9-2005

Revisiting Invasion-Succession: Social Relations in a Gentrifying Neighborhood

Lynda Franks
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Franks, Lynda, "Revisiting Invasion-Succession: Social Relations in a Gentrifying Neighborhood" (2005).
Dissertations and Theses. Paper 2880.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2874>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Lynda (ricci) Franks for the Master of Science in Sociology were presented September 2, 2005, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

Peter Collier, Chair

Grant Farr

Daniel Sullivan

Dalton Miller-Jones
Representative of the Office of Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL:

Veronica Dujon, Chair
Department of Sociology

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Lynda (ricci) Franks for the Master of Science in Sociology presented September 2, 2005.

Title: Revisiting Invasion-Succession: Social Relations in a Gentrifying Neighborhood

This thesis examines the social relationships of different residents in a gentrifying neighborhood in Northeast Portland, Oregon. It examines theoretical tenants in the social identity tradition to understand social change in terms of the impact of neighborhood change on the day-to-day interactions of individuals in a gentrifying neighborhood by exploring the ways in which different members of that neighborhood define and describe the terms “neighborhood”, “neighbor”, and “neighborly behavior”.

Intergroup neighboring research posits two outcomes of neighborhood change on interactions between old and new neighbors, one of conflict, the other of cooperation. The conflict perspective proposes that, in situations where new, higher-income, better educated, socially dominant group members move into a previously lower-income, racially-mixed neighborhood, communication between old and new neighbors is limited by group differences in values and priorities.

Conversely, research in cooperative intergroup neighboring in times of change demonstrates that the different members can, under certain conditions, collectively act to address adverse changes to their shared environment. Conditions promoting between-group cooperation in a changing environment include a history of

neighborhood political activism, *an atypical ideological attraction to diversity*, and the ability to articulate common interests and goals.

The thesis examines the applicability of these two perspectives through a qualitative case study of “neighboring” relations in a portion of King neighborhood. It specifically seeks to understand how residents’ stated perceptions and observed outcomes can be related to issues in class-classism, race-racism, and length of residence in the neighborhood or if other factors such as reasons for choosing *this* neighborhood, prior and recent experiences, and one’s ideological/ cultural worldview supercede economic-racial concerns.

The study found that the ‘different residents’ viewed neighborhood, in general, and their neighborhood and neighbors, in particular, through a variety of filters. While ‘race’ was mentioned in describing past interactions, respondents focused more on the broad, albeit mundane, factors of everyday life such as friendliness, approachability, and speaking rather than specific racial-ethnic or economic-class differences. These results are consistent with intergroup neighboring cohesion research showing that class and race are not readily important when neighborhood is viewed as a place of comfort, self-expression, or desired relaxation.

**'REVISITING INVASION-SUCCESSION':
SOCIAL RELATIONS IN A GENTRIFYING NEIGHBORHOOD**

**by
LYNDA (RICCI) FRANKS**

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of**

**MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SOCIOLOGY**

**Portland State University
2005**

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
Chapter One	
Introduction	1-4
Chapter Two	
Literature Review	5-30
Social Change	5
Social Change and Neighborhood Change	7
Gentrification	11
Characteristics of Gentrifiers.....	12
The Meaning of Neighborhood	15-20
Functions of Neighborhood.....	17
A Meaningful Conception of Neighborhood	20
Neighborhoodly Behavior and Neighborliness	21
Class and Inter-group Neighborliness	22
Race and Inter-group Neighborliness	23
White Neighborhoodly Behavior and Neighborhood Choice	25
Black Neighborhoodly Behavior and Neighborhood Choice	27
Chapter Three	
Theoretical Foundations	31-42
Social Identity Theory	31
Social Identity and Inter-group Relations: Conflict or Cooperation ...	32
Social Identity and Inter-group Conflict	34
Social Identity and Inter-group Cooperation	38
Research Questions	43
Chapter Four	
Methodology	45-54
Rationale	45
The Research Site	46
King Neighborhood in Socio-Historical Context	47
Design	51
Interviews	52
Participants	54
Data Analysis	56
Chapter Five	
Findings	58-83
Research Question 1	58

Research Question 2	71
Chapter Six	
Discussion and Conclusion	84-97
Theoretical Dynamics	93
Implications	96
Limitations	99
Suggestions for Future Research	101
Notes	103
References	104
Appendix A: Table A1: Comparative Census Data	115
Appendix B: Table B1: Who They Are	116

List Of Tables

Table 1: Qualitative Research Design	51
---	-----------

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This thesis investigates social change within the context of neighborhood, by examining the social relationships of residents in a gentrifying area of Northeast Portland, Oregon. It seeks to understand the impact of neighborhood change on individuals' day-to-day interactions by exploring the ways in which different members of that neighborhood define and describe the terms "neighborhood," "neighbor," and "neighborly behavior".

The neighborhood has long been viewed as a microcosm of society, to such a degree that the terms "social relations" and "neighborly relations" are used interchangeably in the literature (Ellen 2000; Gotham 2000, 1986; Jezierski 1999; Molotch 1969; Massey 2001; Massey & Denton 1993; 1989; Park 1934; Saltman 1990; Wilson 1996; Woods 1914). Both are understood as consisting of the institutions and arrangements of society, as well as concrete behaviors that are taking place globally, locally, and with persons next door (Blumer 1961; Brewer 1991, 1996; Woods 1914). In other words, social relations and neighborly relations consist of both macro- (institutional) and micro- (interactional) processes.

In addition, social change and neighborhood change are cited as relatively constant processes in modern society (Ellen 2000; Molotch 1969; Schwirian 1983). This thesis treats neighborhood change as a proxy for social change. It focuses on patterns of neighborly interaction as a means of exploring how individuals experience social / neighborhood change in their everyday life. More specifically, research on

intergroup neighboring posits two outcomes of neighborhood change on interactions between neighbors—one of conflict and the other of cooperation.

The dominant view is one of between-group conflict, as exemplified by social dominance theory's proposition that *real social change* is but an ideological illusion. The other is of between-group cooperation. An example of this approach is social identity theory's conceptualization of real or *meaningful social change* as possible under certain conditions.

The inter-group conflict perspective proposes that, in situations where new, better-educated, higher-income majority group members move into previously lower-income, racially-mixed neighborhoods, communication between old and new neighbors will be limited by group differences in values and priorities (Lee, Campbell, & Miller 1991). From this perspective, higher-income newcomers are likely to have and prefer friendship networks outside of the neighborhood. This approach proposes that regardless of length of residency, 'different residents' are likely to categorize and understand self, environment, and others' behaviors at the group level, i.e. based on class and/or race.

Conversely, research on cooperative inter-group neighboring in times of change demonstrates that under certain internal and external conditions, neighborhood members of different groups can collectively act to address adverse changes in their shared environment (Donnelly & Majka 1998, 1996; Saltman 1991, 1991). This perspective suggests "the longer that people reside in an area, the more likely they are to have extensive neighborly and friendship ties in the neighborhood" (Donnelly &

Majka 1996:270). Conditions promoting between-group cooperation in a changing neighborhood include a history of neighborhood political activism, an expressed atypical ideological attraction to diversity, and the ability to articulate common interests and goals.

This thesis examines the applicability of these two perspectives through a qualitative study of neighboring relations in a portion of Portland's King neighborhood. It specifically explores whether different residents' stated perceptions and observations of interactions with their neighbors are understood exclusively in terms of class and race, or if other factors, such as length of residency, reasons for choosing this neighborhood, and one's ideological / cultural world-view, supercede these concerns. The following two research questions were developed:

- (1) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe the term neighborhood?
- (2) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe the term neighbor? How do they perceive one another as neighbors

Because this thesis draws from a wide range of historical and contemporary literature it is organized in the following manner. In the next chapter (two), I review literature in the areas of social change, concepts of neighborhood, neighborhood change and gentrification, what it means to be a neighbor, and the impact of class, race, and/or culture on intergroup neighborly behavior. In chapter three I discuss the

two competing theoretical perspectives that inform this thesis. I provide the methodological underpinnings of this research in chapter four. In chapter five I present the results of my study. Finally, in chapter six, I discuss the implications of my findings in regards to the literature on inter-group neighborly relations during times of change.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I review the literature relevant to this thesis. The chapter is divided in to four sections, two of which have to do with “change,” the other two with “meaning.” The first section deals with “social change,” while the second section examines the connection between “social change and neighborhood change.” The third section examines the literature on the “meaning of neighborhood,” and the final section examines the “meaning of neighborly behavior,” including racial differences in urban neighboring behavior.

Social Change

“...I believe there will ultimately be a clash between the oppressed and those who do the oppressing. I believe that there will be a clash between those who want freedom, justice, and equality for everyone and those who want to continue the system of exploitation. I believe that there will be that kind of clash. But I do not think it will be based on the colour of the skin” --Malcolm X (1964)

One of the oldest questions throughout American democracy is how and why, after all our efforts social segregation and inequality persist. At the heart of matter are questions about the meaning of social change in contemporary behaviors, what it looks like, and how it gets measured and described. Social change is an often used, but rarely defined concept.

Social change theorists and researchers look for explanations on several different levels. Some look to macro-level analyses of the institutions, arrangements, and relations of society. Others look to micro-level studies of individual and

collective attitudes and behaviors. Still others employ a multiple perspective frame to examine human-social dispositions and the combined affects of macro and micro level processes. A close examination of the literature on social change in the U.S. reveals a complex web of theoretical concepts whose meaning largely depends on who is conducting the research and why, as well as where one is looking.

Broadly understood, social change is a twofold process, taking place on a continuum within a structural frame and existing somewhere between technological innovation (social evolution) and belief system (social revolution).¹ In the research, social change typically refers to population increases, movements, or implies that some shift has occurred in the nature of society—its institutions, arrangements, and relations—such as in education and housing (Bell 2004; Bowles & Gintis 1976; Gotham 2000; Massey 2001; Roberts 1990).

In the United States, social change, in terms of how society is organized, usually refers to some mandated movement away from exclusionary speech and practice deemed inappropriate for a democracy (Bennett 1993; Cromwell 1920; Doyle 1933, 1936; Lee 2000; Michalos & Zumbo 2001; Meertens & Pettigrew 1997; Murray 1953). Such shifts, according to Wilson (1978), have been firmly tied to social conflict in changing economic-class relations at least since antebellum slavery and the early post-bellum era. Contemporary research continues to show how modern forms of structural change are but racialized reconfigurations of economic-class relations.²

As a twofold process, however, social change in a democracy also implies individuals believe democratic structures and institutions are alterable by “changes in

consciousness, climates of opinion, and culture” (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan et al. 1985:275). In the quote at the beginning of this chapter, Malcolm suggested that social change necessarily calls for some ideological shift in beliefs and attitudes, in the ways that people view and treat one another.

While the bulk of contemporary social change research is conflict oriented, historical record is filled with civil protest efforts and battles resulting in new legislation and amendments such as school desegregation and anti-housing discrimination (Bell 2004; Goering 1986; Roberts 1990). It is clear that whenever *real social change* (Hogg & Abrams 1988) has occurred in this country, it was instigated by a collective group of ‘different people’—individuals representing various ethno-cultural, socio-economic backgrounds and political affiliations (Freeman & Johnson 1999; Jasper 1997; Piven & Cloward 1977).

The conflict and cooperative approaches to understanding social change suggests that society is too large a context to look for meaning in contemporary behaviors. Therefore in this thesis, a particular type of neighborhood was selected as a context for understanding how social change in terms of neighborhood change is experienced by individuals in their everyday lives.

Social Change and Neighborhood Change

Social change and neighborhood change are cited as relatively constant processes in modern society, often assumed or expected to go hand-n-hand with each other (Park 1921, 1934). Ecological models of neighborhood change illustrate there

have always been shifts in different classes of people moving into and out of city neighborhoods.³ Urban Sociologists have described these shifts in stage model processes corresponding to the natural aging-cycle of a neighborhood (Hoover & Vernon 1959), or as the ethnic change (invasion) and downward shift (succession) in the class composition of people entering a neighborhood (Park 1921; Schwirian 1983). Although neighborhood change through the life cycle is often treated as a series of invasion-succession cycles, Park's seminal ethnic invasion-succession model of neighborhood change is more widely used (Schwirian 1983). Both models attempt to address processes in social interaction and suggest the process may stall before complete turnover, or may not progress concurrently through stages.

As Park observed urban neighborhood change he predicted that, following a series of contact-conflict stages, neighborly behaviors between old and new neighbors would eventually succumb to cultural assimilation and social harmony. The assumption here is that a constantly changing society will facilitate changes in the way 'different people' view and treat one another juxtaposed against where we (America's citizens) should be as a 'free-thinking' democratic society (Sidanius & Pratto 1999; Sigelman, Bledsoe, Welch, & Combs 1996).

However, a closer examination of this model reveals that social change does not necessarily mean neighborhood change nor does neighborhood change imply social change. Whether concepts of social change and neighborhood change are complimentary or independent depends upon whether one is looking through a lens of class, race, or culture. The point to note here is that while invasion-succession has

been adapted to address 'race-based-issues' in neighborhood change,⁴ the original model dealt specifically with economic-class relations and cultural clashes in response to major international shifts in relations when ethnic-identities were strong and, perhaps, white-skinned newcomers had not yet assimilated American culture (S. Pedraza & R. Rumbaut 1996).⁵

The ethnic invasion-succession model of neighborhood change says nothing about neighborhood race relations. Contemporary neighborhood research continues to treat ethnic relations and 'race' relations' as separate issues (see Park 1919, 1934, 1950). This is not to suggest that Park and other early Chicago School thinkers did not recognize the emerging role and relationship between 'race' and neighborhood. As Park later describes in "The Nature of Race Relations" (1950),

Race relations, as that term is defined in use and wont in the United States, are the relations existing between peoples...particularly when these racial differences enter into the consciousness of the individuals and groups so distinguished, and by so doing determine in each case the individual's conception of himself as well as his status in the community... Race relations, in this more inclusive sense, might comprise, therefore, all those situations in which some relatively stable equilibrium between competing races has been achieved... All this suggests that the term race relations...includes relations which are not now conscious or personal, though they have been; relations which are fixed and enforced by the custom, convention, and the routine of an expected social order (Park 1950 in L. Back & J. Solomos 2000:105-06).

Park's perspectives hold two important implications for the impact of neighborhood change on intergroup neighborly relations. First, social relations in a changing neighborhood will involve contact-conflict between old and new neighbors. Invasion-succession suggests that over time, stable, ethnic-based neighborhood relationships will develop in spite of class-based differences. Secondly, when 'race' is

involved, race-relations, must, by necessity, underlie neighborhood change when multiple groups “distinguished by racial differences” are involved. According to Park (1950), “one speaks of race relations when there is a race problem” (in L. Back & J. Solomos 2000:105).

Although Park’s implications are three decades apart, he points to a shift in American society where prior, ‘race’ and neighborhood relations were relatively unimportant sociological issues. For example, both Gotham (2000) and Massey (2001) indicate it was around the early 1920s when suburbanization (‘white flight’), ghettoization (‘black blight’), and restrictive covenants began sweeping across the country. Prior to this era urban environments were economically strong, socially vibrant, and ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ tended to live close to one another, often sharing the same city block (Ellen 2000; Massey 2001).

Gotham (2000) traces the birth and continual association between ‘race’ and place to economic motivations and the rise of the modern real estate industry. Massey and Denton (1993) highlight federal housing mandate reactions to mass northern migration to illustrate this shift.

In evaluating neighborhoods, the agency followed the HOLC’s earlier lead in racial matters; it too manifested an obsessive concern with the presence of what the 1939 FHA Underwriting Manual call “inharmonious racial or nationality groups.” According to the manual, “if a neighborhood is to retain stability, it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes (Massey & Denton 1993:54).

Gotham identified neighborhood change as a social process in the racialization of place and space “that linked race and culturally specific behavior to place of residence in the city” (2000:616). Gentrification is a recent process in urban

neighborhood change calling attention to the strength of this link between 'race' in terms of inharmonious social groups, place, and culturally specific behavior.

Gentrification

Gentrification is a recent social process in urban neighborhood change. Facilitated by national economic restructuring activities of the late 1960s, gentrification often occurs near the end of a neighborhoods' life cycle (Freeman & Braconi 2004; Kennedy & Leonard 2001; Schwirian & Gustavo 1993; Zukin 1987). The process is marked either sequentially or concurrently by new housing construction, old-stock rejuvenation, new culturally specific neighborhood amenities, and most notably the entry of higher classes of people into "socially marginalized portions of a city" (Zukin 1987:131; Kennedy & Leonard 2001; Kerstein 1990; Taylor 1994; Wilson 1995). According to Zukin, rarely does gentrification extend "beyond a street or neighborhood to an entire census tract" (1987:133). Residents of neighborhoods undergoing gentrification experience a sort of seeping process as old faces and places are replaced by new (Kerstein 1990; Zukin 1987).

Gentrification is a particularly complicated social process with much public and private debate over the intent and consequences of the process. As an urban upliftment process, gentrification may be viewed as a much-needed economic scheme to combat urban deterioration (Freeman & Braconi 2004; Immergluck 1999; Karsten 2003; Zukin 1987). As a displacement process, gentrification may be perceived as just another economic scheme in the racialization of place and space (Bostic & Marin

2003; Gotham 2000; Massey 2001; Massey & Denton 1993, 1989). Interesting, too, is that both sides of this debate are regularly argued by both longtime residents and newcomers.

Characteristics of Gentrifiers

Several distinct and somewhat confusing perspectives have developed in regards to who and what constitutes the gentrifying class. This confusion lends itself to varying implications as to the type of social interaction. In terms of class and 'race' the gentrifiers are typically young, higher-income, well-educated Anglo American-whites who may be city-to-city in-movers, intra-regional re-locaters, or what some call the sons and daughters of white-flighters i.e. back-to-the-city in-movers (Carpenter & Lees 1995; Immergluck 1999; Kennedy & Leonard 2001; Spain 1992; Taylor 1994; Wilson 1992). In most cases the socially marginalized in gentrification studies are African American-blacks, regardless of education, income, or tenure.

Conversely, cultural analyses suggest that the gentrifiers do not represent a single or homogeneous class of people (Redfern 2003; Zukin 1987). The gentrifiers also include single mothers, families with children, first time homeowners, low-income in-movers, the informally and self-employed, educators, and corporate employees seeking close proximity to downtown employment (Karsten 2003; Zukin 1987).

Moreover, socially marginalized neighborhoods and people does not neatly imply African Americans. For example, it is likely that not all 'whites' were

economically able to flee black encroachment, urban deterioration, and ghettoization. According to Zukin, class-based/economic arguments are subject to finely tuned variations because “different forms of capital have a different relation to space and time” (1987:138). To this point, there is little research on a Mexican, Latino, Asian, or a ‘black’ gentrifying class beyond mere inference (Bostic & Marin 2003; Prince 2002). In addition, length of residency has been shown to have various positive affects on intergroup neighboring and on how people view their environment.

Still, when gentrifiers are understood as coming from a range of social groups, there is agreement among researchers that they are “different from other middle class people,” likely to have different economic and political access as well as different “interests than their pre-established neighbors” (Zukin 1987:131; Butler 2003; Redfern 2003). Butler’s (2003) social interaction study found little “day-to-day” contact between middle-class gentrifiers and their children with non-middle-class neighbors. According to Redfern, the gentrifiers are different from both suburbanites and those they displace. However, the motivations for each group are the same, “a concern for defining and preserving identity in the modern world... What differs between them are the means at the disposal of each group” (2003:2351).

These latter studies support Zukin’s assertion that, in no way but proximity does gentrification counteract the economic and racial polarization of most urban populations.

The gentrifiers’ choice of neighborhood does not imply their social integration with existing neighbors of a different race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. In street encounters, they approach each other warily until familiarity with neighborhood routine ensures politeness. New middle class residents

often expect crime to be as prevalent as “background noise.” For their part, existing residents may resent the superimposition of an alien culture...with different consumption patterns and an accelerated pace of change on their community (Zukin 1987:132-133).

While much of the gentrification research spotlights issues of class and ‘race’ to predict intergroup conflict, in most cases the actual between-resident conflict that is expected has more to do with differences in length of residency. Accordingly, different interest, experiences, and expectations are likely to produce contact-conflict over place, space, identity and history “as newcomers... generate a critical mass of people with greater access to resources than long-term residents” (Spain 1993:156; Bowman 1994; Kennedy & Leonard 2001 Schwirian & Gustavo 1993; Zukin 1987).

What is clear about gentrification is that it represents a moment in time where different perceptions, experiences, and resulting expectations are colliding or converging in the neighborhood. What is most intriguing about the process is that it is actually experienced as part of individuals’ everyday interactions with others. In this context, gentrification represents an extraordinary opportunity to gain insights into intergroup relations and the underlying motivations for behavior in a gentrifying neighborhood.

The changing nature of a gentrifying neighborhood also makes available information as to what neighborhood and neighbor means to ‘different people’. This is important because, while the dominant view in literature states that class and ‘race’ can always be used to define neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behavior (Lee et al. 1991; Massey et al. 1994, 1993, 1989), others argue that there exist no single,

generalizable concept, definition, or meaning of these terms (Forrest & Kearns 2001; Kearns & Parkinson 2001).

In the remaining sections I review what appears to be two separate bodies of literature on how neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behavior get defined and described—one of conflict and the other of cooperation. There is also disagreement in the literature over the significance of a neighborhood versus a community. No doubt, a neighborhood is a geographic area that also contains types of people and interactions. Thus, in most cases, defining a meaning and function of neighborhood, infers concepts of neighbor.

The Meaning of Neighborhood

According to the literature, neighborly relations reflect societal relations. Yet, there is still a debate as to what constitutes a neighborhood. Part of the problem with defining neighborhood and neighboring behavior lies in analytical difficulties with understanding actions that only have meaning in a particular context. As Blumer (1969) explains, a large part of the problem with finding out what something means to people is that meaning is a social product, “creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact” (in Collins 1994: 306). What one resident understands to be a neighborhood may not be so for another. There is also debate as to what constitutes a neighborhood, the relevance of a neighborhood as opposed to the significance of a community, and whether the one is sociologically more meaningful than the other. The debates appear to be a matter of meaning rather than geographic size and composition.

In some cases, community constitutes a larger and more mobile entity than a neighborhood. For example, there are church communities, work communities, and other extended networks that an individual may carry to and from the neighborhood (Forrest & Kearns 2001; Jezierski 1999). Lash defines “community” as “collectivities of shared background practices, shared meanings, and shared routine activities in the achievement of meaning” (Lash 1994 in Jezierski, 88). Traditional notions of community are of support systems “based upon overlapping, dense and homogeneous, local social networks” (Jezierski 1999:88). It is this sense of community homogeneity that is under threat of fragmentation by increasing heterogeneity (Hutchinson, Rodriguez, & Hagan 1996; Jezierski 1999; Woolever 1992). A decrease in neighborhood homogeneity has a strong effect on residents’ sense of community and neighboring (Lee et al. 1991).

In other cases, neighborhood may be the larger, more tangible object like money, or symbols and statements of cultural status (Butler 2003; Zukin 1987). Galster (2001:2112) conceptualized the contemporary neighborhood as a commodity, a consumable cluster or “bundle of spatially based attributes” that Forrest and Kearns assert can be bought and sold. “People may buy into neighborhoods as physical environments rather than necessarily anticipate or practice a great degree of local social interaction” (Forrest & Kearns 2001:130; Butler 2003; Zukin 1987).

More often than not, neighborhood and community are used interchangeably, particularly in intergroup neighboring studies. Hutchinson et al. (1996) posit that both neighborhood and community represent something both geographic and

psychologic. However in studies that do make a distinction, frequency, type, and degree of routine social interaction appear to be major distinctions between neighborhood and community.

While researchers agree that there are differences between “neighborhoods” and “communities” in terms of how individuals interact in each, they cannot agree as to what those differences are. Thus, this thesis utilizes Woods’ 1914 definition of neighborhood as “a vital public arena...small enough to be a comprehensible and manageable community unity...large enough to include in essence all the problems of the city, the state, and the nation; and in a constantly increasing number of instances in this country it includes all the fundamental international issues” (578-79).

Functions of Neighborhoods

Neighborhoods tell stories; they have histories, identities, and shared reputations each affected by national and local processes of economic change (Guthrie & Hutchinson 1995; Jaret & Reitzes 1999; Jezierski 1999; Kennedy & Leonard 2001; Logan & Collver 1983; Spain 1993; Zubrinsky 2000). Neighborhoods also serve certain functions in regards to structural organization and individual meaning (Kearns & Parkinson 2001; Massey & Denton 1993).

Some neighborhoods, like some people, are perceived as economically and politically more valuable than others (Harris 1999; Logan & Collver 1983; Zubrinsky 2000; Zubrinsky & Bobo 1996). Desirability studies show that ‘people’—in general, have some common-sense knowledge of a neighborhood’s meaning, value, and location (Krysan 2002; 1983; Logan & Collver 1983; Zubrinsky 2000). However,

having common knowledge by no means implies socially shared experiences in neighborhoods or with neighbors.

As a geographic entity with shared reputations, a neighborhood is a bound area understood as spaces and places wherein particular types of people, thought to look and behave in mannerisms different than other types of people (Fellin & Litwak 1963; Meyer 1951), tend to cluster or be clustered in particular regions of the nation, particular cities, and areas within states (Galster 2001; Gotham 2001; Kearns & Parkinson 2001; Massey et al. 1993, 1989; Meyer 1954; Woods 1914).

A neighborhood is also a social-psychological entity. Stratification studies show that where one lives helps determine one's personal and social well being in terms of access to and accumulation of social value and goods including quality education, good and fresh food, decent health care, clean air, political representation, and social prestige (Alex-Assensoh 1997; Garcia & Herrero 2004; Massey et al. 1994, 1993, 1989; Ross, Reynolds, & Geis 2000; Ross & Mirowsky 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowley 2002; Shinn & Toohey 2003; Tigges, Browne, & Green 1998).

Exemplified in this literature is that the residential history of social relations in the United States is an antagonistic story of a highly contested arena of identity protection that is exhibited most clearly when it is threatened with change (Feagin 2001; Gotham 2000; Jasper 1997; Massey 2001; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000; Olzak, Shanahan, & McEneaney 1996; Schwirian 1993, 1983; St John & Clymer 2000). As Massey and others argue, in an economically and racially stratified environment,

“residential segregation is the principle organizational feature of American society” (Massey & Denton 1993:9; Durant & Sparrow 1997). Relatively clear is that nowhere in the entire social realm have classist and racist attitudes and behaviors proven more resistant to change than in how neighborhood gets defined and described.

At the same time, however, a significant portion of the research shows that ‘people’ do not typically define their environment(s) along a single dimension (Adams 1992; Austin & Baba 1990; Woldoff 2002; Woolever 1992). Social interaction within particular contexts and situations hold non-generalizable meanings for the individual (Benson 1990; Forrest & Kearns 2001; Kearns & Parkinson 2001). Kearns and Parkinson (2001) argue a single neighborhood exists on many different, and overlapping scales wherein each representation has its own predominant purpose and function. According to Grannis (1998), street design affects patterns of neighborly interaction.

Kearns and Parkinson state the “home area” (a 5-10 minute walk from one’s home) provides the strongest sense of identity and belonging in terms of environmental quality and perceptions of co-residents. The home area also serves such functions as places for “relaxation and re-creation of self; making connections with others; fostering attachments... and demonstrating or reflecting one’s own values” (Kearns & Parkinson 2001:2103; Meyer 1951). This fits well with Perin’s (1988) description of the “good neighbor” as “someone who leaves you alone and looks out for you” (in Benson 1990:363). Meyer exclaimed that “the true meaning” of neighborhood is one “where people know one another, are identified by a definite

local status, and present in themselves little societies with marked social stratification and a recognizable public opinion” (1951: 477).

This literature calls attention to a small but growing body of research demonstrating that stable, economically and racially (mixed status) neighborhoods do exist and have existed for more than five decades (Donnelly & Majka 1998, 1996; Ellen 2000; Galster 1998; Hunter 1975; Saltman 1990, 1991; Smith 1998). Although stable mixed status neighborhood research tends to be descriptive—concerned with measuring integration or integrated neighborhoods—Donnelly and Majka’s studies show that in some neighborhoods, ‘different residents’ were deliberately making “atypical ideological choices” towards creating that integrated sense of community (Donnelly & Majka 1996:272; Forrest & Kearns 2001; Guthrie & Hutchinson 1995; Haggerty 1982; Hutchinson et al. 1995; Hunter 1975; Jezierski 1999; Saltman 1990). This line of research suggests that, under certain conditions, the ‘different members’ of a demographically changing neighborhood can create a socially integrated community.

A Meaningful Conception of Neighborhood

The neighborhood, unlike any other social institution, represents a place that conjures ‘pictures in the mind’ containing specific images and words that may also generate special kinds of feelings and behaviors (Forrest & Kearns 2000; Kearns and Parkinson 2001; Mead 1934; Woldoff 2002). For any one individual, neighborhood is considered a resting ground, a place of familiarity, comfort, choice, or an interpersonal haven from a daily grind where personal identities may be subsumed by social

demands (Forrest & Kearns 2000; Kearns and Parkinson 2001; Haggerty 1982; Jagun et al. 1990; Meyer 1951; Woldoff 2002).

For others, ideas of neighborhood, particularly under changing condition, may invoke feelings of fear, anxiety, uncertainty, and discomfort “where the people cannot be trusted and are disinclined to watch out for one another” (Woldoff, 107; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000). In a group of two or more individuals, neighborhood may be described along similar dimensions (Adams 1992; Austin & Baba 1990; Woolever 1992), but it is highly unlikely that the meaning one individual attaches to neighborhood will be exactly the same as another’s, even though they live within the same geographic context or environment. In this respect, the true meaning of neighborhood and neighbor are wrapped up in each of its member’s personal and social identities.

Neighorly Behavior and Neighborliness

According to Mann (1954), “neighborliness” is a twofold concept existing on a continuum of positive and negative behaviors. *Manifest* neighborliness is characterized by “overt forms” of social interactions. Overt behaviors include saying “hello,” lengthy discussions, routine assistance, helping in minor emergencies, problem solving with neighbors, watching each others’ homes, active local friendship networks, and “mutual visiting in the home and going out for purposes of pleasure” (Mann 1954: 163; Lee et al. 1991; Benson 1990; Donnelly & Majka 1996; Woldoff 2002).

Latent neighborliness, “the more crucial form of behavior,” refers to casual contact, conversation, or “favorable attitudes to neighbors which result in positive action when a need arises” (Mann, 164). According to Mann, a mix of too much manifest neighborly behavior with too little latent neighborliness can result in tensions between neighbors. Yet, where there are high levels of both behaviors there is potential “for a great deal of intercourse between neighbors” (Mann 1954:164-65).

More recent studies have expanded Mann’s simple twofold concept. Neighborhood attachment studies describe ‘neighborliness’ as a behavior existing somewhere between a heartfelt sentimental attachment to place and evaluative assessments (Adams 1990; Lee et al. 1991; Woldoff 2002; Woolever 1992). Evaluative attachment usually involves a subjective, comparative assessment of one’s own neighborhood to another, or objectively determined perceptions based on what the neighborhood has to offer economically, politically, and psychologically (Logan & Collver 1983; Woldoff 2002). Although evaluative assessments are often economically and/or racially defined, one’s attachment to place may be as simple as satisfaction with neighborhood upkeep and community participation (Adams 1992; Austin & Baba 1990), or contextual indicators such as feelings of belongingness, pride in the area, level of commitment, or concern with the welfare of the total community (Haggerty 1982; Woolever 1992).

Class and Inter-group Neighborliness

Within the range of possible manifest and latent behaviors, neighborliness most often appears a matter of type and degree. In different studies, content and

frequency may be attributed to sex, age, length of residence, presence of children, tenure, education level, or most notably economic-class status and race (Benson 1990; Campbell & Lee 1990; Durant & Sparrow 1997; Jagun, Brown, Milburn, & Gary 1990; Lee et al. 1991).

Durant & Sparrow (1997) found intra-group variations in neighboring based on perceived economic-class status. Benson's examination of "the good neighbor" in low-status environments argues neighboring behaviors between different racial and ethnic groups is conditioned by, amongst other things, "shared second class status" (1990:361). Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) assert tensions can arise in low-status changing neighborhoods based on the education and income levels of 'different residents'.

Race and Inter-group Neighborliness

In many studies, 'race' is a proxy variable for class. However, considering so-called racial differences in urban neighboring serves as a useful explanatory frame when neighborhood is treated as a vital social institution. According to racial differences research, 'blacks' tend to have more "frequent" and "meaningful" contacts with their neighbors whereas 'whites' tend to have "more short conversations", even in racially mixed settings (Lee et al. 1991:536; Sigelman et al. 1996). Lee et al. offer adaptation theory as an explanation for why "the two races neighbor differently" (1991:542). They suggest that 'blacks' greater frequency in neighboring and use of neighbor may be a generational response to an "outgrowth of limited access to alternative sources of aid" (1991:542, 544; Jagun et al. 1990). More specifically,

adaptation theory is essentially a perspective considering environmental influences on human behavior.

The generational response to neighboring and racial differences in use of neighbor pertains to the history of social inequality. Wilson (1990) highlights this point stating that 'race' is an important indicator of behavior "to the extent that it signifies a historically determined channel of experience." To such an extent, he posits that a "genuine Black" community "life-style" exists to the degree "that unfilled needs for symbols, meaning, and values often had to be met from within the black community" (24).

Still, the generational explanation evades intuitive sense by posing more questions than answers. It suggests that there is enough of a comparative distinction in the ways 'blacks' and 'whites' neighbor to constitute 'black behavior' and 'white behavior'. The distinction assumes a group experience; ignoring the individuals' experience, neighboring in less than 100% black neighborhoods, and the so-called black middle-class experience. It alternatively suggests that regardless of environmental conditions (physical, social, economic, and social psychological) 'white neighborly behavior' is constant.

A more pronounced shift in contemporary research from Mann's apparent class-less and race-less conception of neighborliness is toward distinct 'black'- 'white' behaviors. The distinction between 'black neighborly behaviors' and 'white neighborly behaviors' is commonly found in neighborhood-neighbor preference research seeking to explain persist segregation.

White Neighborly Behavior and Neighborhood Choice

Research argues that social segregation and inequality persist because Anglo-Americans simply do not like African-Americans particularly as neighbors (Massey & Denton 1993; Schuman & Bobo 1988; Schuman & Steeh 1996; Steeh & Schuman 1992). While there exist regional (Farley & Frey 1994), contextual, and cohort variations in type and degree of black-dislike (Bobo & Hutchings 1996; Sigelman et al. 1996), a majority of 'white-identified' respondents appear predisposed to some type of racist behavior or outgroup dislike (Benson 1990; Green, Strolovitch, & Wong 1998; Harris 1999; Lee 2000; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000; Olzak, Shanahan, & McEneaney 1996; Zubrinsky 2000; Zubrinsky & Bobo 1996). This predisposition tends to be strongest and most easily activated in demographically integrated and integrating neighborhoods in response to perceptions of changes in the socioeconomic status (education and income) of the neighborhood.

Neighborhood preference literature further suggests that social segregation and inequality persist because 'blacks' and 'whites' hold deep-seated psychological fears of each other (Bobo & Hutchings 1996; Forrest & Kearns 2001; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000; Ross et al. 2000; Woldoff 2002). Any number of historically determined or learned factors may contribute to the origins of these fears. Some researchers propose that "perceptions of fear affects people's psychological dispositions, social behavior, and is linked to individual socio-demographic characteristics...[but] fear is a social fact rather than an individual fact" (Liska, Lawrence, & Sanchirico 1982:768;

Clemente and Klieman 1977; Ross & Mirowsky 2001). Feagin (2001) explains

‘whites’ fears of ‘blacks’ in the following manner.

Fear is central to the ideology and attitudes woven through the system of anti black oppression... As they are socialized, young whites learn, directly and indirectly, consciously and unconsciously, that the dark otherness of black Americans symbolizes degradation, danger, sinfulness, or the unknown-imagery dating back to at least the seventeenth century and still present in white imaginings (p. 78).

Feagin and others suggest that, because of the comparative advantage in ‘being white’ (Shaw 2000), Anglo-Americans are afraid of amalgamating with any perceived low-status or minority group (Bobo & Hutchings 1996). Class-based preference researchers argue ‘whites’ are economically motivated to avoid low status neighbors and integrated neighborhoods out fear of losing property value because, indeed, ‘they do drop when blacks move in’ (Harris 1999). Harris argues it is not that ‘white people’ have an aversion to ‘black people’ per se, but rather those people “with low incomes [and education], weak attachments to the labor force,” and a “perceived lack of adherence to mainstream values” (Harris, 1999: 463; see also Goering 1986; Pollakowski 1982).

Conversely, Green et al. (1998) found that racially motivated crimes against African-, Asian-, and Latino-Americans (people of color) “stems not from economic frustration but from an exclusionary impulse on the part of ‘whites’ defending what they perceive to be their territory” (373). Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) examine the behaviors of ‘whites’ who lived in low status, ‘mixed-race’ environments. They argue that since ‘whites’ have always had the ability to economically and politically protect themselves against ‘black’ encroachment, “outgroup hostilities” may emerge in a

manner that has nothing to do with the racial composition of a neighborhood.” (575). Instead, ‘whites’ racial animosities towards ‘blacks’ in low status neighborhoods may be part and parcel a “systematic psychological response” to “economic and physical duress” (Oliver & Mendelberg, 575-79).

Kerstein’s (1990) stage-model analysis of gentrification also assumes a psychological relationship exists between time, neighboring, and the proportion of ‘whites’ already present in the neighborhood which is determined by the “risks” (e.g., risk oblivious, risk prone, risk averse respectively) individual ‘whites’ are willing to take upon moving into predominantly ‘black’ neighborhoods. These studies suggest ‘whites’ are simply afraid of becoming a neighborhood’s minority in that the presence of too many ‘blacks’ and other socially marginalized people emblematically challenges a privileged identity (Bobo 1997; Ellen 2000; Farley & Frey 1994; Feagin 2001; Green et al. 1998).

Black Neighborly Behavior and Neighborhood Choice

Less attention has been paid to African-Americans as neighbors beyond reactionary frames used to predict ‘white behaviors’ (Jagun et al. 1990; Krysan 2002). Repeatedly argued is that ‘blacks’ prefer living with ‘whites’, even at a 50/50 ratio, but fear outgroup animosity or hostility (Benson 1990; Green et al. 1998; Krysan 2002; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000; Olzak et al. 1996; Schuman & Steeh 1996). According to Zubrinsky (2000), this preference for ‘white’ neighbors should not be mistaken for an attraction to diversity, but rather a desire to live in cleaner, better neighborhoods.

Because progressive changes in ‘whites’ expressed racial attitudes towards ‘blacks’ have been noted (Bobo & Kluegel 1993; Hamberger & Hewstone 1997; Lee 2000; Meertens & Pettigrew 1997; Michalos & Zumbo 2001; Trepagnier 2002), some “blame persistent segregation” on racial solidarity or neutral ethnocentrism in terms of African Americans’ desire to live amongst their own kind (Krysan 2002: 938, but see Patterson 1997; Thernstrom & Thernstrom 1997). This argument suggests that segregation and inequality persist because a majority of ‘blacks’ simply do not like ‘whites’—in general. Thernstrom and Thernstrom (1997) attempt to explain this viewpoint.

If...fears of being cold-shouldered or worse had been the main deterrent to black movement into largely white neighborhoods...blacks in the Detroit metropolitan area should have shown greater willingness to enter white sections after 1976. White receptivity to having black neighbors certainly increased, and African Americans should have been able to discern the changes (in Krysan 2002:942).

Indeed, 1960’s federal policies have altered the demographic landscape of many U.S. neighborhoods and ‘whites’ general acceptance of ‘blacks’ has changed over the decades (Sigelman et al. 1996). However, as Sigelman and others argue, the quality and quantity of the contact “has undergone little change” (Sigelman et al. 1996:1326; Jackman & Crane 1986). Sigelman and Tuch (1997) suggest that a type of perceptual imbalance exists in ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ stereotypical perceptions of each other that may escape large-scale analyses.

The quality of the contact between ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ appears most attributable to individual-level variation such as age, one’s beliefs about the nature of society and perceptions of equal status, and education including early childhood

schooling (Krysan 2002; Pettigrew 1998; Sigelman et al. 1996, 1997). Individual African Americans who believe there remains a great deal of both institutionalized and individual discrimination tend to be less willing to share neighborhoods with 'whites'.⁶ Conversely, individual Anglo Americans who believe minority groups have gained full and equal rights tend not to prefer 'blacks' as neighbors i.e., the principle-implementation gap (Schuman & Steeh 1996; Zubrinsky et al. 1996, 2000).

In this chapter I have discussed social change, its conceptual complexities, and how it relates to concepts of neighborhood and neighborhood change. I also identified some of the difficulties in finding a single definition of neighborhood and thus, neighbor and neighborly behavior. The reviewed literature on racial differences in neighboring poses several underlying questions. Do 'different people' understand their own and others' everyday behavior in terms of 'black / white', race-based behavior, higher / lower class-based behavior, or do they explain the meaning of behavior in some other terms?

More specifically, if 'whites' dislike 'blacks' but are motivated in choosing a gentrifying neighborhood out of economic concerns, and 'blacks' distrust 'whites' but may welcome neighborhood upgrading, how do fear-based perceptions of race play out in everyday interactions in a gentrifying neighborhood? In addition, if fear is a social fact of American culture and society (Feagin 2001; Liska et al. 1982) is not everyone affected? This question is difficult to address since there is little evidence on other than a 'white' gentrifying class. Finally, if class and race are contrasting predictors of a person's social well being, the question arises, might there be an

alternative, more collective explanation for the ways people neighbor?

In the next chapter, I present the theoretical frame employed to explain expected types of people and intergroup neighborly behaviors in a gentrifying neighborhood. In particular, I explore two versions of Social Identity theory that offer different answers to each of the questions posed above.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

In this chapter I discuss the theoretical perspective used in this thesis. I first present a general description of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel 1969; Turner 1987, 1999; Hogg & Abrams 1988). Next I present two versions of social identity theory – Social Dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto 1999) and Optimal Distinctiveness theory (Brewer 1997, 1996, 1991)– that offer differing explanations of how social identity affects inter-group behavior. I close this chapter by presenting the research questions this thesis seeks to answer.

SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

Social identity and self-categorization theories make up what is generally referred to as the "social identity perspective" (Hogg 2001). This perspective emphasizes the importance of individuals' identities and self-definitions for translating social categories into social groups (Tajfel 1972, 1984). Brewer (1996, 1997) notes that the social identity perspective rests on two basic premises. First, individuals organize their understanding of the social world on the basis of categorical distinctions that transform continuous variables into discrete classes, which minimize perceived differences within categories and accentuate intercategory differences (Tajfel 1969). Second, since individual persons are also members of some of these same social categories, social categorization carries with it implicit ingroup-outgroup (i.e., we-they) distinctions that carry affective and emotional significance (Turner 1985).

Individual's understanding of the social world takes the form of a basic intergroup schema with certain shared characteristics, including:

- a) assimilation within category boundaries and contrast between categories, such that all members of the ingroup are perceived to be more similar to self than the outgroup (i.e. ingroup accentuation principle);
- b) positive affect is selectively generalized to fellow ingroup members but not outgroup (i.e. ingroup favoritism); and
- c) intergroup social comparison associated with perceived negative interdependence between ingroup and outgroup (i.e. social competition principle) (Brewer 1997).

With its emphasis on the importance of ingroup / outgroup distinctions, social identity theory is a useful framework for understanding how the meaning of category membership can impact individual behavior.

Social Identity and Inter-group Relations: Conflict or Cooperation

In the quote at the beginning of Chapter Two, Malcolm X suggested there were two types of people and accompanying behaviors and that change will come about not from a clash between 'blacks' and 'whites' or people of different statuses, but between those who want freedom, justice, and equality for everyone and those who want to continue the system of exploitation. Propositions in social identity theory also highlight different types of people and behaviors.

However, theoretical variations in the social identity tradition regarding salient motivational dynamics in intergroup-individual behavior have produced alternative explanations on what social change might look like, as well as the type of people and behaviors that might be found in a gentrifying neighborhood. The variations underlie the opposing views in the literature dealing with intergroup conflict and cooperation. In an effort to understand the range of possible attitudes and behaviors that might be found in a demographically changing neighborhood, it will be helpful to highlight some common psychological and sociological assumptions.

Discrimination is at best a functional part of the human experience. Psychologically, human beings have fundamental needs to order and control their environment in effort to simplify perceptions and ease information processing (Deschamps & Devos 1998; Hogg et al 1995, 1988; Marcus-Newhall, Miller, Holtz, & Brewer 1993; Turner 1999). Through cognitive functions in self-categorization and social comparisons (Turner 1999), self, objects, and others get compartmentalized into discrete categories of meaning always in reference to the personal self-concept (Hogg et al. 1995, 1988). Social identity is a mediating process connecting individuals to society whereby group behavior is also understood as individual behavior (Hogg et al. 1995, 1988; Turner 1999).

Sociologically, the processes of categorization and social comparison help towards establishing societies, maintaining social order and behavior by way of teaching individuals what to think, feel, and how to behave, i.e. basic socialization (Deschamps & Devos 1998; Hogg et al. 1995). "One major effect of categorization

and the simplification it implies is that it emphasizes the differences between categories...and the similarities within the same category” (Deschamps & Devos, 4). Baron and Pfeffer (1994:192) add that "we anchor our judgments through” social comparisons. Social consequences arise when what is categorically emphasized becomes differentially valued human groupings.

Social Identity and Inter-group Conflict

The conflict perspective in social identity theory asserts that people are categorized in terms of higher-status/dominant and lower-status/subordinate groups and individuals. The theory contends individuals are motivated in choice and behavior by fundamental needs to acquire positive self-esteem, which in turn, “produces pressures for intergroup differentiation [ingroup favoritism and outgroup dislike] to achieve positive self-evaluation in terms of collective self-esteem” i.e. self-social esteem (Turner 1999:8). Social identities as mediating processes are not so much idiosyncratic, self-definitions but rather comprise the “individuals’ knowledge that [s/he] belongs to a particular social group together with some emotional and evaluative significance of group membership” (Hogg & Abrams 1988:7; Turner 1999).

Group membership may involve different levels of identification across contexts but as the individual is a product of the social environment, emotional and evaluative significance largely involves economic-class status and ‘race’. Thus, a given individual’s values and priorities are thought closely aligned with class and ‘race’-based group memberships.

Social Identity Theory centrally maintains intergroup behavior will be determined by the relative or perceived status of the out-group in a situation or context. Turner states, the “character” of intergroup social behavior is a psychological consequence of an interaction between the “perceived nature of intergroup status differences and shared beliefs about the nature of the social structure” (1999:8-9).

A major point of theoretical contention is that, in regards to racial group categorization, positive self-social esteem is so highly associated with dominant group (Anglo American-‘whites’) characteristics and ideologies, it is assumed that low-status, subordinate groups and individuals are in “an unsatisfactory state of affairs due to lower self-esteem” and must seek avenues to change their situation (Hogg & Abrams 1988:27). Social change may occur but within a limited number of options and appears dependent on subordinate individual’s subjective beliefs about the nature of society and whether or not a lesser valued group is present to make comparisons.

The conflict perspective in social identity maintains that, since ‘being black’ serves as society’s negative referent group, meaningful change is not likely for African Americans or persons of perceived African Ancestry, as a group, beyond mere tokenism. Still, whatever measures are adopted by low-status individuals and groups to create “real social change,” the dominant group “must ensure the process does not go to far” (Hogg & Abrams 1988:29).

Social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto 1999) similarly assumes two categories of people expressing behaviors on a continuum. However, this theory

maintains by virtue of living and interacting in a group-based system of social hierarchy such as the U.S., all individuals—regardless of class, race, nationality, gender, etc.—are predisposed to forming a social dominance orientation. Like self-esteem, the dominance orientation is a very general, individual-difference orientation guiding perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors to the degree individuals desire to see themselves as being better than or superior to their neighbors (Sidanius et al. 1999, 1992a-b). Thus, the continuum accounts for the way ‘other’ groups and individual behave.

On one end of the continuum are egalitarians—expressing hierarchy-attenuating behaviors “that attempt to reduce social hierarchy by de-legitimizing inequality or the practices that sustain it” (Sidanius & Pratto 1999:104). Michalos and Zumbo (2001) state the “thoroughly egalitarian” type person is one who “thinks the rights of people are not as comprehensive or secure as they should be; i.e., for such respondents the democratic ideal of complete equality for all residents has not yet been achieved” (207).

On the other end are anti-egalitarian types—expressing hierarchy-enhancing behaviors “that enhance social hierarchy by justifying it or the practices that sustain it” (Sidanius & Pratto 1999:104). Sidanius and Pratto further state that hierarchy-enhancing and hierarchy-attenuating behaviors act as counterbalancing forces. Research in ideological dissonance and to a lesser extent, African American acculturation supports this view.⁷ Both hierarchy-attenuating and hierarchy-enhancing behaviors may be observed in individuals’ speech (i.e. word choice), career and

neighborhood choices, as well as routine and expected everyday behaviors.

From the social identities in conflict perspective, three possible observances can be expected in relations between old and new neighbors of a gentrifying neighborhood. First, class, and particularly race, will manifest itself in residents' definitions and descriptions of neighborhood and neighbor and particularly in residents' stated perceptions of each other as neighbors (Durant & Sparrow 1987; Lee et al. 1991; Massey & Denton 1993; Park 1950). Second, there will be categorically clear distinctions between longtimers' and newcomers' perceptions, definitions, and descriptions of neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behaviors (Bowman 1994; Butler 2003; Redfern 2003; Spain 1993; Zukin 1987).

Third, neighborly behavior in a gentrifying neighborhood will be consciously or otherwise composed of deep-seated, psychological responses consisting of fear, mistrust, and suspicion (Clemente & Klieman 1977; Hughes 1980; Liska et al. 1982; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000). Moreover, the new flavor of the neighborhood may be felt and described in old racialized patterns of behavior (Gotham 2000; Massey 2001) including violence (Olzak et al. 1996), exclusionary impulses (Green et al. 1998), "rigid avoidance behavior" or "short conversations" (Benson 1990:363; Lee et al. 1999:536), or simply a preference for fewer low-status and/or 'black' neighbors (Harris 1999; Oliver & Mendelberg 2000; Zubrinsky 1996, 2000). In such settings, behaviors may be represented and viewed by others as newly constructed privacy fences with patrolling dogs, where people are rarely seen out-of-doors visiting with

neighbors (Butler 2003; Clemente & Klieman 1977; Hughes 1980; Ross & Mirowsky 2001; Zukin 1987).

The conflict perspective may explain defended neighborhoods, racial violence and intolerance, and why residential racial segregation remains the most preferred type of neighborhood formation, but it does not account for the rise in stable, mixed-status neighborhoods. This study seeks an understanding of social change and how that change is manifest in behaviors. The question remains, how are stable, demographically mixed-status neighborhoods created and maintained? According to Brewer (1991), “there is a limit to the cultural shaping of fundamental human needs” (478). Individuals can choose with whom and how to identify.

Social Identity and Inter-group Cooperation

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (Brewer 1991) presents a model of intergroup cooperation in an effort to explain how it is that people can be ‘the same and different at the same time.’ Brewer (1991) argues neither the motivational drive for positive self-social esteem nor the social dominance orientation readily account for “those situations in which individuals choose to identify with groups that are of low status or negatively valued by the population at large” nor do low status individuals appear to suffer from excessively low self-esteem (1991:477).

Accordingly, social identities are more than just evaluative assessments. Social identities also derive from a “fundamental tension between human needs for validation and similarity to others (on the one hand) and a countervailing need for uniqueness and individuation (on the other)” (Brewer 1991:477). Theoretical

propositions, assumptions, and empirical findings in the Optimal Distinctiveness approach are rooted in the principles of self-categorization theory (Turner 1999) and firmly tied to intergroup contact hypotheses.

Self-categorization theory

Self-categorization theory (Turner, 1987, 1999) essentially states that social identities emerge in the psychological shift from the personal-level of identification (subordinate-level) to group/intergroup level (intermediate-level) to identification with the entire human race (superordinate-level). In the shift, persons can choose with whom and how to identify. Turner explains,

The self can be categorized at many different levels and the factors which make for the salience of any given level need not be inversely related. On the contrary...in many situations there will be factors making for the salience of both the personal and the social categorical levels of self-identification. It is the relative salience of different levels of self-categorization in a specific situation which determines the degree to which self-perception is personalized or depersonalized, the degree to which behavior expresses individual differences or collective similarities (Turner 1999:11).

Depersonalization occurs on the psychological shift from the personal-interest 'I' to the ordinate 'we' where social identities can be chosen (Brewer 1991). The superordinate level is the entire human race. Being the same and different at the same time rests on the assumption that "the self-concept is expandable and contractible across different levels of social identity with associated transformations in the definition of self and the basis for self-evaluation" (1991:476). For example, as 'different individuals' come to recognize and act upon a social problem that requires

collective attention, regardless of the class or racial composition of the context, “the more depersonalized the self-concept becomes” (Brewer, 477).

The optimal distinctiveness model is a synthesis of three intergroup contact hypotheses that stress the importance of the structure of the contact situation for promoting positive intergroup relations. As these models neatly portray an entity called neighborhood, it is beneficial to briefly highlight key points that shed light on possible types of interactions. Coincidentally, and keeping in mind that Brewer is interested in large-scale social change, the term “cooperative framework” as discussed below is an ideal concept of neighborhood (Brewer 1996).

First, decategorization as posited by Brewer (1996:293), assumes “contact will be most effective” if neighborly interactions are “highly personalized rather than category-based” or group-based defined. In an economically and racially changing neighborhood where visual cues present clear category boundaries, intergroup cooperation will be achieved if residents take the time to get to know one another personally.

Secondly, “instead of focusing on individuating information,” recategorization proposes intergroup cooperation will be achieved if the contact situation is structured “so as to focus attention on superordinate category identification that encompasses both the ingroup and outgroup in a single social group representation” (Brewer 1996:294). This model suggests if skin color is the defining feature used to make ingroup-outgroup distinctions, thereby limiting positive neighborly interactions, the categorical salience of ‘race’ will be reduced and intergroup hostilities minimized

when superordinate goals (for example, collective efforts in establishing neighborhood watch programs) reduce intergroup distinctions (Brewer 1996). Although re-categorization can not be observed in a case study—primarily because it takes time for “cross group friendships to develop” (Pettigrew 1998:76)—it assumes both ‘race’ and class will become insignificant and cooperative intergroup neighboring will emerge between old and new residents as the ‘different residents’ come to think of themselves as “one unit” rather than two or more separate social groups (Brewer 1996:294).

Third, subcategorization posits that the contact situation will be structured so that “members of the respective groups have distinct, but complementary roles to contribute toward achieving common goals.” (Brewer 1996:295). In this way, the ‘different members’ “maintain positive distinctiveness” within a framework of cooperative neighboring (Brewer, 295). In situating cooperative intergroup neighboring as goal-oriented behavior, subcategorization leaves more questions than answers.

If, as is commonly assumed, communication between ‘different people’ is impeded by their differences (Lee et al. 1991; Woldoff 2002), how might long-timers and newcomers come to understand their common goals and roles? Who or what ensures shared understandings? How is this understanding initially expressed? If neighborhood is about desired relaxation as Kearns and Parkinson propose, then when, how, and to what things is goal-oriented neighboring time devoted? Most importantly, how do the ‘different residents’ perceive neighborhood and neighboring that they

might feel themselves positively distinct and a complementary addition to the neighborhood and each other?

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory maintains that cooperative relations can be achieved if the contact situation is “structured so as to result in altered cognitive representations that would *eliminate* one or more of the features...that assumes negative interdependence between the ingroup and outgroup” (Brewer 1996:295, my emphasis). Eliminating, as opposed to altering a particular dimension of the negative intergroup schema should allow cross-contextual (i.e. beyond the neighborhood) redefinitions of neighbor beyond the usual barriers of class, ‘race’, ethnicity, etc..

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory further contends that self-social identification and intergroup cooperation will be “strongest at that level of inclusiveness, which resolves the conflict between the needs for differentiation of the self and assimilation with others” (Brewer 1991:477). Thus, in many situations, negative behavior is a psychological consequence of feeling too assimilated (as in not feeling like a unique individual), or too distinctive (as in group-based identified or not feeling like a real member of the group). Moreover, these consequential tensions are likely to generate feelings of anxiety, discomfort, fear, suspicion, or lack of trust. Mistrust is found to be a deciding factor in neighborhood disorder (see Kramer 1999).

Theoretically then, social change is a process of developing new attitudes and behaviors, which rest in the balance between social identities in conflict (Hogg et al. 1995, 1988; Sidanius & Pratto 1999), and social identities in cooperation (Brewer 1991, 1993, 1996). At any moment, individuals’ behavior is based on socialization,

their beliefs about the social world, recent experiences, and an adherence to society's needs to maintain a permanent subordinate class of people from which to make self-social comparisons in privilege (Brewer 1991, 1996; Turner 1999).

Social identity in cooperation highlights neighborhood as a place of relaxation, reflection, and self-re-creation where intergroup neighboring and neighborhood may simply be about "face-to-face...reciprocal relations" in a "site" of "ongoing repair work to normalize social relations" (Forrest & Kearns 2001:2127; Kearns & Parkinson 2001). In this view, relaxation and reciprocity suggests greater similarities than differences between old and new neighbors' descriptions, definitions, and perceptions of neighborhood, neighbor, and each other as neighbor.

Research Questions

Given the discussion in this and the previous chapters, this thesis then seeks to answer the following research questions.

- How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighborhood?
- How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighbor? How do they perceive one another as neighbors?

In addition, the analysis draws on the question, "what is the relationship between who residents are and what they say?"

In this chapter I discussed the general theoretical perspective – social identity theory – employed in this thesis. In addition, I explored two versions of social identity theory – social dominance and optimal distinctiveness theories - that propose

entirely different explanations of how social identity might affect intergroup relations within gentrifying neighborhoods. I presented the research questions that this thesis seeks to answer. In Chapter Four, I discuss the setting, participants, and methodology used in this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

The object of this study is to gain insight into the more mundane relations of everyday neighboring between different members of a gentrifying neighborhood. This study seeks to examine how the ‘different members’ of a gentrifying neighborhood might recognize each other and interpret each other’s neighboring actions in a contemporary real life context.

In this chapter I discuss the qualitative procedures employed to capture residents’ attitudes and perceptions about self and others as neighbors, their environment, as well as their prior experiences and future expectations of neighbor and neighborly behavior. The chapter is divided into six sections. The first section discusses the rationale for utilizing a qualitative approach, while the second describes the research site, including its historical context. Sections describing the study design, interview procedures and questions, participant selection and key categories, and data analysis follow this.

Rationale For A Qualitative Approach

A qualitative approach to data collection and analysis is appropriate in research that searches for deeper understanding of participants’ experiences with the topic being studied (Marshall & Rossman 2003; Patton 2003). This approach is particularly useful in studies that seek to understand how different individuals experience and negotiate macro forces, such as classism and racism, in the everyday,

as well as for understanding intergroup social behavior in a specific context during processes of change. While inferences may be made based on large-scale and trend analysis, such quantitative studies cannot answer how ‘different neighbors’ might come to share an “intersubjective understanding of specific life circumstances” (Schwandt 1997:19; Berg 2004; Stewart 1990).

Intersubjectivity signifies the “character or nature of the [everyday] life-world...of human experience and social action...constituted by the thoughts and acts of individuals and the social expressions of those thoughts and acts” (Schwandt 1997:74, 83). Intersubjectivity challenges scientific generalization and validity (Bertaux 1981; Halfpenny 1979; Kirk & Miller 1986; Schwandt 1997). Whether one’s approach is quantitative or qualitative, at some point during question framing, subject selection, data collection and analysis, the social researcher is methodologically intersubjective (Bertaux 1981; Halfpenny 1979; Kirk & Miller 1986; Schwandt 1997).

The present study seeks to understand large-scale social processes—i.e. social change and neighborhood change—by examining individual-level interactions. A qualitative approach is justified because the focus of this research is on the meaning that people place upon their own and other’s neighboring behaviors that are experienced as part of everyday life.

The Research Site

Kearns and Parkinson (2001) concept of the “home area” (a 5-10 minute walk from one’s home) as providing the strongest sense of identity and belonging, fits well with Grannis’ (1998) notion that tertiary streets have an effect on the ways people

neighbor. Grannis defines tertiary streets (i.e. small, residential streets) as pedestrian-based, one-lane streets with no dividers, which are maintained by the city “to provide internal access to areas bounded by non-tertiary streets, but are not to be used as thoroughfares” (Grannis, 1533). Utilizing the concepts of Kearns and Parkinson’s home area, and Grannis’ tertiary streets, the research setting for this study is a portion of King Neighborhood located in the north-northeast region of metropolitan Portland, Oregon.

This particular portion of the neighborhood is bordered by two-lane divided thoroughfares on its perimeters: Seventh Avenue to the west, Fifteenth Avenue to the east, Prescott Street to the south, and Alberta Street to the north. As the intersections of northeast Fifteenth Avenue & Alberta and northeast Fifteenth & Prescott extend two blocks beyond the border of King Neighborhood (Sabin at Alberta, and Vernon at Prescott), and the fact that block-group data changes at ninth street,ⁱ the research setting is bound between northeast Ninth and Twelfth and Going and Humbolt Streets.

Within this border are small, pedestrian-based streets which are maintained by city street cleaning and occasional snow removal services. These blocks represent a 5 to 10 minute walk from my home with my dog.

King Neighborhood in Socio-historical Context

Because the social history of a neighborhood has implications for current behavior, it is necessary to identify the history of King neighborhood in order understand the meaning of neighboring behavior for current residents. The history of

ⁱ Census 2000 American Fact Finder

the north and northeast sectors of Portland, Oregon, and particularly King Neighborhood in Multnomah County, is, in memory, situated in racial exclusion laws; World War II labor needs; Federal Anti-Housing Discrimination Act of 1943; the end of the war and continued 'black' migration; the flood of 1948, and the question of what to do about the Negro in Portland (Maben 1988).

The essence of the memory of King is that after the flood, black Americans were housed in dilapidated areas of the city occupied by out-moving Germans, Italians, and Russians, where property values were lowest, and where it was decided they could do no further damage (Maben 1988). In the early decades of the twentieth century, inner north/northeast Portland was a relatively thriving socially diverse community until 1950s revitalization schemes constructed the coliseum, a hospital, and highway expansion that razed the heart of business districts.

Portland is the largest city in Oregon. Throughout the greater part of the city one can see sprinklings of large, intact, pre and early 1900s Portland Style homes. There are stark visual economic-class differences depending on whether one stands on the east or west side of the Willamette River, and further gradations between and within the northeast and southeast, and northwest and southwest. By no means has the city of Portland ever resembled the concentrated ghettos historically found in Northeastern or Midwest cities. As of yet, there are no high-rise, low-income dwellings, such as a Cabrini Green in Chicago, Robert Taylor Homes in Detroit, or the like. But downtown construction is constantly underway and there is talk of high-rise apartment building.

In regards to national political issues, Oregon is a battleground state. Dubbed “Little Beirut” by George Bush, Sr. in the 1980s, Portlanders tend to pride themselves on liberal ideologies in the midst of a politically conservative state. Yet, Oregon was the only state to enter the union (in 1859) with anti-black, exclusionary constitutional language. African Americans were forbidden to reside in the state except for limited labor needs.

During the 1800s Portland was recognized as the most racially segregated city west of the Mississippi (Maben 1988). Its city officials, commissioners and police chiefs, were proudly and openly Klansmen. The Thirteenth Amendment was passed by referendum in 1865; the Fourteenth was rejected until 1868, while the Fifteenth failed in 1870 but ratified in 1959. Near the turn of the century the city moved to a status of most integrated.

Sometime during the 1920s ‘black’ exclusion was translated into the covenant Article 34—the local rule of real estate industry practice and behavior (see Gotham 2000).⁸ This rule forbade white homeowners from selling their properties to African Americans and other “inharmonious racial or nationality groups” (Massey & Denton 1993:54). In a 2001 referendum, Oregonians successfully removed racist language from their original state constitution. Previous attempts to remove such language had failed in 1895, 1916, and 1927. For several years between 1990 and 2005, Portland was nationally known as the cleanest, ‘most livable city’ in the nation.

Many Portlanders, particularly ‘whites’, tend to perceive their city as rather diverse, if not ethnically at least in attitude.⁹ Census 2000 estimates a statewide

ethnic distribution and increases of over 62,000 African American Oregonians (up thirty-two percent); an 89 percent increase in Hispanics; 57 percent Asian and Pacific Islanders; 13 percent American Indian and Alaska Native, and over three million Anglo American-whites, up 15.4 percent. Over half of the states' African American population lives in Portland.¹⁰ A relatively large proportion of African American Portlanders' (as well as other people of color) live in the north/northeastern regions of the city.

It is, perhaps, the friendly feel of the city in general, and the old stock homes in particular, that underpins population growth and urban renewal. Traveling the streets of inner northeast Portland, the feel and style of a neighborhood may change drastically from block to block. Within King, one regularly sees large two and three story, old stock homes with wrapping front porches on the corners, book ending smaller privately owned and rental properties.

The portion of the research site in King neighborhood is currently gentrifying marked by new housing construction, old-stock rejuvenation, new neighborhood amenities, and changing faces. Although there are several Community Development Corporations, low-income/rent controlled dwellings, and an elementary school, King neighborhood has no record of political activism to speak of. The current feel of the area is one of implied cohesiveness marked solely by the absence of overt conflict. People are often out-of-doors particularly during the summer months. While barbeques and backyard parties are normal, particularly amongst newcomers, observation finds them often attended by unfamiliar faces or non-residents.

Design

Marshall and Rossman (2003) identify 3 distinct general design strategies—in-depth interviews, case study, and microanalysis—each of which is associated with a different genre of qualitative research. Each strategy stipulates the unit of analysis/focus of inquiry as well as the overall approach to collecting data.

Table 1. Qualitative Research Design

Genre	Focus of Inquiry	Strategy
individual lived experience	individuals	in-depth interview
society and culture	groups or organizations	case study
language & communication	speech events	micro analysis

(Marshall & Rossman 2000:61)

Since the purpose of this study is to understand neighboring behavior as participants' experience it—i.e. their subjective experience—then using interviewing as the data collection method makes conceptual sense.

It must be noted that the initial methodological intent of this study was to gather information on the meaning of neighboring behaviors by conducting group interviews (i.e. focus groups). Thus, three key informants were selected based on length of residency. Two of the informants are Mr. and Mrs. O. They are African American retired homeowners, and have been living in the same house in King neighborhood for 47 years. The third informant was Mrs. L, a middle age Anglo American newcomer who has lived in the neighborhood for 8 years. Mrs. L is also a retired homeowner who volunteers at a local hospice. However, upon soliciting residents of the research site, three of the first three neighbors contacted felt focus

groups were “rather un-neighborly”. This immediately resulted in the shift to an individual interview format.

Interviews

This qualitative study utilizes open-ended interviews. Interviews are particularly useful when researchers are interested in understanding perceptions of participants, or how they attach meaning to events. One primary strength of interviewing is that the participant's perspective on the topic being studied unfolds as they see it, not as the researcher views it. Interviews are especially useful when researchers want to learn about what can't be seen, such as feelings, thoughts, intentions, and in this study, the interpretation of others' actions.

Though guided by a set of general questions, the interview process is a social situation based on emergent, first order concepts (Kohli 1991; Schwandt 1997; Warren & Karner 2005). “The qualitative interview is not only a method, it is a social interaction of the very type qualitative methods were designed to study!” (Warren & Karner, 137). First-order concepts may be historically situated, but the data of experience cannot be summed up or averaged (Kohli 1991; Schwandt 1997).

Primary data were collected through eighteen in-depth interviews and two brief on-the-spot conversations (approximately 5 minutes each). Babbie (1999:268) states a qualitative interview is essentially a conversation in which the interviewer establishes a general direction for the conversation and pursues specific topics raised by the respondent.” The interview-conversation is an “interaction between an interviewer and a respondent in which the interviewer has a general plan of inquiry but

not a specific set of questions that must be asked in particular words or order” (Babbie, 269).

All but one of the interviews were audiotape recorded. In addition, notes were taken during the interviews. However, due to audio recording complications, not all interviews are reported. One (key informant) interview took place in my home and the remaining occurred at the respondents’ homes on the front porch, in the back yard, or sitting in the living room. The brief conversations took place randomly and out-of-doors either on the sidewalk or near a neighbor’s home when out walking my dog. The conversations were not recorded and captured through recollection. I approached all respondents identifying myself as a student, stating where I lived, and the purpose of my study.

Based on the literature and informant interviews, five general interview questions were developed to capture and compare old and new residents’ definitions and descriptions of neighborhood and neighbor, perceptions of each other as neighbors, and reasons for selecting this portion of the neighborhood. The data divided into old-timers and newcomers categories based on integrated neighborhood research that measures stability by plus and minus ten-years. The questions included but were not ordered or limited to the following:

- (1) Why did you choose this neighborhood,
- (2) How do you feel in or about this neighborhood
- (3) How would you describe the type of neighboring that goes on in the neighborhood

- (4) How or what do you think about the changes in the neighborhood, and
- (5) Can you describe your past experiences with neighborhoods and neighboring.

A sixth, floating question emerged during the first interview with SA. SA is a Mexican American woman who has lived in the neighborhood since 1996. She states her primary motive for selecting the neighborhood was purely economic affordability, a reason given by all respondents. In expressing high appreciation for the economic, ethnic, and sexual diversity of the neighborhood, SA poignantly stated, "If I had a million dollars and stayed in Oregon, I'd keep my house in the neighborhood." As we laughed she encouraged me to ask others this questions, "to see what they say". Thus, depending on direction and tone of each interview, respondents were asked, (6) if you had a million dollars would you move from the neighborhood?

Participants

Participant selection for the remaining interviews followed a type of snowball technique based on respondents' suggestions on whom, amongst the neighbors most familiar with or curious about, would be a good person to talk to. I spoke with twenty individuals from fifteen households. Participants varied by tenure (14 owners and 6 renters), race-ethnicity (11 African American; 8 Anglo-'whites', 1 Mexican, and 1 self-identified Black/White mixed), age (22 to 77 years old), gender (5 male and 15 female), sexual orientation (same sex partners: 2 female, 1 male), and length of residency (6 to 47 years).

Four of the interviews were with two respondents (two couples, one co-habitants i.e. nuns, one mother and daughter) and are paired together where relevant. Two respondents are nuns residing in “the nuns house.” Participants’ status in the neighborhood varied in other ways. For example, one respondent is a roommate of a homeowner, and one is the daughter of long time resident who has lived in the neighborhood most of her life. Another grew up in the neighborhood, married and moved out, but happened to be visiting her mother during the interview. Many of these residents grew up in the neighborhood, area, or house in which they currently reside, and have strong memories of what the neighborhood used to be like.

Key Categories and Representation

This qualitative study seeks an initial understanding of the ways ‘different people’ in a portion of a gentrifying neighborhood perceive self and each other as neighbors. The study references census tract data. Three key categories or variables of interest to this study are tenure, race-ethnicity, and length of residency. However, the object at this stage is not generalizability. To the degree the participants represent the population at large, Table 2 Comparative Census Data shows the total city, neighborhood, tract, and study area comparisons of populations, race-ethnicity, housing units, tenure, and tenure by race-ethnicity (see Appendix A-1).

Tenure denotes homeowners and renters. Race-ethnicity largely pertains to African American-‘blacks’ and Anglo American-‘whites’. Race-ethnicity is both subjectively determined by observed skin color and, in the case of the one self-identified Mexican American and the two mixed-raced respondents, verified by

asking. Census 2000 tract data shows approximately 49.2 percent of the residents are 'black'; 30.6 percent are 'white'; 13.2 percent are Hispanic, and 8.2 percent represent category Other (including 'two or more races').

Length of residency is the primary category in this study. An old/longtimer is any resident who has lived 10 or more years in the neighborhood. Newcomers are those with less than 10 years of neighborhood residency. Length of residency is used in the conflict literature to say something about intergroup neighboring in terms of racist and perhaps classist behaviors. While class and 'race' remain the dominant themes in most neighborhood and neighborhood change research, gentrification studies actually anticipate conflict between oldtimers and newcomers. Thus, respondents in the present study were divided into long/old-timers and newcomers categories based on integrated neighborhood (see Appendix A-2). Captured here is the fact that both 'blacks' and 'whites' are long time and new residents.

Data Analysis

The interview data were thematicized and reported by the research questions: (1) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighborhood? (2) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighbor? How do they perceive one another as neighbors? The analysis draws on the additional question: What is the relationship between who residents are and what they say?

The respondents statements and opinions represent the data of experience wherein my interpretations and the procedures are "true" and "certain" in so far as

“there are no good grounds for doubting” the evidence (Schwandt 1997:168). Data interpretation is also informed by participant observation to the extent that I am a recent resident of the neighborhood under study.

In this chapter I reviewed the methodological issues associated with this research. I presented my rationale for choosing a qualitative approach, reviewed the geographic and historical context of the research setting, and discussed the research design, interview procedures and question, participant selection and data analysis. In the next chapter I present my research findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS

This thesis captures and compares data collected through in-depth interviews on the ways old and new residents of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behavior. The data are thematicized and laid out according to the two research questions. (1) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood describe and define neighborhood? (2) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood describe and define neighbor? How do they perceive one another as neighbors? In addition, the thematicized analysis seeks to understand what, if anything, is the relationship between who they are and what they say.

All respondents spoke to the ways in which they perceive neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behavior in times of change. Major differences in responses appeared to occur within instead of between categories, particularly in regards to descriptions of whether or not and how the neighborhood represents, or feels like a community.

Research Question 1:

How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood describe and define neighborhood?

This question captures information on people's general definition of neighborhood. Three themes emerged in relation to definitions and meanings of

neighborhood: Meaning of Neighborhood: *A Neighborhood versus A Community*,
Changing Neighborhood Conditions, and Motivations for Choosing this
Neighborhood.

MEANING OF NEIGHBORHOOD

A Neighborhood versus A Community

There were no clear distinctions between old and new residents' responses on issues of neighborhood versus community. For some, neighborhood and community are both about "one-on-one relationships with... every person you see" [ML]. For others it is about comfort and being visible [Ms. MT]. Differences in opinions about neighborhood and community emerged more so from within the newcomer interviews.

ML: It's kind of funny that whole neighborhood thing, for me its my walk to work...the 3 miles. I don't know its not like neighborhood and community and all that is in the front of my mind...just your relationship with whose there...like your coworkers...it's a one on one relationship with everyone you and them. It's every person you see...not just neighbor. I guess maybe that's why, where we get that attitude of neighbors aren't just the people you live with on the street (m-r.nc)

Ms. MT: I see much! Well I see more people on the streets. There are a lot more couples that are out walking in the evening um...families, mothers with their children going for walks People walking their dogs...and I'm a dog person so I'll always fuss over dogs. And um, yes, I think for that reason the neighborhood feels a little more comfortable (w.ot)

For still others a distinction exists, although it is not so clearly defined.

Respondent LY and her Anglo American husband moved to Portland and this neighborhood from an "eclectic" urban neighborhood in Houston, Texas where she had strong friendship networks in a diverse community. She states that comparatively

This is not a community! I have never felt like this was a neighborhood. I just see it as a plat, an area defined by busy streets. We've been thinking about moving to a smaller place, a smaller community...an intact place (w.nc)

In hearing her description of having lived in a collective, "committed community" in Texas, I was curious to know what obstacles were preventing her from creating or at least seeing neighborhood/community here. LY explained,

They try to do it. They plunk Natures and other places, but there is too much diversity. [If it were up to me the] Amenities would be in the center as oppose to being in between Irvington and the neighborhood. It's more for Irvington than for here. They [stores on Alberta] are too diverse... too spread out ...like a drive-through (w.nc)

Regardless of race-ethnicity, length of residency, and sexual orientation, old and new neighbors appear to share a seemingly disgruntled view on the newly named Alberta Street Art District, just two to three blocks north. Several spoke rather negatively about the city and the changes, and only one newcomer reported attending or frequenting the new, culturally specific stores.

Ms. MT: Now the only place I have a little apprehension...and really it's just a matter of change, is what they're doing in the Alberta Street Project. And a, I'm just wondering, as I go back and forth on Alberta, I'm wondering about some of what they call quote "improvement" unquote (w.ot)

ML: Neighborhood is about the familiar stuff. We're kind of disinterested in Alberta Street... They're so artistic...I don't know...they're trying so hard...it's a little embarrassing. Portland all that...a little forced...good in the hood...they come up with these things (m-r.nc)

MK: Gepetto in the ghetto (w.nc)

Ms. MT: Well I'm not all that happy with the city of Portland when they have a tendency to abandon the neighborhood which happened back in the '80s here in the northeast when they figured just about the only thing they could do to improve the neighborhood was to plant those darn

trees in the middle of MLK boulevard. Now they figured that that was improving it, but all it did was make it more of a freeway. Before then, why the traffic pace was slow enough that you could pull off to the side, go to a business, do your shopping... you don't do that any more unless there's off-street parking...you don't stop. The area is rejuvenating, just as long as they don't make it quite as much as trendy-third over in northwest (w.ot)

Liking or disliking the neighborhood and current circumstances appears to have as much to do with past experiences in neighborhoods and future expectations as reasons for choosing this neighborhood. While some respondents suggest both neighborhood and community come from within, others appear to view creating neighborhood and community is, at least in part, the responsibility of outside (external) forces. For these residents, urban planners and city officials need to do a better job in designing community.

This is an unfortunate position for several reasons. The most pronounced being that none of the respondents in this study indicated that they had attended neighborhood association meetings or the city's requests for citizen input in redesigning the Arts District. It's unfortunate when no one shows up to present their views, yet voice dissatisfaction with what "they" (the city) are doing to the neighborhood. The city has used the street signs on abandoned or neglected local buildings posting such messages as 'Tell Us What You Would Like To See Here'. The Alberta Streetscape Project also sought citizen-neighbor feedback on re-designing the roughly eighteen-block portion of Alberta Street (aka Alberta Arts District). Outreach efforts largely fell on closed ears and doors.

Changing Condition

Seven of the twenty respondents expressed a particular fondness first for their homes and secondly for the neighborhood. Several oldtimers talked about how the neighborhood was currently changing “back” or closer to the way it was in the past.

Mrs. V: The neighborhood is now like it was back then (b.ot)

Ms. MT: ... It was just a whole neighborhood type of thing. It was a lot of fun it was really neat. There were a lot of Norwegians, Scandinavians, Germans... even a Finish bath place. It was a community, a solid community. Things change, people die out and new people come in (w.ot)

Mr. O: The neighborhood is getting to be like it was when we first moved in 47 years ago... (b.ot)

Mrs. O: ...Getting more quieter. There were more white people [back then]... (b.ot)

Mr. O: ...They moved when blacks moved in...[the] neighborhood went down. (b.ot)

Mrs. O: The neighborhood is coming up It used to be an Italian neighborhood. I like the mix. Not just one nationality now. The way it is now it's all right (b.ot)

MK: For us its great just this way and it seems like that's how most people are here...I mean nobody's looking at us odd, you know because we push a wheel barrel to the store instead of driving to the store...and...till you get down to Irvington... [laughter]

Different perceptions on current conditions appear based on past experiences, one's cultural worldview, meaning of neighborhood, and expectations of neighbor (Brewer 1991; Wilson 1990). In other words, not all respondents indicated liking the neighborhood or changing conditions. One respondent stated that although she likes the fact that there are more people walking around the neighborhood, “there are too

many white people” [BB₂]. BB₂ is an African American homeowner who no longer resides in the neighborhood.

Another respondent professed dissatisfaction with the neighborhood in general and with what she called “Portland Blacks” in particular [AT]. AT is an African American-‘black’ mother of two school-aged children, a renter, and resident since 1997. When asked how long she has lived here, she adamantly stated “four years too long”

Portland used to be family oriented. The people are not friendly; they don’t like to work together... They’re like me, selfish with time... The land is ok, not the people. You learn from a kid how to make the best of it. Economics keeps us here. We would live in Mt Tabor if I had my way (b.nc)

The above respondents indicated in conversation their beliefs in both institutional and individual discrimination. When asked what, if anything, could/would you do to change the neighborhood both AT and BB₂ suggested moving from the neighborhood. However, one’s negative experiences or outlook does not in all cases directly correlate with present feelings about the neighborhood. Seventeen of the twenty respondents, both old and new, ‘black’ and ‘white’, agreed with Mr. O’s comment about “liking the mix just the way it is now”.

Many of the neighborhood problems and subsequent changes Mr. O and other residents referred to were gang-related. This portion of the neighborhood, like other north/northeast Portland area neighborhoods, experienced a time of high gang activity including drug trafficking, graffiti, and crime. An early sign that a marginalized neighborhood has been targeted for revitalization (gentrification) is the construction of

local police station. This occurred in King in 1995 as much of the gang activities have been pushed further north.

Curious to understand others' points of view, I posed the question whether or not the police station moving in made the neighborhood better to two longtimers and three newcomers. This question yielded some differences in respondents' experiences with local police. On the one hand, Mrs. O states the streets have been "more quieter" and that "All the troublemakers are gone now." On the other hand Mr. O stated,

[the] Police station didn't make much difference. The neighbors just got together and shook them up. Back then a few of us got together and talked about it [drug problems]. I just peek out the window... if I see something... and pick up the phone...that's the way you s'pose to do it. If I see something I don't like I just pick up the phone, can't be getting in their faces... that's why we pay taxes, to pick up the phone (b.ot)

ML: You know we've seen odd people come by you know we'll automatically watch...is that person breaking in or you know we've called the police a few times... And when they've been around its like, they're ridiculous... (m-r.nc)

MK: Yeah, you try to tell them that the guy you're looking for is here and they tell you to get back in the house (w.nc)

ML: "Get in the house!" I was more afraid of them with their [they had assault rifles] big old assault rifles... (m-r.nc)

MK: But they got their blinders on...procedures... (w.nc)

LY told a story that five years ago they experienced a drive by shooting that instigated some social interaction as neighbors stepped outside to investigate. She recalled being advised by her pre-established neighbors to as often as possible "stay in the back of the house to avoid stray bullets". LY is an Anglo American semi-retired

newcomer who has lived in the neighborhood since 1995. Her experiences with the local police struck a slightly different note.

We had a *great* relationship with police. They don't have the attitude 'well you're white, they don't want you here'. They did everything but give us their home phone numbers. (w.nc)

Motivations for Choosing this Neighborhood

Interesting, class-based preference research argues race is not the defining feature in people's preferences for neighborhood and neighbor. Instead, people are economically motivated in choosing neighborhood and neighbor (Harris 1999). Much of this argument rests on the definition of 'people' as those with unrestricted access or Anglo American-'whites'. Contrarily, all respondents in this study, regardless of skin color, ethnicity, length of residency, and tenure indicated *choosing* their homes and this neighborhood was in some way economically motivated.

MK: Because it's cheapest! When we went to buy a house. We felt comfortable here Yeah (w.nc)

ML: When we first went to buy a house I wanted to live somewhere that was a little more diverse (m-r.nc)

Of course, economics and history lay out racial distinctions between choosing and remaining, and between old and new neighbors' reasonings. Portland's residential history of racial-group clustering highlights this point. At the same time that race has played (and plays) a major role in defining residential areas, Portland's neighborhoods are and have been distinctly divided along economic-class lines. Conceivably, poor and low-income people of all colors experience limited neighborhood choice options. In the case of African American-'black' longtimers,

for example, one difference drawn between choosing the neighborhood and remaining in the neighborhood was explained in dialogue with the O's.

During the interviews with both old and new neighbors it was learned that several long-time African American- 'black' residents grew up in the neighborhood and/or inherited their properties from their parents. Others entered and have remained since the 1940s. In both cases long timers may have a host of sentimental and evaluative reasons for remaining in the neighborhood, but the choice in being there in the first place was likely made by default.

The O's entered the neighborhood in 1957 from elsewhere in northeast Portland. They moved to Portland from Alabama in 1947. Mr. O is a retired freight car builder and would have first hand knowledge of the racial climate of the era—the end of the war, the flood, and the problem with Negroes in Portland. Yet Mr. O said he and his wife chose this neighborhood because

We got a good deal that worked out for us. We're here to stay. [It's a] good area to live in... Don't have to worry about rain washing you out. We've been satisfied with the place. We been satisfied every since we bought the place... Even in the changes...[we] stuck it out (b.ot)

Similarly, Ms. MT is a sixty-three year old long time resident since 1966. She and her family moved from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania to Portland in 1945 specifically to work in Vanport shipyards "during the war". After the war, she says a man came by wanting his house back. The family relocated to the Albina district in north Portland. Ms. MT is a low-income Anglo American-'white' neighbor. She

states she loves the neighborhood, particularly her home, and is extremely proud of the recent 14 foot extension on a previously 25x25 sq foot home.

I tried living out North. It just didn't feel comfortable. It was like hello stranger if any body said hello at all. That was ok, but I moved back into northeast and was lucky enough to land here. I really didn't know that much about the neighborhood except that it was about a mile from home. It's just sort of a family oriented neighborhood. Out there it was more transient (w.ot)

This feeling of being lucky enough to land here is reflected throughout the interviews with both old and new neighbors who expressed a certain sentimental or emotional attachment to place. Fifteen of the twenty interviewees directly expressed an attachment to the neighborhood. What brings about this feeling of attachment is in some way a combination of the house, in terms of being one's home, and to a lesser degree, the neighborhood or even home area. As old and new neighbors alike express

Ms. MT: Oh well, it's just...this is home! I like the house I think it's an open expression of me (w.ot)

ML: Well I mean its our home...its our home...you know...it's the thing. I like it. I mean to me, home and house I mean its... it's about who you are and how your house feels... that's where you go to get away from you know the world.... It's like you tend your own garden.... our home is us, if the neighborhood changes, we're still who we are (m-r. nc)

MK: Right but um...this house is going to be the way we want it (w.nc)

SA: If I had a million dollars and remained in Portland I'd live right here in this house (M.nc)

Five of the respondents who expressed a sentimental/emotional attachment to place conversely argued they were not necessarily attracted to or by the diversity.

Some discussed having diversity with co-workers and friends, not neighbors. Indeed,

economic affordability and a sense of comfort played a key role in neighborhood and home selection. Conversely, one newcomer passionately stated, “It’s a great neighborhood” [RD], noting his strong attraction to its diversity.

RD is an Anglo American-‘white’ self-employed newcomer whose attraction to diversity is apparently so strong that he seeks to buy it. In hopes of preserving the diversity, he owns at least 2 houses within the research site, one rental, the other owner-occupied and both recently and substantially restored. In conversation he mentioned an awareness of how his role and presence in the neighborhood was altering the very thing he was attracted to. However, in mid conversation on displacement issues, his tone switched to a rather impassionate market explanation for his presence

Neighborhoods are always changing. People move into places and out of neighborhoods all the time. It’s the way the market works (w.nc)

According to the literature, RD’s mentality and ability to buy into the neighborhood does not indicate a preference for diversity or local social interaction. Yet, his actions and behaviors are not consistent with this view. Observations found him constantly out-of-doors interacting with his neighbors.

Neighbors are aware of each other’s behaviors, some stating an awareness and concern with displacement issues. In an interesting but guided conversation between themselves, ML and MK discussed issues of feeling guilty.

MK: Remember when we first moved here...we were fixing up the yard...I built this little retaining wall and [Ms. MT] was worried about her property values going up. People can get displaced... (w.nc)

ML: (interrupting) I use to get kind of weird about that displacement thing... (m-r.nc)
 MK: Like guilty? (w.nc)
 ML: Guilty! Yeah...feeling...(m-r.nc)
 MK: (interrupting) Knowing this was a rental before we bought it... (w.nc)
 ML: (interrupting) Right. We moved in an I think its []...just knowing that there were a lot of people who seemed kind of angry 'well where we gonna live'? But then I had to think well we lived in a studio apartment for 5 years trying to save up to buy a home you know, we did without a lot of stuff (m-r.nc)
 MK: Still do (w.nc)
 ML: ...didn't we...we kind of had a car but still walked...we did a lot in order to have what we have so...the guilt dissipated after a while (m-r.nc)

These respondents' statements echoed similar comments from others who also recognized and talked about a difference between people who move in and want to be part of the neighborhood and those who basically pour money into the property and want "to cut a profit". Discussing the previous owner of the newly constructed house across the street, ML and MK described

ML: This house was funny because when it was first built...it was sold to a guy who wanted to cut a profit basically. His intention was I'm gonna live here for two years...(m-r.nc)
 MK: ...and sell it (w.nc)
 ML: ...so I can get the property tax gains waiver and then I'm out of here...I'm going back to Lake Oswego (m-r.nc)

Respondent ML, a thirty-six year old biracial (black and white) woman, and MK, her Anglo American-white husband, have lived in the neighborhood since 1997. ML grew up in Portland, living at times in southeast, but mostly in north/northeast. MK came to Portland in 1970 from a small midwestern town in Illinois. They consider themselves part of the working class. They discussed past experiences and

the current flavor of the neighborhood in terms of the difference between suburbia and covenants, and how this neighborhood has a “sort of classless feel” that ML said is

...probably because there were a few houses that were sort of fixed up...but they were a little more...[refers to Mk] colorful? I guess maybe that's [classless] a nice way of saying maybe not suburban. Not conscious. Or maybe everything's very...kind of individual...people are...like you got a nice home and it looks like people live there as opposed to it looks like a place a certain type of person would live

MK: Like a magazine (w.nc)

ML: Yeah, like anybody can live here. Like I like the house down the street where they've got the sort of orange with the Dodge Dart... And they got this cool paint job...(m-r.nc)

MK: ...and it's ok...we can go two months without mowing the lawn [and] nobody's going to come and tell you to mow the lawn. We throw tortillas in the street for the crows and nobody gets upset about that. And yeah, it's nice (w.nc)

Respondents in this study used a variety of filters to describe and define what neighborhood means to them. The generally agreed upon appreciation for “neighborhood coming up”, “liking the way it is now”, and choosing to remain are statements about gentrification, at least in countering a once neglected, socially undervalued place. At the same time, choosing to remain and moving in has as much to do with the ‘feel’ of the place as its economic or racial changes. Strong feelings of attachment appear to stem initially from satisfaction with one's house, as a free expression of self, and extending thereafter to the home area. Still, how one feels in or about the home says little about one's perceptions and interactions with those living near.

Research Question 2:

How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighbor? How do they perceive one another as neighbors?

The questions above first ask respondents for a general description of a neighbor, then for a more meaningful, experiential definition of current interactions. Asking respondents their definition and description of self and each other as neighbors' moves their thinking from a general definition of a neighbor to their perceptions of each other as neighbors. Here, ideas of neighbor emerged as an assessment of self and each other's behavior.

The four themes and sub themes include, Definition Of Neighbor: *What is a neighbor*; Self and Others As Neighbors: *Being Neighbors*; Meaning of Neighbor and Neighborly Behavior: *"The Stranger"*; Acting Like A Neighbor: *A Neighborhood Ethic and Wanting to Fit In*. There also emerged fascinating distinctions between being neighbors and beings friends, between how much one wants to *know* their neighbors, and, at the same time, wanting a sense that those living near will be there when a need arises.

DEFINITION OF NEIGHBOR

What is a neighbor?

In the broadest terms, respondents defined a neighbor as

Mrs. O: Someone you can trust...leaving keys with... (b.ot)

Mr. O: Someone you can talk to and uh express yourself with... If you got a problem or something and you can't talk to your wife... I can go over there and talk to him and I feel better (b.ot)

- ML: You know we've seen odd people come by you know we'll automatically watch...is that person breaking in or... (m-r.nc)
- MK: Yeah. The tree we use to have in our front yard we trimmed the lower branches so we could see across because they would be gone at night and...just kind of keep an eye on the house for them. (w.nc)
- SA: Saying hello when you walk by, happy birthday... did you have a good trip (M.nc)
- CY: Commenting on your roses, having a barbeque and inviting you over...on the 4th whatever (w.nc)

SELF AND OTHERS AS NEIGHBORS

Being Neighbors

More detailed idiosyncratic descriptions emerged as respondents began describing their perceptions of each other as neighbors. Like Cooley's 'looking glass self', one's interpretation of others as good or bad neighbors stems also from how self is or would like to be perceived. As one respondent put it,

- ML: People just sort of respect the fact that you're just who you are. But...I guess I just sort of feel that way because I would be there for them (m-r.nc)

People's perceptions of others' actions and intentions play a meaningful role in how neighbor and being a neighbor get described. Ms. MT, a longtimer, states that because she knows there are good people in the neighborhood, she has good neighbors. But she worries that because she is not out much, others may perceive her as unfriendly,

I need to open my house and say come on in, would you like to come over for dinner, or something of that sort. I need to do that more, and I'm ashamed of myself for not doing that... I think the fact that we're not out...and of course we have a lot of reasons. One of them is, I mean I'll sit in front of the television... I hope that the people who are

new to the neighborhood are aware that I'm not an unfriendly person because I do try an speak (w.ot)

Having time, being out-of-doors doing nothing more than tending the flowers, or sitting on the porch appeared to play a vital role in one's perception of self and others as being friendly. Yet, as was observed and pointed out by several respondents, the use value of porch sitting gets lost under the exchange value of new construction.

Still, the response above highlights the ways in which neighbor and being neighbors in times of change is a matter of approachability, friendliness, and speaking. Moreover, approachability and friendliness have gradations that may or may not explicate concepts and problems in class and/or race. Residents' own perceptions of class and race, when mentioned, appear to have a good deal to do with past experiences in neighborhoods and in society at large.

The literature suggests those having prior negative experiences will be most likely to describe neighbor and intergroup neighboring in classist and/or racist terms. This was not the general case in my study. As one respondent stated, "people can't always be labeled in class-race patterns... that's part of what makes up the neighborhood" [SA].

In telling her story SA described having had lots of experience with racism both abroad and in the US. She stated she was "raised to think about white people in a certain way." When I asked about how her experiences with racism might influence

her perceptions of being a neighbor under changing demographic conditions, she adamantly pointed out that

Being neighbors on a very non-intimate level overrides all that stuff... It's not like... I want to know what they're doing in the bedroom or... you know. I just want them to know that hey, I'm over here if you need some help.

These guys over here are friends. You know like friends they hang out and go for walks. They have parties and sometimes we go and sometimes we don't... I don't want to know them that close...they're my neighbors! (M.nc)

'Neighbors known' or 'knowing your neighbors' is a common variable used to say something about levels of interaction or cohesion in intergroup neighboring studies. Factors contributing to 'not knowing' include dissimilar race-ethnicity, length of residency, and class status in terms of tenure. Homeowners are said to hold negative feelings towards renters and rental properties because of an apparent lack of pride in the neighborhood and property upkeep.

This study found both old and new, black and white homeowners made mentioned of this on three separate occasions. Both pointed out how 'renters don't realize what it takes or care to keep up the property [Mrs. O, and LY]. On knowing neighbors, ML states, "we know most of them [our neighbors]...not any renters".

However, the most striking reason given for this seeming dislike of renters amongst homeowners was in reference to the transient nature of renters, which, according to JA, prohibited lasting relations. JA is an Anglo American newcomer and a recent mother. She loves the neighborhood and her neighbors, particularly those with young children, but has a particular concern about the renters

I *do* have a problem with all the rentals... Because of my time and the fact that they'll be leaving...it's just not worth investing in them, it's not worth the payoff. And another thing, they can't improve their houses! I mean Friends Of Trees leaves flyers on our doors... and will plant just about anything you want, no cost to you at all. But the flyer goes to the renter not the landlord! (w.nc)

MEANING OF NEIGHBOR AND NEIGHBORLY BEHAVIOR

The Stranger

It has been argued that neighborhood cohesion in times of change depends, to a large extent, on the speed in which "the host neighbor group" is willing to integrate the stranger (Fellin & Litwak 1963: 372). Others posit that creating and maintaining cohesion works best when long time residents act as "socializing agents" in welcoming newcomers or extending themselves to the stranger (Donnelly & Majka 1996:272). Exactly who and what constitutes the host group and the stranger depends on whether one is looking in residential segregation literature or gentrification studies.

The host group, in segregation literature, tends to be Anglo American-'whites'. Neighborhood preference and race-relations studies describe the host in terms of length of residency and by the dominant economic-status and racial composition of the neighborhood. In gentrification research, however, the host neighborhood group constitutes long time, lower-income and African American-'black' residents.

The stranger may be described in number of ways including by class, race, or length of residency. In gentrification studies, the stranger may be the higher-income, Anglo American-'white' newcomer. According to Meyer (1954), the stranger is the

one who refuses or has difficulties integrating themselves into new and changing environments.

Many respondents in this study that might fit the description of the stranger do not see themselves as newcomers but as living in the neighborhood long enough to make summary judgments about how other people ought to behave. This was particularly evident for those who expressed strong emotional/sentimental attachments to place. Amongst this group, the common response to the question of how long have you lived in this neighborhood was, "a long time, six or seven years". Conversely, one respondent expressing dissatisfaction with the neighborhood and particularly the changes indicated being here four years "too long" [AT]

What became evident, however, is that people's background or childhood experiences in neighborhoods with neighbors play a meaningful role in their current efforts to meet new neighbors. Some respondents simply grew up being leery of approaching strangers.

Ms. MT: I always knew as a kid growing up who the neighbors were. We had to be good because the neighbors would tell on us (w.ot)

ML: You know its funny...I didn't grow up with that concept of meeting your neighbors...so that was always new for me...And you know and um...Well my parents were fundamentalist Christian types and it was very us versus them attitudes. Even though that kind of came and went...I think that was kind of just one of those things that you grow up with and you internalize that... And there were certain people that we knew...you know there were some people across the street they were an older couple and I remember going over to their house after school a couple times...but it was very kind of like you don't go talking to anybody because they might be evil [laughter]... and also just personality wise... (m-r.nc)

ACTING LIKE A NEIGHBOR

A Neighborhood Ethic and Wanting to Fit In

When residents were asked what, if any, changes you would make to the neighborhood, several agreed with the longtimers saying they would like to keep the mix just as it is now. The mix, as one respondent described, has a sort of class-less/race-less feel similar to Meyer's concept of the stranger and Mann's conception of manifest and latent behaviors. In this case, the stranger may best be understood as a specific behavior rather than a demographic description of particular people. Here, the idea of the stranger cuts across class, race, and length of residency. A non-racial, classless conception of stranger maybe extended to describe what some respondents observed as having or not having an "ethic". Whether someone possesses this neighborhood-neighbor ethic is inevitably determined by the viewers' perceptions of whether or not others (the stranger) want to "fit in" [SA].

Mr. O refers to a type of neighborhood-neighbor ethic in terms of neighbors *being regular* versus *being bumpy*. According to CY, the ethic is an "interactive" behavior. It exists somewhere between inviting and excluding one's neighbors.

SA and her partner CY locate this ethic while explaining that there are neighbors in the neighborhood who have barbeques/parties and don't invite anybody from the neighborhood and only "their outside friends". And there are others who invite their neighbors.

SA: Well these guys [over here] have both things. They have parties just with their outside friends then they'll have parties with the neighbors" (M.nc)

CY: Part of that is age. I wouldn't expect to see [the older residents throwing parties] (w.nc)

SA: Part of that is also being new to the neighborhood because [these guys] want to fit in; they want to meet people and fit in (M.nc)

Probing for deeper understanding of the idea of neighborhood-neighborly ethic, I asked SA and CY first, how they know their neighbors want to fit in and secondly to contrast their perceptions of neighborliness described above with their previous, somewhat negative description of the neighbor on their left (not shown).

SA: They want to sit out and feel safe in the neighborhood (M.nc)

CY: It's an ethic that they have and a commitment and they're very good about it (w.nc)

Q: What about this guy, do you think he has an ethic?

SA: No. Not like these guys (M.nc)

CY: Because he hasn't, he's younger...he hasn't initiated any interaction since then (w.nc)

SA: Well he says hello (M.nc)

CY: But remember the musician guys who used to live there before, they would peer over the fence and talk to me while I was smoking and we would talk back and forth... They were interactive, more intimate (w.nc)

At the same time, "this guy" does express some redeeming, neighbor qualities. He is trying to fit in.

SA: I do [think he's trying to fit in] He rides his bike everywhere, he um, hires the neighborhood kids to mow his lawn, which I think is a good sign (M.nc)

CY: I think that we should support our neighbors whenever we can, financially. He's just not a gregarious guy, like we are (w.nc)

Respondent LY, an Anglo American newcomer discussed the ethic and an undefined stranger in terms of an adherence to "informal unspoken rules" that, when

violated, interrupt one's routine and expectations. Informal neighborhood rules consist of what other neighbors do or don't do that make the perceiver uncomfortable. The description here does not appear to depend on time in the neighborhood but rather an assumption that by virtue of close proximity, either face-block or next door, neighbors should be aware and respectful of each other's habits, including usual time at home and usual parking spot when off-street. LY referred to such things in a list of "oddball situations" while in conversation about neighbors known

Another little oddball situation is...you know...I can't figure out who actually lives in that house! (w.nc)

LY, like other respondents, admitted to not getting out much but spoke from an awareness of neighborhood activities. This scenario somewhat confuses the issue of 'not knowing'. On the one hand, not knowing gets in the way of communicating with certain neighbors. On the other hand, not knowing and claiming awareness suggests a selection process, which invariably implies a certain criteria for whom one chooses to neighbor with.

Many different faces coming and going from one residence may be a function of class and racial differences in how 'blacks', 'whites' and 'others' use neighborhood and extended family networks. In this case, however, the house in question is owned and occupied by a lower-income, longtimer Anglo American-white, single mother of three teenagers who grew up in the neighborhood—each with boyfriends, girlfriends, and young children. In addition to the comings and goings of many different people,

LY mentions little appreciation for the type and volume of music that often peers from the house.

Perceptions of others behavior as wanting to buy into the neighborhood or fit in was also noted as making a difference in neighboring approachability and who to do neighbor.

ML: There are people who move in and just pour money in [snap finger] like that and its like no consideration actually because its' a thing to consider like you're in the neighborhood for what...I'm not sure [there is a] reason...but you just pour to make your property value go up but you're doing it to everyone else...(m-r.nc)

MK: ...and you could force people out because of that (w.nc)

ML: There's no consciousness about that...but you come in and be who you are...like we are I think...it's kinda, you want to be part of it (m-r.nc)

In these respondents' view, there is a fundamental difference between wanting to be a part of the neighborhood and wanting to recreate it. Clarifying the point, MK stated that it is not so much about trying to be a part of something that already exists. Rather, "who lived here wasn't [the issue]...we weren't thinking really thinking in terms of neighborhood, I mean we wanted a home." As they described what the home area looked like prior to moving in, "empty and condemned" houses and lots in one direction and bared windows in another, notions of "urban pioneers" come up

ML: But we were also a lot more reclusive than we are now [laughter]. But I mean feeling at home in the neighborhood is just a bonus. I guess I never felt frightened here (m-r.nc)

MK: It never felt like we were the urban pioneers which you hear people talk about which is offensive because what was there before? People! And there's a store on 15th and Prescott, which we still go to. We use to go there a lot when we smoked. After we quit we said we'd go there to buy milk because...so they don't feel the hit so much...I guess it's a casual connection (w.nc)

Mr. O, a long time neighbor since 1957, is “always walking about the neighborhood” [Mrs. O]. In a discussion about the changes to the neighborhood and types of neighborly behavior he stated,

Race change...that's ok. If that's where a person wants to live, don't bother me a bit. I'm happy for them you know. Black and white men and women, doesn't bother me. I talk to all of them... no problem with me talking to them. You know if you going to be in the neighborhood you might as well speak to people...and talk to em, get to know em.

Now if I get a snob...I can tell them right off. If I say good morning or good afternoon you don't ever say any thing...so I aint got no more use for them so why should I put myself off on them? That's the way I look at it. But I'm going to give you the benefit of the doubt, and see how you're going to operate with me...if you aint going to be regular then let's [...] forget it. [Mr. O] (b.ot)

Are these classist or racist statements? When asked to clarify what being “regular” looks like and *who* is being given the benefit of the doubt, Mr. O referred to a specific problem he felt needed collective attention but in which some neighbors did not want to participate

We was doing something... we was trying to get up a neighborhood watch...I think I talked to you guys about that. [We] was having problems with your neighbors. So them two guys over there...they didn't want to cooperate... them's the only two I ever... you know...so I don't have nothing to do...I talk to [everybody]... but them other two guys...they want to be...to themselves, don't want to be regular in the neighborhood that's fine. I don't have any problems. We have never had any... confusion...I mean, people meddling in other peoples business...Coming to you, cursing you out... Sometimes we have a good week sometimes a not so good one. Some neighbors get bumpy once in a while. (b.ot)

In this case, the “two guys” referred to were newcomers—a young, Anglo American-‘white’ couple. Apparently, being “regular” as opposed to being “a snob”

or “bumpy” is an expression of approachability and friendliness. This expression has something to do with the perceivers’ concern about the general welfare of the neighborhood and whether or not others will be there if a need arises.

The general pattern of responses suggests long timers and newcomers share similar opinions, expectations, and perceptions of being neighbors. Although the words are different, both seem to recognize neighbor in terms of a behavior such as not wanting to fit in. The reverse of this behavior appears to be friendliness, approachability, and speaking. Neither group’s responses explicate class or race.

Mr. O’s comments do reflect his expectations for how people in general, and newcomers in particular, ought to behave. Interesting enough, some newcomers express similar expectations

MK: You know when you think about it no one has to be best friends. You just treat people like people...and they treat you like people...and it just works (w.nc)

ML: You don’t really think of people as neighbors...just folks (m-r.nc)

In this chapter, I have presented the findings of my research. For Research Question 1, four themes emerged: Meaning of Neighborhood: A Neighborhood versus A Community, Changing Conditions, and Motivations for Choosing this Neighborhood. Four themes and sub-themes emerged for Research Question 2: Defining Neighbor: *What is a Neighbor*; Self and Others as Neighbors: *Being Neighbors*; Meaning of Neighbor and Neighborly Behavior: *The Stranger*, and Acting Like A Neighbor: *A Neighborhood Ethic and Wanting to Fit In*

In the final chapter of this thesis, I discuss the research findings and how these findings relate to Social Identity theory. I examine the implications of this research for subsequent efforts to study gentrification and social change, discuss the limitations of this study, and present some suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This thesis explored the social relationships of ‘different residents’ in a gentrifying neighborhood to understand a contemporary meaning of social change. The term ‘different residents’ (‘people’, ‘members’ or ‘neighbors’) refers to differences in class, race, length of residency, and tenure. These differences are often thought to underlie intergroup conflict and miss-communication.

Neighborly behavior in a gentrifying neighborhood may involve a large array of economic-class, racial, political, and/or social psychological factors. None of these factors are exclusive. When class (determined by education and income) is the issue of difference, outgroup hostilities may emerge in a manner that has nothing to do with ‘race’. When ‘race’ is the differentiating focus, outgroup animosity may emerge as a psychological result of economics and history. In this study, social change was understood as the degree to which ‘different members’ of a gentrifying neighborhood perceive self, other, and their changing environment in terms other than class and/or race. Gentrification is used as a proxy for social change.

A specific area within King neighborhood in northeast Portland was selected as the study context in order to gain insights about the type of people and behaviors that might be found in a gentrifying neighborhood. The King neighborhood residents should be considered expert sources of information about how intergroup neighboring during gentrification is experienced in everyday interactions. The use of a neighborhood as the research context is appropriate because the literature states that

‘people’—in general, have some commonsense knowledge of its meaning, value, and location.

The study sought to understand social interactions in a gentrifying area by exploring how King neighborhood residents describe and define neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behavior. This thesis examines how ‘different residents’ experience gentrification (i.e. change) in their everyday interactions with one another. The residents agree their neighborhood is changing. According to the literature, economic and/or racial conflict is likely to ensue between old and new neighbors of a gentrifying neighborhood. Captured and compared was the degree to which class and/or ‘race’ can be interpreted to play a meaningful role in the individual’s description of neighborhood, neighbor, and neighborly behavior, or if other factors such as reasons for choosing *this* neighborhood, prior and recent experiences, and one’s ideological/ cultural worldview supercede economic-racial concerns.

Data collected through in-depth interviews and brief conversations with old and new neighbors was thematicized and compared to shed light on the question: What is the relationship between who individuals appear to be and what they say? Comparisons were made by dividing respondents into two categories: long/oldtimers and newcomers. The study captured and compared some of the ways the ‘different members’ understand their changing environment.

The research questions: (1) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighborhood? (2) How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighbor? How do they perceive

one another as neighbors?

How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighborhood?

The study found that ‘different King residents’ define neighborhood, in general, and their neighborhood, in particular, through a variety of filters. There were no clear distinctions between an oldtimers and newcomers response on issues of neighborhood versus community. Differences in opinions about these concepts emerged more so from within the newcomer interviews. The difference here had to do with prior experiences and expectations of neighborhood.

One newcomer moved to the area from an eclectic, diverse area and felt that “this is not a community”. Another stated that the differences between neighborhood and community were not really in “the front” of her mind. The general theme for both groups is that “neighborhood is about the familiar stuff”.

Interestingly, both class and ‘race’ were implied factors in some long time and newly arrived African American-black residents’ descriptions of the neighborhood and neighborhood change in relation to other black residents. Longtimers’ recollections of how the neighborhood used to be, compared to their appreciation for the changes brought on by gentrification were exemplified in one respondent’s comments that the “neighborhood is coming up” and that “all the troublemakers are gone”.

These comments arose in conversation about previous drug activity and people not taking care of their yards. The troublemakers were unquestionably black youth

and renters. It is an interesting racial statement when long time black residents express an appreciation for the neighborhood now being quieter “like it used to be when more white people resided.”

Overall, residents in this study appear to understand “neighborhood” in terms of their immediate environment and current interactions. This suggests several things for social researchers. Most importantly, in situations where the goal is to understand social change in contemporary intergroup interactions, geographic concepts of neighborhood and community may be too large a context. While most respondents alluded this, one King resident explicitly stated, “Well I mean its our home...its our home...you know its our home...it’s the thing.” In this respect, size did not appear to be a factor in the definition of neighborhood or distinction between neighborhood and community. For some, both neighborhood and community are about “one-on-one relationships with every person you see.”

Respondents’ emphasis on their home calls attention to Kearns and Parkinsons (2001) concept of the home area and the literature on neighborhood satisfaction. The home area includes both one’s home, in terms of self-expression, and the 5 to 10 minute walk from the front door. In this study, most residents expressed an emotional and evaluative satisfaction first with their house and then their immediate home area. This supports Kearns and Parkinson’s notion that the home area provides people with the greatest sense of meaning, belonging, and identity. While it is clear that for many residents, the King neighborhood was chosen out of economic concerns, all but two

concurrently stated that they like the feel of the area and would not want to live anywhere else in the city.

Residents' identification with a home area, rather than a geographic neighborhood, had other implications in regards to gentrification and its effect on the type and availability of neighborhood amenities. Geographically, all the residents in the research site live within a 10-minute walk of the newly named Alberta Arts District. Yet, only one resident indicated frequenting the district. Most expressed dissatisfaction with pricing, the feel, and types of shops. Other's stated they felt the new amenities were not intended for their use. As one newcomer put it, the Arts District is like "Geppeto in the ghetto." In this case, the meaning of home area was limited by or at least subject to residents' personal meaning of the built environment. This further suggests that city officials and urban planners need to develop different, more meaningful tactics to get local input on how the neighborhood ought to be redesigned.

According to my findings, the individuals' greatest sense of belonging was found in their personal and/or experiential conception of the things that subjectively define neighborhood. This was captured in a respondent's statement that neighborhood is a kind of "funny" thing. "It's not like neighborhood and community and all that is in the front of my mind...for me it's my walk to work...the 3 miles".

How do the different members of a gentrifying neighborhood define and describe neighbor? How do they perceive one another as neighbors?

Asking the ‘different residents’ their perceptions of each other as neighbors proved the most important question in the study. Residents are aware of each other’s behaviors, and it is clear from my conversations with them that ‘different residents’ behavior influenced how they thought and felt about one another. Though respondents described the abstract “neighbor” in common language such as “saying hello” and “someone you can leave your keys with”, various filters were used in idiosyncratic descriptions of self and other as neighbor.

The important and repeated similarities within and between each group were between being neighbors and being friends, between how much one wants to *know* their neighbors and at the same time wanting a sense that those living near you will be there when a need arises. Old and new respondents stated that they didn’t need to know what people were doing in the privacy of their homes, but rather that others knew they would be there for them in the event of an emergency. Even those expressing neighborhood dissatisfaction spoke of having this sense that they would be there for their neighbors and that their neighbors would be there for them.

Several newcomers indicated that they liked the feel of the area yet were not particularly concerned with or attracted to neighborhood diversity. Respondents stated in various ways having diversity with friends and co-workers not my neighbors. Yet the class-less and race-less “feel” of the area that respondents spoke of does say something about an appreciation for the ‘different’ types of people and behaviors in the area. The feel of the neighborhood involves much more than housing structures and trees. People, more specifically, oldtimers emanate that certain feel. The ways

that residents described neighbor and spoke of diversity addresses some of the literature on intergroup neighboring.

On one hand, conflict-based research that relies on friendship variables to say something about type and degree of intergroup neighboring may, in fact, be underestimating neighborliness. As respondents stated in my study, “You know when you think about it no one has to be best friends. You just treat people like people...and they treat you like people...and it just works”. “You don’t really think of people as neighbors...just folks”. In this respect, appearing unfriendly and being friends with the neighbors are two different behaviors.

On the other hand, if a concept of “a good neighbor” can be determined, respondents in this study support the notion that a good neighbor is someone who leaves you alone *and* will be there when a need arises (Perin 1988 in Benson 1990). There were no clear distinctions between a neighbor and a good neighbor.

However, to impose the concept of good neighbors on my data, it is safe to say that “good neighbors” were generally understood by these residents to be people who want to fit in with the neighborhood. Clear behavioral distinctions were made between people who move in for the sake of turning a profit and those who wanted to be apart of it. Interestingly, when such people and behaviors were pointed out, there was a tendency not to know the persons’ names.

For many respondents in this study, approachability, friendliness, and speaking were key neighborly behaviors. While ‘race’ was mentioned in describing past interactions and neighborhood conditions, respondents focused more on everyday

factors such as friendliness, approachability, and speaking rather than specific economic-class or racial-ethnic differences. Approachability and friendliness may have gradations that explicate problems in class and/or race.

In other words, approachability, friendliness, and speaking appear to have little to do with class, race, length of residency, or intimate friendships within the neighborhood. It is, perhaps this sense of being there, facilitated by friendliness and speaking that gives the area (at least for the moment) a non-confrontational feel.

Thematically, the majority of respondents talked about self and other as neighbor in terms of sharing a neighborhood ethic. This ethic includes demonstrating an awareness of unspoken neighborhood rules about being a neighbor. These themes appear to reflect residents' shared ideas of neighbors being "regular" versus being "bumpy" in the neighborhood. None of these themes should be interpreted as implying issues of class-classism and/or 'race'-racism. Instead, being regular in the neighborhood and wanting to fit are, as one respondent put it, "interactive" behaviors that display a type of open, approachable behavior.

Being regular is not so much a matter of effort or consistency in being a good neighbor (as subcategorization theory would argue), but rather an indication that other residents recognize and acknowledge that the person is someone who can be counted on in a time of need. Part of this recognition involves being out-of-doors, and most certainly speaking. Evidence of this was found in one oldtimers statement that the neighborhood's 'race' changes doesn't bother him. What bothers him and apparently other respondents is when people—regardless of class and race—move into the

neighborhood and don't speak to others. "If you're going to be in the neighborhood you might as well speak to people."

Being regular as opposed to being bumpy is also an expression that displays one's neighborhood-neighbor ethic and adherence to "informal unspoken" neighborhood rules. The rules are not necessarily taught. They are, however, expected behaviors that neighbors, by virtue of close proximity—either next door or face-block—are aware of, such as speaking, usual time home and parking when off-street. Thus, the adherence to informal neighborhood rules consists of what other neighbors do or don't do that make the perceiver comfortable or uncomfortable.

Assessing the ethic no doubt falls on the viewers' perception. Yet, these residents suggested that being regular and wanting to fit in were recognizable behaviors, in that what one does shows one's values and beliefs. In addition, being regular and approachable might also allow for perceptual corrections—i.e. between-group dialogue. Again, feeling comfortable—beyond the confines of one's home—is achieved through regularity in speaking with other residents. If this is established, then addressing the actions of others that produce discomfort may be more easily achieved.

Finally, old and new residents seemed to recognize the difference between a stranger and a neighbor in terms of immediate behaviors. All indicated an expectation that those living near will be there when a need arises. Although the words were different, findings revealed greater similarities than differences in old and new residents', and residents from different racial groups' meanings, perceptions, and

expectations of neighbor and neighborly behaviors, and, in particular, their view of each other as neighbors.

The fact that intergroup neighborly tensions, typically associated with gentrification, appear, at the moment, to be non-existent can be attributed to the overall similarities in old and new residents' responses. The similarities suggest that, on issues of being and doing neighbor, the relationship between who respondents' appear to be (i.e. class and race) and what they say cannot be automatically inferred. If, as my findings suggest, what 'different neighbors' most want is to know that those living near will be there when a need arises, then being bumpy and not speaking may be the very micro condition creating uncertainty and tension found in most gentrification studies.

People's perceptions of others' actions and intentions do play a meaningful role in how neighbor and being a neighbor get described. The similarity in King residents' definitions and descriptions of neighborhood and neighbor, regardless of differences in length of residence or racial-ethnic group membership, are consistent with cooperative intergroup neighboring research that shows class and race are not readily important when neighborhood is viewed as a place of comfort and desired relaxation. One of the strongest points in my findings is that approachability and speaking to 'others' can go a long way towards minimizing conflict in intergroup neighboring during times of change.

Theoretical Dynamics

The present study sought to understand the degree to which class and/or race

can be used to say something about intergroup neighborly relations in a gentrifying neighborhood. It investigated two different theoretical-perspectives in the social identity tradition to find out which version best described the current experiences and behaviors of people in a gentrifying neighborhood.

Social Dominance Theory

Social Dominance Theory predicted that, in a group-based system of social hierarchy, issues of class and race will dominate people's perceptions on all levels of interactions. Members of groups with greater power (e.g. higher income white Americans) will structure the nature of interactions with members of less powerful groups in ways that force the socially dominant group's definitions of the situation on others. Gentrification research tends to support this perspective arguing conflict between old and new neighbors will ensue over place, space, identity, and history.

In a gentrifying neighborhood, social dominance predicts inevitable polarization. From this perspective, higher income newcomers, regardless of race-ethnicity, will tend to be self-interest oriented, more concerned with property values and maintaining group-level distinctions than with developing a sense of community or establishing neighborly ties with pre-existing residents. My findings do not support this view.

However, social dominance theory does predict that anti-egalitarian, hierarchy-enhancing type people would not likely move into a gentrifying neighborhood and if they do so, their behaviors should be recognizable. Anti-egalitarian type neighborly behavior would involve the large, newly constructed privacy fences with patrolling

dogs, rigid avoidance behavior, and people being rarely seen out-of-doors interacting with neighbors. To the extent that inferences can be made, this was observed in two cases

The first case occurred when I was seeking participants for my study. The opportunity arose to contact a particular Anglo American newcomer whom I had rarely seen out-of-doors. One late afternoon while walking my dog I noticed that the car parked outside his house had its lights on. Because of the dogs, I could not directly approach the door, but instead rang the bell outside the fence. There was no answer. However, he was home as I saw him peering out the crack in the window shades. The second case also involves a large privacy fence, residents rarely seen out-of-doors, and perhaps the most expensive, refurbished house in the research area.

The home-owning occupants were an Anglo American couple, newcomers, and an infant son. I made contact with the residents who, in turn, were not interested in participating in my research. What is interesting about these neighbors' behavior is that both longtimers and newcomers recognized them as being rather unfriendly. In fact, during the interview with N₁ and N₂,ⁱⁱ I was told the story about some brief interactions with these residents in which the descriptive term used was "un-egalitarian". These anti-egalitarian-type neighbors resided in the area about two-years and no longer live in the neighborhood.

Optimal Distinctiveness Theory

Conversely, Optimal Distinctiveness Theory proposes that under certain conditions, individuals can move beyond group-level differences in order to

ⁱⁱ Not mentioned in Chapter Five due to audiotape difficulties

understand interactions with others in terms of shared goals, common interests, and similar values. In-group biases minimize the differences between categories. Once different individuals see themselves as neighbors, categorical distinction can collapse “them” and “us” dichotomies into a single, common understanding of “we” in terms of being King residents. According to Brewer, people can choose how and with whom to identify.

By no means would Optimal Distinctiveness Theory suggest that classism and racism do not exist in the minds and behaviors of residents in this study just because they share an understanding of each other as neighbors. It is quite clear that individuals living and interacting in a group-based system of social hierarchy must negotiate structural forces shaping their everyday interactions. However, the different residents in this study appear, at the moment, to understand self and each other’s behaviors in terms of immediate action, not demographic descriptions.

The residents observed in this study were more concerned with face-to-face interactions in the home area than changes to their larger, geographic environment. In this sense, the meaning of neighbor and being a good neighbor is something that is bestowed based on perceived common values. These values are determined by and demonstrated in peoples’ perceptions of others immediate behavior. The findings of this study support both Optimal Distinctiveness Theory and Donnelly and Majka’s studies on intergroup cohesion in times of change.

Implications

Neighborhoods do tell stories; they have histories, identities, and shared

reputations each affected by national and local processes in economic change. The dominant story of neighborly relations since Park's seminal invasion-succession model of neighborhood change is one of intergroup conflict. The 'different residents' of a gentrifying neighborhood are expected to enter a series of contact-conflict stages. However, cooperative intergroup neighborhood literature suggests that conflict may be curbed if and when old and new neighbors assimilate new understandings of neighborhood and neighboring. My findings support the latter view.

My research further suggests that macro-level gentrification processes do not have to result in the experience of class or race-based conflict on the level of everyday interactions among 'different neighbors'. Implied here are two things. One is that when newcomers absorb the current flavor of the neighborhood—i.e. take on a longtimer mentality—a desire for active intergroup interaction can be promoted that demonstrates common values in terms of what is good for the immediate environment or neighborhood.

What is good for the neighborhood is analytically slippery and says nothing about the progression or halting of the gentrifying process. What is good for the neighborhood is both a perception and a set of behaviors that cannot be objectively imposed. It is also an emergent concept, particularly in a demographically changing neighborhood, that involves immediate interaction and 'different residents' perceptions of those actions. Again, "Neighborhood is about the familiar stuff". However, as gentrification brings together 'different people' with different expectations and experiences, what is familiar to some may not be for others.

Second, social interaction in a gentrifying neighborhood does not have to center on overt or subtle conflict. Cooperative intergroup neighboring research suggests that to facilitate cohesion, newcomers must literally show their understanding of neighborhood and neighbor by *taking* the opportunity to demonstrate both manifest and latent forms of behavior. At the same time, long time residents must extend themselves in welcoming newcomers.

Paying more attention to how residents experience actual neighboring behaviors in everyday interactions has the potential to minimize the negative effects of gentrification while maximizing the positive ones. Some negative effects include displacement and intergroup social conflict. Understanding the positive effects involves much more than neighborhood improvements—i.e. new amenities and property values. One must move towards an expectation that each resident, both old and new, can exhibit a type of neighborhood ownership and develop a sense of belonging simply by demonstrating neighborliness in forms one would like to receive. The challenge, for social research interested in progress and change is, according to Jezierski (1999), to rethink and reorder class status locations.

Usefulness of qualitative methods for studying gentrification and social change

This study used a qualitative interview method to understand how King neighborhood residents experience the effects of gentrification in their everyday neighborly interactions. Qualitative research on micro-level interactions can make a valuable contribution to understanding macro-level social processes such as gentrification and social change. As noted in the previous section, a focus on how

residents experience actual neighboring behaviors in everyday interactions actually provides insights into how to minimize the negative effects of gentrification.

In no way should my choice to explore the effects of gentrification through everyday interactions be taken to ignore other methodological approaches, e.g. larger scale social area analysis studies. I am proposing that it is helpful to understand both macro- and micro-level processes associated with gentrification, in particular, and social change, in general. In regards to gentrification from a micro perspective, social change that appears to be slow and typically associated with class- and/or race-based conflict from a macro-level perspective, may actually be progressing at a steady rate based on the recognition of shared values associated with “being a good neighbor”.

Limitations

Two main areas of limitations have been identified with this particular research: (1) issues relating to personal characteristics of the researcher, and (2) issues relating to participant selection, number of respondents and the generalizability of findings.

Researcher characteristics

One limitation of this research is associated with my personal characteristics. Particularly in qualitative studies, it is significant to note the researcher’s personal background and potential for bias. I am an African American-black resident of King neighborhood. I am a newcomer, and by definition a gentrifier. How this bundle of personal characteristic influenced the purpose of study is both uncertain and relatively

unimportant. On one hand, however, my experience as a resident may allow for keen insight into a population that I am part of and familiar with on a variety of levels. For example, as a resident and community outreach volunteer I had first hand knowledge of who did and did not attend city invitations to community meetings. It was me who knocked on my neighbors' doors inviting them to attend the Alberta Streetscape project.

On the other hand, there is potential for bias if I chose to analyze data in such a manner that is consistent with my experiences and my own perceptions. To minimize such bias, I first made sure that respondents knew that I was a student, a resident in the neighborhood, and the purpose of my study. And, as indicated by the data presentation, I also reviewed each respondent's comments during the interview to make sure I had captured that person's views, as they understood them. This was further achieved by asking for clarification. Finally, during analysis, I took every effort to ensure that data was categorized and coded in such a manner that is consistent with the perceptions of the respondents.

Participant selection, number of respondents and the generalizability of findings

It is important to note that this study is set in a very isolated context with few participants and is not intended for generalization. Participant selection was achieved by asking residents who, amongst neighbors known or most curious about, would be a good person to talk to. This technique may contain a degree of participant-neighbor bias. Given my personal characteristics, I cannot and do not claim that my findings will necessarily be the same if conducted by a different researcher, in another city or

even in a different Portland neighborhood.

However, when considering qualitative research conducted in these kinds of situations, Marshall and Rossman (2000) propose that it is necessary to consider the theoretical framework upon which the study is based before attempting to apply findings to other settings. Because this study does draw from larger theories of social identity, as well as research on inter-group cooperation, it may be that general themes that emerged might be applicable to understanding the effects of gentrification in other areas.

Suggestions for future research

This thesis has generated several possibilities of extending the study to future research projects. First, it would be a logical next step to extend this research into a longitudinal study that would explore if and how these residents' understanding of neighborhood and neighbor change over time. Initially, residents' understanding of neighborhood and neighbor could be measured at one stage of gentrification, with a follow-up interview study – asking similar questions – at a later date after the process of gentrification appeared to have brought about changes in the neighborhood.

Second, although residents in this study felt the focus group approach is rather un-neighborly, this method would be highly useful in capturing the 'different residents' awareness of and reaction to each other. This is particularly true if the goal is to understand and, at the same time, facilitate social change through 'different residents' recognition of each other's goals and concerns. An approach of this type may result in a useful model of reducing the negative effects of gentrification in

northeast Portland and elsewhere as ‘different residents’ become aware of their similar values and priorities.

What is the relationship between who they are and what they say? Race and class-based conflict described in the gentrification literature did not seem to form the basis for how residents understood each other as neighbors. Instead there was much more emphasis on good neighbors being people, regardless racial group or how long they had lived in the neighborhood, who were “regular,” followed unspoken neighborhood rule, and shared a neighborhood ethic. As one resident noted,

“People can’t always be labeled in class-race patterns...that’s part of what makes up the neighborhood. Being neighbors on a very non-intimate level overrides all that stuff... I just ant them to know that hey, I’m over here if you need some help.”

Notes

¹ The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology (4th ed).

² For a more detailed look at how I derive this statement peruse the following readers. M. Bulmer & J. Solomos (Eds.). (1999). *Racism*. Oxford University Press. L. Back & J. Solomos (Eds.). (2000). *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader*. New York: Routledge.

³ *c.f.* Fischer 1971, 1975; Goodwin 1979; Greer 1962; Hunter 1971, 1974; Suttles 1972; Wirth 1938; Yinger 1976

⁴ *c.f.* Duncan & Duncan 1957; Kerstein 1990; Taeuber & Taeuber 1965

⁵ Second-Wave European immigration roughly between 1880 and the 1940s

⁶ *c.f.* Ellen 2000; Jagun et al. 1990; Krysan 2002; Sigelman et al.1996; Zubrinsky 2000; Zubrinsky & Bobo 1996.

⁷ *c.f.* Jost, J.T., Pelham, B.W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B.N. (2003). Social inequality and the education of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33 (1), 13-37.

⁸ Article 34 legitimates racist behavior such as redlining, blockbusting, and all we know about mortgage lending. But see Gotham's (2000) comprehensive discussion on the rise of the modern real estate industry.

⁹ "Many" Portlanders is determined by my personal contact and academic experiences

¹⁰ (<http://www.cnn.com/2000/US/08/29/minority.growth.glance.ap/index.html>
2003 County distribution African American-black 38,852; Asian 41,397; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander 2,237; American Indian and Alaska Native 5,482; Hispanics (US Census: American Community Survey Aug. 30, 2004)

References

- Adams, R.E. (1992). A tale of two cities: Community sentiments and community evaluation in Indianapolis and Pittsburgh. Social Focus, 25 (3), 217-240.
- Alex-Assensoh, Y. (1997). Race, concentrated poverty, social isolation, and political behavior. Urban Affairs Review, 33, 209-227.
- Austin, D.M., & Baba, Y. (1990). Social determinants of neighborhood attachment. Sociological Spectrum, 10 (5), 59-78.
- Babbie, E. (1999). The basics of social research. Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Baron, J.N. & Pfeffer, J. (1994). The social psychology of organizations and inequality. [Special Issue]. Social Psychology Quarterly, 57 (3), 190-209.
- Bell, D. (2004). Silent covenants: Brown V. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform. Oxford: University Press.
- Berg, B.L. (2004). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. (5th ed). Boston: Pearson.
- Bennett, L., Jr. (1993). The shaping of Black America: The struggles and triumphs of African-Americans, 1619 to the 1990s. New York: Penguin Books.
- Benson, J.E. (1990). Good neighbors: Ethnic relations in Garden City trailer courts. Urban Anthropology, 19 (4), 361-386.
- Bertaux, D. (1981). From the life-history approach to the transformation of sociological practice. In D. Bertaux (Ed.), Biography and society: The life-history approach in the social sciences (29-45). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Blumer, H. (1969) Symbolic interactionism. In R. Collins (Ed.), Four sociological traditions: Selected readings (pp. 306-321). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bobo, L., & Hutchings, V.L. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial social context. American Sociological Review, 61 (6), 951-972.

- Bobo, L., & Kluegel, J.R. (1993). Opposition to race-targeting: Self-interest, stratification ideology, or racial attitudes. American Sociological Review, 58 (4), 443-464.
- Bostic, R.W., & Martin, R.W. (2003). Black home-owners as a gentrifying force? Neighborhood dynamics in the context of minority home-ownership. Urban Studies, 40 (12), 2427-2450.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Education and Inequality. In N.V. Benokraitis (Ed.) Seeing ourselves: Classic, contemporary, and cross-cultural readings in sociology. (pp.347-353). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bowman, A.O. (1994). The city evolved: Naturally and not so. Urban Affairs Review, 31, 267-274.
- Brewer, M.B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 17 (5), 475-482.
- Brewer, M.B. (1996). When contact is not enough: Social identity and intergroup cooperation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20 (3/4), 291-303.
- Brewer, M.B. (1997). The social psychology of intergroup relations: Can research inform practice? Journal of Social Issues, 53 (1), 187-211.
- Butler, T. (2003). Living in the bubble: Gentrification and its 'others' in North London. Urban Studies, 40 (12), 2469-2487.
- Carpenter, J., & Lees, L. (1995). Gentrification in New York, London and Paris: An international comparison. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 19, 286-303.
- Clemente, F., & Klieman, M.B. (1977). Social control and deviance: Fear of crime in the United States: A multivariate analysis. Social Forces, 56 (2), 519-531.
- Cromwell, J.W. 1920. The aftermath of Nat Turner's insurrection. Journal of Negro History 5: 208-234.
- Deschamps, J-C., & Devos, T. (1998). Regarding the relationship between social identity and personal identity. In S. Worchel, J. F. Morales, D. Paez, & J-C Deschamps (Eds.), Social identity: International perspectives (pp. 1-12). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

- Donnelly, P.G., & Majka, T.J. (1996). Change, cohesion, and commitment in a diverse urban neighborhood. Journal of Urban Affairs, 18 (3), 269-312.
- Donnelly, P.G., Majka, T.J. (1998). Residents' efforts at neighborhood stabilization: Facing the challenges of inner-city neighborhoods. Sociological Forum, 13, 189-213.
- Durant, T.J., & Sparrow, K.H. (1997). Race and class consciousness among lower- and middle-class blacks. Journal of Black Studies, 27 (3), 334-351.
- Ellen, I.G. (2000). Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The prospects for stable racial integration. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.
- Ellen, I.G. (1998). Stable racial integration in the contemporary United States: An empirical overview. Journal of Urban Affairs, 20 (1), 27-43.
- Farley, R., & Frey, W.H. (1994). Changes in the segregation of Whites from Blacks During the 1980s: Small steps toward a more integrated society. American Sociological Review, 59 (1), 23-45.
- Feagin, J.R. (2001). Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations. New York: Routledge.
- Fellin, P., Litwak, E. (1963). Neighborhood cohesion under conditions of mobility. American Sociological Review, 28 (3), 364-376.
- Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. Urban Studies, 38 (12), 2125-2143.
- Freeman, L., & Braconi, F. (2004). Gentrification and Displacement. Journal of the American Planning Association, 70 (1), 39-53.
- Galster, G. (2001). On the nature of neighbourhood. Urban Studies, 38 (12), 2111-2124.
- Galster, G. (1998). A stock/flow model of defining racially integrated neighborhoods. Journal of Urban Affairs 20 (1), 43-52.
- Garcia, E., & Herrero, J. (2004). Determinants of social integration in the community: An exploratory analysis of personal, interpersonal and situational variables. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 14, 1-15.
- Goering, J.M. (1986). Housing desegregation and federal policy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- Gotham, K.F. (2000). Urban space, restrictive covenants and the origins of racial residential segregation in a US city, 1900-50. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 24 (3), 616-633.
- Grannis, R. (1998). The Importance of trivial streets: Residential streets and residential segregation. American Journal of Sociology, 103 (6), 1530-1564.
- Green, D.P., Strolovitch, D.Z., & Wong, J.S. (1998). Defended neighborhoods, integration, and racially motivated crime. American Journal of Sociology, 104 (2), 372-403.
- Guthrie, P., & Hutchinson, J. (1995). The impact of perceptions on interpersonal interactions in an African American/Asian American housing project. Journal of Black Studies, 25 (3), 377-395.
- Haggerty, L. (1982). Differential social contact in urban neighborhoods: Environmental vs. sociodemographic explanations. The Sociological Quarterly, 23 (3), 359-372.
- Halfpenny, P. (1979). The analysis of qualitative data. Sociological Review, 27 (4), 799-805.
- Hamberger, J., & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Tests of a model in four West European nations. The British Journal of Social Psychology, 36 (2), 173-190.
- Harris, D.R. (1999). "Property values drop when blacks move in, because...": Racial and socioeconomic determinants of neighborhood desirability. American Sociological Review, 64, 461-479.
- Hogg, M.A. (2001). "Social identity and the sovereignty of the group: A psychology of belonging." In C. Sedikides & M. Brewer (Eds.), Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self (pp. 125-143). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Hogg, M.A., & Abrams, D. (1988). The social identity approach: Context and content. In Social Identifications (pp. 6-30). Routledge: Chapman and Hall.
- Hogg, M.A., Terry, D.J., & White, K.M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. Social Psychology Quarterly, 58 (4), 255-269.
- Hughes, M. (1980). The fruits of cultivation analysis: A reexamination of some effects of television watching. The Public Opinion Quarterly 44 (3), 287-302.

- Hunter, A. (1975). The loss of community: An empirical test through replication. American Sociological Review, 40 (5), 537-552.
- Hutchinson, J.F., Rodriguez, N., & Hagan, J. (1996). Community Life: African Americans in multiethnic residential areas. Journal of Black Studies, 27 (2), 201-223.
- Immergluck, D. (1999). Neighborhoods, race, and capital: The effects of residential change on commercial investment patterns. Urban Affairs Review, 34, 397-411.
- Jackman, M.R., & Crane, M. (1986). "Some of my best friends are black...": Interracial friendship and whites' racial attitudes. The Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (4), 459-486.
- Jagun, A., Brown, D., Milburn, N., & Gary, L. (1990). Residential satisfaction and housing characteristics of urban black adults. Journal of Black Studies, 21 (1), 40-51.
- Jaret, C., & Reitzes, D. (1999). The importance of racial-ethnic identity and social setting for blacks, whites, and multiracials. Sociological Perspectives, 42 (4), 711-737.
- Jasper, M.J. (1997). The art of moral protest: Culture, biography, and creativity in social movements. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jezierski, L. (1999). Changing Communities and Contested Identities. Research in Politics and Society, 7, 87-109.
- Jost, J.T., Pelham, B.W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B.N. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. European Journal of Social Psychology, 33 (1), 13-37.
- Karsten, L. (2003). Family gentrifiers: Challenging the city as a place simultaneously to build a career and to raise children. Urban Studies, 40 (12), 2573-2586.
- Kearns, A., & Parkinson, M. (2001). The significance of neighborhood. Urban Studies, 38 (12), 2103-2110
- Kennedy, M., & Leonard, P. (2001). Dealing with neighborhood change: A primer on gentrification and policy choices. [*A discussion paper prepared for The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy*].

- Kerstein, R. (1990). Stage models of gentrification: An examination. Urban Affairs Quarterly, 25 (4), 620-639.
- Kirk, J., & Miller, M.L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Kohli, M. (1991). Biography: Account, text, method. In D. Bertaux (Ed.), Biography and society: The life-history approach in the social sciences (69-72). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Krysan, M. (2002). The residential preferences of Blacks: Do they explain persistent segregation? Social Forces, 80 (3), 937-981.
- Krysan, M. (1983). Community undesirability in Black and White: Examining racial residential preferences through community perceptions. Social Problems, 49 (4), 521-544.
- Lee, J. (2000). The salience of race in everyday life. Work and Occupations 27 (3), 354-376.
- Lee, B.A., Campbell, K.E., & Miller, O. (1991). Racial differences in urban neighboring. Sociological Forum, 6 (3), 525-550.
- Liska, A.E., Lawrence, J.J., & Sanchirico, A. (1982). Fear of crime as a social fact. Social Forces, 60 (3), 760-770.
- Logan, J.R., & Collver, O.A. (1983). Resident's perceptions of suburban community differences. American Sociological Review 48, 428-433.
- Maben, M. (1988). Vanport. Portland, Or: Oregon Historical Society Press.
- Mann, P.H. (1954). The concept of neighborliness. American Journal of Sociology, 60 (2), 163-168.
- Marcus-Newhall, A., Miller, N., Holtz, R., & Brewer, M.B. (1993). Cross-cutting category membership with role assignment: A means of reducing intergroup bias. British Journal of Social Psychology 32, 125-146.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (2000). Designing qualitative research (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Massey, D. (1996). The age of extremes: Concentrated affluence and poverty in the twenty-first century. Demography, 33 (4), 395-412.

- Massey, D.S., & Denton, N.A. (1989). Hypersegregation in US metropolitan areas: Black and Hispanic segregation along five dimensions. Demography, 26 (3), 373-391.
- Massey, D.S. (2001). Residential segregation and neighborhood conditions in U.S. metropolitan areas. In N. Smelser, W. Wilson, & F. Mitchell (Eds.), America Becoming: Racial trends and their consequences Volume I (pp391-429). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Massey, D.S., & Denton, N.A. (1993). American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, D.S., Eggers, M.L., & Denton, N.A. (1994). Disentangling the causes of concentrated urban poverty. International Journal of Group Tensions, 24, 267-316.
- Meertens, R.W., & Pettigrew, T.F. (1997). Is subtle prejudice really prejudice? Public Opinion Quarterly, 61, 54-71.
- Meyer, J. (1951). The stranger and the city. American Journal of Sociology, 56 (5), 476-483.
- Michalos, A.C., & Zumbo, B. (2001). Ethnicity, modern prejudice and the quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 53 (2), 189-222.
- Millard-Ball, A. (2000). Moving beyond the gentrification gaps: Social change, tenure change and gap theories in Stockholm. Urban Studies, 37 (9), 1673-1693.
- Molotch, H. (1969). Racial change in a stable community. American Journal of Sociology, 75 (2), 226-238.
- Murray, P. (1953). The historical development of race laws in the United States. Journal of Negro Education, 22, (1), 4-15.
- Oliver, E.J., & Mendelberg, T. (2000). Reconsidering the environmental determinants of white racial attitudes. American Journal of Political Science, 44 (3), 574-589.
- Olzak, S., Shanahan, S., & McEneaney, E.H. (1996). Poverty, segregation, and race riots: 1960-1993. American Sociological Review, 61 (4), 590-613.
- Park, R.E. (1950). The nature of race relations. In L. Back & J. Solomos (Eds.), Theories of Race and Racism: A reader (pp. 105-112). New York: Routledge.

- Pedraza, S., & Rumbaut, R.G. (Eds.). (1996). Origins and destinies: Immigration, race, and ethnicity in America. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. Annual Review of Psychology, 49, 65-85.
- Piven, F.F., & Cloward, A.R. (1977). Poor people's movements: Why they succeed, how they fail. New York: Vintage Books.
- Pollakowski, H.O. (1982). Urban housing markets and residential location. Mass: Lexington Books.
- Prince, S.R. (2002). Changing places: Race, class, and belonging in the 'New' Harlem. Urban Anthropology & Studies of Cultural Systems & World Economic Development, 31 (1), 5-38.
- Redfern, P.A. (2003). What makes gentrification 'gentrification'? Urban Studies, 40 (12), 2351-2367.
- Roberts, B.R. (1990). Peasants and proletarians. Annual Review of Sociology, 19, 353-377.
- Ross, C.E., Reynolds, J.R., & Geis, K.J. (2000). The contingent meaning of neighborhood stability for residents' psychological well-being. American Sociological Review, 65, 581-595.
- Ross, C.E., & Mirowsky, J. (2001). Neighborhood disadvantage, disorder, and health. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 42 (3), 258-276.
- Saltman, J. (1991). Maintaining racially diverse neighborhoods. Urban Affairs Quarterly, 26, 416-441.
- Saltman, J. (1990). Neighborhood stabilization: A fragile movement. The Sociological Quarterly, 31, 531-549.
- Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing "neighborhood effects": Social processes and new directions in research. Annual Review of Sociology, 28, 443-478.
- Schuman, H., & Bobo, L. (1988). Survey-based experiments on whites racial attitudes toward residential integration. American Journal of Sociology, 94 (2), 273-299.

- Schuman, H., & Steeh, C. (1996). The complexity of racial attitudes in America. In S. Pedraza & R.G. Rumbaut (Eds.), Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America, (pp. 455-469). Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth.
- Schwandt, T.A. (1997). Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwirian, K.P. (1983). Models of neighborhood change. Annual Review of Sociology, 9, 83-102.
- Schwirian, K.P., & Gustavo, S.M. (1993). Embattled neighborhoods: The political ecology of neighborhood change. Research in Urban Sociology, 3, 83-110.
- Shaw, W.S. (2000). Ways of whiteness: Harlemising Sydney's aboriginal Redfern. Australian Geographical Studies 38, (3), 291-306.
- Shinn, M., & Toohey, S.M. (2003). Community contexts of human welfare. Annual Review of Psychology, 54, 427-459.
- Sidanius, J., & Devereux, E. (1992). A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology, 132 (3), 377-396.
- Sidanius, J., & Liu, J.H. (1992). The Gulf War and the Rodney King beating: Implications of the general conservatism and social dominance perspectives. Journal of Social Psychology 132 (6), 685-701.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). Social Dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression. New York: Cambridge University.
- Sigelman, L., Bledsoe, T., Welch, S., & Combs, W.M. (1996). Making contact? Black-White social interaction in an urban setting. American Journal of Sociology, 101 (5), 1306-1332.
- Sigelman, L., & Tuch, S.A. (1997). Metastereotypes: Blacks' perceptions of whites' stereotypes of blacks. Public Opinion Quarterly, 61, 87-101.
- Smith, R.A. (1998). Discovering stable racial integration. Journal of Urban Affairs, 20 (1), 1-25.
- Spain, D. (1992). A gentrification research agenda for the 1990s. Journal of Urban Affairs, 14, 125-134.

- Spain, D. (1993). Been-Heres versus Come-Heres: Negotiating conflicting community identities. Journal of the American Planning Association, 59, 156-171.
- Steeh, C., & Schuman, H. (1992). Young white adults: Did racial attitudes change in the 1980s. American Journal of Sociology, 98 (2), 340-367.
- Stewart, D. (1990). Focus groups: Theory and practice. Newbury Park, Calif. Sage Publications.
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Social and cultural factors in prejudice. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 79-97.
- Taylor, M.M. (1994). Gentrification in Harlem: Community, culture and the urban redevelopment of the black ghetto. Research in Race and Ethnic Relations, 7, 147-188.
- Tigges, L.M., Browne, I., & Green, D.P. (1998). Social isolation of the urban poor: Race, class, and neighborhood effects on social resources. Sociological Quarterly, 39 (1), 53-77.
- Trepagnier, B. (2001). Deconstructing categories: The exposure of silent racism. Symbolic Interaction, 24 (2), 141-164.
- Turner, J.C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theory (pp. 6-34). Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Turner, J.C. (1987). Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-categorization theory. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.
- Wagner, G.R. (1995). Gentrification, reinvestment, and displacement in Baltimore. Journal of Urban Affairs, 17, 81-96.
- Warren, C., & Karner, T.X. (2005). Discovering qualitative methods: Field research, interviews, and analysis. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Co.
- Wilson, B.M. (1990). The black orientation: A basic for environmental planning and designing in the black community. Journal of Black Studies, 21 (1), 23-39.
- Wilson, F.H. (1992). Gentrification and neighborhood dislocation in Washington, D.C.: The case of black residents in central area neighborhoods. Research in Urban Sociology, 2, 113-143.

- Wilson, F.H. (1995). Concentrated poverty, housing change, and urban redevelopment: Blacks in U.S. cities, 1980-1990. Research in Community Sociology, 5, 91-124.
- Woldoff, R.A. (2002). The effects of local stressors on neighborhood attachment. Social Forces, 8 (1), 87-116.
- Woods, R.A. (1914). The neighborhood in social reconstruction. American Journal of Sociology.
- Woolever, C. (1992). A contextual approach to neighbourhood attachment. Urban Studies, 29, 99-116.
- Zubrinisky, C.L. (2000). Neighborhood racial-composition preferences: Evidences from a multiethnic metropolis. Social Problems, 47 (3), 379-407.
- Zubrinisky, C.L. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. Annual Review of Sociology, 29, 167-207.
- Zubrinisky, C.L., & Bobo, L. (1996). Prismatic metropolis: Race and residential segregation in the city of the angels. Social Science Research, 25 (4), 25: 335-374.
- Zukin, S. (1987). Gentrification: Culture and capital in the urban core. Annual Review of Sociology, 13, 129-147.

APPENDIX A: Comparative Census Data
Table A1

<i>Total Population</i>			
CITY	NEIGHBORHOOD	TRACT	STUDY
529,121	5,979	3,223	20
<i>Race-Ethnicity</i>			
%	%	%	
Black (6.6)	2,749 (42.3)	1,586 (49.2)	7
White (95.9)	2,082 (32.1)	986 (30.6)	11
Hispanic (6.8)	772 (11.9)	426 (13.2)	1
Other/2+ (4.1)	703 (10.8)	264 (8.2)	1
<i>Housing/Household Units</i>			
Total	237,307	2,148	14
Occupied	223,737	(92%)	
Owner (55.8)	124,767	1,119 (52.0)	12
Renter (44.2)	98,970	1,029 (48.0)	2

APPENDIX B: Who They Are
Table B1

		Homeowner	Renter	Length in years	Race-Ethnicity	Identifier
1	Mr. O	X		47	Black American	b. ot
2	Mrs. O	X		47	Black American	b. ot
3	ML	X		6	Mixed-raced	m-r. nc
4	MK	X		6	White American	w. nc
5	Ms. MT	X		35	White American	w. ot
6	N ₁		X	23	White American	w. ot
7	N ₂		X	8	White American	w. ot
8	LY	X		8	White American	w. nc
9	SA	X		6	Mexican American	M. nc
10	CA		X	2	White American	w. nc
11	RD	X		7	White American	w. nc
12	JC	*	X	-	White American	w. ot
13	AT		X	4	Black American	b. ot
14	Mrs. L	X		18	Black American	b. ot
15	ET	X		36	Black American	b. ot
16	BB ₁	X		27	Black American	b. ot
17	BB ₂	**		-	Black American	b. ot
18	Mrs. VN	X		22	Black American	b. ot
19	JA	X		5	White American	w. nc
20	JQ		X	3	Black American	b. nc

Note. ot = oldtimer or longtimer 10+ years residency; nc = newcomer <10 years residency

*= Daughter of oldtimer currently residing; **=Daughter of oldtimer not residing