

THE MIDDLE CLASS IS MOVING INTO THE
SLUMS: A STUDY OF GENTRIFICATION,
DISORGANIZATION, AND DELINQUENCY

By

STANLEY JAMAL COLLINS

Bachelor of Arts in Economics

Morehouse College

Atlanta, GA

2014

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 2016

THE MIDDLE CLASS IS MOVING INTO THE
SLUMS: A STUDY OF GENTRIFICATION,
DISORGANIZATION, AND DELINQUENCY

Thesis Approved:

Kelley Sittner, PhD

Thesis Adviser

Heather McLaughlin, PhD

Andrew Fullerton, PhD

I'd like to thank my family for their unwavering support, God, my church family in Oklahoma City, and Dr. Sittner, my committee chairperson, for her patience and guidance. None of this would have been possible without all of you. Thank you.

Name: STANLEY JAMAL COLLINS

Date of Degree: July, 2016

Title of Study: THE MIDDLE CLASS IS MOVING INTO THE SLUMS: A STUDY OF
GENTRIFICATION, DISORGANIZATION, AND DELINQUENCY

Major Field: SOCIOLOGY

Abstract: Gentrification, the dramatic demographic shift in a community to a younger, more affluent population, has become a topic of debate in policy, academic and community circles. Using Shaw and McKay's social disorganization as the theoretical framework, this study proposes that gentrification – in the short run – mirrors that of a disorganized community. Additionally, this study discusses gentrification in the context of disadvantageous, and racist, housing policies that have taken place over the course of the 20th century in helping form many of the low-income, high crime neighborhoods that exist today. Moreover, the first goal of this study was to test the relationship between gentrification and disorganization. Comparing black youth to white youth, this study also sought to understand the ways in which neighborhoods that are characterized as being in a gentrifying stage impact delinquency. Findings show that neighborhoods characterized as disorganized and organized, impact black and white youth similarly. Conversely, neighborhoods that were characterized as gentrifying saw stark differences between the rate at which black youth and white youth commit acts of delinquency, with black youth being more likely to commit acts of delinquency. Data for this study was taken from the Project of Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN), a multilevel dataset. This study employed t-tests and negative binomial regression.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
UNDERSTANDING CHICAGO.....	2
II. SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION.....	5
URBAN ECOLOGY	5
SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION	6
III. GENTRIFICATION.....	9
HISTORY OF GENTRIFICATION.....	9
WHAT IS GENTRIFICATION.....	10
COULD GENTRIFICATION BE A GOOD THING?.....	11
SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION AND GENTRIFICATION	14
IV. RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION	16
RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN THE UNITED STATES IN THE 20 th CENTURY.....	17
EFFECTS OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION.....	19
RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND WEALTH.....	21
V. WHERE DOES DELINQUENCY FIT WITHIN THE DISCUSSION OF GENTRIFICATION AND DISORGANIZATION?.....	23
STRUCTURAL FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIME	24
VI. DATA AND METHODS	28
DATA	28
MEASURES	29
METHOD OF ANALYSIS.....	31

Chapter	Page
VII. RESULTS.....	33
VIII. DISCUSSION.....	41
IX. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	45
X. CONCLUSION.....	47
REFERENCES.....	48
APPENDICES.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Pairwise Correlation Matrix.....	54
Descriptive Statistics.....	55
T-Test, Comparison of Means	56
Negative Binomial Regression	57
Percent Change Model.....	58
Percent Change Model Comparing Black and White Youth.....	59
Ideal Type Neighborhoods.....	60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gentrification, the dramatic shift in the demographic composition of urban neighborhoods toward better-educated, more affluent, and typically younger residents and middle- to upper-income households (Freeman and Braconi, 2004; Covington and Taylor, 1989), has become a hot-button word in both policy and academic discussions. Those on the policy end of the spectrum largely see the process as being beneficial, as it has been shown to increase the tax base, improve the physical condition of urban communities, and reduce urban sprawl, amongst other things (Lees, Slater, and Wylie, 2008: 196). Conversely, those in academic circles have been largely skeptical of the process, challenging its ability to do the aforementioned things, (Lees, Slater, and Wylie, 2008; Chaskin and Joseph, 2013) and identifying negative impacts on existing urban neighborhoods. While gentrification is a rather new adaptation of urban development, many of its characteristics – high residential mobility, sparse local friendship networks, and family disruption – have been studied through the lens of social disorganization. Extending on that research, social disorganization theory, as proposed by Shaw and McKay (1942) will be used as a theoretical framework for this study.

Absent from the story of disorganization and gentrification is the narrative of youth that are reared in these communities, and what affects these processes have on their development and potential delinquent outcomes. To address this gap in research, the goal of the current study is to test the relative impact gentrification has on youth using data from the Project of Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). This study is organized in the following order: a discussion of the social disorganization theoretical tradition, followed by a review of the literature on residential segregation and gentrification. Next, I will discuss the relationship of the focal independent constructs on the outcome of interest, juvenile delinquency. This study is organized beginning with a discussion of ecological landscape of Chicago, a discussion of the theoretical framework – social disorganization, a review of the literature pertaining to the history gentrification, followed by a discussion of residential segregation as it relates to socially disorganized communities. In regard to gentrification and social disorganization, there is a theoretical gap between the two bodies of literature. Moreover, a goal of this paper is to fill that gap, making connections between the two bodies of literature and test their relationship as it pertains to delinquency.

Understanding Chicago:

Chicago has been used as a social laboratory for many years. Given its ever-changing social, political, and economic landscape, Chicago presents itself as a prime location for study. Chicago's ecological landscape has evolved over the past two centuries; however, all of the developments and changes that have taken place will not be

discussed in this study. Rather, a brief discussion of the Chicago's neighborhoods, as well as some key events, will be addressed.

During the 1990's Robert Sampson (2012) conducted a study in Chicago comprised of a longitudinal cohort study, community survey, systematic social observation, a network panel study, and a field experiment. In conducting his study of Chicago, Sampson draws upon his experiences living in Chicago, outlining its many neighborhoods. Similar to the work outlined by Park and Burgess and the concentric zone model, at the center of Chicago lies Michigan Avenue, a bustling shopping district often referred to as the "Magnificent Mile." Moving north toward the Chicago River is an area filled with skyscrapers, namely the Trump tower. Crossing the Chicago River from the near North Side into The Loop – the central business district and the location of Chicago's City Hall – lays Millennium Park, a \$500 million-dollar project spurred by former Mayor Richard M. Daley. To the near South side of Michigan avenue, lays a community that was historically marked by vacant rail yards and run down hotels has been redeveloped for lofts, condos, and restaurants. A neighborhood many would not have imagined as a attraction for middle- and upper-class citizens given its position during the '90's. Moving further south, one can see dilapidated housing projects, vacant and boarded-up building, and drug deals transacting; these communities that are not occupied by whites.

In 1997, one of the most popular high-rises in Chicago – the Robert Taylor Homes – was built for the city's black poor. Subsequently many living in the Robert

Taylor Homes were isolated from mainstream economic markets. In a survey of families living in the Robert Taylor Homes it was found that the majority of residents either had a family member in prison or expected one to return from prison within the next two years (Alexander 2012). In 2006, the Robert Taylor Homes were demolished, scattering many residents throughout Chicago, with the Chicago City Council recognizing the housing development as a failed policy experiment (Sampson 2012: 9). To the west lays North Lawndale, a community on Chicago's West Side, which also suffers from extreme poverty, and is overwhelmingly black. Additionally, in North Lawndale seventy percent of men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five are ex-offenders (Alexander 2012: 196). Both the Robert Taylor Homes and North Lawndale represent socially disorganized communities.

CHAPTER II

SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION

Urban Ecology:

Within the United States, the ecological landscape of urban communities has been well documented (Park and Burgess, 1925). Like many other northern cities in the United States, Chicago saw rapid population growth and increased industrialization during the first quarter of the 20th century (Kubrin, Stucky, and Krohn, 2009). Chicago presented itself as a living laboratory of sorts for sociologists at the University of Chicago, where sociologists Robert Park and Ernest Burgess (1925) would conduct one of the most pivotal studies contributing to the early development of urban sociology. In their study, Park and Burgess focus on sociodemographic changes in urban, Chicago neighborhoods. Given their background in human ecology, Park and Burgess parallel the urban community to an ecological system, creating what they note as the concentric zone model. Park and Burgess' concentric zone model divides Chicago into five zones, measuring neighborhood demographic change. The concentric zones are as follows: Zone 1 – Central Business District, Zone 2 – Transitional Zone (typically comprised of recent immigrant groups), Zone 3 – Working Class zone, Zone 4 – Residential Zone, and Zone 5 – Commuter Zone. By outlining the concentric zones in Chicago, Park and Burgess identify and outline the regions where poverty and racial groups are

concentrated. Additionally, Park and Burgess' concentric zone model helps us understand the process of gentrification, concentrated poverty and crime, and how communities are racially segregated.

It is important to note that the work of Park and Burgess was not intended to study crime, but rather their work has been used as the basis for urban sociology and studies of crime and deviance. However, the concentric zone model's emphasis on urban and residential deterioration was used as the basis for social disorganization theory, developed by Shaw and McKay (1942).

Social Disorganization:

Building upon the work of Park and Burgess, Shaw and McKay (1942) use the concentric zone model as an outline for identifying areas with high rates of poverty and crime, and in periods of transition; moreover, the work of Park and Burgess was used as a starting point for analyzing urban change, disorder, and delinquency. Social disorganization, developed during the early 20th century by sociologists, Shaw and McKay, refers to the inability of a community to realize common goals and solve chronic problems, through a means of informal social control (Kubrin and Weitzer, 2003). Shaw and McKay place emphasis on poverty, differential systems of values, racial heterogeneity and economic opportunity as the leading factors contributing to delinquency, and more broadly, crime. Additionally, in their study they concluded that the neighborhoods in the inner city zones [of the concentric zone model], consistently had higher rates of crime, regardless of who lived there, which tells us that crime, in the

context of social disorganization, is a characteristic of a place and not a group of people. Shaw and McKay's early work on social disorganization in urban areas laid the foundation for several scholars in their efforts to explain crime in urban communities (Sampson and Groves 1989; Sampson and Raudenbush, 1999; Kubrin and Weitzer, 2003).

Shaw and McKay's emphasis on poverty, differential systems of values, racial heterogeneity and economic opportunity proved to be critical to the work of Sampson and Groves (1989), as they would further adapt social disorganization theory. In their study of community social disorganization, Sampson and Groves found that communities characterized by sparse friendship networks, unsupervised teenage peer groups, and low organizational participation had disproportionately high rates of crime and delinquency. This study extends the work of Shaw and McKay for a couple of reasons: 1) It relied on data from 238 localities in Great Britain, which tells us that the data is generalizable to other regions, and 2) even though it was conducted more than forty years later, and Sampson and Groves were able to find results that correlated with that of Shaw and McKay's, which speaks to the viability and usefulness of social disorganization theory. In a later adaptation of social disorganization, Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) address social disorganization in terms of its physical and social components. Physically, a disorganized neighborhood is said to have deteriorating buildings, graffiti in public spaces, abandoned cars, broken windows, and garbage in the streets. Socially, a disorganized community is typically characterized as exhibiting verbal harassment on the

street, open solicitation for prostitution, public intoxication, and rowdy groups of people in public. Considering the physical and social components of disorganized communities, building trust and cohesiveness amongst residents can be challenging (Sampson and Earls, 1997), which also affects a community's ability to internally prevent crime. In large part this is due to the nature of disorganized communities. Often times, residents can become withdrawn, or fearful, of neighborhood activities, causing them to retreat from proactively combatting crime (Chappell, Monk-Turner, Payne, 2011). Moreover, the ability, and willingness, of a community member to intervene on the behalf of the common good to reduce crime, and/or violence, is referred to as collective efficacy (Sampson and Earls 1997), a critical component of neighborhood and community dynamics.

The relationship between disorder and collective efficacy is critical to understanding crime and delinquency. Typically, where there is high disorder, there is a low level of collective efficacy, and ultimately higher rates of crime (Kubrin, Stucky, and Krohn, 2009, p.88). Social disorganization works against the creation of strong [social] bonds. Thus, the combination of community solidarity, low [residential] integration, and little cohesion deters the creation of collective efficacy, which is necessary to combat crime. Further, collective efficacy is both a cause and consequence of high crime, as residents can be so withdrawn (because of fear) from their communities that they do not actively try to control crime.

CHAPTER III

GENTRIFICATION

History of Gentrification:

Gentrification has become a hot-button word in social policy and urban planning circles, sparking debate around the perceived benefits and/or disadvantages of neighborhood transformation (Papachristos et al 2011; Martin 2008). Gentrification – coined by British sociologist Ruth Glass (1964) – sought to explain the process by which once heavily populated working class neighborhoods in London were beginning to see an influx of middle class residents (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 4). Glass argues that the core business districts of cities around the world are becoming spaces occupied by the poor and declining physical structures. Glass’ analysis of gentrification failed to recognize its impact on other cities around the world, as the process of gentrification is not limited to the context of London. We can see evidence of gentrification in the United States as early as the 1970’s, most prominently in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York (Covington and Taylor 1989).

In the current research conducted on gentrification, specifically in sociology, we can see a similar trend of attention being placed outside of the United States (Khalil Johar Sabri 2014; Patterson Silver 2015; Wang Bao Lin 2015). This is not to say that

gentrification is not studied within the United States by sociologists. However, there is room for growth in studying gentrification in the United States.

What is Gentrification?:

One of the major concerns with studying gentrification is how it is defined, which also has implications for how it is measured. This can be seen in the literature, as gentrification has been defined differently across, and within, academic disciplines. Several scholars across disciplines have contributed to the discussion of gentrification (Glass, 1964; Smith 1982; Covington and Taylor, 1989; Smith 2000; Freeman, 2005), with each adding different elements to its definition. Glass (1964), the first to conceptualize gentrification, defines it as the process which working class neighborhoods were rehabilitated by middle class homebuyers, landlords, and professional developers. In another conceptualization of gentrification, Covington and Taylor (1989) define it as the migration of younger, middle-, and perhaps upper-income households into centrally located urban neighborhoods and the accompanying upgrading of the worn-out housing stock that previously had “filtered down” to lower-income occupants. In a paper analyzing gentrification and displacement in New York City in the 1990s, Freeman and Braconi (2004) defined gentrification as a dramatic shift in a neighborhood’s demographic composition toward better-educated and more affluent residents. Kennedy and Leonard (2001) define gentrification as the process of wealthier residents moving into poorer neighborhoods in su Neil Smith (2000) defines gentrification as the reinvestment of capital at the urban center, which is designed to produce space for a more

affluent class of people that currently occupies that space. While the aforementioned scholars have added their conceptualizations of gentrification, at its core, we can see some common themes. These themes include: social class, demographic changes in terms of age, an increased demand for urban housing, education levels of those moving into the urban area, and physical change. Moreover, gentrification will be conceptualized as the dramatic shift in the demographic composition of urban neighborhoods toward better-educated, more affluent, and typically younger residents and middle- to upper-income households.

Could Gentrification Be A Good Thing? Benefits and Disadvantages of Gentrification:

In addition to how gentrification should be defined, the literature is also unsettled regarding the overall effects of gentrification. Proponents cite increases in residential investment, reduced crime rates, restored neighborhoods, and improved infrastructure as benefits of gentrification (Lester Hartley 2014). Wyly and Hammel (2005) attribute economic development in business districts to the work of gentrification, as it capitalizes on land use, revitalizing abandoned homes, and relies on middle-class market demand. Helms (2003) notes that the process of gentrification transforms neighborhoods, both physically and demographically. Gentrification is also shown to improve the tax base in a neighborhood, increase social mixing, reduce suburban sprawl as well as to improve a city's physical health by avoiding decay (Slater et al 2008: 196). In addition to the physical changes that come as a result of gentrification, some posit that gentrification lowers crime, although findings regarding changes in crime rates have been contested

(McDonald 1986; Covington and Taylor 1989). Additionally, it is important to note that some of the perceived benefits of gentrification such as social mixing and reduced crime rates can be both a benefit and disadvantage of gentrification. The process of gentrification is not without its side effects. Critics point to its ability to raise the value of homes by such an amount that the people living in the community prior to gentrification are forced out of their homes, the secondary psychological costs of displacement, unsustainable speculative property price increases, homelessness, increased costs and changes to local services, and commercial/industrial displacement (Slater et al 2008:196). Gentrification has also shown to increase certain types of crimes. Covington and Taylor (1989) find that gentrification was linked with increases in robbery and higher rates of larceny. In another study measuring gentrification and crime conducted by Papachristos, Smith, Scherer and Fugiero (2011), levels of homicide and robbery tended to be higher in disadvantaged black neighborhoods, whereas gentrification tended to be concentrated in higher income areas with non-black residents. They also found an inverse relationship between the number of coffee shops – an indicator of gentrification – in a neighborhood and the number of neighborhood homicides and robberies. However, the effect of coffee shops on robberies varied by racial composition of a neighborhood, as black neighborhoods were associated with higher levels of robbery.

While the findings with regard to gentrification and its association with crime may be inconclusive, McDonald (1986) offers some explanation as to why gentrification may increase crime. Displaced [delinquent] persons may not move far from where they

originally lived, the process of gentrification may happen over a long period of time, and thus there is an increased likelihood in “income mixing,” which can present wealthier in-movers as better targets. Additionally, it appears that gentrification presents opportunities for specific types of crimes to be committed – robbery and larceny. Again, these findings should not be seen as definitive, as they vary across studies, especially when introducing race into the discussion; moreover, the explanation offered by McDonald (1986) is simply a theoretical assumption that can be made in regards to gentrification and its association with crime.

Two dominant narratives – benefits and disadvantages – of gentrification have been presented thus far. The benefits of gentrification are largely the result of a supply side analysis – highlighting the things gentrification can do economically for inner cities, and cities at large. Conversely, the disadvantages of gentrification – what the process does to harm those indigenous groups in a particular area – presents a much different narrative. One component in particular that has not been addressed thus far is the role race plays in the process of gentrification. Race is an increasingly important dynamic in this process, given many of the areas being gentrified in inner cities are predominantly occupied by people of color. While it may be difficult to capture quantitatively, Martin (2008) and Freeman (2006) explore the relationship between race and gentrification by collecting qualitative data. Martin (2008) pointed out in their study of gentrifying neighborhoods in Atlanta that gentrification fosters uncertainty and the mixture of diverse race and class-based groups can trigger conflict between groups of residents. Martin’s

analysis of gentrification introduces an element many advocates ignore – the role of race and class and how it affects residents living in communities prior to being gentrified.

Social Disorganization and Gentrification:

Social disorganization is most commonly applied in the context of urban communities (Wilson and Kelling 1982; Sampson and Groves Kubrin and Weitzer 2003). Given the changes in the social and economic landscape of cities in the 21st century, as a result of dynamics such as increased urbanization, sociodemographic changes within cities, and an increased desire to move “back to the city” (McDonald 1986), social disorganization has theoretical contributions that can be made in studying these changes. Kubrin, Stucky, and Krohn (2003) make this argument as well, specifically with regard to the urban political economy. In the context of urban communities, people with less economic and political capital typically occupy neighborhoods being gentrified, and moreover have less control over the changes that take place within their communities, which is part of the explanation of why crime persists in disorganized communities. For example, when new businesses are introduced into a disadvantaged community, highly disorganized communities often lack the [political] resources to push back against these new business developments, or any other large-scale changes taking place in the community. According to Guest (2000) highly disorganized communities often times lack the social ties to external decision makers. Disorganization can become exacerbated by the introduction of a new entity into the community. Additionally, the introduction new businesses attracts a new sociodemographic audience into a disorganized

community; a population that may be more susceptible to crime (Papachristos, Smith, Scherer, and Fugiero 2011; Covington and Taylor 1989). Moreover, social disorganization's emphasis on collective efficacy, racial heterogeneity, and physical and social disorder presents several [theoretical] tools that can be used to analyze the impact of changing urban communities, including gentrification, the ways in which people interact in these spaces, and ultimately the implications these changes have on crime and delinquency.

CHAPTER IV

RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

Residential segregation refers to the degree to which two or more groups live separately from one another (Adelman and Gocker, 2007). A variable included in Shaw and McKay's social disorganization theory was racial heterogeneity. According to Shaw and McKay, racial heterogeneity – multiple races occupying and living in the same area – would lead to increases in crime. While Shaw and McKay's hypothesis may seem plausible initially, over the course of the 20th century it has proven to be incorrect, as many urban communities throughout the United States have become more racially homogenous, yet crime persists. Moreover, a racially homogeneous – residentially segregated – community is often a uniquely disadvantaged space as it is geographically, socially, and economically isolated (Massey and Denton 1993:2). Additionally, the physical separation of racial groups should not be viewed as happenstance, as racial segregation has been imposed by legislation, enforced by the judicial system, and supported by economic institutions (Massey and Denton, 1993; Williams and Collins, 2001). Considering health outcomes, wealth accumulation, and educational trajectories, racial segregation adversely impacted African-Americans more than any other race (Williams and Collins, 2001; Dinwiddie, G.Y., Gaskin, D.J., Chan, K.S., and Norrington, J., McCleary, 2013; Massey and Denton, 1993). Moreover, in an effort to properly

discuss and understand the process of gentrification in the United States, we must view gentrification in the context of racially biased housing policies that have taken place over the course of the 20th century, as well as the consequences of residential segregation.

Residential segregation in the United States In the 20th Century:

The history of residential segregation on the basis of race in the United States dates back hundreds of years. However, the purpose of this section is to highlight the some of the critical changes in political and economic landscapes that have affected black and urban communities over the course of the 20th century. In Michelle Alexander's (2012) assessment of mass incarceration, she notes the impact and relevancy of residential segregation as a vehicle by which blacks are swept into the criminal justice system. Jim Crow laws mandated residential segregation, where blacks were relegated to the most economically and socially deprived parts of cities. The timeline of population growth in urban cities begins in the early 1920s, with the increases in industrialization in northern cities, drawing the attention of many southern Blacks, as they moved from farms to urban spaces in hopes of achieving greater economic opportunities. The changing racial demographics of northern cities increased racial tension, as many northern whites responded the to rising tide of black migration with hostility (Massey and Denton, 1993). Some were afraid of losing their jobs due to increased competition, while others saw this as an opportunity to affirm and/or reaffirm their whiteness. These sentiments held by many Whites is most apparent through discriminatory housing practices, as well as acts

of violence against Blacks, which created a color line in many cities, sectioning off areas on the basis of race and creating racially homogenous spaces.

Following the 1920s-1940s, the next pivotal period for residential segregation would follow World War II. Massey and Denton (1993) cite a series of events following the United States entrance into the Second World War. Due to the entrance into the war homebuilding came to a halt creating a shortage of available homes; moreover, spatial isolation increased further. Increased migration and a shortage in available urban housing would subsequently increase demand for suburban housing. Additionally, the increased demand for suburban housing was met by increased capital, in the form of loans, from the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the Veterans Administration (VA), presenting many middle-class white families with the opportunity to flee the city, and make the suburbs their home. To give a look inside at the numbers, Sorensen, Taeuber, and Hollingsworth (1975) report the block-level indices for nonwhite-white segregation for thirty cities from 1940-1970. Just to give an example – in 1940 Chicago reported a segregation index of 95. Comparatively, in 1970 Chicago reported a segregation index of 88. Similarly, in 1940 Philadelphia reported segregation index of 88. Comparatively, in 1970 Philadelphia reported a segregation index of 83.2. Lastly, consider Atlanta during the 1940s. Atlanta reported a segregation index of 87.4 during the 1940s, peaked at 93.6 during the 1960s, and reported a score of 91.5 during the 1970s. Moreover, Massey and Denton state – by 1970 at least 70% of blacks would have had to move to achieve an even residential configuration in most cities, and in many

places that figure was closer to 90% (Massey and Denton, 1993: 46). These findings indicate that residential segregation, on average, has increased in most cities across the United States. Thus, as segregation indices increase over the course of the 30-year window, tells us that a block within a city is becoming more racially segregated, which is problematic given the nature of residential segregation and its ramifications. The ramifications of said discrimination will be discussed in greater detail in the following sections.

The practice of residential segregation and institutional racism would continue well into the postwar era. Institutions such as the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC), which was designed to provide funds for refinancing urban mortgages in danger of default and granted low-income interest loans to former owners who had lost their homes through foreclosure, was instrumental in creating racially homogenous neighborhoods. Through the HOLC, the practice of redlining – lending (or insurance) discrimination that bases credit decisions on the location of a property to the exclusion of characteristics of the borrower or property (Hillier, 2003) – took place. Moreover, this practice of discrimination predominately took place to prevent African-Americans from receiving loans, thus cutting off many blacks from mainstream society, increasing residential segregation.

Effects of Residential Segregation:

According to Shaw and McKay's social disorganization theory, racial homogeneity should decrease crime. However, as it pertains to blacks residing in urban

communities, this is not the case. In Shihadeh and Flynn's study (1996) examining the effects of segregation, they found that black isolation from mainstream institutions was a major predictor of the rates of homicide and robbery amongst blacks. Blacks are also more likely than whites to be victims of all types of crime, including homicide (Williams and Collins 2001). Often secluded in their own communities, being cut off from mainstream society deprives residents of economic opportunities, educational opportunities, and as we will see later, opportunities to build wealth.

Residential segregation also has major implications in determining health outcomes and access to health institutions (Dinwiddie, Gaskin, Chan, Norrington, and McCleary, 2013; Williams and Collins 2001). In Dinwiddie et al.'s (2013) study of residential segregation and racial disparities in access to mental health institutions, they found that living in segregated neighborhoods influences access and utilization of mental health services differently for race/ethnic groups. The racial makeup of neighborhoods had a significant bearing on the type of mental health care professional available where blacks were residing in majority homogenous communities more often were treated by social workers, therapists, and other certified mental health care professional's rather than psychiatrists. In addressing issues regarding health care disparities, Dinwiddie et al, Williams and Collins (2001) state that institutional racism and residential segregation create unfavorable conditions for health outcomes and harm the physical and social environment. Physical and social conditions such as water, sewer systems, and other

public services that supported the white areas of town frequently that did not extend to black areas (Alexander 2012).

In addition to the adverse health outcomes produced by residential segregation, residential segregation is also deeply connected to crime and the War On Drugs that began in the 1980s. In her book *The New Jim Crow* Michelle Alexander (2012) charts the history and roots of mass incarceration, as well as drawing theoretical comparisons between Jim Crow policies, which date from the end of slavery to the mid-1960s, and what she posits as “The New Jim Crow.” In her analysis she states:

Every year, hundreds of poor people of color who have been targeted by the War on Drugs are forced to return to these racially segregated communities – neighborhoods still crippled by the legacy of an earlier system of control...mass incarceration, like its predecessor Jim Crow, creates and maintains racial segregation. (Alexander 2012: 197).

Residential segregation has had a profound impact on health outcomes, educational opportunities, and has greatly aided in the imprisonment of poor black and brown people, as well as maintaining racially stratified and segregated neighborhoods.

Residential Segregation and Wealth:

Home ownership and wealth are inextricably linked (Shapiro, 2004). While wealth is one of the many areas impacted by residential segregation – like health, educational, and employment opportunities – the relationship between residential segregation and wealth accumulation may be the most pronounced. Moreover, the

impacts of residential segregation may not be more apparent than in the creation, maintenance, and accumulation of wealth.

Most Americans accumulate assets through homeownership (Shapiro, 2004). Home wealth accounts for 60 percent of the total wealth amongst America's middle class. In large part, many Americans were able to build wealth through loans made available by government agencies such as the federal housing agency, the Veteran's administration, and the GI bill – all of which were instrumental in denying access to black homebuyers, as previously noted.

Shapiro outlines what he sees as the major phases of the homeownership process that have major implications for wealth, and also present opportunities for discriminatory practices to take place. First, Shapiro notes that access to credit is essential in homeownership because ultimately banks decide who creditworthy, which ultimately dictates who can buy a house. The second phase outlined is the price of credit or interest rates attached to loans. This point is important in understanding wealth gaps because blacks typically pay higher interest rates on home mortgages, which has major implications for discretionary income, home equity, and savings.

The practice of residential segregation impacts health outcomes, educational opportunities, access to meaningful work opportunities, and the creation of wealth. Given the history of racist institutional practices in housing, it would be unwise to perceive gentrification as a simply harmless process of urban revitalization.

CHAPTER V

WHERE DOES DELINQUENCY FIT WITHIN THE DISCUSSION OF GENTRIFICATION AND DISORGANIZATION?

Lost within the discussion of social disorganization and gentrification is the narrative of youth. Specifically, little attention has been paid to how youth are impacted by processes of gentrification and the implications this has for potentially triggering delinquent behavior. Martin's (2008) study of gentrification and community sentiments is one of the few studies to highlight the narratives of community members with regard to gentrification and how this process impacts children. Martin found that community residents, in three gentrifying neighborhoods in Atlanta, expressed their concerns with issues related to class and race differences as a means of boundary-work. Most importantly, residents expressed their concerns with race and class through their concern for their children. Boundary-work refers to the strategies group members employ, and the criteria they draw upon to construct a symbolic divide between their group and out-group members (Lacy, 2002: 43). For example, many of the residents in Martin's study voiced concerns about their children not having a space for recreational activities, because of the changes in-movers – the perceived out-group – have brought with them. Moreover, the residents of this gentrifying neighborhood saw the need to protect their children as a means of boundary-work – protection from the out-group. Martin's study

helps the literature regarding youth and how they can be impacted by gentrification.

While useful, Martin's qualitative study limits our ability to make generalizations about how youth are impacted by gentrification broadly.

Although Martin's (2008) study of gentrification introduces the narrative of how youth are potentially impacted, it does not explore the structural factors that can increase the likelihood of delinquency. Moreover, while scholars have not addressed any association between gentrification and delinquency, there have been several scholars to note the implications of structural [neighborhood-level] factors, and subsequent delinquency (Shaw and McKay 1942; Vazsonyi, Cleveland, Wiebe 2006; De Coster, Heimer, Wittrock 2006).

Structural Factors Associated with Crime:

Returning to the argument presented by Shaw and McKay (1942), delinquency is said to be higher in socially disorganized communities. In this argument it is more than simply attributing delinquency to physical/social disorganization. Rather, they include factors such as poverty, collective efficacy, residential mobility, and racial heterogeneity as characteristics that are typical of disadvantaged communities and that foster disorganization. According to Shaw and McKay (1942), with regard to race, of all of the racial groups in Chicago, the black population was the most disadvantaged, as efforts for a more economic and social life were consistently thwarted by many restrictions as a result of residence, employment, education, and social and cultural pursuits.

In a study conducted by Vazsonyi et al. (2006) studying the effects of impulsivity, neighborhood disadvantage, and delinquency, general levels of delinquency and aggression increased with neighborhood disadvantage, although nonviolent delinquency decreased. The findings presented by Vazsonyi et al. do not show support for social disorganization theory. The authors emphasize factors such as parental monitoring, consistent socialization, and having two-biological-parents as having a greater impact on whether or not youth would become involved in delinquent activity. In another study concerning neighborhood disadvantage and youth violence, De Coster, Heimer, and Wittrock (2006) found that violent delinquency was largely a product of individuals' status characteristics, family disadvantage, community disadvantage, weakened family bonds, and exposure to some elements of criminogenic street environment. Their findings also point to an interesting idea regarding disadvantaged communities and delinquency – minorities and disadvantaged families experience constrained residential choices, which results in an increased likelihood of residing in disadvantaged communities. Moreover, residing in disadvantaged communities increases the likelihood of youth violence. The findings across these three studies depict a similar narrative – disadvantage, in the form of economic poverty and social capital, family instability, and race, all play a crucial role in delinquent outcomes.

From the literature and previous studies presented thus far, we are given, at least, a basic understanding of the factors that lead to delinquency. Within the context of social disorganization, these factors include high neighborhood turnover, neighborhood

disorganization, low levels of social cohesion coupled with low collective efficacy, and racial discrimination in the housing market. The research questions for this study are as follows: 1) What is the relationship between gentrification and disorganization? 2) How does gentrification impact delinquency? 3) Does the impact of gentrification differ across racial groups?

Shaw and McKay's study of delinquency and disorganization posits that youth living in disorganized communities – communities with low levels of social control, neighborhood decline, both physical and social – can expect to see higher rates of delinquency relative to communities that are socially organized and have high levels of social control. Thus, the first hypothesis is that disorganization and gentrification are significantly correlated with each other. Secondly, one of the goals of this study is to test the relationship between gentrification and social disorganization. For some, gentrification has been posited as a beneficial process. However, this process may only be beneficial for the long run. Conversely, in the short run many of the components of gentrification mirrors social disorganization – high rates of neighborhood turnover, residential instability, social mixing with potential class tension, all of which can result in a decrease of social control, and a subsequent increase in delinquency. Additionally, given the nature of residential segregation and the neighborhoods that are typically being gentrified, there is also a racialized component to gentrification. The second and third hypotheses are as follows: gentrification is associated with higher rates of delinquency,

above and beyond the effects of disorganization, and the impacts of disorganization and gentrification will be more pronounced for Black youth.

CHAPTER VI

DATA AND METHODS

Data:

Data for this study will be taken from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). The PHDCN is an interdisciplinary study of how families, primary caregivers, schools, and neighborhoods affect child and adolescent development. It was designed by Felton J. Earls, Stephen W. Raudenbush, Albert J. Reiss Jr., and Robert J. Sampson to advance the understanding of the developmental pathways of both positive and negative human social behaviors. The project consists of three different components, two of which will be used in the present study. The first, the community survey, contains data from a cross-sectional survey of Chicago residents collected in 1994. The survey gathered information from Chicago residents aged 18 or older, selected using stratified random sampling, on their perceptions of the neighborhoods in which they live. Neighborhoods were operationally defined as 343 clusters of census tracts, comprised of an average of 8,000 residents. The Community Survey also included a probability sample of 8,782 residents who were situated within the neighborhood clusters. Data collection consisted of a household interview to assess key neighborhood dimensions, including the dynamic structure of the local community, organizational and political structure, cultural values, informal social control, formal

social control, and social cohesion. Individual responses to survey questions were aggregated to the neighborhood level. The current study will utilize the aggregated data.

The second component is the longitudinal cohort study, consisting of three waves of data over a period of seven years from a sample of children, adolescents, young adults, and their primary caregivers. The longitudinal cohort study sample is comprised of seven randomly selected cohorts of respondents. Data were collected at three points in time – 1994-1997, 1997-1999, and 2000-2001. The age cohorts include birth (i.e., 0 years), 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 years. For the purposes of this paper only cohorts 12 and 15 will be used, as they represent the group that is most likely to be delinquent. Responses will be merged with the community survey data using neighborhood cluster identifiers. This allows me to assess how neighborhood-level processes and characteristics affect the adolescents residing therein.

Measures:

The dependent variable – delinquency – was drawn from wave 2, cohorts 12 and 15. To measure delinquency, this study relied upon a measure provided by the PHDCN coming from the delinquency checklist from the Child Behavior Check List (CBCL). Developed by Thomas Achenbach (1991), the CBCL is one of the most widely used measures in child psychology. The CBCL is composed of 112 items that significantly differentiate clinically referred from non-referred children. The CBCL used a parent-report questionnaire, administered to primary caregivers, on which the child was rated on

various behavioral and emotional problems. For the empirically based, CBCL problem scales, the alphas ranged from .78 to .97.

Individual Level Independent Variables

Four control variables were included: binary variables for child *gender* (0=male, 1=female) and age *cohort* (0=twelve, 1=fifteen) of the youth in the study, a continuous measure of *prior delinquency* (wave 1 of the CBCL), and race. In the longitudinal cohort study, only the race of the child's primary caregiver was reported. Thus, the parent's self-reported race was used as a proxy for the child's race. Given the ways in which racial socialization, and racial identification influence children, the race of the parent is a reliable substitution, as children often identify as the race of their parents (Neblett Jr., Smalls, Ford, Nguyen, and Sellers 2009; Hughes 2003). Race is dummy coded as white, black, and other. Number of *years living in current address* is a continuous measure reported by the caregiver. *Salary of recent job* is an ordinal measure of the caregiver's employment income (1=\$5,000, 2=\$7,500, 3=\$15,000, 4=\$25,000, 5=\$35,000, 6=\$45,000, 7=>\$50,000). *Homeownership* was assessed with a question asked of caregivers regarding whether they own their home, rent, or live with someone else. Responses were recoded into a binary variable (1=own, 0=do not own).

Neighborhood Level Independent Variables

All neighborhood-level variables were drawn from the aggregated community survey data. The gentrification measures were used to address neighborhood mobility, socioeconomic status, age, and residential segregation. Averaged measures from the

Community Survey to represent neighborhood characteristics are as follows: *average age, average homeownership, percent White, and percent Black, average number of years living in neighborhood, and average mobility, and average household income.*

Social disorganization refers to the inability of a community to realize common goals and solve chronic problems, through a means of informal social control. Additionally, social disorganization refers to aspects of physical and social disorder. Social disorganization will be measured using the following variables: *anomie* and *neighborhood decline*.

Anomie ($\alpha = .96$) was measured using five items (see Appendix A). Anomie refers to the normlessness of a space that results in a loss of control and disorder. Responses have been recoded to reflect the normlessness of a neighborhood, ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. A higher value reflects more perceived normlessness.

Neighborhood decline ($\alpha = .96$) was measured using four questions (see Appendix B) that addressed a neighborhood's physical and social deterioration. The response options for this item ranged from 1=Better to 3=Worse.

Social control refers to a community's ability to informally fight back against disorganization without the help of outside sources. This will be measured using social control from Community Survey. *Social control* ($\alpha = .84$) was measured using five items (see Appendix C) that addressed the likelihood of neighbors intervening in the protection and organization of their neighborhood. The response options have been recoded where 1=Very Unlikely and 5=Very Likely.

Method of Analysis:

The study relied upon two methods of analysis. To begin, this study employed a bivariate analysis, correlations and t-tests, followed by a multivariate analysis, negative binomial regression. Correlations were examined to address the first hypothesis. T-tests were performed to gain a basic understanding of the differences in neighborhood and family characteristics between black youth and white youth.

Multivariate analyses were used to test the second and third hypotheses. To account for the overdispersion of non-delinquency, this study employs negative binomial regression. Negative binomial regression addresses the necessity of an under fitted dispersion and the high frequency of 0's in a model. In the case of these models measuring delinquency, this means that there are a high number of non-delinquent cases. As previously stated, this study includes variables from two levels of measurement – the longitudinal cohort study, which includes individual-level variables, as well as a community survey which includes data aggregated in neighborhood clusters. In all regressions we account for neighborhood clustering.

CHAPTER VII

RESULTS

To address the first research question, *what is the relationship between gentrification and disorganization*, Table 1 provides a pairwise correlation matrix that helps us begin to understand the relationship between gentrification and disorganization. Years at current address was significantly, weakly and negatively correlated with neighborhood decline. However, years at current address was positively correlated with anomie, an unexpected finding. Considering a measure of disorganization – neighborhood decline – owning a home, average black, average homeownership, and average age were all positively correlated. Conversely, neighborhood decline was significantly and negatively correlated with household income, average mobility, and average household income.

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for variables used in multivariate and bivariate analyses measuring delinquency. On average the families in the longitudinal cohort study have been at their current address for 6.8 years and had a median family income of \$27,153.73. At the neighborhood level, the average years in a neighborhood for respondents was 10 years, with 44.8% homeownership in a neighborhood. Additionally, the average neighborhood income was \$30,000-\$39,999.

Table 3 provides t-tests that were performed to determine if there was a significant difference between black youth (n=311) and white youth (n=184) on key theoretical measures. In a straightforward manner, these initial t-tests help us understand some of the basic differences between black youth and white youth. Results from t-tests on individual level variables indicate several significant differences between the means of black and white youth. First, black youth had a higher average rate of delinquency at wave 1 (2.672 vs. 1.864, p=0.001) and wave 2 (2.695 vs. 1.978, p=0.002) than white youth. Considering the individual-level independent variables, there were two significant differences – owning a home and family income. First, in comparison to black youth, white youth lived in homes with higher average homeownership rates (0.576 vs. 0.325, p=0.000). Additionally, white youth had higher average family incomes than black youth (\$30,000-\$39,000 vs. \$10,000-\$19,999, p=0.000).

Results from t-tests on neighborhood level variables indicate several significant differences between black youth and white youth. First, black youth lived in neighborhoods that are characterized by more anomie than white youth (2.525 vs. 2.446, p=0.000) and more neighborhood decline (1.973 vs. 1.853, p=0.000). White youth lived in neighborhoods reported as having more social control (4.113 vs. 3.853, p=0.000), higher average household income (\$40,000-\$49,999 vs. \$30,000-\$39,999, p=0.000), and higher average homeownership rates, (0.532 vs. 0.456, p=0.001). In terms of the percentage of homeownership, white youth live in neighborhoods where there is 53% homeownership. Conversely, black youth live in neighborhoods where there is 45%

homeownership. Moreover, white youth lived in more organized communities, had higher incomes, and had higher rates of homeownership, and had higher incomes. Lastly, in an effort to address the element of residential segregation, there was a stark difference in the percent white and percent black of a neighborhood, as well as how black youth and white youth, respectively, were isolated from each other. When looking at the percentage of black residents in a neighborhood we see that black youth live in neighborhoods that are 69% black, and white youth live in neighborhoods that are 8.4% black. Comparatively, when looking at the percentage of white residents in a neighborhood we see that white live in neighborhoods that are 52% white, and black youth live in neighborhoods that are 8.4% white. These differences were both statistically significant ($p=0.000$). This finding indicates the degree to which there is social isolation; in black neighborhoods there were some white youth, however in white neighborhoods there were very few black youth.

Table 4 provides results from five negative binomial regression models measuring delinquency. Additionally, table 4 helps in addressing the second research question, *how does gentrification impact delinquency?* Separate models for each group of variables were estimated, beginning with controls (model 1), then moving to disorganization (model 2), social control (model 3), and gentrification (model 4). The full model (model 5) includes all of the aforementioned models. In model 1, with only control variables, there were two significant relationships. First, an increase in delinquency at wave 1 was positively associated with delinquent acts at wave 2. Second, compared to white youth, being black was associated with an increase in delinquent acts at wave 2. In model 2, anomie was the only significant predictor of delinquency at wave 2. Increases in

neighborhood anomie were associated with an increase in delinquent acts at wave 2. In model 3, neighborhood social control was not associated with delinquency at wave 2. In model 4 there were two significant predictors of delinquency. First, for every additional year a primary care giver lived in their home, the number of delinquent acts at wave 2 decreased. When looking at the average number of black residents in a neighborhood, increases in the average black population in a neighborhood were associated with increases in the number of delinquent acts at wave 2.

All of the variables from prior models were included in model 5. Three significant predictors of delinquency at wave 2 emerged. First, an increase in delinquency at wave 1 was associated with an increase in more delinquent acts at wave 2. Second, as neighborhood decline decreased, the number of delinquent acts at wave 2 increased. Renting, as opposed to owning a home, decreased the number of delinquent acts at wave 2. Third, for every additional year a child lived at their current address, the number of delinquent acts decreased.

Table 5 provides percent change models measuring the expected count of delinquency. In comparison to white youth, being black increased the expected count of delinquent acts by 20.8%, holding all else constant. Considering the level of anomie present in a neighborhood, there was one of the largest percentage increases in the expected count of delinquency of all measures. For a standard deviation increase in anomie, a child's expected rate of delinquency increased by 3.7%, holding all else constant. In another measure of disorganization, for a standard deviation increase in neighborhood decline, a child's expected count of delinquency decreased by 8.9%, holding all else constant. Owning a home, as opposed to renting, decreased the expected

count of delinquency by 13.9%, holding all else constant. For a standard deviation increase in the number of years a child lived at their current address, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 was expected to decrease by 7.6% holding all else constant. For a standard deviation increase in the average age of a neighborhood, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 increased by 5.5%, holding all else constant. For a standard deviation increase in the average household income for a neighborhood, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 increased by 4%. It is important to note that the percentage change is much smaller once anomie was put into standard deviation units.

To begin addressing the third research question, *does gentrification differ across racial groups?* the percent change calculations were repeated separately for black and white youth (Table 6). Measures of disorganization were considered first. For every additional unit of anomie in a neighborhood, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 increased by 128.2% for black youth, and decreased by 9.5% for white youth, holding all else constant. For every additional unit increase in neighborhood decline, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 decreased by 45.8% for black youth, and decreased by 77.9% for white youth, holding all else constant.

Several differences in the gentrification measures, as well as individual level proxy measures of gentrification, emerged between black and white youth. For black youth whose caretakers owned their home, as opposed to renting, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 decreased by 8.3%, holding all else constant. Comparatively, for white youth, homeownership decreased the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 by 21.3%. At the neighborhood level, for every additional increase in average homeownership in a neighborhood, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2

increased by 5.7% standard deviations for black youth, and increased by 19.7% standard deviations for white youth. In terms of the average household income for a neighborhood, for every additional increase in average household income, the expected count of delinquency at wave 2 increased by 6.1% for black youth, and decreased by 2.3% for white youth, holding all else constant.

Finally, for a more complete analysis of the differential impact gentrification has for black and white youth, ideal type models were constructed predicting the probability of committing zero delinquent acts by the type of neighborhood: disorganized, organized, stable, unstable, and gentrifying (Table 7). Ideal types rely upon theoretically based models that utilize the predicted probability of the desired outcome, in this case the predicted probability of committing zero delinquent acts. In an effort to assess the impact differing neighborhood context and processes have on youth several ideal types were constructed. The first ideal type represented a disorganized neighborhood. Relying upon the work of Shaw and McKay (1942) we know that disorganized communities are characterized as having high levels of anomie, high levels of physical decline, low levels of homeownership (i.e. high neighborhood turnover), and higher rates of poverty (i.e., low household income). In this type of neighborhood, black youth had a slightly lower predicted probability of committing zero delinquent acts in comparison to white youth (0.244 vs. 0.282). Conversely, for a neighborhood that was characterized as being organized, again, white youth were slightly more likely to not commit delinquent acts relative to black youth (0.638 vs. 0.674).

Two ideal types were constructed to capture the effects of stability versus instability, characterized by differing age of residents and homeownership rates, on youth

behavior. Unlike the disorganized neighborhood, these types of neighborhoods are not experiencing anomie or physical decline. The third ideal type, the stable neighborhood, was considered as having older residents with an average age one standard deviation above the mean (roughly 47 years of age), an average household income ranging from \$30,000-\$39,999, and an average homeownership that is one standard deviation above the mean (66% homeownership). In a stable neighborhood, black youth had a lower predicted probability than white youth of committing zero delinquent acts (0.002 vs. 0.095). The fourth ideal type, the unstable neighborhood, was constructed where the average age was one standard deviation below the mean (approximately 38 years of age), an average household income one standard deviation below the mean (roughly \$30,000-\$39,000), and an average homeownership one standard deviation below the mean (23% homeownership). For this ideal type model, black youth were predicted to have a lower probability of committing no delinquent acts than white youth (0.011 vs. 0.179).

The final ideal type was the neighborhood that was considered as being at a stage in the gentrification process. Gentrification typically occurs when younger people with more education and a higher income move into neighborhoods that are historically poor. The gentrifying ideal type was constructed to have an average age one standard deviation below the mean (37 years of age), an average household income one standard deviation above the mean (\$50,000 or greater), and an average rate of homeownership one standard deviation above the mean (66% homeownership). In this ideal type neighborhood, black youth had lower predicted probability of committing zero delinquent acts than white youth (0.004 vs. 0.122).

To summarize, across the ideal type neighborhoods, black youth reported lower predicted probability scores of committing zero delinquent acts than white youth. To put it simply, across the four ideal type neighborhoods, black youth were more likely to be delinquent. However, the type of neighborhood still matters. There was little difference in the probability of delinquency between black and white youth living in neighborhoods that were characterized as being disorganized or organized. However, there were stark differences between black youth and white youth living in neighborhoods that were characterized as gentrifying saw one of the biggest differences, across races, in the predicted probability of delinquency. This finding indicates that black youth living in neighborhoods that are at some point in the gentrification process will be more adversely impacted than white youth, thus committing more delinquent acts.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION

The social disorganization theoretical tradition offers many insights into the study of crime, delinquency, neighborhoods, and race. Additionally, it offers a starting point to analyze neighborhoods and cities at large. More specifically, social disorganization helps in understanding a potentially new form of disorganization – gentrification, the dramatic shift in the demographic composition of urban neighborhoods toward better-educated, more affluent, and typically younger residents and middle- to upper-income households. In building upon the work done on social disorganization and its application to gentrification, it is also important that the study of gentrification be placed in the context of housing segregation that took place for many years in U.S. cities – the challenge of residential segregation was apparent in this study as black youth lived in racially isolated spaces. To address the aforementioned areas, this study sought to answer three questions: what is the relationship between delinquency and gentrification? How does gentrification impact delinquency? And lastly, does the impact of gentrification on adolescents differ across racial groups?

In addressing the first question, it was hypothesized that measures of gentrification and disorganization would be significantly correlated with each other. After an analysis of the pairwise correlation matrix, several expected relationships were found. Gentrification measures such as homeownership, years at current address, household

income, average rates of homeownership in a neighborhood, average mobility in a neighborhood, and average household income were all negatively and significantly correlated with anomie, a measure of disorganization. This preliminary analysis tells us that there is a relationship between anomie, or normlessness, present in a neighborhood and different indicators of gentrification. This finding is consistent with the work done by Shaw and McKay (1942), as well as confirming the hypothesis that gentrification and disorganization are related.

There has been relatively little research done on gentrification and how it impacts youth, specifically how gentrification impacts delinquency. Thus, the second question (how does gentrification impact delinquency?) sought to understand the relationship between delinquency and gentrification. Given some of the proposed similarities between gentrification and disorganization, it was hypothesized that gentrification would be associated with higher rates of delinquency, above and beyond the effects of disorganization. This hypothesis was tested using negative binomial regression and was partially supported. The number of years a child spent at their current address was a consistent and significant indicator of delinquency across regression models. Additionally, a child that lived in a home that was owned was a significant and negatively correlated predictor of delinquency. Home stability is crucial for building collective efficacy and strengthening neighborhood ties because this allows for informal controls to be put in place, allowing a community to combat crime. Thus, it comes as no surprise that when the opposite occurs, delinquency increases. The effects of gentrification and social disorganization appear to be additive; homeownership did not become significant until measures of disorganization were included in the model. Thus, in opposition to the

hypothesis that gentrification would matter, above and beyond the effects of disorganization, this finding may indicate that disorganization and gentrification operate in tandem.

In addition to understanding how gentrification relates to disorganization and delinquency, a goal of this study was to understand how these associations varied across racial groups. There were stark differences between black and white youth. Results indicated that homeownership, on both the individual level and the neighborhood level, accounted for substantial differences between black youth and white youth. This finding tells us that homeownership – a symbol of economic stability – matters for children, especially when considering delinquency. Additionally, while the number of years at their current address decreased delinquency for black youth, there were increases in delinquency for white youth.

These differences were further explored through the use of different ideal types of neighborhoods. The work done by Sampson and Raudenbush (1999), Sampson and Groves (1989), Shaw and McKay (1942), and others, offers insight into what disorganized and organized communities are characterized by, and what they look like. Additionally, the work of Covington and Taylor (1989) and Freeman (2006) offers insight into some of the characteristics of gentrifying neighborhoods. Differences in the predicted probability of no delinquency were found between black and white youth were quite small in disorganized neighborhoods (.038) but were comparatively quite large in the gentrifying neighborhood (.118) and in the unstable neighborhood (.168). The type of neighborhood a child is reared in, specifically one characterized as gentrifying, has an impact on their delinquency, and this impact appears to be more pronounced for black

youth. But the impact of disorganized neighborhoods appears to be damaging for youth in general, irrespective of race. Thus, the second and third hypotheses largely held true – the impacts of gentrification were more pronounced than that of disorganization, and these impacts of gentrification more adversely impacted black youth.

CHAPTER IX

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While this study offers some understanding of how disorganization relates to gentrification, and how gentrification impacts delinquency, it is not without its challenges and limitations. One of the goals of this study was to bridge the theoretical links between gentrification and social disorganization. However, it should not go without saying that the purpose of this study (PHDCN) was to measure disorganization, not gentrification. But measuring gentrification has proven to be a challenge noted by other researchers, and is not unique to this study. Because gentrification is a process that takes place over time, measuring it and analyzing its impacts are best done with time-series data (Freeman 2006). For example, while the use of ideal types was helpful in constructing a theoretical basis by which gentrification can impact youth; the ideal type is a cross-sectional estimate. The use of two waves of data allowed changes in delinquency to be assessed, but changes in neighborhood-level characteristics and processes could not be assessed. Additionally, the current study had a limited range of gentrification measures available. Gentrification is more than an increase in younger residents buying property. It may be more adequately measured through the use of average home values in a neighborhood, which, when coupled with time-series data, would more directly allow researchers to assess changes in the tax base present in a neighborhood. Moreover, a limitation to this study is that it is only a snapshot of gentrification.

Another limitation to the study was a lack of data concerning the child's race. While the use of the parent's race can be used as a proxy for the child's race, the most reliable measure would be having access to the child's race; however, this information was not available.

While the experience of parents living in gentrifying neighborhoods has been documented (Martin 2008; Lacy 2002), the ways in which children are impacted by gentrification continues to be overlooked in the literature. Future studies should consider the use of qualitative methods, in conjunction with quantitative methods, seeking to understand how gentrification impacts children directly, as well as their narratives while living in transitory neighborhoods. Qualitative methods can also be useful in explaining, and depicting, the physical and social condition of a neighborhood. Future studies should also consider alternative outcomes other than delinquency. For example, outcomes such as, depression, and mental health at large, which can result from economic strain placed on poor families that are forced to move.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

Heralded by some as a process that revitalizes communities physically and socially, gentrification also has some potential consequences for indigenous residents. Additionally, given the history of residential segregation in the United States, the discussion of residential gentrification is pertinent and must be discussed in its proper context. More succinctly stated, the story of gentrification and its impacts is complex.

In an effort to better understand these complexities, this study bridges the gap between the social disorganization theoretical tradition and gentrification. In particular, this study posits that gentrification, in the short run, is a form of a disorganized community, and has harmful implications for black youth by increasing delinquency. In the long run, gentrification has the potential to have a positive lasting impact on a community. Thus, gentrification should not be viewed solely as a beneficial process as it can have harmful impacts, especially for low-income black families with children.

In consideration of the findings presented in this study, steps must be taken to address how neighborhoods can be made better for youth living in disorganized, high-crime spaces. Moreover, some lessons can be learned from gentrification in terms of the physical revitalization process that occurs, as well as the commercial investment that takes place in a neighborhood. For example, maintaining and supplementing existing resources for young people may provide an avenue for stability in an otherwise changing

environment. If neighborhoods can be improved, surely they can be improved for all groups, but especially for those that have seen the neighborhood at its lowest point.

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T. (1991). Manual for the Youth Self-Report and 1991 Profile. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.
- Adelman, R.M. and Gocker, J. C. (2007). Racial Residential Segregation in Urban America. *Sociology Compass* 1,1, 404-423.
- Chappell, A. T., Monk-Turner, E, and Payne, B.K. (2011). Broken Windows or Window Breakers: The Influence of Physical and Social Disorder on Quality of Life. *Justice Quarterly*, 28, 3, 522-540
- Chaskin, R. J. and Joseph, M. L. (2013). ‘Positive’ Gentrification, Social Control and the ‘Right to the City’ in Mixed-Income Communities: Uses and Expectations of Space and Place. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37, 2, 480-502.
- Covington, J. and Taylor, R.B. (1989). Gentrification and Crime Robbery and Larceny Changes in Appreciating Baltimore Neighborhoods During the 1970s. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 25, 1, 142-172.
- Dinwiddie, G. Y., Gaskin, D. J., Chan, K. S., Norrington, J., and McCleary, R. (2013). Residential Segregation, Geographic Proximity and Types of Services used: Evidence for Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Mental Health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 80, 67-75.
- Freeman, L. and Braconi, F. (2004). Gentrification and Displacement: New York City in

- the 1990s. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70, 1, 39-52.
- Glass, R. (1964). Introduction: Aspects of change, in Centre for Urban Studies (ed.)
London: Aspects of Change.
- Helms, A.C. (2003). Understanding Gentrification: An Empirical Analysis of the
determinants of Urban Housing Renovation. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 54, 3,
474-498.
- Hillier, A. E. (2003). Redlining and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. *Journal of
Urban History*, 29, 4, 394-420.
- Hughes, D. (2003). Correlates of African-American and Latino Parents' Messages to
Children About Ethnicity and Race: A Comparative Study of Racial Socialization.
American Journal of Community Psychology, 31, 15-33.
- Kennedy, M. and Leonard, P. (2001). Gentrification: Practice and Politics. The LISC
Center for Home Ownership and the LISC
- Khalil, R.A.A., Johar, F., and Sabri, S. (2015). The Impact of New-Build Gentrification
in Iskandar Malaysia: A case study of Nusajaya. *Procedia – Social and
Behavioral Sciences* 202, 495-504
- Kubrin, C. E. and Weitzer, R. (2003). New Directions in Social Disorganization Theory.
Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40, 4, 374-402.
- Kubrin, C. E., Stucky, T. D., and Krohn, M. D. (2009). Social Disorganization Theory. In
Researching Theories of Crime and Deviance (82-106). New York, NY: Oxford
University Press.
- Lacy, K. R. (2002). A Part of the Neighborhood?: Negotiating Race in American

- Suburbs. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 22,1, 39-74.
- Lees, L., Slater, T., Wylie, E. (2013). *Gentrification*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lester, T. W. and Hartley, D.A. (2014). The Long Term Employment Impacts of Gentrification in the 1990s. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 45, 80-89.
- Massey, D. S. and Denton, N. A. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Martin, L. (2008). Boredom, Drugs, and Schools: Protecting Children in Gentrifying Communities. *City and Community*, 7, 4, 331-345.
- McDonald, S. C. (1986). Does Gentrification Affect Crime Rates. *Crime and Justice*, 8, 163-201.
- Neblett Jr., E.W., Smalls, C.P., Ford, K. R., Nguyễn H. X., Sellers, R. M. (2009). Racial Socialization and Racial Identity: African-American Parents' Messages About Race as Precursors Identity. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 38, 189-203.
- Park, R.E., Burgess, E.W., and McKenzie, R. D. (1925). *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Patterson, Matt and Silver, D. (2015). The Place of Art: Local Area Characteristics and Arts Growth in Canada, 2001-2011. *Poetics*, 41, 69-87.
- Papachristos, A.V., Smith, C.M., Scherer, M.L., and Fugiero, M.A. (2011). More Coffee, Less Crime? The Relationship Between Gentrification and Neighborhood Crime Rates in Chicago, 1991 to 2005. *City and Community*, 10, 215-240
- Sorenson, A., Taeuber, K. E., and Hollingsworth Jr., L. J. (1975). Indexes of Racial Residential Segregation for 109 cities in the United States, 1940 to 1970. *Sociological Focus* 8, 128-130.

- Sampson, R. J. and Raudenbush. (1999). Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 603-651
- Sampson, R. J. and Groves, W. B. (1989). Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social-Disorganization Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 4, 774-802.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S.W., Fels, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science*, 277, 5328, 918-924.
- Shapiro, T. M. (2004). The Hidden Cost Of Being African-American: How Wealth Perpetuates Inequality. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, C. and McKay, H. D. (1942). Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shihadeh, E. S. and Flynn, N. (1996). Segregation and Crime: The Effect of Black Isolation on the Rates of Black and Urban Violence. *Social Forces*, 74, 4, 1325.
- Smith, N. (1982). Gentrification and Uneven Development. *Economic Geography* 58, 2, 139-155
- Smith, N. (2000). Gentrification in R.J. Johnston, D. Gregory, G. Pratt, and M. Watts (eds.) *The Dictionary of Human Geography* 4th ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 294-296.
- Wang M., Bao, H.X.H., Lin, P. (2015). Behavioral Insights into Housing Relocation Decisions: The Effects of the Beijing Olympics.
- Williams, D. R. and Collins C. (2001). Racial Residential Segregation: A Fundamental Cause of Racial Disparities in Health. *Public Health Reports*, 116, 404-416
- Wilson, W. J. and Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken Windows: The Police and neighborhood Safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249, 29-38

APPENDICES

A.

Anomie (Originally, 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree or Disagree 4=Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree)

1. Laws are made to be broken
2. It's okay to do anything you want as long as you don't hurt anyone
3. To make there are no right and wrong ways anymore, only easy and hard ways
4. Fighting between friends or within families is nobody else's business
5. Nowadays a person has to live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself

B.

Neighborhood decline (Originally, 1=Better, 2=Same, 3=Worse)

1. Change in personal safety in neighborhood during the past 5 years
2. Change during the past 5 years in the way the neighborhood looks
3. Change in the people living in the neighborhood
4. Change in level of police protection in neighborhood

C.

Social Control (Originally, 1=Very Likely, 2=Likely, 3=Neither Likely nor Unlikely, 4=Unlikely, 5=Very Unlikely)

1. Neighbors would do something if a group of neighborhood children skip school and hang out on street corner
2. Neighbors would do something if some children spray-paint graffiti on a local building
3. People in neighborhood would scold child if child shows disrespect to an adult
4. Neighbors would break up a fight in front of your house where someone was being beaten or threatened
5. Neighborhood residents would organize to keep closest fire station open if it were to be closed down by city because of budget cuts

Table 1

Pairwise Correlation Matrix

	Anomie	Ndecline	CONTROL	OWN	YearCurAdd	Family Income	Avg. Own	Avg. Black	Avg. Age	Avg. Mobility	Avg. HHIncome
Anomie	1.000										
Ndecline	0.1513*	1.0000									
CONTROL	-0.3387*	-0.2282*	1.0000								
OWN	-0.1157*	0.0272	0.3115*	1.0000							
YearsCurrAdd	-0.0193	-0.1520*	0.1089*	0.2435*	1.0000						
Family Income	-0.2192*	-0.0501	0.3439*	0.5051*	0.1902*	1.0000					
Avg. Own	-0.2852*	0.1298*	0.6309*	0.4285*	0.0973*	0.3327*	1.0000				
Avg. Black	0.1429*	0.2441*	-0.0884*	-0.0588	0.1508*	-0.0876*	0.0676*	1.0000			
Avg. Age	-0.1764*	0.1604*	0.2747*	0.1469*	0.1469*	0.1728*	0.3790*	0.2941*	1.0000		
Avg. Mobility	-0.0037	-0.1957*	-0.3445*	0.2535*	-0.1700*	-0.0992*	-0.6796*	-0.3462*	-0.4743*	1.0000	
Avg. HHIncome	-0.5208*	-0.1376*	0.6408*	0.3427*	0.0584	0.4356*	0.6619*	-0.1421*	0.2036*	-0.1325*	1.0000

*=P<.05

Ndecline = Neighborhood Decline
 YearsCurrAdd = Years at Current Address
 HHIncome = Household Income

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics Used in Models Measuring Delinquency

Dependent Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Description
Delinquency – Wave 1	2.150	2.717	0	26	Child behavior check list
Delinquency – Wave 2	2.219	2.386	0	14	Child behavior check list
Independent Variables					
<i>Individual Level Variables</i>					
Years at Current Address	6.835	7.291	.080	59	Years living at current address
Family Income	27,153.730	15,349.510	5,000	50,000	Family Income
Own	.422	.494	0	1	
Race					Self-reported race of caregiver
Black	.336	-	0	1	
White	.193	-	0	1	
Other Race	.480	-	0	1	
Gender					Gender of adolescent
Female	.513	-	0	1	
Male	.487	-	0	1	
Age Cohort					Age cohort of adolescent
Twelve	.559	-	0	1	
Fifteen	.441	-	0	1	
<i>Neighborhood Level</i>					
Anomie	2.507	.159	2.103	2.998	Normlessness in a community
Neighborhood Decline	1.927	.204	1.379	2.505	Social and physical decline over time
Social Control	3.871	.352	3.021	4.681	Neighbor's willingness to intervene
Age	42.317	4.823	33.627	55.129	Average age of respondents
Years in Neighborhood	10.003	3.701	2.994	19.461	Average years in neighborhood
Household Income	5.489	1.492	2.812	9.498	Household income in thousands (\$)
Mobility	95.231	0.439	0	100	Percent respondent mobility
Homeownership	44.881	21.462	0	100	Percent respondents who own
% White	25.199	27.939	0	100	Percent white respondents in neighborhood
% Black	31.685	35.929	0	100	Percent black respondents in neighborhood

n=953. Data come from Project of Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). All values have been mean centered.

Table 3

T-Test – Comparison of Means between Black and White Youth

Variables	Black Youth n=311	White Youth n=184	Mean Difference	P-value
Delinquency (W2)	2.695	1.978	-0.716	0.002
Delinquency (W1)	2.672	1.864	-0.808	0.001
<i>Individual Level Variables</i>				
Own	0.325	0.576	0.251	0.000
Family Income	25,426.050	35,842.390	29,297.980	0.000
Years at Current Address	7.806	8.315	0.509	0.518
<i>Neighborhood Level Variables</i>				
Anomie	2.525	2.446	-0.078	0.000
Neighborhood Decline	1.973	1.853	-0.120	0.000
Social Control	3.853	4.113	0.251	0.000
Age	43.936	43.692	-0.243	0.611
Average Years in Neighborhood	11.039	10.369	-0.661	0.062
Average Household Income	5.256	6.466	1.201	0.000
Average Homeownership	0.456	0.532	0.077	0.001
Mobility	0.818	0.942	0.124	0.003
% White	0.084	0.529	0.445	0.000
% Black	0.699	0.084	-0.615	0.000

Table 4

Negative Binomial Regression Models Measuring Delinquency

Model 1 – Controls

Variables	B	SE	Sig.
Delinquency (W1)	0.171	0.016	0.000
Black	0.178	0.079	0.024
Other Race	0.042	0.079	0.596
Twelve	-0.106	0.060	0.079
Female	-0.044	0.064	0.489
Intercept	0.727	0.069	0.000

Model 2 – Disorganization

Anomie	0.455	0.223	0.041
Neighborhood Decline	-0.151	0.167	0.359
Intercept	0.794	0.039	0.000

Model 3 – Social Control

Social Control	-0.158	0.087	0.070
Intercept	0.796	0.031	0.000

Model 4 – Gentrification

Own	-0.156	0.089	0.081
Family Income	-3.680	2.460	0.135
Years at Current Address	-0.010	0.005	0.030
Average Black	0.269	0.104	0.010
Average Own	-0.217	0.389	0.577
Average Age	0.002	0.007	0.792
Average Mobility	-0.044	0.133	0.740
Average Household Income	0.021	0.049	0.671
Intercept	0.780	0.038	0.000

Model 5 – Full Model

Delinquency (W1)	0.169	0.015	0.000
Black	0.189	0.088	0.071
Other Race	0.016	0.095	0.868
Twelve	-0.108	0.060	0.073
Female	-0.045	0.064	0.488
Anomie	0.230	0.186	0.215
Neighborhood Decline	-0.456	0.171	0.007
Social Control	-0.244	0.142	0.086
Own	-0.140	0.077	0.051
Family Income	-8.330	2.260	0.713
Years at Current Address	-0.011	0.004	0.015
Average Black	-0.076	0.133	0.569
Average Own	0.140	0.353	0.691
Average Age	0.011	0.006	0.087
Average Mobility	-0.017	0.105	0.869
Average Household Income	0.027	0.046	0.569
Intercept	0.684	0.092	0.000

Notes. n=953. Data come from Project of Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). All continuous and categorical variables have been mean centered.

Table 5

Percent Change Model Measuring Expected Count of Delinquency – Full Model

Variable	β	Sig.	% Change^x	SD % Change[◇]
Delinquency (W1)	0.169	0.000	18.400	58.400
Black	0.189	0.071	20.800	--
Other Race	0.158	0.868	1.600	--
Twelve	-0.108	0.073	-10.200	--
Female	-0.045	0.693	-4.400	--
Anomie	0.230	0.215	25.900	3.700
Neighborhood Decline	-0.456	0.007	-36.600	-8.900
Social Control	-0.244	0.086	-21.700	-8.200
Own	-0.149	0.051	-13.900	--
Family Income	-0.000	0.713	0.000	1.500
Years at Current Address	-0.011	0.015	-1.100	-7.600
Average Black	-0.076	0.570	-7.300	-2.700
Average Own	0.140	0.691	15.100	3.100
Average Age	0.011	0.087	1.100	5.500
Average Mobility	-0.017	0.869	-1.700	-8.000
Average Household Income	0.026	0.569	2.700	4.000

Notes n=953. All continuous and categorical variables have been mean centered. x = Percent change in expected count for unit increase in X. ◇= Percent change in expected count for SD increase in X.

Table 6

Table 6. Percent Change Models Measuring Expected Count of Delinquency When Controlling for Black and White

Variable	Black n=311				White n=184			
	β	Sig.	% Change	SD % Change	β	Sig.	% Change	SD % Change
<i>Delinquency (W1)</i>	0.145	0.000	15.600	51.200	0.246	0.000	27.900	75.400
<i>Twelve</i>	-0.115	0.091	-10.900	-5.500	0.087	0.614	9.100	4.400
<i>Female</i>	-0.103	0.297	-9.800	-5.000	-0.266	0.099	-23.400	-12.500
<i>Anomie</i>	0.825	0.013	128.200	15.100	-0.100	0.849	-9.500	-1.400
<i>Neighborhood Decline</i>	-0.613	0.004	-45.800	-9.700	-1.508	0.007	-77.900	-25.700
<i>Social Control</i>	-0.446	0.064	-36.000	-12.300	-0.564	0.033	-43.100	-20.000
<i>Own</i>	-0.087	0.354	-8.300	-4.000	-0.231	0.193	-21.300	-11.200
<i>Family Income</i>	0.000	0.196	0.000	-5.000	0.000	0.518	0.000	-6.000
<i>Years at Current Address</i>	0.078	0.081	-0.800	-6.800	0.006	0.584	0.600	4.600
<i>Average Own</i>	0.212	0.513	23.700	5.700	0.807	0.363	124.000	19.700
<i>Average Black</i>	-0.139	0.519	-13.000	-4.000	-0.046	0.929	-4.500	-0.800
<i>Average Age</i>	0.020	0.043	2.000	11.100	0.011	0.650	1.100	5.500
<i>Average Mobility</i>	-0.128	0.243	-12.000	-5.700	0.210	0.554	24.600	9.300
<i>Average Household Income</i>	0.059	0.397	6.100	10.000	-0.023	0.782	-2.300	-3.500

Table 7

Table 7. Ideal Type Models Predicting the Probability of Zero Delinquent Acts by Type of Neighborhood

Type of Neighborhood	Prob. Of Zero	Prob. Of Zero – Black	Prob. Of Zero – White
Disorganized	0.274	0.244	0.282
Organized	0.666	0.638	0.674
Stable*	0.089	0.002	0.095
Unstable ^x	0.127	0.011	0.179
Gentrifying ⁺	0.099	0.004	0.122

Notes.

Neighborhood level variables were used to construct stable, unstable, and gentrifying neighborhood ideal types.

Disorganized Community: Characterized by high levels of anomie, high levels of neighborhood decline, low levels of social control, low levels of homeownership (i.e. high neighborhood turnover), and low household income.

Organized Community: Characterized by low levels of anomie, low levels of neighborhood decline, high levels of social control, high levels of homeownership, and high household income.

*=Stable communities were characterized as having an average age that is one standard deviation above the mean, an average household income, and an average homeownership that is one standard deviation above the mean.

^x=Unstable communities were characterized as having an average age that is one standard deviation below the mean, an average household income that is one standard deviation below the mean, and an average homeownership that is one standard deviation below the mean.

⁺=Gentrifying communities were characterized as having a an average age that is one standard deviation below the mean, an average household income that is one standard deviation above the mean, and an average homeownership that is one standard deviation above the mean.

VITA

Stanley Jamal Collins

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE MIDDLE CLASS IS MOVING IN TO RECLAIM THE SLUMS: A
STUDY OF GENTRIFICATION, DISORGANIZATION, AND
DELINQUENCY

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Sociology at
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2016.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Economics at
Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA/USA in 2014.