents had slightly lower neighborhood perceptions than Philadelphia residents in general. They were slightly less likely to feel a sense of belonging in their neighborhood. In the Powelton-Mantua sample, 71.1% of respondents indicated “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” in response to “I feel I belong in my neighborhood.” In the Philadelphia sample, 82% of residents answered this way.

In both the Philadelphia sample and the Powelton-Mantua sample, neighborhood perception is shown to have a positive correlation with age. Elderly people tended to
have more positive perceptions of their neighbors. In Powelton and Mantua, 100% of respondents aged 75+ indicated “Strongly Agree” in response to “neighbors are willing to help each other.” 100% of respondents aged 60-74 and 75+ indicated “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” in response to “I feel I belong in my neighborhood.” In contrast, only 8.3% of respondents aged 18-39 agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. 16.7% of respondents aged 18-39 strongly disagreed with the statement. This pattern is consistent among Philadelphians as a whole, but the correlation between age and neighborhood perception is stronger in Powelton and Mantua than in Philadelphia as a whole. In Philadelphia as a whole, 76.6% of people 18-39 agreed or strongly agreed that they belonged in their neighborhood, which is dramatically higher than the 8.3% of Powelton or Mantua residents who did.

In Philadelphia as a whole, females are slightly more likely to have lower neighborhood perception than males. In the Powelton-Mantua sample, variation in neighborhood perception between males and females is not statistically significant. 47.3% of females felt that neighbors were “always” or “often” willing to help, while 50% of males felt the same way. This compares to counts of 52.4% and 49.2%, respectively, in Philadelphia as a whole. The slight difference is not shown to be statistically significant.

Overall, neighborhood perception was slightly lower in Powelton and Mantua than in Philadelphia. Age seemed to impact neighborhood perception more strongly in the Powelton-Mantua, as younger people seemed to feel less positively about the neighborhood than elsewhere in Philadelphia.

**Health Insurance Status**

In the City of Philadelphia, it appears that the majority of residents (86.1%) do have health insurance. In Mantua and Powelton, these numbers are slightly lower with 84% of people having health insurance in Powelton and just 82.3% of residents having health insurance in Mantua. In Philadelphia, people who are older are more likely to also have health insurance. Although only 77.6% of people between ages 18-39 are insured, those older than 75 are insured at a rate of 99.4%. This percentage increases steadily with two age groups in between. There is also a relation between an individual’s race and whether or not they have health insurance in Philadelphia. White residents are by far the most likely to have health insurance at a rate of 91.6% followed by Blacks (84.9%), Asians (81.9%), and Latinos (73.9%). Another expected trend that appears is that neighborhoods with high percentages of poor residents are also likely to have higher percentages of uninsured residents. While the wealthiest 20% of neighborhoods have just a 7% uninsured rate, the poorest 20% of neighborhoods have a 19.8% uninsured rate—a number almost three times as large. This points to either a lack of social services for low-income Philadelphians or barriers to connecting low-income neighborhoods with existing social services.
Current Health Status

According to the Community Health Database, obesity level was coded as a categorical variable with numbers 1 through 4 coding to underweight, normal weight, overweight, and obese respectively. In Philadelphia, the mean weight is 2.94—meaning that the average Philadelphian is just under the “overweight” category. Residents are significantly more likely to be obese (30.3%) than they are to be underweight (1.8%) which points to the fact that it access to health foods and knowledge surrounding healthy eating habits is perhaps more problematic than food scarcity. Interestingly, while Mantua appears to be quite similar to the City of Philadelphia as a whole (with 1.6% of residents underweight and 32.3% of residents obese), Powelton looks different with a higher percent of residents who are underweight (7.8%), a higher percent of residents who are normal weight (41.2% compared with 32.8% in Philadelphia and 25.8% in Mantua), and a much lower percent of residents who are obese—just 17.6%.

Looking deeper into obesity trends in the city as a whole, it appears that those without a bachelor’s degree are less likely to be obese (23%) whereas those without a bachelor’s degree seem to follow a similar pattern to the city as a whole (34%). Furthermore, residents in the highest income quintile are much less likely to be categorized as obese (21.1%) compared with those in the lowest income quintile (37.9%). Again, this points to the fact that access and knowledge surrounding healthy food is likely more problematic than food scarcity.

Nutrition

Given that an analysis of obesity levels pointed to a possible lack of access to healthy foods in Philadelphia, assessing the quality of groceries in the city might help determine whether healthy foods simply aren’t in the city or whether they are just unaffordable. According to the Community Health Survey database, respondents’ answers surrounding the quality of groceries were coded 1 through 4 corresponding to poor, fair, good, and excellent respectively. In Philadelphia (excluding Mantua and Powelton), the survey found that 33.4% of residents thought groceries in their neighborhood were excellent, 43.7% reported they were good, 17.8% reported them as fair, and just 5.1% found them to be poor.
With regard to quality of groceries, Powelton and Mantua each take on unique identities. In Powelton, residents are most likely to report the groceries as “good” (46.9%) followed by excellent (24.5%), poor (18.4%), and fair (10.2%) indicating groceries are perhaps slightly worse than in the City as a whole. Mantua appears to have the lowest percentage of residents who believe groceries in the neighborhood are excellent (16.7%) but also a much lower percentage of residents who believe their groceries are poor (6.7%) when compared with Mantua.

In the City of Philadelphia, the quality of groceries was considered with both regard to the respondents’ level of educational attainment and also the per-capita income of the respondents’ neighborhoods. Although percentages were not calculated for these variables, frequency tests show us that there does not appear to exist a relationship between level of educational attainment and the individual’s perception of the quality of groceries with each level of educational attainment following the same pattern that is shown on the bar graph above (which represents the responses of all Philadelphians). When looking at the breakdown of the quality of groceries with regard to neighborhood per-capita income level, it appears that neighborhoods with higher per-capita incomes are more likely to have a high quality of groceries. In the top 20% quintile of per-capita income, more respondents answered that their groceries were excellent than good, fair, or poor.

*Barriers to Health Care*
One way of looking at barriers to health care is to assess whether or not people have a regular source of care. In Philadelphia as a whole, 87% of residents responded that they had a regular source of care. In Powelton, this number appeared to be slightly lower with only 80% of respondents reporting a regular source of care. Residents of Mantua reported having a regular source of care at a rate between these two at 83.6%. When comparing whether or not someone has a regular source of healthcare with level of educational attainment in Philadelphia, there appears to be a trend where those with a higher level of educational attainment are slightly more likely to have a regular source of healthcare than those with lower levels. Although there is one exception to this rule (with those having graduated from college having a slightly lower rate than those with just some college), all other levels fit this pattern and range from 84.6% (for those with less than a high school diploma) to 89.5% (for those with graduate level college coursework).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has regular source of care?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q306 Adult respondent's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q306 Adult respondent's education</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3637</td>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q306 Adult respondent's education</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college 13-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q306 Adult respondent's education</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q306 Adult respondent's education</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post college 16+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q306 Adult respondent's education</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9557</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>11077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether or not someone has a regular source of care was also analyzed when considering the per-capita income of the neighborhood he/she lived in for the City of Philadelphia as a whole. Although those living in neighborhoods in the bottom 20% of per-capita income have the lowest percentage of residents with a regular source of care (85.2%), there does not seem to be a relationship overall between the two variables.
with all other per-capita income quintiles having rates between 86.1% and 89.5% in no particular ascending or descending order.

Discussion/Conclusion

In our analysis of the Powelton-Mantua health data, we were most interested in the ways it differed significantly from the data of the rest of Philadelphia. Because of our small sample size, we are unable to draw conclusions regarding many of the relationships that we examined. Among the few conclusions we were able to make, we discovered that there is a stronger negative correlation between educational attainment and obesity levels in Powelton and Mantua than in the rest of the city. That is, Powelton or Mantua residents with lower education levels are more likely to be obese than residents with similar education levels elsewhere in the city. Additionally, we discovered that Powelton and Mantua have a higher concentration than other areas of highly engaged residents with poor health.

To contextualize our study within the history of the region, we compared it to Elijah Anderson’s 1990 study of Powelton and Mantua. Anderson devotes little space to physical health; however, he draws conclusions that can be applied to our study of neighborhood perception and community engagement. He describes an increasing “segmentation” of the Powelton neighborhood:

“As the community life has experienced the coming and going of so many residents, social life has become less stable. … Public spaces have become increasingly complicated and dangerous, or at least they are perceived that way.”

Though the small sample size of our study limit the generalizations we can draw about public life in Powelton and Mantua, we postulate that Anderson’s assessment of increasing segmentation has come to fruition. This is evident in the dramatic divide between neighborhood perception by elderly and young people. While Anderson describes a stable, mentor-like relationship between elders and young men and women in the neighborhood, our analysis shows that elders perceive their neighborhood as far better than young people.

In a point contrary to Anderson’s assessment, young people now tend to be more engaged than older people in the neighborhood. Young white people, in particular, are most engaged in the neighborhood. Because the neighborhood, as Anderson discusses, is historically largely black, we infer that the population of highly engaged residents largely includes residents who have recently moved to the area. This contrasts significantly with Anderson’s description of Powelton’s “old heads,” elderly black men and women who were characterized by engagement and leadership in the neighborhood. This difference may imply a growing isolation of elderly black residents from younger white residents.

---

5 Elijah Anderson, Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 76.
In conclusion, our analysis shows a neighborhood that may not differ dramatically in health from the rest of Philadelphia. A greater sample size within Powelton and Mantua could produce more rigorous data about its relationship to Philadelphia as a whole. By examining our findings in conjunction with Anderson’s discussion of Powelton and Mantua’s past, we are able to identify several potential areas of recent change in the community’s health. A future study of these factors—in particular, the relationship between age and race versus neighborhood perception and community engagement—could provide us with more rigorous data by including on a larger sample size. Additionally, a comparative study of the neighborhood’s health over time could provide valuable data on its changing health.
### Appendix A: Community Health Survey Database Extract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>VARIABLE LABEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to health care</td>
<td>COSTCARE</td>
<td>Q36 Sick but did not seek care due to cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to health care</td>
<td>COSTPRES</td>
<td>Q37 No prescription med due to cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic condition</td>
<td>EVRASTHAd</td>
<td>Q3a Ever had Asthma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic condition</td>
<td>EVRDIABA</td>
<td>Q3d Ever had Diabetes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>PARTICIP</td>
<td>Q82 # of groups currently participate in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>IMPROVEd</td>
<td>Q86 Neighbors ever worked together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>HIGHBPd</td>
<td>Q7 Doctor ever told have high BP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Body Mass Index level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>OBESITY</td>
<td>Obesity level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>EVERSMOOkd</td>
<td>Q48 Smoked at least 100 cigarettes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>healthstat0812</td>
<td>Health status (4 categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>HOSPERA</td>
<td>Q17 # of visits to emergency room in past yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current health status</td>
<td>healthstat0812_dich</td>
<td>Health status (2 categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>GETSSI</td>
<td>Q323b Receive SSI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>GETSSDI</td>
<td>Q323c Receive SSDI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>GETTANF</td>
<td>Q323a Receive TANF?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>FB</td>
<td>Foreign born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RACEA2</td>
<td>Q312 Race categories with Latino separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RENTOWN</td>
<td>Q309 Rent or own home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RESPAGE</td>
<td>S12 Adult respondent’s age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RESPEMPL</td>
<td>Q307 Adult respondent’s employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RESPMAR</td>
<td>Q310 Adult respondent’s marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RESPREL2</td>
<td>Q318 Religious affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>SEX01</td>
<td>S11.3 Adult respondent’s sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>SOURCEA</td>
<td>Q14 Has regular source of care?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>RESPGRAD</td>
<td>Q306 Adult respondent’s education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>NPOV100</td>
<td>Less than 100% poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>NPOV150</td>
<td>Less than 150% poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>NPOV200</td>
<td>Less than 200% poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>AGER1</td>
<td>S12a Adult respondent’s age by category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurance</td>
<td>INSUREDA</td>
<td>Adult respondent’s insurance status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurance</td>
<td>PRIMPLA2</td>
<td>Q28 Type of primary health plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood perception</td>
<td>BELONG</td>
<td>Q87 I feel I belong in my neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood perception</td>
<td>NEIGHBOR</td>
<td>Q85 Neighbors willing to help each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood perception</td>
<td>BELONGd</td>
<td>Q87 I feel I belong in my neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood perception</td>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>Q88 People in neighborhood can be trusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>GETSTAMP</td>
<td>Q323e Receive food stamps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>GETWIC</td>
<td>Q323g Receive WIC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>GROCERY</td>
<td>Q67 Quality of groceries in neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>Totpop12</td>
<td>Total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>pctwhite</td>
<td>Tract: Pct white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>pctblack</td>
<td>Tract: Pct black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>pctasian</td>
<td>Tract: Pct Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>pcthisp</td>
<td>Tract: Pct Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>pctbaplus</td>
<td>Tract: Pct with BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>Pci12</td>
<td>Tract: Per capita income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood value</td>
<td>Pctpoor12</td>
<td>Tract: Percent poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Community Engagement in Powelton and Mantua

Introduction

Community engagement -- participation by neighborhood residents in social, philanthropic, and religious activities -- is not immune from the effects of Drexel’s expansion into Powelton and Mantua. As the university grows from a commuter college to a residential institution, its outsized influence on the demographics of Powelton and Mantua is causing a sea change in the way community members interact with one another and characterize each other. Two different foci of engagement are emerging, differentiated not only by the demographics of its members, but also by the way prior demographic experiences inform their lives. One method of engagement -- what we describe as “engagement among newer residents” in this paper -- is driven by university students who, as one might expect considering their inherently transient lifestyles, participate less in the traditional social fabric of the neighborhood. Instead, these newer residents carve out distinct spaces for themselves in which to interact with their peers. “Older residents” maintain the region’s more traditional demographic profile and engage with longstanding community institutions: libraries, nonprofits, and churches. What remains to be seen, however, is whether or not these two groups can find ways in which to engage with one another.

Methods

Both primary and secondary data were used to study community involvement in Powelton and Mantua. Maps and Images provided a preliminary background of the neighborhood and its development over time. Following this the PHMC Community Health Survey data 2008-12 was analyzed. In order to statistically (tables, charts) and visually (graphs etc.) represent data the statistical analysis software SPSS was used. Specifically SPSS was used to generate frequency tables, histograms, T-tests of statistical significance, Chi tests and Pearson’s Correlation. SPSS was used to analyze the number of community groups that residents had participated in. Furthermore SPSS was used to assess four ‘community perception’ questions: Neighbors are willing to help each other? I feel I belong in my neighborhood? People in the neighborhood can be trusted? Neighbors ever worked with each other? These provided a limited insight into community involvement through the perception of its residents. Moreover independent variables such as age, gender and race were used in each case to examine correlations and local data was also contrasted with Philadelphia data to provide context.

Secondly, visits and interviews were undertaken within the neighborhood to gain a primary understanding of community involvement. Initially, community validation surveys were carried out to see which members of the neighborhood would be willing...
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to conduct interviews. This provided an opportunity to gain a visual awareness of Mantua and Powelton by observing their built environments, public interactions and behaviors. Specifically interviews were conducted with several neighborhood groups: businesses, residents, and religious and non-profit groups. Interview protocols were made in order to channel the discussion toward neighborhood change over time. In part, these protocols posed questions toward community engagement. For example, the church group directly asked pastors whether their congregation had initiatives within the community. This primary data collection was fundamental in strengthening our understanding of community involvement, development and relationships within Mantua and Powelton.

Findings

Validating Community Resources

In the community validation surveys, we visited 113 businesses, churches, and nonprofits in Mantua and Powelton. This map shows each of the locations we visited and whether they appeared to be open or permanently closed.

It is difficult to put each establishment into a concrete category (for example, churches often offer or house services similar to nonprofits), but we calculated the percentage still open for each type of establishment. Churches in Mantua and Powelton are most
likely to be open. 83% of the churches we visited were still in business. In Powelton and the eastern edge of Mantua, churches are mostly large, older, traditional church buildings (Appendix A). In contrast, most of the churches in Mantua are storefront churches or incorporated into an old rowhome (Appendix B). After churches, the nonprofit groups were most likely to still exist. We found that 81% of them were still functioning in the location listed. It is likely that some have moved locations. Businesses were most commonly closed or moved from the neighborhood; 60% of those we visited are no longer open. The businesses we visited ranged from corner stores and restaurants, to salons, to real estate companies. Because businesses comprised the majority of the institutions we visited, the total percentage of open institutions in Mantua and Powelton was 65%. While this number seems high, this data does not account for the institutions that have moved, or the fact that they may have been replaced with another institution. For example, the salon on 40th and Lancaster Avenue was replaced with another salon, and one of the playgrounds was replaced with a library. However, this low number does demonstrate institutional instability in the neighborhood.

**Resident Engagement**

Data from the PMHC Community Health Survey from 2008-2012 drew several interesting findings in the civic involvement of residents in Powelton and Mantua. The survey data that was analyzed asked respondents to answer whether they had worked with their neighbors in the past, and the extent of their involvement, if any, with neighborhood groups, thus measuring community cohesion through neighborly interaction and civic engagement.

While the survey sample was small, residents aged 18 to 39 and residents above 60 years old reported to be the most civically active in both categories, neighborhood regardless. However, there was an overall higher rate of community involvement in Mantua than Powelton. This can be partially attributed to a few active senior residents who were involved with three or more neighborhood groups (Appendix C). However, age regardless, reported cooperation between neighbors in Powelton was greater than that reported by residents in Mantua and in the Philadelphia as a whole (Appendix D).

Through interviews with residents, church leaders, business owners and members of neighborhood organizations, we found that there is a dichotomy in community engagement between more recent and often times younger residents and longstanding often times older residents of Powelton and Mantua. Church leaders and neighborhood organizations noted working more with older residents, while businesses reported engaging frequently with students and young professionals, the latter of which may work near the neighborhood but not necessarily live there. Interviewees often referred to students as newer residents, and older residents regarded their presence as physically and socially disruptive to the neighborhood.
Discussion

Community Engagement Between Newer and Older Residents

Although younger residents rarely engage in the longstanding forms of civic organization, like churches and neighborhood associations, they are engaged in other ways. Students are moving deeper into the neighborhoods of Powelton and Mantua, often converting single-family homes into multi-unit apartments. Longtime residents may see this trend as an erosion of neighborhood cohesion; however, newer residents, particularly students, do find ways to connect with each other within the broader community.

One of the ways that students engage with one another is by frequenting the same local businesses. Interviews with small businesses owners in Mantua, Powelton and along the Lancaster Avenue corridor revealed that students and ‘young professionals’ comprise a significant portion of local clientele. The proliferation of younger clients has led some business owners to adapt their business plans to better cater to new customers. After relocating his barbershop to Lancaster Avenue, the owner of Styles by Marc noted that he was able to raise his price point and offer an all-inclusive package to customers. He said that many of his clients come from Drexel University, where he advertises his business in the student newspaper. The owner of Polish Nail Salon said that the salon’s average customer is a Drexel student. The owner of Reed’s Coffee and Tea House on Lancaster Avenue noted that in addition to students, employees, which he referred to as ‘young professionals’ from nearby Penn Presbyterian Medical Center frequent and sometimes hold meetings in his shop.

Patronizing local businesses may not be the most substantial form of civic engagement, especially within neighborhoods that were once defined by strong collective activism and interpersonal relationships between “old heads” and “young boys”. However, it is worth noting that the new generation of students and young professionals in the neighborhoods find platforms for engaging with each other in the spaces provided by local businesses, particularly those that provide services. It could be argued that this type of engagement within the community could allow for engagement between older residents and younger residents, however, most of the business owners interviewed were not residents of the neighborhood and with the exception of one business, had been in operation for less than five years. However, interviews with local residents found that they often frequent affordable breakfast and take-out restaurants. It’s possible that the latter could allow for some cross-generational interaction, as students and young professionals may also dine at affordable breakfast and take-out restaurants, however, this was not a significant finding in our research.

It is undeniable that students’ engagement within the community differs from that of their longer-term neighbors. However, this is not to say that their routines are entirely devoid of any civic engagement. Our research scope was limited in exploring the extent of this notion, but we can speculate that there may be cohesion between students who are neighbors, and through other university resources that aim to connect students to
the community through service-related projects and volunteering. One resident noted the positive influence of the student population in the neighborhood by saying, “I like to think that the schools may inspire the kids to do something with their lives.” A sentiment that was echoed by a number of other residents interviewed.

Older residents dominate community engagement between long-term Mantua and Powelton residents. Anderson writes, “Black social life in the 1940s and 1950s appears to have been highly cohesive compared with the present situation”. Neighbors met at street fairs, participated in parades, and attended community meetings. The neighborhood residents who grew up in this era of community engagement are now the elderly who constitute the majority of the civically engaged population in Mantua and Powelton. In interviewing residents, we observed this phenomenon; only one (a white male from Powelton) of the five interviewees that are a part of any neighborhood organizations identifies as a young adult. Nonprofit leaders interviewed in our study often mentioned a strong desire to involve the younger population in the community. However, Anderson notes that the well-educated population and even the newly educated population from Mantua are increasingly distant from the rest of the “ghetto residents”. We see also that the separation of generations is apparent within the “ghetto residents” as well.

In the past, as Anderson describes, employment was a form of civic engagement in Mantua; “because of [the black professionals’] presence and the honor accorded them, there was more cohesion among individuals and the various classes of the black community than is generally seen today”. Especially black professionals, but also men doing hard physical labor, “hustlers” working two jobs, and women in the workforce were looked up to in the neighborhood. The older generation still adheres to these markers of success, but broad economic changes are testing the old-young relationships that used to exist. Anderson writes: “An old head was a man of stable means who was strongly connected to family life, to church, and, most important, to passing on his philosophy, developed through his own rewarding experience with work, to young boys he found worthy. He personified the work ethic and equated it with value and high standards of morality; in his eyes a workingman was a good, decent individual”. Older men (and old women in the form of “mamas”) were engaged with their community as leaders based largely on their employment status. Young people were engaged as protégés. Now that employment is disappearing in Mantua and these intergenerational relationships have eroded, “law-abiding people who remain in or near the neighborhood, particularly the elderly, fear crime and personal injury. An atmosphere of distrust, alienation, and crime pervades the community, segmenting its residents”. Several of the residents we interviewed shared this fear. One elderly black man told us: “I've been a victim of home invasion, I've been a victim of the druggies. You name it." "I'm really sick of the drug-ridden neighborhood... It's a damn shame when you got to go your house and you got to ask the druggies to move off of your corner... right outside my house". Having lost the connection to the younger generation through employment, the elderly populations of Mantua and Powelton primarily engage with other elderly people in a somewhat “old-fashioned” way.
Neighborhood churches serve as the primary mode of civic engagement for the older, long-term residents. Walking around the neighborhood on a Sunday morning, one sees While going to church is, in itself, a form of civic engagement, the churches in the neighborhood are only engaging with a segment of the population: the elderly and the poor. Churches in Powelton and Mantua provide community dinners, baby supplies, connections to social services, food and clothes pantries, and summer programming for children. We noted that each church has its own specialty in terms of civic engagement; some churches focus on Narcotics Anonymous meetings, some on food pantries and community dinners, and others on educational initiatives. For example, “[Pastor 2] is involved in Operation Turnaround, which works in local schools to get kids on a path to college and operates on the basis of churches adopting schools and supporting students. Pastor 2 worked with Drexel to get 5 scholarships to be given to students in the program”. Many of these services draw in a younger family base to their traditional forms of civic engagement, but fail to attract the yuppies and students. As Pastor 1 noted, “the Drexel students who are moving into the neighborhood are generally ‘not churched’ people, so they’re displacing existing community members [and threatening] church attendance”. Despite this displacement and disjuncture between communities, the churches hope to be able to attract more young people, students and yuppies of varying races and ethnicities, into their congregations as the neighborhood changes. Whether the younger residents of Mantua and Powelton want to join, however, remains unclear.

Conclusion

Community engagement is a tricky thing to study. Because what is a community if not a group of people interacting together? A neighborhood founded only on geographic proximity (and perhaps demographic similarity) is less a neighborhood and more a meaningless grouping of individuals. Powelton and Mantua are changing, and its residents are engaging differently with one another and the community as a whole. Neighborhood institutions are continuing to operate the way they have for 50+ years, choosing not to adapt to the community’s changing climate. Their continued relevance is uncertain. What is evident, however, is the lack of concrete plans to bridge the communities of newer and older residents. Even the existing organizations that want to broaden their coalitions to include students and young professionals are unsure of the appropriate steps. Mantua and Powelton would benefit from a framework detailing the ways in which older and newer residents could come together. Without such a fusion, the terms “Mantua” and “Powelton” are in danger of becoming empty geographic shells devoid of real meaning.
Appendix

A

B
### Have You Ever Worked With Your Neighbors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q86 Neighbors ever worked together</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rest of Philadelphia</th>
<th>Powelton</th>
<th>Mantua</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7166</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q86 Neighbors ever worked together</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Greater Powelton Mantua</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3304</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q86 Neighbors ever worked together</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Greater Powelton Mantua</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10470</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Q86 Neighbors ever worked together</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Greater Powelton Mantua</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Perceptions of Community Change

Introduction

Mantua and Powelton have seen substantial transformations in their communities throughout the past decade. Drexel University’s expansion into the neighborhood has fueled many of these changes due to its massive construction projects and influx of students. There have also been other forces at work, like shifts in real estate, crime rates, and the labor force. While many residents are worried about these dramatic changes in their neighborhood, there are some, such as local business owners, who have embraced the transformations. Through our interviews with community members, we were able to understand and analyze neighborhood change in Powelton and Mantua. First, we will explain our interview process with data and methods, then we will discuss our findings and common themes, and finish with concluding thoughts.

Data and Methods

Interviews were the primary source of research for this chapter. First, we validated all community organizations by visiting them, speaking with people inside, and taking photographs. From there, we ruled out nonvalid community organizations, and we divided all others into four categories: nonprofits, churches, businesses, and residents. We created four groups of students to interview these specific populations. All four groups used class time to formulate interview questions in advance, centering primarily on the theme of neighborhood change. Despite this similar research focus, all groups used slightly varied methodology and spoke to very different groups of people, outlined below. After finding and conducting interviews, groups filled out cover sheets with basic information about their interviewees, and then noted important themes and quotes in interview summaries. From there, each group analyzed this information and drafted a specific report on their topic. For our final chapter, we condensed these findings and drew on similarities between the different groups to reach a conclusion about neighborhood change in Powelton and Mantua.
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All four groups separated their interview questions into different categories, with some overlap. Every group asked basic questions to collect background information on their interviewees, and the nonprofit and business groups also asked questions about organizational structure. All groups had questions relating to neighborhood change and people’s experiences in Powelton and Mantua. The church and resident groups both asked questions about community involvement as well. However, residents were the only group to focus specifically on university impact in their interview questions, and the nonprofit group was the only one to ask specifically about the Promise Zone designation.

All groups used a mix of the validated resources list, personal contacts, and neighborhood visits to find people to speak with, successfully conducting numerous interviews. The local business group spoke to eight different business owners, including the owners of a nail salon, a deli, a pizza parlor, a laundromat, an exterminator supply company, a consignment boutique, a barbershop, and a coffee shop. The resident interview group conducted 14 interviews in total. Of these, two residents were from Powelton, and both were middle-aged white men. The remaining 12 residents were African-American and from Mantua. The church group spoke to the Pastor at Transfiguration Baptist Church, the Deacon at Church of Faith, the Administrator and Treasurer at Transfiguration Baptist Church, and Reverend Albright at Transfiguration Baptist Church. Lastly, the nonprofit group interviewed Lucy Kerman, Vice Provost for University and Community Partnerships at Drexel University; Terri Shockley, Executive Director of Community Education Center (CEC); James Crowder, Program Officer for Sustainable Communities Initiative at Philadelphia Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC); and Kira Strong, Vice President of Community and Economic Development at the People’s Emergency Center (PEC).

Despite different focuses, all four groups faced similar challenges. Most notable among them was finding interviewees. This was especially difficult for the church group given churches’ limited hours. It was also hard for the nonprofit group, as their work required advanced planning and scheduling meetings, as opposed to just showing up to offices and organizations. In general, residents and local businesses seemed more receptive to being interviewed. For all groups, busy Penn student schedules made finding interview times even harder. However, despite these challenges, we were ultimately able to collect robust interview data to craft this final report.

Findings:

Local Businesses

The local businesses in Mantua and Powelton have noted that they have seen significant change in the neighborhood in the past few years. The most notable theme throughout the interviews with the small businesses was the studentification, a term used by Lucy Kerman, which describes the increasing presence of Drexel University and its students in
the area. Drexel has been increasing its efforts to expand its territory and construct new buildings, which has increased local property values as well as created an influx of students in the area. Drexel’s construction projects, along with its many students, have significantly changed the face of the neighborhood.

A vast majority of the local business owners view the changes that have occurred in the neighborhood in a favorable light. They appreciate the students who have begun to patronize and support their businesses. The Drexel students and young professionals tend to have more disposable income than the residents, which directly benefits the local businesses. One example of a business that caters towards and has benefitted from Drexel’s presence is Pizza, Wings, Steaks. This local establishment primarily serves Drexel students and has partnered with Drexel Athletics and several Drexel clubs to cater events. They do so much business that they are considering opening another location in University City. Another example of a business that has profited from Drexel’s presence in the neighborhood is Polish Nail Salon. This three-year old business characterizes their average customer as a Drexel student. When we asked the manager about her plans to expand, she said, “We have been so successful that we are considering opening up another location and possibly creating a chain of Polish Nail Salons.” Even some of the businesses that have served Mantua and Powelton for over two decades are poised to profit from Drexel’s presence. Tiong’s Laundry is a local laundromat that has been operating in the same location for over 25 years. The Drexel students have had such a positive impact on his business that he is also considering opening a second location. He noted, “Business is booming. We have so many new customers from Drexel that it may pay to open a second location in the neighborhood.”

On the other end of the spectrum, there are people who believe that the increasing property values and the new businesses that cater to the younger, higher earning clientele are pushing out some of the businesses that have served the community for decades. One such businesses that has felt the negative effects of gentrification is Exterminator’s Supply Co., which believes that the neighborhood has become too expensive and difficult to operate in. When we interviewed the owner of Exterminator’s Supply Co., he explained that the students have pushed many of his customers out of the neighborhood. With increasing rents and fewer customers, Exterminator’s Supply Co. may not be able to operate in the neighborhood for much longer.

One positive change that all of the businesses unanimously agreed that had occurred in the neighborhood was the reduction of crime, as noted in Chapter 3. Drexel’s effort to reduce crime in the area has made it easier to run a small business in the neighborhood. In addition, many of the business owners noted that they have seen an increased number of “young professionals” patronizing their businesses. These young professionals are coming from all over Philadelphia, which is another indicator of gentrification in Mantua and Powelton. These young professionals are most likely coming for the businesses that cater to the young Drexel student.

By conducting these interviews, it is evident that the small business owners are conscious of the changes in clientele and in the physical environment surrounding their
establishments, and consider them essential to their daily and long-term operations. Although none of the businesses explicitly stated it, there is proof that Mantua and Powelton are becoming “hip,” as evidenced by the influx of college students and young professionals. Every local business that we interviewed, whether it was a retail, food, or service establishment, noted significant change in the neighborhood. The uniformity in answers is evidence that the changes primarily driven by Drexel are both widespread and consistent. While there are certainly many residents who feel threatened by this change, the vast majority of the small business owners have embraced the neighborhood’s transformation.

Residents

Overall, the resident interview group received primarily negative comments about Mantua from its residents, while Powelton residents rated their neighborhood highly. However, the lack of interview subjects from Powelton (two out of 14) prevents an in-depth analysis of the neighborhood’s residents, or an accurate comparison between Powelton and Mantua residents. Instead, we will focus mainly on Mantua, and the variety of faults that its residents proposed.

Out of the 12 Mantua residents interviewed, all described weaknesses in the neighborhood and only 3 mentioned any strengths. Nine out of 12 Mantua residents mentioned crime in their neighborhood. One former resident said that the neighborhood’s crime rate was the reason he had moved to South Philadelphia, while another said that “I’ve been a victim of home invasion, I’ve been a victim of the druggies. You name it.” Many residents worry about the safety of their children, saying that they have to “travel far to find a safe place” for their children to play. One couple said that there were “lots of guns and drugs” in the neighborhood, and they wanted to move somewhere else in order to “provide a better environment for our kids to grow up in.”

The residents’ concern for their children extended to education as well. 3 residents in Mantua expressed disapproval for the public education system provided in the area. One resident even started to homeschool her kids after having several bad experience with the public elementary schools her children were enrolled in. Two residents even thought that the poor education system was what was leading children to grow up to commit crimes. None of the interviewees with children sent them to school nearby. They either sent them to Catholic schools or schools in Center City.

The vast majority of the residents interviewed said that they would leave Mantua if it were possible for them. 6 residents were planning on leaving, and 2 had already left. 2 seniors said that they wished they could leave, but they couldn’t. One 70-year-old woman said she was still paying off the mortgage on her house, while the old man seemed to feel trapped, asking “Where would I go?”
The largest change that both Powelton and Mantua residents had seen in their neighborhoods over time was the expansion of the nearby universities, Drexel University and the University of Pennsylvania. Every resident interviewed said that the nearby universities affected their neighborhood. One man from Powelton even said that the universities “shaped the neighborhood”. The most common observation by the interviewees was the building or converting of neighborhood buildings into student housing. As student housing was built in the neighborhood, the number of students in the neighborhood increased. Of the 14 interviewees, 2 were anti-University, 6 were pro-University, and 5 had mixed feelings.

Of the two interviewees who were decisively anti-University, both were African American women from Mantua. One was middle-aged and the other was a senior. The senior resident said that “Drexel is the worst” and described students as one of the neighborhood’s current weaknesses. The middle-aged resident said that she felt that African Americans were being pushed out to “white out” the neighborhood. Other interviewees acknowledged that there was “animosity towards students” and said that older residents saw the universities as trying to take over the neighborhood, raising rent. One senior citizen referred directly to gentrification, saying that “they want to move the poor people out to move in the other people who got money.” Two interviewees specifically cited Drexel, saying that “Drexel is taking over”.

However, a large portion of the residents interviewed mentioned the positive effects of the universities on the neighborhood. They argued that student housing made the neighborhood nicer and cleaner. The fact that students lived in the neighborhood resulted in increased numbers of university police, whose presence made the neighborhood safer. Three residents agreed that universities helped the businesses in the areas, and one predicted that more companies and businesses would move into the neighborhood as the number of students increased. Two interviewees even said that they thought the universities set positive moral examples for the neighborhood children, by painting murals and helping to clean up the neighborhood. One couple agreed that “without the schools, it would be even worse around here.”

Overall, the majority of Mantua residents interviewed were not involved with the community. Some said that they didn’t want to be associated with community centers, while other said that there were too few centers. Out of the 12 Mantua residents interviewed, only one community center was mentioned (the Mantua-Haverford Community Center), while the two Powelton residents said that they participated in two different Powelton-related associations (the Powelton Civic Association and the Powelton Village Association). One interviewee said that there was a divide between the older and younger generations in the neighborhood, with deep trust issues involved, and that as a young adult he was rarely invited to the older generation’s social events.

In conclusion, university expansion was the most widely recognized cause for change in the neighborhood over time. Residents were divided on whether or not the increase of student housing and students in the neighborhood was a positive change, but many seemed to be optimistic. Mantua residents expressed deep issues with their
neighborhood, particularly drugs, crime, and lack of a good education system. These, however, were not new issues—one 70-year-old woman said that when she moved into the neighborhood 20 years ago it was just as bad. Neighborhood participation was nearly non-existent in Mantua, while both of the two Powelton residents interviewed were members of neighborhood associations.

_Churches and Religious Organizations_

Since churches serve as gathering places for local residents, they were an important focus of our community involvement and neighborhood change analysis of Powelton and Mantua. Similar to residents’ views on the area, church leaders had mixed opinions on the evolution of their respective neighborhoods. While some have embraced the change that is happening in their communities, others do not approve of it. One of the major trends that religious leaders are seeing is a turnover in the individuals that make up their congregations. For example, religious leaders in Mantua say that their congregations are shrinking in size. In addition, many of their parishioners now live outside of the community and commute in order to attend religious services in Mantua. For those religious leaders whose organizations are located in Powelton, there has been an increase in the number of students who frequent their churches. Religious centers in both locations see this trend in a negative light and attribute to the change in the makeup of their congregations to the increasing presence of Drexel University.

In recent years, Drexel has been expanding into both Powelton and Mantua. This expansion has affected religious centers greatly. From the perspective of religious leaders, the university has displaced a large portion of their parishioners. As stated earlier, a majority of congregants who attend churches in Mantua commute from other neighborhoods. Religious centers attribute this to the fact that Drexel’s increasing presence has driven property values up. This in turn has forced those who worship at these religious organizations to move out of the neighborhood. One religious leader was quoted saying, “we don’t stop anybody from coming in to do good, but we want to make sure that people who are here can stay.” In general, religious centers in Mantua see Drexel’s increased presence as a negative development in their neighborhood.

Religious leaders in Powelton had a much different perspective on Drexel University’s expansion. For example, one pastor commended the university’s new development within the neighborhood. Another Pastor noted that, “Drexel had done work in reaching out to the area and helped develop the community rather than imposing itself.” The fact that this Pastor’s church is located much closer to Drexel’s campus than those in Mantua may be the reason for a more positive interaction with the university. Additionally, one Deacon agreed that Drexel University has made a positive impact on the community. When prompted on university impact he explained that Drexel had provided laptops to his church in order to help interactively teach children through a partnership program. This difference of opinions shows that a well established church
located closer to Drexel’s campus will likely view university expansion in a more positive light.

In addition to displacement, another trend that religious leaders noticed was the increased police presence that came along with Drexel’s expansion. The increase of police has undoubtedly made the neighborhoods of Powelton and Mantua much safer. Religious leaders agree that there has been a reduction in crime as Drexel has expanded into the area. However, while all religious centers seemed to agree that the heightened police presence has made the community safer they do question Drexel’s motive in placing additional officers on the streets. One Pastor believes that they are simply there to protect the Drexel students, not to make the entire community safer. He questions whether Drexel’s security presence on campus was “genuine.” He felt it was “more to protect kids from the community than help it.”

While the communities of Powelton and Mantua are constantly changing, the recent expansion of Drexel University has accelerated this process. Church and other religious leaders agree that the university is the main reason for change and they have mixed views on the school’s intentions. Overall religious leaders in Powelton have been more positively affected by Drexel’s expansion than those in Mantua. One church Administrator summed up the two communities’ views on university expansion quite well, saying that the university is clearly “doing good in the neighborhood,” but that she was still “disappointed in the development not being all-inclusive.”

Nonprofit Organizations

We also interviewed members of nonprofit and community organizations to find common trends in Mantua and Powelton. All interviewees noticed similar trends from their nonprofit work, including demographic and landscape changes, differences sparked by the Promise Zone designation, an influx of young students, and rising real estate prices.

According to all of our nonprofit interviewees, Mantua and Powelton have undergone a number of general changes in recent years. A large number of Caucasian young professionals and students have come into the area, creating a 300% increase in the number of white residents in the past decade, according to Kerman. This is in large part due to Drexel’s expansion from a commuter school to a large, residential campus that is now a “disruptive institution,” as Kerman put it. Interviewees noticed changes in the visual landscape as well. Countless new buildings are being constructed by both Drexel and outside developers, and many old buildings are taking on new uses. Specifically, Strong highlighted the historic Victorian-style homes in Powelton that are being ‘renovated’ and divided into college apartments, as well as changes in Western Mantua near Penn Presbyterian Hospital. However, Kerman stressed that Drexel is concerned about the consequences of their new developments in the neighborhood, stating that,

“Our goal is to work in partnership with a community to provide them with the tools to manage their own future. And to absolutely be able to maintain their homes, get jobs, have a high quality of life. In very simple terms, I think our goal
would be to ensure that their children can live in the neighborhood. Which is really hard to do right now”

However, other organizations have not found this to be the case. While Strong believes that relations with Drexel are improving,

“In the beginning it didn’t start that well, Drexel was pushing through zoning codes in council instead of working with the planning commission. They were asking for unlimited height restrictions so we facilitated the conversation with community members in public meetings to have their voices heard. I package that into some of the ‘controversy’. That’s an area where we really want to make sure the community is heard.”

Therefore, interviewees were on different pages about University-community relations.
In order to explain these changes that have taken place in Powelton and Mantua, many of our interviewees first referenced the recent Promise Zone designation. The Promise Zone Initiative seeks to foster relationships between the federal government and local leaders in order to create jobs, promote education, reduce crime, and increase economic activity in distressed neighborhoods. And, in 2014, Mantua became one of America’s first five Promise Zones. However, interviewees had mixed feelings about this designation, citing that it is representative of already occurring neighborhood change, yet it has contributed to further, more rapid developments as well. One of the most positive changes of the designation was the new unity between community leaders. Interviewees noted that many organizations have started to come together, and, as Kerman put it, “the Promise Zone designation has brought more people to the table that weren’t necessarily willing to be there before.” Community leaders have come together to create comprehensive neighborhood plans like “We are Mantua” and “Make Your Mark,” and they are now more inclined to attend other organizations’ meetings. However, challenges have arisen from the Promise Zone designation as well. Despite a renewed effort to improve the community, many longtime community organizations do not know how to work newcomers to the area, and they often do not have the necessary resources. As Strong explained,

“The challenge with the promise zone, as many know, is that it didn’t come with any resources. Lots of people are positioning themselves saying, ‘When the windfall comes, we want to be there.’ We’re an area that has been resource-starved so people are scrambling, but there aren’t any resources yet. This doesn’t always create the best dynamic setup.”

However, despite this lack of funding, the Promise Zone designation has attracted new grants, such as early childhood education and fresh food grants, and it has also led to
the creation of a community economic development and workforce subcommittee to address workforce development.

Our interviewees also noticed an increase in young people in Powelton and Mantua, which has created some divides in the neighborhood. The expansion of Drexel and the general appeal of living in an affordable neighborhood near Center City have brought countless young residents to the area, many of which are only temporary, and they tend to be more affluent and caucasian. As such, Mantua and Powelton have seen countless changes and challenges due to this influx of young residents. First and foremost, community leaders have been struggling to get this younger demographic more involved in the community. Crowder explained that “[One] tough issue is finding a way to get younger people to get involved in community meetings. We’re still trying to figure out how to do that [since] younger people don’t want to come to meetings dominated by older people.” Second, interviewees also noticed a change in retail. Crowder explained this quite clearly:

“There’s always a point of contention when you have older and new residents living in the same space because they have different shopping and buying needs. I was at a community meeting when there was a group of older people who typically attend these civic meetings, and they were complaining about not being able to go to Lancaster Avenue to buy a needle and thread because new people moving into the neighborhood want coffee shops or nice restaurants. And in terms of what shops are on Lancaster Avenue it's all about what the market analysis says will flourish there.”

According to interviewees, these “nice restaurants” and other new institutions cater to the younger, more affluent crowd and seem to ignore the needs of original, older residents. As such, it is clear that interviewees feel that these changes caused by younger, temporary residents have created a divide between the necessities of the older and younger populations in Mantua and Powelton.

One specific consequence of this increase in young residents, as noted by all of our interviewees, is that real estate prices in Powelton and Mantua are on the rise. This area has become especially popular due to its affordable prices and proximity to University City and Center City. But as young professionals and students and faculty members from Drexel University move in, real estate values rise. Kerman explained this quite clearly: “We are, by definition, the problem. Our students have increasingly moved into the neighborhood. Students are natural gentrifiers because they change the balance of real estate.” As students move in, interested in living on their own or with a few friends, developers see new opportunities for profit. As Strong explained,

“In our location we feel the impact of the student housing development. It’s created a market in certain pockets that’s unattainable for some to purchase single-family homes...Developers are purchasing them at much higher prices and chopping them into smaller apartments. Then the rent is so much higher than
what an average family can pay. Families can no longer rent then move into ownership.”

This increase in real estate prices has also led to higher property taxes. Crowder explained that “something we’ve heard over and over again from residents and other constituents in the neighborhood is that all this new development is raising property taxes and most of these new developments are receiving ten year tax abatements from the city—so why should my taxes go up if this development is not being forced to pay their fair share?” Unfortunately, these higher real estates prices and taxes have driven some lower income residents out of the area, making way for a growth in younger, more affluent residents. While this is a clear trend in our research, it seems that community leaders are striving to change this, with the Mantua Civic Association’s initiative for a tax moratorium on increased property taxes, as well as Drexel’s initiatives to get more students to live in on campus housing.

In sum, nonprofit and community leaders clearly notice common trends in Mantua and Powelton. From racial makeup to age, the community is clearly changing. The Promise Zone designation has only fueled this fire, and new, younger residents have led to changes in community involvement, retail, and real estate. Moving forward, it is important that all community members and organizations continue to work together towards the common goal of equitable development in Mantua and Powelton.

Conclusion

The interviews conducted by this class showed clear trends of neighborhood change in Mantua and Powelton. Each of the four groups interviewed focused primarily on the neighborhood change caused by the expansion of local universities, particularly Drexel University. Interviewees attributed nearly every major shift in the neighborhood, ranging from safety to demographic, to university expansion (an attribution that may or may not be accurate, given the fact that there are many other forces for change at work in Philadelphia).

While residents, nonprofits, and religious organizations were divided on their opinions of the neighborhood’s recent and rapid changes, business owners were universally pleased with university expansion. The students and young professionals who have moved into Mantua and Powelton tend to be more affluent than the older, original residents; and as more and more move in, they gentrify the neighborhood. Businesses cater to the high-income students, rent prices and property values rise, and the neighborhood becomes more desirable. Businesses appreciate the influx of affluent customers.

But residents, and therefore also the nonprofits and churches which serve as their community hubs, feel marginalized by these changes. They are suspicious of Drexel, believing that its agenda ignores the interests of the legacy residents. High rent forces
some of the lower income residents to leave the neighborhood in order to make way for the newcomers. There is a racial element to this shift, as the newcomers are typically white, while the residents, particularly in Mantua, are African American. However, the residents, churches, and nonprofits do appreciate some aspects of the neighborhood changes brought on by universities. They like that the neighborhood is safer, that there are fewer abandoned buildings, and that the neighborhood’s negative stigma seems to be dissipating. Drexel has even formed partnerships with some of the local businesses and churches, and it is increasingly cooperating with local nonprofits.

Therefore, despite interviewees’ almost unanimous opinions, it is probable that the blame for neighborhood change should not fall completely on Drexel’s back. As explained by Lucy Kerman, Drexel is clearly working to ameliorate tensions with the surrounding area. Further, other neighborhoods of Philadelphia, like Fishtown and Point Breeze, have seen similar transformations without the presence of a university. Thus, the interviewees’ reactions to its newest members do not have clear implications, and there are likely other forces at work, besides Drexel, that are changing Mantua and Powelton. But one thing is for sure—the universities are here to stay.
APPENDIX:
URBS200 COURSE SYLLABUS
Urban Studies 200—Urban Research Methods
Spring 2015
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Goal:
Over the past several years, URBS200 has been focused on learning a variety of research methods through the study of a particular neighborhood, typically one undergoing rapid community change. Since 2010, we have examined the West Park district of West Philadelphia, Chinatown North, Fishtown, South of South, and Point Breeze.

Last Spring, we took this approach one step farther. The students in URBS200 completed a coordinated community study of Point Breeze, and wrote together the first volume in the Urban Studies of Rapid Neighborhood Change. This semester, we will complete the second volume with a focus on Mantua in West Philadelphia.

We will continue to focus on a variety of research skills: using online mapping tools, statistical analysis, and a variety of qualitative techniques. However, we will pursue several additional skills that are needed to completing the Urban Studies Senior Seminar (URBS400). First, we'll examine several sources for historical research, including historical maps and documents. Second, we'll focus on a set of skills associated with collaborative research, including reviewing one another's work.

By the end of the semester, students should be able to:

- Formulate questions: be able to begin with a general topic and develop research questions that can be answered through empirical research.
- Identify literature: be familiar with online guides to scholarly literature and have an elementary ability to use the literature to frame original research questions.
- Design project: show the connection between a set of questions and appropriate methods for gathering data to answer those questions
- Collect and use quantitative and qualitative data.
- Present findings in written, oral, and visual form.

Required materials

There are no required texts for the course. We will be making extensive use of SPSS, a statistical package. Students can use SPSS in computer labs on campus or at Van Pelt, but are encouraged to purchase the premium edition (http://cms.business-services.upenn.edu/computerstore/component/sobi2/?sobi2Task=sobi2Details&catid=80&sobi2Id=360) for $105, which will allow you to do your work on your own computer.
Schedule

January 15—Introduction


January 20—Historical documents: newspapers, maps, journals


Have a look at the Sanborn maps at:

Greater Philadelphia GeoHistory Network

January 22—Readings on rapid neighborhood change


January 27—Lab: Finding sources on Mantua, outlining Chapter 2

January 29—Using ecological data


February 3—Lab: Social explorer & Policy Map

Assign demographic profile groups

February 5—Creating a demographic profile of Mantua (class exercise)

February 10—Lab: Work on ACS section of demographic profiles

February 12—Using individual-level data, intro to PHMC survey

black all-cause mortality in Philadelphia. Social science & medicine, 68(10), 1859-1865.


February 17—Lab: SPSS to analyze PHMC survey
“Introduction to SPSS”

February 19 –Sampling and error


February 24 –Lab: t-tests: is Mantua really different?
Goldstein, “What to do when comparing two group means.”
Healey, Statistics, pp. 142-176.

February 26—Correlations and scatterplots

March 3—Lab: Work on community health section of demographic profiles of Mantua, prepare presentations

March 5—Presentations

March 17—Mapping Community Institutions

March 19—Introduction to interviewing,

March 24—Workshop: Designing a questionnaire
March 26—Physical traces


March 31—Observation


April 2—Coding closed- and open-ended questions


April 7—Examining themes in interview data (lab)

April 9 & April 14—Presentation: Community survey

April 16—Group meetings and writing sessions

April 21—Group meetings and writing sessions

April 23—Final presentations

April 28—Final presentations
Assignments

1. January 29—Historical documents: (10 percent).

Use two of the following three historical sources:

*Newspapers.* Find two newspaper articles about Mantua. Explain why you chose the articles and what they tell us about the history of the neighborhood.

*Maps.* Identify two historic maps of the Mantua. Choose one or two areas of 4-6 square blocks and discuss how land use in the area changed between the two maps.

*Manuscript Census.* Use one of the finding aids on the URBS200 guide to find a block in Mantua. Review the pages for the block and determine what you can find out about its residents from the census. Summarize the occupational distribution, race and ethnic background, and household structure of its residents.

Write a 3-4 pp. paper (double-spaced) about what you learned. If possible attach copies of the maps and articles.

2. February 17 Aggregate data analysis (20 percent)

You’ll sign-up to focus on one of the following topics. For that topic, you should use PolicyMap and Social Explorer to provide an overview of how the Point Breeze neighborhood has changed since World War II with particular focus on the past decade. Paper should include tables and maps that illustrate the changes discussed.

1. Race, ethnicity, and age
2. Work and employment
3. Family and household structure
4. Poverty and income
5. Educational attainment
6. Migration
7. Housing
8. Food stamps, disability, health insurance and income support
3. March 17—Individual Data analysis: health and social connection: assigned to one topic (20 percent)

For the next assignment, we will be conducting statistical analysis of the PHMC Community Health Survey for 2008-12. Each student should choose ONE of the following topics:

- Barriers to health care
- Chronic conditions
- Community engagement
- Current health status
- Insurance
- Neighborhood perception
- Nutrition

See the list for the variables included in each topic, as well as the independent variables for #3 below.

Your analysis should include the following elements:

1. Use EXPLORE, DESCRIPTIVES, or FREQUENCIES to examine the distribution of the variable on your topic for the entire city of Philadelphia.

2. Compare the overall status of Mantua residents on the topic with that of the rest of Philadelphia. Use t-tests to see if the differences are statistically significant.

3. Using the entire Philadelphia sample, analyze the relationship of your topic to TVO of independent variables on the file (e.g. age, educational attainment, religious affiliation). Do certain groups on the independent variables have a distinctive profile? Determine if the relationship is statistically significant and measure the strength of association.

4. Then, do a separate analysis just for Mantua residents. Is the relationship similar to that for the entire city?

Papers can be done individually or in groups (maximum 3 people). They should include an introduction, a description of what data and methods you used, your results, and a discussion of what your results tell us about the Mantua community and its relationship to the rest of Philadelphia. (5-7 pages of text, plus appropriate tables and figures).
4. March 26—Validating community resources (5 percent)

During the middle two weeks of March we'll be in the field, using information from ReferenceUSA to map community resources in Mantua and confirming that they actually are present in the neighborhood.

You'll be assigned several sites to investigate (see the spreadsheet below). You should arrange a time to travel to Mantua (I encourage you to travel with one or two classmates.) If you have a bike, travel will be quicker. Do the following steps:

1. Go to each site. (Before you go, map out a route so you can cover your sites efficiently)

2. Determine if the institution on your list is actually there and, if so, if it appears to be active

3. Take a photo of the site if it's still there (phone photo is ok).

4. Write a short (2-3 pp.) paper explaining:
   1. What you did
   2. What you found out
   3. Questions that you had about the sites you visited and their relationship to the rest of the neighborhood.

Include digital copies of your photos.

5. April 16—Interviewing: Community involvement and vision (20 percent)

During first week of April, we'll develop a questionnaire on community involvement and vision. Students will divide into teams of two and each team will complete 8 interviews using the questionnaire. Each team will write a short paper reporting the findings of their interview. Students have the choice of submitting an individual paper (analyzing four interviews) or as a group paper including all interviews the team conducted.

Identifying subjects

Research teams are free to identify subjects for the interview any way they wish. Some alternatives to consider are:

Identifying commercial settings where people often are waiting, e.g. laundromats, barbershops, beauty parlors. Depending on the setting, you may have to ask a proprietor's permission to speak with people (more likely in a barbershop or beauty parlor).
Identify commercial settings with a lot of foot traffic (e.g. convenience store) and try to grab people on their way in or out? See list of commercial sites below.

Membership or civic organizations. Again, contacting an officer or minister ahead of time may allow you to obtain their active help in obtaining subjects.

Public space. If the weather is good, many people may be out in the park (Wharton square) or basketball courts.

Asking people on the street or front porches.

Conducting the interview

Make sure subjects understand that this is a student project and that they are free not to participate (see intro)

Give each interview a unique ID consisting of your last name and a number, e.g. Stern1, Stern2.

Generally speaking, have one person asking question and the other recording answers. Both members of team can ask follow-ups, but it's best to have a single person conducting interview.

When you're done with interviews, take a few minutes to record your impressions of the interview. Was the interviewee guarded or expressive? Were there some questions they seemed more or less willing to answer?

At the end of the day, write down more extensive impressions of the interview.

Were you able to use either observation or physical traces to provide greater detail about your subject?

Listen to the audio recording (if available) and write down any additional comments that you may have missed. Finally, fill in the cover sheet for each interview

Analyzing your interviews

• Make a grid in which you summarize the answer to each question by each respondent.

• Identify common themes that more than one respondent mentioned and unique themes that only one person mentioned. Did the central themes in your interviews reflect those identified by other members of the class?

• Was there any association between these themes and the characteristics of the respondent (race, gender, length of residence, household status)?

• Was there any association between how respondents answered one question and how they answered another? For example, did people who said they thought the neighborhood was going to get worse point to particular recent changes?

• Did data from observation or physical traces give you a fuller understanding of your topics?
Your final paper should be 6-12 pages in length

Your final paper should include:

- **Introduction**: What are the major claims based on the interviews? How is the paper organized?
- **Data and methods**: Review how you conducted and analyzed the interviews. How would you characterize the representativeness of your interviews (Keep in mind, that it's ok if they only represent one or two types of residents)? What problems did you have recording or otherwise capturing the responses? How long did interviews take? Did you incorporate observation or physical traces into your analysis.
- **Findings**: Major themes with examples from your notes. Suggestions about possible connections between who respondents were and types of answers they gave. Include any findings from observation of behavior or physical traces?
- **Discussion/Conclusion**: How has your analysis changed your understanding of neighborhood change in Mantua and in Philadelphia generally. Did the findings connect to other research we've done during the semester (history, newspapers, census, health survey, institution validation)?

**Appendices**

Include the following to your paper (not included in page limit):

- All of the cover sheets for your interviews
- 1-2 filled-in interview questionnaires
- An example of the documents you used to identify themes in your interviews

**6. May 5—Draft of final report (10 percent)**
**7. May 12—Final report: (15 percent)**

During late April and early May, we’ll be working on the final report. Students will be divided into groups to work on individual chapters. The number of students will reflect the amount of work involved in each chapter (and may be adjusted later in the semester).
Groups will turn in drafts of their chapter on May 5. Professor Stern will return them by May 8, and the final copy of the chapter is due May 12.