The Landscape of Immigrant Resources in Urban & Suburban Philadelphia

Alejandro Rivas, Princeton University

Andrea Panchok-Berry, University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

As immigrant settlement in suburbs outpaces urban settlement, this research asks if urban areas still provide more access to immigrant resources than suburban areas. Further, as immigrant organizations provide a variety of resources, ranging from subsistence and mobility resources to cultural maintenance, integration, and transnational resources, this paper examines the distribution of resource types to determine whether there is an urban advantage for each resource type. Last, as the patterns of immigrant settlement often vary by nation of origin, this paper seeks to determine whether some immigrant groups have greater access to resources in general, or to specific resource types in particular. By analyzing American Community Survey 2005-2009 five-year estimates and a self-collected dataset of immigrant organizations in the greater Philadelphia region, we examine the distribution of immigrant organizations across the cities of Philadelphia, PA, Camden, NJ, and Wilmington, DE as well as their surrounding suburbs. Results show that urban areas do provide greater access to organizational resources for immigrants—approximately an additional 1.14 more organizations per census tract when compared to non-urban tracts. This urban advantage increases a great deal for subsistence, mobility, and integration resources, to 1.83, 1.62, and 1.18 more organizations per tract, respectively, while the urban advantage for cultural maintenance resources is less than the average at only 0.8 more organizations in urban areas than non-urban one. This research also reveals varied access to different types of resources by immigrant national groups.

Introduction

As immigrants now settle in suburbs at higher rates than cities (Singer 2004, 2008), suburbs are providing needed resources to immigrants that have previously been provided most often by cities (Cadge et al. 2010). This paper examines the landscape of immigrant organizations to determine whether or not there is an urban advantage in terms of access to such resources. Further, this work attempts to understand what neighborhood characteristics may be associated with an urban advantage to access immigrant organizations.

As immigrant organizations provide an array of resources, this research also aims to understand variation in the distribution of resource types across urban and nonurban areas. This paper therefore identifies five types of resources that immigrants commonly seek out—including subsistence, mobility, cultural maintenance, integration, and transnational resources—and asks if there is an urban advantage in terms of access to each type of resource.

Last, this research aims to understand whether immigrants from different countries of origin have different levels of access to organizations generally and specific resource types in particular. As research has shown significant differences in settlement patterns of immigrants by country of origin, this work aims to understand whether the spatial settlement patterns of immigrants result in some groups having greater access to organizational resources than others.

Literature Review

Overview of Immigrant Organizations

Immigrant organizations provide five basic resources, including (1) subsistence resources such as housing and food (Hung 2007; Truelove 2000; Leon et al 2009), (2) mobility resources such as job training and education (Patraporn et al. 2010; Leon et al 2009), (3) opportunities for cultural maintenance such as religion or food (Cheki 2006; Hung 2007; Cordero-Guzman 2005; Min 1992), resources to help integrate into American society, such as ESL or naturalization classes (Jones-Correa 1998; Cheki 2006; Hung 2007; Cordero-Guzman 2005; Leon et al. 2009), and transnationalism resources such as travel agents and mutual aid societies (Goldring 2001; Portes et al. 2007; Cordero-Guzman 2005). Some organizations may provide only one type of resource, while others may provide multiple resources (Min 1992).

Immigrant organizations provide important resources for immigrants. While many types of organizations provide services that would be helpful to immigrants, organizations that don't specifically focus on immigrants tend not to consider the cultural, religious, and language needs specific to immigrants (Leon et al. 2009). Further, immigrants' often tenuous legal status can complicate their ability to access resources from non-immigrant organizations (Truelove 2000).

The functions organizations play often rely on close physical proximity of the organization and immigrant communities (Medeiros 1991; Singer 2004). Access to immigrant organizations—and the physical spaces they provide to meet—is therefore essential (Cordero-Guzman 2005; Leon et al. 2009; Singer 2004; Small 2010). Though urban research often takes physical proximity for granted, such proximity does not always exist in the suburbs (Waldinger et. al. 1990). Further, in the absence of comprehensive public transit, such as is often the case in suburbs, physical proximity may be that much more important (Tomer et al 2011). Studies find that immigrants heavily rely on public transit immediately after arrival in the U.S.

(McGuckin and Srinivasan 2003; Casas et al. 2004; Handy et al. 2009; Blumenberg 2008). Direct migration to the suburbs may pose a particular transportation challenge to these immigrants, making immediate proximity to resources that much more important.

Factors Influencing Urban and Suburban Location of Immigrant Organizations

More literature has come to examine the factors that might influence the establishment of immigrant organizations in the city relative to the suburbs. Some literature suggests an increase in the number of organizations in the suburbs, especially ethnic businesses (Light and Bonacich 1988; Zarrugh 2007; Grey 2006; Fong et al. 2005; Li 2009). But other evidence suggests that cities still retain higher densities of organizations even as more immigrants live outside central cities (Truelove 2000; Leon et al 2009). This leads us to our first hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1*: Census tracts in urban areas will have a higher likelihood of having an immigrant organization within one mile of their boundaries than those in suburban areas.*

Factors Suggesting an Urban Advantage

Ecology, Zones of transition, Ethnic Enclaves

The traditional Chicago School human ecology and zones of transition model put forward by Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925) suggests that immigrants migrate first in central cities where they can find co-ethnic networks that provide access to jobs and housing. These destinations, or "zones of transition" were thought to be undesirable neighborhoods, characterized by social disorganization and poverty. As immigrants assimilated, learning English and increasing their social and economic capital, they were thought to leave these enclaves and

"assimilate spatially" into non-immigrant areas, including the suburbs. The human ecology theory suggests that while immigrants lived in enclaves, they established businesses and organizations to serve their community, a process that Fong et al. (2005) and others suggest hinges on dense populations of co-ethnic residents (Light, 1972; Wilson and Portes 1980; Waldinger et al. 1990; Evans 1989). This research points to reasons for an urban advantage in access to immigrant organizations.

The temporal lags model complicates this above literature by suggesting that, because organizations want to reach as many potential clients as efficiently as possible, they opt for densely populated urban locations over more sparsely-populated suburban ones. Once organizations are located in an area, there may be a "lag" time before they redirect their attention to new geographies, even if their clientele are living in new areas at growing rates. Recent research on immigrant organizations suggests that suburbs with large immigrant populations may have fewer organizations than traditional immigrant neighborhoods in cities for this reason (Leon et al. 2009; Truelove 2000). Still, as the "proportional immigrant presence" is still greater in cities than suburbs, the urban orientation and temporal lag models suggest that organizations may focus their resources on urban areas even as the immigrant population is growing faster in the suburbs than in cities (Singer 2004). Added to this trend, as organizations tend to be founded near similar organizations (Hannan and Carrol 1992; Baum and Oliver 1996; Murphy and Wallce 2010), this pattern tends to maintain an urban advantage when it comes to access to organizations. This literature suggests why there may be a "mismatch" between where immigrant organizations are located and where growth in the immigrant population is occurring (Leon et al 2009; Singer 2004).

Last, in the absence of federal immigration regulations, variations in local support for immigrants can result in vast differences in local, county, and state policies (Horton 1995; Singer 2004; Ramakrishnan and Wong 2007; Wang and Li 2007). Such *ad hoc* policies may can impact immigrants access to resources through organizations: while some localities welcome immigrants as economic and cultural assets essential to their own development and provide them with helpful resources, other localities perceive immigrants as threats and attempt to make it difficult for immigrants to access resources by undermining organizations' efforts (Cadge et al 2010; Horton 1995; Portes and Borocz 1989; Jones-Correa 2006).

Factors Influencing Immigrant Settlement Patterns by Country of Origin

Research has shown significant differences in settlement patterns of immigrants by country of origin. "Patterns of recent suburban and urban immigration show significant disparities in what types of urban and suburban neighborhoods different immigrant ethnic groups settle. In general, immigrants arriving to new immigrant gateways, including the suburbs, tend to come from Asia or Mexico more so than prior waves of immigrants, which may differentially shape the demography of immigrants in the suburbs versus the city (Singer 2004). Further, as noted above, where immigrants land is largely shaped by their economic circumstances and their education (in combination with opportunities for work, housing, and family ties) (Katz et al. 2010; Alba et al. 1999; Suro et al. 2011; Iceland 2009). Those who are more likely to come from affluent backgrounds, like South Asians, Koreans, Filipinos, and Chinese, tend to settle in thriving, newer suburbs while those more likely to come from lower socio-economic status backgrounds, like the Vietnamese, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans, tend to

settle in older, declining suburbs or within the central city (Katz et al. 2010). Additionally, homeownership rates vary widely across ethnic groups living in ethnic clusters. For example, Pamuk (2004) finds that the Chinese have above average rates of home ownership. These different settlement patterns may have implications for differences in the access to organizations by immigrant group living in ethnic clusters across suburbs and between cities and suburbs.

Fong et al.'s (2005) study of Chinese businesses in Toronto points out that the number of Chinese businesses in the suburbs is negatively related to the higher proportion of recently arrived immigrants in the area. They argue that this may be because recent immigrants have higher education and language abilities, and thus may not need the social and organizational support offered by urban ethnic enclaves. Together, these literatures suggest that because of differences in education, wealth, and language ability by immigrant ethnic group, settlement across urban and suburban neighborhoods may differ by immigrant group characteristics, which would in turn differentially shape the availability of immigrant organizations by immigrant settlement."

The above literature informs our second hypothesis, that:

Hypothesis 2: Immigrants' access to immigrant organizations will vary by immigrant country of origin, controlling for neighborhood characteristics.

Philadelphia as a Case

To test these hypotheses, we use the Philadelphia region as our test case. Philadelphia makes for a good case study for many reasons. First, the Philadelphia region has become what Singer (2008) calls a "re-emerging gateway" due to its fast growing immigrant population (Singer, Vitiello, Katz, and Park 2008). While much research on immigration has examined traditional gateway cities such as New York or Chicago, changing immigration patterns make cities like Philadelphia a worthy of study. Second, as direct migration to Philadelphia's suburbs has increased faster than migration to its central cities (Katz et. al. 2010), the Philadelphia region offers an excellent opportunity to study a nation trend of direct immigrant settlement in suburban areas. Last, the demographic diversity of this region's recently-arrived immigrant population also makes the Philadelphia area an excellent choice for this research. Not only does this region's immigrant population similar to that of many other cities, making it a modal case (Massey and Capoferro 2008), but the diversity of immigrants provides a complex view of immigrants' proximity to resources in both urban and suburban areas.

DATA & METHODS

Data

Data for this analysis includes immigrant organization data, spatial data, and neighborhood data.

Immigrant Organization Data

In order to be included in our analysis, an organization needed to explicitly state in it's mission that it serves immigrant populations and their ethnic communities in general.

Organizations in this analysis may be public, non-profit, or for profit. Organizations run by immigrants were only included if they serve immigrant communities, as we are interested in resources for immigrants, not simply immigrant leadership (see Hung 2007). Furthermore, simply offering services in languages other than English did not qualify an organization for inclusion if it does not explicitly seek to serve immigrants. Organizations in this analysis are also required to have physical locations where immigrants can go to obtain services, to the exclusion of newspaper, websites, and tv and radio stations.

With these parameters for inclusion, we collected data about organizations in the Philadelphia CMSA from multiple sources: Guidestar, the Yellow Pages, the Philadelphia Welcome Center, media coverage, county websites, Internet searches, telephone calls to organizations, and referrals. Data collected includes names, addresses, phone numbers, programs, and services. After collecting a list of organizations we researched each organizations mission statements and specific services provided to immigrant communities. We deleted from our database any organizations that did not specifically serve immigrants. Our final database consists of 537 organizations.

Spatial Data

Spatial data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) five-year estimates from 2005-2009 for Philadelphia's consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CMSA), an area including 14 counties in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. As census tracts are the smallest geographic units for which nation of origin data is available for

the foreign born population, we use census tracts as the primary unit of analysis to capture the most granular view of immigrant settlement. By using five-year estimates, we increase the sample sizes at the tract level and decrease the margins of error. Census tract boundary files come from the National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS) at the University of Minnesota.

Neighborhood Data

As this research examines differences between urban and suburban areas, our primary independent variable is whether or not a census tract is located in an urban area. We define urban areas in this analysis as all census tracts within the city limits of Philadelphia, PA; Wilmington, DE; and Camden, NJ. We recognize that there are more complex ways to operationalize urbanity, specifically to distinguish different types of urban and suburban neighborhoods or to distinguish areas by population density (Orfield YEAR; Pop Density citation). Following the work of Crighton (2010), we use municipal boundaries.

Along with differences between urban and suburban areas, we examine possible relationships between census tract demographics and the location of immigrant organizations. We therefore include census tract counts of residents by race or ethnicity (white, black, Hispanic, and Asian). As research reveals varied settlement patterns within ethnic groups, we analyze the foreign born population by country of origin rather than by ethnic group (Pamuk 2004; Portes and Truelove 1987). Last, we include poverty rate in our models to examine possible relationships between poverty and the number of organizations in a tract.

Also, interactions between the Hispanic and Asian population variables and the foreign-born population were included to gauge the interaction between ethnic and foreign-born populations. Separate analyses were run including interactions between black and foreign-born populations, which yielded no significant effects. These interactions are excluded in the final models for the sake of parsimony.

To standardize variables across urban and suburban tracts, we control for census tracts' population-density and geographic size. As older neighborhoods may attract different populations than newer ones, we control for mean housing stock age. Last, we control for the percentage of vacant housing units to control for neighborhood blight.

Methods

Socio-spatial Methodology

We used ArcMap to analyze ACS data spatially. Using ArcMap's "buffer" tool, we identified each tract that has an immigrant organization within a one-mile "buffer" of its tract boundary. This method is superior to previous research that has selected tracts depending upon whether they contain an organization within their boundary. This approach fails to identify tracts that provide access to an immigrant organization within a short distance of their boundaries. While using our method provides benefits, there are still limitations of our approach. Though a Euclidian mile "buffer" provides an equal distance around each tract, the length of time it takes to travel one mile from a tract boundary depends upon the location of

roads and availability of public transportation. Still, this "buffer" methodology provides a useful means of identifying tracts that contain or are close to immigrant organizations.

Statistical Methodology

Our statistical analysis consists of four Poisson regressions each looking at a different kind of immigrant organization by resources offered to clients. The distribution of our outcome variable has a pronounced rightward skew, which is common with analyses of organizations (Ranger-Moore et al. 1991). The founding of immigrant organizations is relatively rare with increasing numbers of organizations in a buffered tract being rarer still. For this reason we chose to use a Poisson model for our analysis over a linear regression as the normal distribution required for an OLS regression would be inappropriate. A Poisson analysis provides a "natural baseline model" for relatively rare events such as the founding of organizations (Baum and Oliver 1996; Barnett and Amburgey 1990; Hannan and Freeman 1989; Lomi 1995; Ranger-Moore et al. 1991). In order to account for over-dispersion in our data, we also adjusted the standard errors in our models by scaling them by the square root of the Pearson chi-square dispersion.

The first model's outcome variable is the number of total immigrant organizations in a census tract and its buffer. The second, third and fourth models' outcome variables are the number of immigrant organizations that focus on providing subsistence, mobility, integrations and cultural maintenance resources, respectively. Our original analysis also included a fifth model for organizations offering transnational resources. Unfortunately, we did not find

enough organizations offering these resources to run a statistically meaningful analysis. By running these 4 models, are able to examine if immigrant organizations can be expected to be found in different areas of a metropolitan area according to the resources they provide.

Descriptive Statistics

Number of organizations per census tract by urban and suburban Type of organizations

Our dataset includes 1597 census tracts, of which 429 are categorized as urban while 1,168 are non-urban. While there are only 537 organizations in our sample, there are an average of 1.92 organizations per tract due to overlap occurring from the use of buffered tracts. The average number of organizations in an urban tract and its buffer is 4.52, while for non-urban tracts that figure is 1.77 organizations. When broken down by the number of organizations offering a certain type of resource, these figures are as follows.

Table 1: Average Number of Resources by Type in and Around Census Tracts

	Subsistence	Mobility	Cultural Maintenance	Integration
Urban	2.12	1.62	1.43	2.36
Non Urban	.19	.20	.50	.42
Overall	.71	.58	.75	.93

Results

Our results show that the extent to which a community has access to resources for immigrants not only depends on the demographic characteristics of that community, but also

the type of resources offered by immigrant-serving organizations. There exist relationships between the ethnic composition, size of foreign born population and urban status of a community and the number of immigrant-serving organizations in and around communities, which should be expected, as immigrant-serving organizations need immigrants to serve. More interestingly, the relationships between these demographic and geographic indicators and immigrant-serving organizations differ depending on the type of resources organizations provide. We discuss this in detail below.

[Tables 2a and 2b about here]

The Totality of Organizations

In our analysis of census tracts in the Greater Philadelphia area, we find that urban areas will have more access to immigrant-serving organizations providing all kinds of resources. Also, while greater numbers of various racial and ethnic individuals in a tract are positively correlated to the number of organizations in and around a tract, the size of certain groups of foreign born individuals appears to make a difference in whether to expect a greater number of organizations. In our model, the effect for urban location is significant as controlling for all the variables included, urban tracts have on average 1.14 more organizations of all types within them and their buffer. Therefore, there is indeed an urban advantage in overall number of organizations. Interactions in our model suggest that this urban effect, however, is weakened as the number of Mexicans, Haitians, and European foreign born individuals increase in a tract. We also find no significant effect for the poverty rate of a tract. There are also effects for the number of white, Asian, black, and Hispanic individuals in a tract. Though white, black, and Hispanic population counts have negligible effects, Asian population count effects are of a

much larger magnitude, with an increase of 1031 Asians associated each with an increase of 1 organization. Meanwhile, increases of 1540 whites, 1654 blacks, and 1718 Hispanics each would have the same effect. As for the effect of foreign born populations, we found similar positive effects of the Mexican (increase of 1 organization per 1337), Haitian (increase of 1 organization per 255), European (increase of 1 organization per 709), East African (increase of 1 organization per 224), and West African (increase of 1 organization per 402), foreign born counts on the number or organizations in and around a tract, but no significant effect for any Asian foreign born group population counts.

[Maps 1 about here]

Organizations Providing Subsistence Resources

When we run the same analysis on the number of organizations providing subsistence resources, we find shifts in which demographic characteristics are related to the number of organizations in and around a census tract. Compared to the model for all organizations, the effect for urban location of a tract is greater, with urban tracts having 1.83 more organizations in and around them than suburban tracts. In contrast to the model for all organizations, the white, Asian, and foreign-born European population counts of tracts no longer have an effect on the outcome variable. The effect of the Mexican foreign-born population counts is an increase of 1 organization for every 1222 Mexican individuals. An increase of 1 organization was also found to be correlated to increases of 283 West Africans, 150 East Africans, 175 Koreans, and 173 Vietnamese foreign-born individuals in a census tract. None of the other foreign national groups were found to have significant effects. Finally, the interaction between urban tract and both West African and Vietnamese foreign-born counts yield negative effects,

offering support to the idea that the urban effect is weaker for tracts with more foreign-born individuals from both these areas.

Organizations Providing Mobility Resources

Running the same model once more for organizations providing mobility resources, we again find differences in the relationship between organizations and demographics. There is still an urban effect, with 1.62 more organizations providing mobility resources in urban tracts than in suburban tracts, controlling for all variables in this analysis. The effect of the Hispanic population count is an increase of 2054 Hispanics associated with increases of 1 organization in and around a tract. Unlike organizations providing subsistence resources, there are no longer relationships between East African, Mexican, and Vietnamese population counts and the number of organizations offering mobility resources. An increase of 1 organization is associated with increases in 302 foreign born West Africans, 176 foreign born Haitians, 255 foreign born Koreans and 329 foreign born Europeans. While the Mexican population no longer has a significant relationship with the number of organizations in a census tract, an increase in 260 Central Americans now is associated with an increase of 1 organization. No interaction effects between the indicator for urban tracts and the counts for these foreign born populations suggested that the urban effect is affected by the greater the size of these populations.

Organizations Providing Cultural Maintenance Resources

Turning to organizations that offer cultural maintenance resources, we find a dynamic similar to that of all organizations. We find that urban tracts still have more organizations than suburban tracts, but that effect is now only 0.80 more organizations in urban tracts controlling for all variables included. There are positive effects on the number of organizations offering cultural maintenance resources from the counts of all racial and ethnic groups included in this analysis. Increases in 1 organization are associated with increases of 1321 whites, 1392 blacks, 976 Asians, and 1613 Hispanics in a tract's population. As for the effect of foreign born populations, we found positive effects of the Mexican (increase of 1 organization per 1194), Haitian (increase of 1 organization per 199), European (increase of 1 organization per 791), Cambodian (increase of 1 organization per 75), East African (increase of 1 organization per 195), and West African (increase of 1 organization per 426). Finally, the interactions between urban tract and Haitian, Cambodian, and European foreign-born counts yield negative effects, offering support to the idea that the urban effect is weaker for tracts with more foreign-born individuals from both these areas.

Organizations Providing Integration Resources

Finally, we ran the analysis on organizations offering integration resources. The urban effect is still positive, with 1.18 more organizations in urban tracts than suburban tracts. Only White and Hispanic population counts have significant effects on the number of these types of organizations, with increases in 2050 Whites and 2180 Hispanics associated with an increase in 1 organization in the tract. As for foreign born populations, West African, Mexican, Taiwanese, and European foreign born populations had positive effects on the number of organizations,

with increases in 366 foreign born West Africans, 1169 foreign born Mexicans, 91 foreign born Taiwanese, and 533 foreign born Europeans associated with increases of 1 organization in a tract. Furthermore, Interaction effects between the indicator for urban tracts and the count of foreign born Mexicans and Europeans suggests that the urban effect is weaker the greater the size of this population of those groups.

Discussion

As we expected, we found differences in access to organizations based on urban or non-urban location. Urban areas have more organizations after controlling for a series of neighborhood characteristics: we find an overall urban advantage of 1.14 organizations per tract compared to non-urban tracts. We thought that the urban advantage would have been larger, but find that once neighborhood and demographic characteristics are controlled for, a good deal of the urban advantage visible in descriptive statistics (2.6 more organizations on average) disappears.

Degree of urban advantage depends upon resource type. Comparing descriptive statistics with results from the regression models reveals some of these differences by type of resource. For instance, we find that for organizations providing cultural maintenance and integration resources, the urban advantage shrinks in the regression models relative to descriptive statistics. While the urban advantage for the number of organizations offering integration resources is similar to that of all immigrant organizations, the urban advantage for the number or organizations offering cultural resources is smaller than that for all

organizations. Furthermore, the urban advantage for organizations offering subsistence and mobility resources is greater than that for organizations as a whole. This suggests that while there is still more cultural and integration resources found in urban tracts relative to non-urban tracts, those types of resources exist in increased numbers in non-urban tracts to decrease the advantage of urban tracts. In the continuum of resources, we believe that subsistence and mobility resources are most needed by immigrants who are in more economic need while cultural and integration resources would be more sought out by immigrants who are more established in their host country or have greater economic resources. If immigrants' demand for resources is driving the supply or resource types, this suggests that urban areas may have more immigrants with basic needs requiring attention while non-urban areas have more immigrants who are looking for opportunities to maintain their culture while more fully integrating into American society. This is merely a suggestion, as further research is needed to determine if demand is driving supply of resource types.

We also found differences relative to the presence or absence of different immigrant groups examined by nation of origin. For instance, for all immigrant organizations, and all resource types except mobility resources, we found a positive relationship between the number of Mexican immigrants in a tract and the number of organizations/resources in and around a tract. At the same time, the number of Central American immigrants in a tract is positively related to mobility services. We find this result very telling, as earlier analyses we conducted lumped all Latin American immigrants together, which yielded no significant results regarding these groups of immigrants. This suggests that analyses of immigrant groups and organizations must go beyond splitting immigrants into ethnic groups and consider differences

between immigrants at the nationality level. We found similar results among Asian immigrants, with immigrants from different Asian nations having unique effects from one another. These results merely demonstrate an overlap between concentrations of certain national groups and certain resource types. While these groups do have greater access to these resources, it is inaccurate to infer any difference in these groups' demand for different resource types. We can only say that tracts with more individuals from certain countries have greater access to certain resources—we cannot say that those individual are in fact using, or driving the increase in, those types of resources.

Limitations & Directions for Future Research

This research examines urban and non-urban areas broadly. As recent scholarship suggests that what we understand as "urban" and "suburban" refer to a great diversity of spaces. While we found an urban advantage, and there are indeed more organizations and resources found in and around urban tracts, we found that organizations and resources in urban Philadelphia are concentrated in a dense group of tracts. As such, future research should incorporate other methods of examining both urban and suburban census tracts to better understand what kinds of urban tracts provide a higher concentration of opportunities for immigrants. Our research moves in this direction by identifying factors that are positively or negatively related to the location of immigrant organizations. Future research can go further by categorizing types of urban and suburban areas, following the work of Gary Orfield and others, to determine if some types of urban or suburban areas provide greater or lesser access to organizational resources for immigrants.

Last, while we found differences across different immigrant groups by nation of origin, we are unable to tell from this research why one group seems to have greater access to organizations than another group without relying on speculation. In order to understand this dynamic, it may be necessary to qualitatively investigate relationships between immigrant-serving organizations and the communities they serve. Further research should also attempt to establish whether concentrations of immigrant groups drive a demand for resources that is then met by those who establish organizations.

In the final analysis we conclude that the analysis of the immigrant organizational landscape in metropolitan areas is more than a simple urban vs. non-urban dynamic. Not all immigrant-serving organizations are the same, and their missions and the resources they offer play a role in their geographic distribution. Furthermore, the ethnic and immigrant composition of a community also aids in predicting the extent to which a community is served by immigrant-serving organizations. Finally, even though we worked to account for urban/non-urban, organizational mission, and demographic differences, we still found that within urban and non-urban areas, there may exist differences that may offer an even clearer picture of the nature of the immigrant organizational landscape.

References

Alba, R.D., Logan, J.R. & Crowder, K. (1997). White Ethnic Neighborhoods and Assimilation: The Greater New York Region, 1980-1990. *Social Forces,* 75, pp. 883-912.

Alba, R.D., Logan, J.R., & Stults, B.J. (1999). Immigrant Groups in the Suburbs: A Reexamination of Suburbanization and Spatial Assimilation. *American Sociological Review,* 64, pp. 446-460.

Barnett, W. P., & Amburgey, T. L. (1990). Do larger organizations generate stronger competition? In J. V. Singh (Ed.), *Organizational evolution: New directions:* pp 78-102. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Baum, J. & Oliver, C. (1996). Toward an Institutional Ecology of Organizational Founding. *Academy of Management Journal,* 39:5, pp. 1378-1427.

Blumenberg, E. (2008). Immigrant and Transport Barriers to Employment: The Case of Southeast Asian Welfare Recipients in California. *Transport Policy,* 15:1, pp. 33-42.

Cadge, W., Curran, S., Jaworsky, B.N., & Levitt, P. (2010). The City as Context: Culture and Scale in New Immigrant Destinations. *Amerique Latine Histoire et Memoire Les Cahiers ALHIM,* 20.

Casas, J., Arce, C., & Frye, C. (2004). Latino Immigration and Its Impact on Future Travel Behavior. Available: http://trb.org/conferences/nhts/Casas.pdf

Cheki, D.A. (2006). "Immigrant and Refugee Serving Organization in a Canadian City: An Exploratory Study. PCERII Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. WP01-06, pp. 1-23.

Cordero-Guzman, H.R. (2005). Community Based Organizations and Migration in New York City. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 31, pp. 889-909.

Dreier, P., J. Mollenkopf, & T. Swanstrom. (2004). *Place Matters: Metropolitics for the Twenty-first Century.* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Evans, M.D.R. (1989). Immigrant Entrepreneurship: Effects of Ethnic Market Size and Isolated Labor Pool. *American Sociological Review,* 54, pp. 950-62.

Fong, E., Luk, C., & Ooka, E. (2005). Spatial Distribution of Suburban Ethnic Businesses. *Social Science Research,* 34, pp. 215-235.

Goldring, L. (2001). The Gender and Geography of Citizenship in Mexico-U.S. Transnational Spaces. *Identities,* 7:4, pp. 501-537.

Grey, M.A. (2006). Obstacles and Opportunities: Latino-Owned Small Business in Iowa. *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies,* 2:1, pp. 1-23.

Handy, S., Blumenberg, E., Donahue, M., Lovejoy, K., Rodier, C., Shaheen, S., Shiki, K., Song, L., & Tal, G. (2009). Travel Behavior of Immigrant Groups in California. UC Berkley: California Path Program Institute of Transportation Studies Research Report.

Hannan, M. & Caroll, G. (1992). *Dynamics of Organizational Populations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational ecology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Horton, J. (1995). *The Politics of Diversity: Immigration, Resistance, and Change in Monterey Park, California.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hung, C.R. (2007). Immigrant Nonprofit Organizations in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 13, pp. 707-729.

Iceland, J. (2009). *Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Jones-Correa, M. (1998). Different Paths: Gender, Immigration and Political Participation." *International Migration Review,* 32:2, pp. 326-349.

Jones-Correa, M. (2006). "Reshaping the American Dream: Immigrants, Ethnic Minorities, and the Politics of the New Suburbs." In K.M. Kruse & T.J. Sugrue (Eds.), *The New Suburban History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Katz, M., Creighton, M.J., Amsterdam, D., & Chowkwanyun, M. (2010). Immigration and the New Metropolitan Geography. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 32:5, pp. 523-547.

Leon, E.d., Maronick, M., De Vita, C.J., & Boris, E.T. (2009). Community-Based Organizations and Immigrant Integration in the Washington D.C., Metropolitan Area. Washington, Dc: The Urban Institute, pp. 1-51.

Li, W. (2009). *Ethnoburb: The New Ethnic Community in America.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Light, I. (1972). *Ethnic Enterprise in Urban America.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Light, I. & Bonacich, E. (1988). *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Koreans in Los Angeles 1965-1982*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Lomi, A. (1995). The ecology of organizational founding: Location dependence and unobserved heterogeneity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: pp 111-144.

Massey, D. & Capoferro, C. (2008). The Geographic Diversification of American Immigration. In D. Massey (Ed.), *New Faces in New Places: The Change Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 25-50.

McGuckin, N. & Srinivasan, N. (2003). National Summary: Journey to Work Trends in the United States and its Major Metropolitan Areas 1960 – 2000. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Publication No. FHWA -EP-03-058.

Medeiros, M. (1991). Family Services for All: Study of Family Services for Ethnocultural and Racial Communities in Metropolitan Toronto. Toronto: Multicultural Coalition for Access to Family Services.

Min, P.G. (1992). The Structure and Social Functions Of Korean Immigrant Churches in the United States. *International Migration Review,* 24:4, pp. 1370-1394.

Murphy, Alexandra & Danielle Wallace. (2010). Opportunities for Making Ends Meet and Upward Mobility: Differences in Organizational Deprivation Across Urban and Suburban Poor Neighborhoods. *Social Science Quarterly,* 91:5, pp. 1164-1186.

Pamuk, A. (2004). Immigrant Clusters and Homeownership in Global Metropolises: Suburbanization in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York. IURD Working Paper Series, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, UC Berkley, pp. 1-40.

Park, R., Burgess, E. W., & McKenzie, R. D. (1925). *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Patraporn, R.V., Pfeiffer, D., & Ong, P. (2010). Building Bridges to the Middle Class: The Role of Community-Based Organization in Asian American Wealth Accumulation. *Economic Development Quarterly,* 24:3, pp. 288-303.

Portes, A. & Borocz, J. (1989). Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation. *International Migration Review,* 23, pp. 606-630.

Portes, A. & Truelove, C. (1987). Making Sense of Diversity: Recent Research on Hispanic Minorities in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 13, pp. 359-416.

Portes, A., Escobar, C., & Radford, A.W. (2007). Immigrant Transnational Organizations and Development: A Comparative Study. *International Migration Review,* 41:1, pp. 242-281.

Ramakrishnan, K. & Wong, T. (2007). Immigration Policies go Local: The Varying Reponses of Local Governments to Low-Skilled and Undocumented Immigration. Unpublished Paper. Available at:

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.161.2071&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Ranger-Moore, J., Banaszak-Holl, J., & Hannan, M. T. (1991). Density-dependent dynamics in regulated industries: Founding rates of banks and life insurance companies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, pp. 36-65.

Singer, A. (2004). The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways. The Living Cities Census Series, The Brookings Institution, pp. 1-34.

Singer, A. (2008). Twenty-first Century Gateways: An Introduction. In A. Singer, S.W. Hardwick, & C.B. Brettell (Eds.), *Twenty-first Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America.* Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution Press, pp. 11-29.

Singer, A., Vitiello, D., Katz, M., & Park, D. (2008). Recent Immigration to Philadelphia: Regional Change in a Re-Emerging Gateway. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, pp. 1-39.

Small, M., E. Jacobs, & R. Massengill. (2008). ‘‘Why Organizational Ties Matter for Neighborhood Effects.’’ *Social Forces,* 87, pp. 387–414.

Small, M. (2010). *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Suro, Roberto, Jill Wilson, and Audrey Singer. (2011). “Immigration and Poverty in America’s Suburbs.” Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, pp. 1-20.

Tomer, A., Kneebone, E., Puentes, R., & A. Berube. (2011). Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, pp. 1-64.

Truelove, M. (2000). Services for Immigrant Women: An Evaluation of Locations. *The Canadian Geographer,* 44:2, pp. 135-151.

Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H., Ward, R. & Associates. (1990). *Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.*

Wang, Q. & Li, W. (2007). Entrepreneurship, Ethnicity, & Local Contexts: Hispanic Entrepreneurs in Three U.S. Southern Metropolitan Areas. *GeoJournal,* 2-3, pp. 167-182.

Wilson, K.L. & Portes, A. (1980). Immigrant Enclaves: An Analysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami. *American Journal of Sociology,* 86, pp. 295-319.

Zarrugh, L.H. (2007). From Workers to Owners: Latino Entrepreneurs in Harrisonburg, VA. *Human Organization,* 66:3, pp. 240-248.

Table 2a: Poisson Co-efficient Results For All Organizations and Specific Resources

	All	Subsistence	Mobility	Cultural	Integration
Urban Tract	1.14**	1.826**	1.616**	0.796**	1.176**
Rent	0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Poverty Rate	0.03	-0.478	0.331	0.132	-0.098
White Population	0.001**	0.000	0.000	0.001**	0.000*
Black Population	0.001**	0.000*	0.000	0.001**	0.000
Asian Population	0.001**	0.000	0.001	0.001*	0.001
Hispanic Population	0.001**	0.001**	0.000**	0.001**	0.000**
Foreign Born - East African	0.004*	0.007*	0.004	0.005**	0.003
Foreign Born - North Africa	0.002	-0.009	-0.001	0.002	0.003
Foreign Born - West Africa	0.002**	0.004**	0.003**	0.002**	0.003**
Foreign Born - Bahamas	0.016	0.024	-0.022	0.014	0.005
Foreign Born - Dominican	0.000	-0.001	-0.006	-0.002	0.001
Foreign Born - Haiti	0.004*	0.003	0.006*	0.005**	0.003
Foreign Born - Jamaica	0.000	-0.001	-0.002	0.000	-0.004
Foreign Born – Central America	-0.001	-0.001	0.004**	-0.002	0.000
Foreign Born - Mexico	0.001**	0.001*	0.001	0.001**	0.001*
Foreign Born - South America	0.001	0.000	-0.001	0.002	0.000
Foreign Born - China	0.001	-0.005	-0.003	0.001	0.002
Foreign Born - Hong Kong	-0.008	-0.003	0.009	-0.009	-0.01
Foreign Born - Taiwan	0.008	0.008	0.009	0.003	0.011*
Foreign Born - Korea	0.001	0.006**	0.004**	0.001	0.001
Foreign Born - India	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001
Foreign Born - Cambodia	0.01	0.011	0.007	0.013*	0.006
Foreign Born - Philippines	0.002	-0.004	0.002	0.002	0.003
Foreign Born - Vietnam	0.002	0.006**	0.001	0.002	0.000
Foreign Born - Europe	0.001*	0.001	0.003**	0.001*	0.002*
Foreign Born - Other	0.004	0.003	-0.005	0.001	0.004
Vacant Housing Unit	0.000	0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000
Housing Stock Age	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Area (sq mi)	-0.126**	-0.162*	-0.163	-0.106**	-0.162**
Population Density	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
Total Population	-0.001**	-0.001**	0.000*	-0.001**	-0.001**
Constant	0.167	-1.405	-1.054	-2.931	-2.931
Observations	1568	1568	1568	1568	1568
z statistics in parentheses ---- * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%					

Table 2b: Poisson Interaction Co-efficient Results For All Organizations and Specific Resources

	All	Subsistence	Mobility	Cultural	Integration
Urban Tract/Foreign Born China	0.000	0.006	0.003	-0.001	-0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born HongKong	0.015	0.008	-0.006	0.009	0.018
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Taiwan	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004	0.002	-0.008
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Korea	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.002	0.004
Urban Tract/Foreign Born India	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Cambodia	-0.011*	-0.011	-0.005	-0.016**	-0.004
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Philipines	-0.001	0.007	0.001	0.000	-0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Vietnam	-0.003*	-0.005**	-0.003	-0.003*	-0.002
Urban Tract/Foreign Born EastAfrica	-0.003	-0.007	-0.001	-0.005	-0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born NorthAfrica	-0.006	0.007	-0.003	-0.002	-0.01
Urban Tract/Foreign Born WestAfrica	-0.002	-0.004**	-0.004**	-0.002	-0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Bahamas	-0.04	-0.036	0.057	-0.041	0.037
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Dominican	0.002	0.001	0.007	0.003	0.000
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Haiti	-0.005*	-0.006	-0.004	-0.009**	-0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Jamaica	-0.005	-0.003	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Central America	0.002	0.002	-0.002	0.003	0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Mexico	-0.001*	-0.001	-0.001	0.000	-0.001**
Urban Tract/Foreign Born South America	0.000	0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.001
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Europe	-0.001*	-0.001	-0.003**	-0.002*	-0.002*
Urban Tract/Foreign Born Other	0.002	0.002	0.007	0.005	0.001
Constant	0.167	-1.405	-1.054	-2.931	-2.931
Observations	1568	1568	1568	1568	1568
z statistics in parentheses ---- * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%					

Map 1: Distribution of Immigrant Organizations, Philadelphia CMSA, 2009