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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the cultural leader focus groups was to gain an organizational perspective on cultural participation and to get feedback on the preliminary findings from the Philadelphia Cultural Benchmark Project (referred to herein as the “Benchmark Project”). Research for Action conducted two focus groups with twenty-one individuals identified as ‘cultural leaders’ who represented sixteen organizations in Camden and Philadelphia. Participants for the cultural leader focus groups were drawn from the Knight Foundation grantee list and also included others who played key roles in assisting with the research.

Because both the earlier Benchmark Project research strands conducted by Research for Action and Audience Insight LLC turned up such a wide range of activities that respondents characterized as “cultural participation,” the cultural leaders focus groups included an activity to engage the leaders to reflect on this range of activity. In addition, we asked the cultural leaders to compare the activities and events discussed to their own definitions and assumptions made about cultural participation. This activity was followed by three brief presentations of the Benchmark Project research findings from the work of Audience Insight LLC, Research for Action (RFA), and the University of Pennsylvania’s Social Impact of the Arts Project (SIAP). Following the presentations, we asked participants a series of questions to elicit feedback on the findings, to further their discussion of cultural participation in the geographic areas they knew best, and to consider the implications for their organizations of what they have learned from the Benchmark Project.

This report provides some overall observations about what the cultural leader focus groups revealed, observations made by the leaders themselves on the range of activities/definitions of cultural participation presented, leaders’ reflections on the implications of the expanded definition of cultural participation/range of activities for programming and increasing cultural participation, and factors that were identified as creating challenges to carrying out programs and increasing cultural participation both in Camden and in Philadelphia.

SUMMARY

Overall, the Benchmark Project findings resonated with both the Camden and Philadelphia groups; therefore, we would conclude that the report is credible to cultural leaders and accurately reflects their own sense of cultural participation in their communities. As one participant summarized,

Everything that you talked about is what we see on a regular basis, kind of what we knew instinctively but we couldn’t articulate it because we didn’t have the research numbers to back it up.

Both groups were intrigued by the range of activities that respondents from the focus groups and survey identified as cultural participation; particularly, the degree to which cultural participation was defined as activities that occurred close to or within the home (e.g. the “living arts” such as cooking or hair-styling)

---

1 Elaine Simon and Gretchen Suess of Research for Action conducted the focus groups. Mark Stern and Susan Seifert of SIAP also attended and assisted with facilitation. Anna Gavin, a consultant to RFA, helped to set up the meetings and was also present. In order to ensure anonymity, all names of individuals and organizations have been omitted from the text. Comments that were made specifically about one city or the other are referenced as such. The Philadelphia cultural leader focus group was conducted at International House in West Philadelphia. The Camden cultural leader focus group was conducted at the office of Research for Action, also in International House.

2 In order to do this, participants were asked to categorize, into sets, different activities drawn from the Benchmark Project focus group and survey research and to discuss the rationale they used to come up with categories.
or activities that were participatory such as singing and dancing. Individual participants noted that future research might more fully explore community members’ different definitions of “culture” and “art” and how different activities relate to their cultural participation repertoire. In addition, leaders were surprised that there was little or no mention of public media, such as TV or magazines. Several of the leaders mentioned that the findings gave them new ideas that they wanted to integrate into their programming, which would allow them to capitalize on a wider range of activities as cultural participation. In addition, the cultural leaders discussed the primary barriers they have encountered in doing community arts programming, such as a perceived lack of infrastructure and resources to support organizations in their efforts to stimulate cultural participation.

**OBSERVATIONS ON THE BREADTH OF CULTURAL PARTICIPATION**

**Defining, Clarifying, and Expanding the Meanings of “Cultural Participation”**

During the initial sorting exercise, all focus group participants categorized the various examples of cultural participation based on where an activity took place: the home, neighborhood, at an organization in the neighborhood, outside of the neighborhood, or anywhere.3 Two participant subgroups also created further divisions in their categories in order to distinguish participatory from observational activities and “art” or “cultural” activities from more non-traditional definitions (e.g. braiding hair, socializing on the front porch, or singing with the radio).

When asked about the research findings during the remainder of the focus group, both the Philadelphia and Camden groups spoke about the need to clarify or expand notions of what is considered “art” and “culture”:

> I think the word culture can get interpreted in a few ways. Generally speaking, it kind of shows me, especially coming from a non-arts background, that perhaps we should broaden our views of what the community sees as art. Because what we’re seeing here is really broad.

Whereas neighborhood residents in the Benchmark Project did define culture as including formal “art” activities that one observes or participates in at an organizational or institutional setting, they more routinely defined it as ethnic heritage or daily activity that shapes one’s identity. Two cultural leaders were particularly surprised that residents labeled routine activities ‘cultural’ participation, such as socializing on the porch or cooking at home, however one leader associated with a nature center was actually glad to learn that residents shared her broader definition:

> Working in community gardening we see it as cultural participation but I was interested to see the respondents saw it as cultural participation because it’s something that the community does and there’s often ethnic aspects to it. People sharing their different cultural backgrounds and its also related to food.

Cultural leaders also identified the fact that cultural activities take place in a lot of different spaces and places, such as gardens, local parks, front porches, inside the home, and at church. Both sets of leaders, but particularly the Camden leaders, noted that given what the findings indicated about the nature of cultural participation, it was important that indicators of participation be expanded to include such components as outreach or support for the non-traditional arts or heritage activities (e.g. cooking, gardening, etc.)

---

3 For a complete list of the different categories that the subgroups created, and the activities each group associated with those categories, see the attached Appendix.
Cultural Participation is Deeply Personal and Local
The cultural leader participants understood and respected the fact that individuals from the Benchmark Project, and community residents alike, want to engage in cultural activities that speak to their personal experiences and are “relevant” to their daily lives. Several of the leaders in the Camden group felt that cultural participation is greatest when events and activities are held in neighborhoods or in some other way connected to individuals, such as in the following examples:

I found that people don’t go to or understand a whole lot of esoteric stuff, like plays where you have a lot of people bouncing off the walls and stuff. It’s like, “What are they doing and what are they even talking about?” And for us it makes us only do things that they absolutely can relate to. So if we have a play going on it has to be something that’s relevant to the neighborhood. And I think when you see Beauty Shop and Barber Shop, those movies sell out and the critics say, “It was such a lousy movie,” but they’re making 100 million dollars. A lot of people relate to it and that’s what goes on when you go to the barber shop or the beauty shop. So for them, it’s relevant.

We found when we had our exhibition, we had an artist who made food, or preserved it with varnish. And the kids would run in there immediately because it was set up as a table, and they were like, “My Mom makes this!” It was really neat but it was set up sort of like artwork, like sculpture. And it was kind of fun that they all had this reaction because it really meant something to them.

In addition to the above, Camden cultural leaders believed that it is important to recognize the importance and legitimacy of activities that contribute to strengthening the social life of communities, whatever those activities may be. One individual argued that there actually is a lot of community based activity going on in neighborhoods throughout Camden, which organizations could capitalize on, but it is not getting the kind of support, recognition, or publicity that is needed to help groups connect with residents and establish trusting relationships.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CULTURAL LEADERS
Organizations Can Capitalize on What’s Already in Neighborhoods
During the cultural leader focus groups, many individuals thought about strategies that they had not previously considered, particularly strategies for capitalizing on what potential program recipients already think of as cultural participation, such as: reaching out more into homes and on the streets; targeting schools that kids attend rather than expecting that all cultural participation will occur at an organization’s site; and reconsidering the experience of public space for participation or the space in which art occurs, such as in the following:

We don’t think as much about gardening, cooking, etc. as particular art forms yet at the same time in our events that’s always part of it … so even though those things are considered less formal art forms, they’re still part of what our arts programming is, so its part of the whole experience of culture.

In Eastern North Philly, 9% go to an art exhibit but 49% have art displayed in their homes, and a big light bulb went on in my head about what we ought to be doing there.

Leaders also explored ways to translate their program vocabulary in order to mesh with what focus group participants shared about their cultural participation experiences. “Changing the experience
of public space” through landscaping was used as an example for connecting with a community’s deep attachment to public space and gardening.

**Reaching Adults through Youth Programming**

Some of the cultural leader participants also shared their experiences reaching adults through programming for their children, because adults are willing to attend an event in which their children are participating. In addition to developing programs that involve children, it is incumbent on the organizations to think about how to engage those adults in additional activity:

_Lots of times, the first time people are introduced to culture is through their children and then they’ll appreciate it. They’ll go to see their kids perform at something and, if we’re having something [going on] other than what their child is participating in, they might come to see another type of performance. Especially when we do outdoor activities, they’ll initially come to see their kids but then they’ll stay if we have other entertainment. Then it also leaves the door open that if we get free tickets to events downtown, that we can pass it on to them to see other things._

_When we offer a program for kids, the whole family gets involved. And we know that. When we go into the classroom and do a project the kids go home and talk about it and it gets the whole family involved. And we know that. But how do you translate that into something we can pay for?_

One leader felt strongly that more information is needed and attention should be paid to the integration of youth culture in programming and how ‘culture’ is differently translated between adults and youth:

_The youth really believe they have a culture that’s worth something. And they don’t really see their connection to their elders or the neighborhood. Plus on top of that in Eastern North Philadelphia you have the whole immigrant experience where the kids’ language is different from their parents’. So the expression of cultural forms is automatically going to be different because of the language._

With this, there is possibility that community cultural arts organizations need to capitalize on the positive side of youth culture and try to connect youth with adults.

**CHALLENGES TO INCREASING CULTURAL PARTICIPATION**

**The Difficult Reality of Doing Cultural Programming**

The dominant barriers to cultural participation that leaders identified were the need for residents to leave their neighborhoods or their high expectations for what participation entails (getting dressed up, making a night of it, etc.), thus incurring significant expense in order to attend a cultural event.

_And then when you talk about going in town to see a ticketed event, that’s a destination, especially when tickets are anywhere from 75-100 dollars. I don’t know about other cultures, but for African Americans to see a 75 or 100 dollar ticketed event means an outfit, the hair is done, I mean it’s an outing. It’s not something you take lightly…it’s a dress up and go downtown to see that kind of thing._
When cultural leaders pondered about strategies for creating cultural participation outlets inside residents’ homes and for engaging more youth, they saw funding as the primary barrier. For example, when brainstorming about how cultural participation might get ‘inside’ peoples’ homes through television, radio, or the Internet, one leader said,

*So lots of times we’re working in organizations that don’t have ten million dollars or really sophisticated boards, we’re doing the best we can do with what we can do and we’re holding on lots of times by a shoe string.*

*It takes a lot of money to get something videotaped and in a nice package to hand to a television station. And even with a public station, even to get them to play that perfectly nice, expensively edited piece you have, takes jumping through a gazillion hoops.*

Cultural leaders in Philadelphia emphasized the need to consider the larger context of their programming in different neighborhoods, particularly since they work in high poverty areas with children who do not have the benefits of the cultural and arts programming that might be found in private school settings or in the suburbs. In addition, they expressed concern over the difference between academic theories for how to increase cultural participation and the realities that they encounter, which were also reflected in the Benchmark Project findings, in having to build community-based cultural arts programming.

The cultural leaders noted that there are also challenges for organizations to attend to local definitions of cultural participation as they conduct outreach and attempt to maintain a strong organizational presence within communities. In Camden, cultural leaders spoke of the challenges of residents’ lack of access to information about organization-sponsored cultural activities, of dealing with communities with very few neighborhood activities to build from, and of encountering the negative feelings that residents have about institutions, in general:

*There can be such a barrier with feelings about institutions that people won’t attend [our events], but we’re slowly but surely trying to make sure that people know they’re invited but going out into the community or the schools you get a whole different experience.*

*When you go into a community and start providing stuff, people are still not quite able to take advantage of it ... our challenge is to meet people where they are and to build trust, and go from there.*

**Infrastructure and Resources to Support Cultural Arts Programming is Vital to Success** Cultural leaders in both focus groups perceived that there was a lack of resources and infrastructure to support their activities. The Camden leaders interpreted the finding that while organizational participation was high, individual participation in local cultural organizations was not as high as it is in Philadelphia, as an indication that there is more support and infrastructure in Philadelphia. However, they also acknowledged the possibility that this finding reflected their not being as closely connected with neighborhoods as the groups in Philadelphia because of the particular origins and orientations of some of the organizations. Philadelphia leaders, however, did not perceive themselves as having resource advantages; rather, they too described how they were struggling to maintain funding levels and obtain basic organizational supports. In general, the cultural leaders in both settings worried about the adequacy of the infrastructure needed to support community-based arts organizations; either in terms of umbrella associations, the supportiveness of foundations and funding, and the synergy achieved among organizational partners.
Several of the cultural leaders expressed concern over what they felt was pressure from funding agencies to forge partnerships with organizations that were not productive or sustainable due to the fact that they were not based on strong social ties, intimate histories, or parallel goals. In addition, leaders agreed with the research finding that partnering does not necessarily reflect a higher audience participation rate. However, leaders in both groups agreed that foundations share common goals with the cultural arts organizations and that there need to be stronger lines of communication about the realities of doing such programming:

*I think its time for an open dialogue about what we all want the world to be like. It’s not about complaining. It’s been a real challenge for me, personally, to figure out how to accomplish that ... having a social justice background and not knowing how to translate that into politically appropriate action.*

In light of the findings about how community residents define art and cultural participation, leaders from both Camden and Philadelphia saw implications for how funders can structure their support strategies: committing more to providing general operating funds, rather than always requiring new program development; funding staff that does outreach and community building activities, in conjunction with arts programming; and increasing communication with local arts organizations. Several individuals felt strongly that cultural participation could be increased, in part, by simply supporting the longevity and sustained presence of cultural organizations in neighborhoods through an increased commitment to providing general operating funds:

*What this says is that if you’re there doing the job, its important, but it is very difficult to get anybody to pay straight up salaries and for light bulbs. This says that having the lights on and doing the job is really more important than coming out with an AMAZING new program. Sexy new initiatives are really quite cost consuming.*

The cultural leaders concurred with the Benchmark Project findings that local organizations fill a gap or need for residents from low- or mixed-income minority neighborhoods and believed that these findings could make a strong case for funders to continue or expand support for community-based arts organizations:

*I think that what makes sense is a legitimization of the importance of community based organizations to residents. We’ve noticed that neighborhood residents tend not to go outside the neighborhood very often, and ... there are relatively higher rates of participation from outside the area even as far as the tri-state area, and that the perception is that we offer something valid and authentic.*

Finally, as leaders began to think more about the barriers to their successes, they also voiced their frustrations over traditional means of determining success based on attendance rates:

*I think sometimes it’s not numbers, sometimes it’s depth, quality, even focusing on one person ... you can help change that person’s life.*

---

4 This is based on the Benchmark Project finding that these residents do not participate in “mainstream” arts activities to the degree that others in the region do.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, findings from the Philadelphia Cultural Participation Benchmark Project resonated with the cultural leaders we spoke with in Camden and Philadelphia. Leaders shared a glimpse into the complex realities of their work and spoke of the challenges they face in coordinating and implementing successful cultural arts programming in their communities. The focus groups also generated many ideas for how cultural arts organizations and funders can expand their notions of cultural participation and surfaced implications for cultural programming, staffing, funding, and evaluation measures.
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APPENDIX

PARTICIPANTS
Simone Jones- Rutgers Camden Center for the Arts
Noreen Scott Garrity- Rutgers Camden Center for the Arts
Virginia Steel- Rutgers Camden Center for the Arts
Barbara Klaczyńska- Camden City Garden Club, Camden Children’s Garden
Lise Ragbir- Perkins Center for the Arts
Donna Brown- Point Breeze Performing Arts Center
Valerie Clayton- Settlement Music Center, Camden branch
Patricia Reid-Merritt – RSC (cultural plan for the city of Camden)
Pam Bridgeforth- Walt Whitman Arts Center
Lavinia Awosanya- South Jersey Performing Arts Center
Barbara Whiteman, Philadelphia Doll Museum
Susan Glassman, Wagner Free Institute of Science
Pat Warner, Wagner Free Institute of Science
Carmen Febo San Miguel, Taller Puertorriqueño
Theresa Williams, New Freedom Theatre
Carolyn Chernoff, Spiral Q
Batia Gottman, AMLA
Lorene Carey, Art Sanctuary
Patrick Cabello Hansel, Centro Nueva Creación
Nicole Marcote, Centro Nueva Creación
Jerushia Graham, Spiral Q

Facilitators
Gretchen Suess, RFA
Elaine Simon, RFA

Others Present
Mark Stern, Social Impact of the Arts Project
Susan Seifert, Social Impact of the Arts Project
Anna Gavin, RFA Consultant/Events Coordinator

CARD ACTIVITY

Group 1
This group formed categories based on the location of where events took place and how “accessible” they were. The leaders in this group felt that the church was part of the community:

- **Home**, these things were very solitary or family oriented activities that tend to happen in the home or seem to be very home oriented. [Listening to children play musical instruments at home, Listening to music on the radio, Playing musical instruments at home, Participate in family celebrations at home, Braid someone’s hair, Gardening in one’s neighborhood/home, Decorating one’s house, Cooking traditional ethnic foods, Singing with the radio, Observing religious holidays at home, Socializing on the front porch, and Making crafts]

- **Neighborhood**, things that were neighborhood centered, wanted close by, and accessible all the time or anytime. [Attend ethnic festival in one’s neighborhood, Attending ethnic/cultural festival in neighborhood park, Attending a crafts exhibit in one’s neighborhood, Attending free performance in one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances in one’s neighborhood, Going to the library in
outside one’s neighborhood, Participate in hip-hop event at community arts center, Participate in hip-hop event at neighborhood club, Participating in heritage day at one’s church, Participating in social dancing at a club in one’s neighborhood, Singing in the church choir, Taking an art class in one’s neighborhood, Visit art exhibition inside one’s neighborhood, Visit historical exhibit inside one’s neighborhood, Volunteering for social action through one’s church]

- **Outside Neighborhood**, things that seemed to be very specifically outside one’s own community or required going somewhere to participate. [Attending a crafts exhibit outside one’s neighborhood, Attend ethnic festival held on the Parkway, Attend outdoor musical concert at Penn’s landing, Attending a son’s concert performance at a regional performing arts center, Attending free performance outside one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances outside one’s neighborhood, Going to another city for a cultural tour, Visit art exhibition outside one’s neighborhood, and Visit historical exhibit outside one’s neighborhood]

- **Anywhere - Everywhere**, things that could be done anywhere but they tended to be about teaching, learning, and preserving ethnic and cultural traditions. [Teaching cultural traditions to children, Learning about one’s ethnic/cultural history, and Teaching language heritage to children]

**Group 2**

This group formed nearly identical categories of cards based on the geographic location of events. However, the cultural leaders in this group felt that they placed a stronger symbolic emphasis on the home as the center of cultural participation where everything gets passed on. The group attempted to subdivide the categories based on activities that were either ‘cultural’ or ‘educational’ but in the end decided that all of the cards were both:

- **Home**, the cultural center where different events take place. [Attending ethnic/cultural festival in neighborhood park, Listening to music on the radio, Listening to children play musical instruments at home, Playing musical instruments at home, Participate in family celebrations at home, Braid someone’s hair, Gardening in one’s neighborhood/home, Decorating one’s house, Cooking traditional ethnic foods, Singing with the radio, Observing religious holidays at home, and Socializing on the front porch]

- **Neighborhood**, things taking place in the neighborhood. [Attend ethnic festival in one’s neighborhood, Attending a crafts exhibit in one’s neighborhood, Attending a crafts exhibit outside one’s neighborhood, Attending free performance in one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances in one’s neighborhood, Going to the library in one’s neighborhood, Participate in hip-hop event at community arts center, Participate in hip-hop event at neighborhood club, Participating in heritage day at one’s church, Participating in social dancing at a club in one’s neighborhood, Singing in the church choir, Taking an art class in one’s neighborhood, Visit art exhibition inside one’s neighborhood, Visit historical exhibit inside one’s neighborhood, Volunteering for social action through one’s church]

- **Outside Neighborhood**, just outside or well outside the local neighborhood. [Attend ethnic festival held on the Parkway, Attend outdoor musical concert at Penn’s landing, Attending a son’s concert performance at a regional performing arts center, Attending free performance outside one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances outside one’s neighborhood, Going to another city for a cultural tour, Visit art exhibition outside one’s neighborhood, and Visit historical exhibit outside one’s neighborhood]

- **Anywhere - Everywhere**, self explanatory. [Making crafts, Teaching cultural traditions to children, Learning about one’s ethnic/cultural history, and Teaching language heritage to children]

**Group 3**

Cards were sorted based on how, with whom, and where activities took place, rather than by kind of activity, like music or cooking or visual arts:
• **Things you can do at home**, which included gardening at home, braiding hair, singing along to the radio etc. [Listening to music on the radio, Socializing on the front porch, Participate in family celebrations at home, Singing with the radio, Braid someone’s hair, Making crafts, Learning about one’s ethnic/cultural history, Playing musical instruments at home, Gardening in one’s neighborhood/home, Observing religious holidays at home, Decorating one’s house, & Listening to children play musical instruments at home. This group added their own, “Literature – reading/writing”]

• **Cultural events in one’s own neighborhood**, with two sub-groups: attending events or programs which could either be free or have a cost [Going to the library in one’s neighborhood, Attending a crafts exhibit in one’s neighborhood, Visit art exhibition inside one’s neighborhood, Visit historical exhibit inside one’s neighborhood, Attend ethnic/cultural festival in neighborhood park, Attend ethnic festival in one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances in one’s neighborhood, & Attending free performance in one’s neighborhood]; OR activities that were participatory like volunteering or taking an art class, singing in a choir, etc. (audience vs participatory) [Participate in hip-hop event at community arts center, Participate in hip-hop event at neighborhood club, Participating in heritage day at one’s church, Participating in social dancing at a club in one’s neighborhood, Singing in the church choir, Taking an art class in one’s neighborhood, & Volunteering for social action through one’s church]

• **Cultural events outside one’s own neighborhood**, which could be free or not. [Visit historical exhibit outside one’s neighborhood, Visit art exhibition outside one’s neighborhood, Attending a crafts exhibit outside one’s neighborhood, Attending free performance outside one’s neighborhood, & Attends ticketed performances outside one’s neighborhood]

• **Activities or interests that can happen in all three contexts**, which were all participatory such as learning about one’s cultural heritage, making crafts, etc. [Cooking traditional ethnic foods, Teaching language heritage to children, Teaching cultural traditions to children, Attending a son’s concert performance at a regional performing arts center, Attend outdoor musical concert at Penn’s landing, Going to another city for a cultural tour, & Attend ethnic festival held on the Parkway]

The group also realized that there was a bridge between the first two categories because certain things done at home like socializing on the front porch or gardening automatically got you connected to the neighborhood as well.

**Group 4**
Categories were based simply on geographic divisions:

• **Church**, everything in the church was participatory
  o Singing in the church choir, Participating in heritage day at one’s church, Volunteering for social action through one’s church, & Observing religious holidays at home

• **Home**:
  o ‘Participating’: Socializing on the front porch, Participate in family celebrations at home, Playing musical instruments at home, Decorating one’s house, & Cooking traditional ethnic foods
  o ‘Observing’: Listening to children play musical instruments at home & Listening to music on the radio

• **Neighborhood**:
  o ‘Participating’: Participate in hip-hop event at neighborhood club, Taking an art class in one’s neighborhood, Participate in hip-hop event at community arts center, Gardening in one’s neighborhood/home, Going to the library in one’s neighborhood, & Participating in social dancing at a club in one’s neighborhood
Philadelphia Cultural Participation Benchmark Project – Cultural Leader Focus Groups

- **Observing**: Attend ethnic/cultural festival in neighborhood park, Attending a crafts exhibit in one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances in one’s neighborhood, Attending free performance in one’s neighborhood, & Attend ethnic festival in one’s neighborhood

  - **Outside neighborhood**, everything seemed to be observing/attending
    - Attend ethnic festival held on the Parkway, Attend outdoor musical concert at Penn’s landing, Attending a crafts exhibit outside one’s neighborhood, Attending a son’s concert performance at a regional performing arts center, Attending free performance outside one’s neighborhood, Attends ticketed performances outside one’s neighborhood, Going to another city for a cultural tour, Visit art exhibition inside one’s neighborhood, Visit art exhibition outside one’s neighborhood, Visit historical exhibit inside one’s neighborhood, & Visit historical exhibit outside one’s neighborhood

- **Things that can happen anywhere**:
  - **Participating**: Singing with the radio, Teaching language heritage to children, Learning about one’s ethnic/cultural history, Teaching cultural traditions to children, & Making crafts
  - **Observing**: Braid someone’s hair

**Group 5**
This group created categories using, “what’s commonly thought of as ‘more or less’ cultural”:

- **Home**:
  - **more**: music, teaching, learning [listening to children play musical instruments at home, playing musical instruments at home, teaching language heritage to children, learning about one’s ethnic/cultural history, & teaching cultural traditions to children]
  - **less**: gardening, decorating, cooking [Observing religious holidays at home, making crafts, singing with the radio, decorating one’s house, socializing on the front porch, gardening in one’s neighborhood/home, cooking traditional ethnic foods, braid someone’s hair, participate in family celebrations at home, listening to music on the radio]

- **Neighborhood**:
  - **more**: church, community arts center, parks, clubs, library [Volunteering for social action through one’s church, attend ethnic festival in one’s neighborhood, visit historical exhibit inside one’s neighborhood, visit art exhibition inside one’s neighborhood, singing in the church choir, participating in heritage day at one’s church, attend ethnic/cultural festival in neighborhood park, attending free performance in one’s neighborhood, attends ticketed performances in one’s neighborhood, taking an art class in one’s neighborhood, & going to the library in one’s neighborhood.]
  - **less**: crafts [Attending a crafts exhibit in one’s neighborhood, participating in social dancing at a club in one’s neighborhood, participate in hip-hop event at community arts center, participate in hip-hop event at neighborhood club.]

- **Outside the neighborhood**:
  - **more**: regional performing arts, city, parkway, Penn’s landing, galleries, museums [Attends ticketed performances outside one’s neighborhood, going to another city for a cultural tour, attending a son’s concert performance at a regional performing arts center, attending outdoor musical concert at Penn’s landing, attending free performance outside one’s neighborhood, visit art exhibition outside one’s neighborhood, Attend ethnic festival held on the Parkway & visit historical exhibit outside one’s neighborhood.]
  - **less**: crafts exhibits [Attending a crafts exhibit outside one’s neighborhood.]