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CIVIC PARTICIPATION CAN HELP ADDRESS GENTRIFICATION CHALLENGES

“Hundreds of Logan Square residents show up to fight for 100% affordable housing complex as opponents try to slow down process” (Blockgroupchicago.org)

Alderman Carlos Ramirez-Rosa
CIVIC PARTICIPATION CAN ENHANCE COMMUNITY & INDIVIDUAL WELL-BEING

Build
Build relationships

Achieve
Achieve personal goals

Solve
Solve problems

Empower
Empower less powerful groups

Expose
Expose people to new kinds of people and experiences
"Only about 1 in 10 Americans have a lot of friends of the opposing political party."

- Washington Post
CIVIC AND SOCIAL CONNECTIONS CAN REDUCE MISINFORMATION

“Could social alienation among some Trump supporters help explain why polls underestimated Trump again?

- 538.com, Nov. 24, 2020
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CIVIC PARTICIPATION CAN ENHANCE COMMUNITY & INDIVIDUAL WELL-BEING

Build
Build relationships

Achieve
Achieve personal goals

Solve
Solve problems

Empower
Empower less powerful groups

Expose
Expose people to new kinds of people and experiences

Build
Build bridges across communities and groups
CONTEXT AFFECTS OUR CIVIC ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR
INEQUALITY MAY LEAD TO UNEQUAL PARTICIPATION
INEQUALITY MAY LEAD TO 
DIMINISHED PARTICIPATION
INEQUALITY MAY LEAD TO CONFLICTUAL PARTICIPATION
AND INEQUALITY MAY MAKE CIVIC COLLABORATION MORE IMPORTANT
WHAT CONTEXTUAL FACTORS MIGHT SHAPE CIVIC PARTICIPATION?

• High levels of inequality and diversity
• Rapid social and economic change
• Clearly visible change
• Challenges to individual and community life

And this can cause....

• Conflict between groups rather than collaboration
• Uneven participation, where some groups gain more of a voice
• Or lower overall participation
But there are major challenges to studying civic participation:

- Distinctive contexts
- Changing contexts
- Isolating causality (context vs composition)
WHY STUDY GENTRIFYING AREAS?
BECAUSE THEY ARE

- Diverse
- Unequal
- Rapidly changing
- Represent a new social pattern
SUMMARY OF STUDY

• **Question:** What is the relationship between gentrification and civic participation?

• **Data:** Original survey of Chicago residents, with oversamples of gentrifying areas

• **Analysis Techniques:** Multivariate analyses, survey experiment

• **Findings:**
  
  • Overall, residents of Gentrifying areas tend to participate less
  
  • GentrifiERS tend to participate in different organizations than their neighbors
  
  • BUT they can be nudged to be more aware and concerned about the negative aspects of neighborhood change.
OUTLINE OF RESEARCH STRATEGY

• Concept clarification and measurement: gentrification
• Description of survey
• Analysis
  • Observational study of participation
  • Survey experiment suggesting intervention
WHAT IS GENTRIFICATION?
WHAT IS GENTRIFICATION?
Knowledge about gentrification is limited.

Previous research

- Mostly single neighborhood or city case-studies that select on DV
- Quantitative: Varied, inadequate definitions
- Quantitative: Only compare across neighborhoods
  - No systematic individual-level studies

My approach

- Develop new measures that better match concept
- Target survey frame
- Compare across and within neighborhoods
NEED TO DIFFERENTIATE INDIVIDUAL & COMMUNITY-LEVEL GENTRIFICATION
NEED TO DIFFERENTIATE INDIVIDUAL & COMMUNITY-LEVEL GENTRIFICATION

Across-Neighborhoods

- High SES, In Non-GA
- Low SES, in Non-GA
- Non-Gentrifiers, in GA
- High SES, in GA (Gentrifiers)

Community Gentrification Score

Individual Gentrification Score
NEED TO DIFFERENTIATE INDIVIDUAL & COMMUNITY-LEVEL GENTRIFICATION
SURVEY DESIGN
As PI, I led team of researchers (faculty and graduate students) in developing the Chicago Neighborhood Survey (CNS)

THE SURVEY STUDY TEAM

PI: Thomas Ogorzalek  Jaime Dominguez  Kumar Ramanathan  Matthew Nelsen  Traci Burch  Reuel Rogers
Winter 2018-19, Chicago Metro Area
N=2400
Oversamples
- Gentrifying areas
- Diverse Suburbs
- Black Suburbanites
Topics
- Community Life
- Civic Participation
- Political Behavior
- Policy Opinions
BUILDING NEIGHBORHOOD GENTRIFICATION INDICATOR
WHY DO WE NEED A NEIGHBORHOOD LEVEL GENTRIFICATION MEASURE?

• For collecting an oversample of respondents from gentrifying areas
• For ACROSS-neighborhood analyses
• For identifying respondents for WITHIN-neighborhood analyses
** Lots of Variation in Previous Gentrification Area Indicators **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
<th>Restricted to city?</th>
<th>Compatible w/ existing survey data?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voorhees</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwang &amp; Lin</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grube-Calvers</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Influx of individuals with high levels of income and education (most often white), into a previously low-SES big-city neighborhood (most often predominantly non-white), with attendant cultural and economic changes."
**MY INDICATORS**

**CAPTURE MORE DIMENSIONS OF GENTRIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
<th>Restricted to city?</th>
<th>Compatible w/ existing survey data?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voorhees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwang &amp; Lin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grube-Calvers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS (me)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP (me)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CNS and CDP are factor-based indicators, while Voorhees, Hwang & Lin, and Grube-Calvers use a boolean algorithm.*
ADDITIVE INDEX-OF-INDEXES (Previous)
ADDITIVE INDEX-OF-INDEXES
(Previous)

(Mine)
ADDITIVE INDEX-OF-INDEXES

(Previous)

(Own)

Index-of-indexes
Used ZIP to sample respondents, but want to refine measure

“The Process:”

• Collect Block Group Data from Census
• Use GIS to map block groups onto neighborhoods
• Aggregate census counts by neighborhoods
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The Process:

- Collect Block Group Data from Census
- Use GIS to map block groups onto neighborhoods
- Aggregate census counts by neighborhoods

**NEIGHBORHOOD DEMOGRAPHY**
CREATING NEIGHBORHOOD GENTRIFICATION MEASURE

• I created a factor-based indicator that combines:
  • Racial change (2010-2018)
  • Income change: per cap, median, and % high income
  • Educational attainment change
  • Changes in Rent
  • Number of recent arrivals

• Two factors emerge:
  • Income/rent
  • Race/Education
SPOT CHECK: NEIGHBORHOOD GENTRIFICATION SCORES
REFINING THE SET OF GENTRIFICATION AREAS
IDENTIFY NEIGHBORHOOD FOR EACH SURVEY RESPONDENT

Need to match individuals with very local contexts

ZIP not good enough

Two approaches:

Ask neighborhood/town
Ask nearest intersection (geocode and spatial join with neighborhood map)
CHALLENGES OF IDENTIFYING GENTRIFIERS

• No agreed upon definition
• Social desirability bias
• Single demographics may be too simple
MY APPROACH TO IDENTIFYING GENTRIFIERS

- Factor analysis, using survey responses from gentrifying neighborhoods
  - Race
  - Educational attainment
  - Income
  - Newcomer status
- Two factors emerge
INDIVIDUAL & NEIGHBORHOOD GENTRIFICATION SCORES FOR EACH CNS RESPONDENT
WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENTRIFICATION AND CIVIC PARTICIPATION?

Across neighborhoods:
• Are residents of gentrifying areas more or less likely to engage in civic participation?

Within gentrifying neighborhoods, do gentrifiers and their neighbors...
• Engage in different levels or kinds of participation?
• Hold similar views about neighborhood change and its challenges?
WE ASKED ABOUT 14 TYPES OF PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL COMMUNITY

- School groups
- Parent groups
- Senior groups
- Veterans
- Business groups
- Neighborhood associations
- Labor/employee associations
- Religious groups
- Charity
- Sports
- College groups
- Other clubs
- Other community groups
- Volunteering
ANALYSIS

• Index construction of overall participation
  • Additive (1-0)
  • Principal components analysis

• Modes of analysis
  • Matching
  • Multilevel Regression
  • Across neighborhoods
  • Within neighborhoods
PEOPLE WITH MORE RESOURCES TEND TO PARTICIPATE MORE

Predictors of Participation in CNS Sample (OLS Regression)

DV=Additive participation index. Estimates represent OLS regression coefficient for factor at left. Lines are 95% CIs.
ARE RESIDENTS OF GENTRIFYING AREAS MORE LIKELY TO ENGAGE IN CIVIC PARTICIPATION?
Civic participation is lower in gentrifying areas, but gentrifiers participate more.

Points are estimated marginal effects of variable at left on additive index of participation. Observations matched to nearest neighbor on race, gender, income, education, homeownership, and local diversity. Models estimated using pools of respondents indicated in legend.
WITHIN GENTRIFYING AREAS, ARE GENTRIFIERS OR THEIR NEIGHBORS MORE LIKELY TO ENGAGE IN CIVIC PARTICIPATION?
**GENTRIFIERS PARTICIPATE MORE THAN THEIR NEIGHBORS (MATCHING)**

Civic participation is lower in gentrifying areas, but gentrifiers participate more.

Points are estimated marginal effects of variable at left on additive index of participation. Observations matched to nearest neighbor on race, gender, income, education, homeownership, and local diversity. Models estimated using pools of respondents indicated in legend.
IS THIS DUE TO CONTEXT OR COMPOSITION?
We see:

- **Lower** overall participation on average in GAs
- **Higher** participation by **high-SES individuals**

Is context causing differences, or is it just that high-SES people participate more?

Matching suggests context matters, but want to look closer:

- **Compare lower-SES respondents in GA and non-GA**
LOWER-SES RESIDENTS IN GENTRIFYING AREAS PARTICIPATE LESS

Low-SES residents of gentrifying areas are less engaged with civic life than similar people elsewhere.

This supports contextual effects.
LOWER-SES RESIDENTS IN GENTRIFYING AREAS PARTICIPATE LESS

Low-SES residents of gentrifying areas are less engaged with civic life than similar people elsewhere.

This supports contextual effects.
ARE GENTRIFIERS AND THEIR NEIGHBORS LIKELY TO ENGAGE IN THE SAME KINDS OF CIVIC PARTICIPATION?
WITHIN GA, LOCAL CIVIC PARTICIPATION IS UNEVEN ACROSS VENUES

(LINEAR PROBABILITY MODEL)

Point estimates are the point estimates (with 95% confidence intervals) of the coefficient on Gentry indicator in LPM regression of area of participation on right. All models control for general trust, sex, and homeownership.
TESTING AN INTERVENTION
SO, IS THERE HOPE FOR GREATER COLLABORATION IN GA’S?

• Participating in different venues → Can’t build trust or relationships across gentrifier and non-gentrifier groups

• Maybe do not see same challenges in neighborhood
DO GENTRIFIERS AND NON-GENTRIFIERS HAVE SIMILAR PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY CHALLENGES?
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“In your own words, how would you describe the way [your neighborhood] is changing lately?”
"I hate seeing the people like me being pushed out. I'm wondering when it will be me. Rich white people have been ruining neighborhoods in Chicago for far too long."
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"Rich people are building huge houses and tearing down our beautiful old buildings. The people buying these homes are not contributing to the neighborhood's well-being. I feel our neighborhood feel is getting lost in these self-centered newcomers."
"I hate seeing the people like me being pushed out. I'm wondering when it will be me. Rich white people have been ruining neighborhoods in Chicago for far too long."

"Rich people are building huge houses and tearing down our beautiful old buildings. The people buying these homes are not contributing to the neighborhood's well-being. I feel our neighborhood feel is getting lost in these self-centered newcomers."

"More high-end construction. Mostly good, but some character is being lost, but that might be okay."
"I hate seeing the people like me being pushed out. I'm wondering when it will be me. Rich white people have been ruining neighborhoods in Chicago for far too long."

"Rich people are building huge houses and tearing down our beautiful old buildings. **The people buying these homes are not contributing to the neighborhood's well-being.** I feel our neighborhood feel is getting lost in these self-centered newcomers."

"**More high-end construction.** Mostly good, but some character is being lost, but that might be okay."

"It is making it better to live and **more chances at jobs** are available because of businesses being opened."
"More age & political diversity leads to a more balanced community."
"More age & political diversity leads to a more balanced community."

"Gentrification is kicking in. I like it as a property owner but I am mindful of the displacement this may cause."
"More age & political diversity Leads to a more balanced community."

"Gentrification is kicking in. I like it as a property owner but I am mindful of the displacement this may cause."

"More housing being built that’s more expensive. Good for property values but not sure if being more populated is the best."
"More age & political diversity. Leads to a more balanced community."

"Gentrification is kicking in. I like it as a property owner but I am mindful of the displacement this may cause."

"More housing being built that’s more expensive. Good for property values but not sure if being more populated is the best."

"No change of getting teens to stop hanging out on street corners."
"More age & political diversity Leads to a **more balanced community**."

"Gentrification is kicking in. **I like it as a property owner but I am mindful of the displacement** this may cause."

"More housing being built that’s more expensive. Good for property values but **not sure if being more populated is the best**."

"No change of getting **teens to stop hanging out on street corners**."

"I literally have lived here for a month, so I haven't experienced changes."
**Gentrifiers Have More Positive Impression of Neighborhood Change**

How do you feel about how the area is changing?

**Gentrifiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Gentrifiers (in GAs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

←More Negative  More Positive→  ←More Negative  More Positive→
ARE WE REALLY LIVING TOGETHER?

- Disruptive neighborhood changes associated with gentrification are more concerning to non-gentrifiers than gentrifiers.
- Gentrifiers are taking part in community, but not the SAME community as their neighbors.
Can community leaders or groups help to alter this pattern?
Rethinking Gentrification:

How to Become an Agent of Positive Change in Your Community
SURVEY EXPERIMENT: NUDGING GENTRIFIERS TO RECOGNIZE CONCERNS

**Control:**

City neighborhoods often change: new people move in and others leave. Would you say the changes are more positive or negative?

A message about neighborhood changes makes gentrifiers more concerned about changes.
**SURVEY EXPERIMENT:**
**NUDGING GENTRIFIERS TO RECOGNIZE CONCERNS**

**Treatment (optimism):**
City neighborhoods often change: new people move in and others leave. A number of community leaders have expressed optimism about recent changes in your neighborhood. How about you: would you say the changes are more positive or negative?

A message about neighborhood changes makes gentrifiers more concerned about changes.
SURVEY EXPERIMENT: \textbf{NUDGING GENTRIFIERS TO RECOGNIZE CONCERNS}

\textbf{Treatment (concern):}

City neighborhoods often change: new people move in and others leave. A number of community leaders have expressed concern about recent changes in your neighborhood. How about you: would you say the changes are more positive or negative?

A message about neighborhood changes makes gentrifiers more concerned about changes.

![Graph showing changes more negative than positive by treatment and gentrifier status.](image-url)
CIVIC PARTICIPATION CAN HELP ADDRESS GENTRIFICATION CHALLENGES

“Hundreds of Logan Square residents show up to fight for 100% affordable housing complex as opponents try to slow down process” (Blockgroupchicago.org)

A concerned gentrifier
CIVIC PARTICIPATION CAN HELP ADDRESS GENTRIFICATION CHALLENGES

“My husband and I moved to Logan Square 10 years ago because we value living in a diverse community and we’ve watched our community change,” the woman said, her voice quivering.

“We value the people of this community that have been here long before we moved here. In our window, we have one of those posters that I know so many people have that says, ‘Hate has no home here,’ and I believe in that and I will continue to stand by that, and I fully support this project.”

(Blockgroupchicago.org)
CIVIC PARTICIPATION CAN HELP ADDRESS GENTRIFICATION CHALLENGES

Work Begins On Affordable Housing Project Next To Logan Square Blue Line

In lieu of a traditional ground-breaking ceremony, the developer is putting out a series of videos that highlight the significance of the project and the community effort to get it built.
TAKEAWAYS

• Gentrifying areas tend to have less civic participation
• But gentrifiers participate more than their neighbors
NEED TO DIFFERENTIATE
INDIVIDUAL & COMMUNITY-LEVEL GENTRIFICATION

- High Participation
  - High SES, in Non-GA

- Med Participation
  - High SES, in GA (Gentrifiers)

- Med Participation
  - Low SES, in Non-GA

- Low Participation
  - Non-Gentrifiers, in GA
TAKEAWAYS

• Gentrifying areas tend to have less civic participation
• But gentrifiers participate more than their neighbors
• Gentrifiers participate in and perceive their neighborhoods differently than non-gentrifiers
• But small interventions by leaders and community groups might help build bridges and collaboration to address challenges
QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Across neighborhoods:
• Are residents of gentrifying areas (RGAs) politically distinctive?
• Do RGAs have distinctive policy preferences?

Within gentrifying neighborhoods,
• Do gentrifiers and their neighbors have different or similar policy preferences?
• What kinds of interventions could build bridges between these groups?
• What kinds of tools or programs could amplify the voices of those with less power?

Do these patterns hold in other cities and countries?
OTHER PROJECTS
SOCIAL MEDIA AS A FORUM FOR LOCAL DEMOCRACY

(WITH KUMAR RAMANATHAN)
FACEBOOK AS A FORUM FOR LOCAL DEMOCRACY
FREQUENCY OF FACEBOOK POSTS BY CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
**COUNCILMEMBER FACEBOOK POSTS:**
*RECENTLY ELECTED ARE MOST ACTIVE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year took office</th>
<th>Mean # of posts (2015-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1995</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2004</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2014</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2015</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 year --> 18 posts (OLS with controls)
COUNCILMEMBER FACEBOOK POSTS: RANGE OF TOPICS

Percent of Posts "Best Fitting" Each Topic
COUNCILMEMBER FACEBOOK POSTS: MOST “LIKES” ON POLITICALLY SALIENT TOPICS

Regression of likes count on all topics

- National Issues
- Policing

Excluded category is Topic 4. Controls for alderman and month included but not reported.
COUNCILMEMBER FACEBOOK POSTS: CURRENT EVENTS DRIVE FREQUENCY

Monthly Frequency of Posts on State and National Politics

![Bar chart showing monthly frequency of posts on state and national politics from 2015 to 2018. The x-axis represents months from 2015m7 to 2018m1, and the y-axis represents frequency. The chart highlights a peak in 2017m1.](chart.png)
### NEXT STEPS:
**ACTIVITY OF NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS ON FACEBOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group type</th>
<th>Number of groups</th>
<th>Proportion &quot;open&quot;</th>
<th>Total members</th>
<th>Average members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General news</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>163,466</td>
<td>163,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of affinity</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>115,111</td>
<td>115,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically political</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30,703</td>
<td>30,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime reports</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>74,112</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39,128</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage sale</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>260,960</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>169,303</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with city or alderman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL PROJECTS

• **FORGE Sustainability (initial stages):** Interdisciplinary project to evaluate and support community well-being, adoption of smart cities technologies and environmental policies in Midwest urban regions.

• **Close to Home (complete):** Study of grassroots political mobilization in predominantly Black communities

• **The City Re-Centered (mid-stages):** Study of progressive policy changes in 21st century American cities, connected to major changes associated with the knowledge economy
THANK YOU!
COUNCILMEMBER FACEBOOK POSTS: MORE POSTS, MORE PAGE LIKES

1 post --> 2 page likes (OLS w/ controls)
CURRENT EVENTS AND PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES DRIVE POSTS

Coefficient on Aldermanic Indicators and National Posts

Monthly Frequency of Posts on State and National Politics
CLOSE TO HOME: COMMUNITY PLACE-BASED MOBILIZATION IN RACIALIZED CONTEXTS

(WITH SALLY NUAMAH)
SCHOOL CLOSURES IN CHICAGO, 2012-13

- 49 schools closed in a wave
- Concentrated in largely black neighborhoods
- Required public meetings before each school closed

Hunger strikers (parents of students at Dyett High School)
LEARNING POLITICAL PARTICIPATION FROM POLICY

Community at T0: Low participation, Low information

Community at T1: Learning organizing

Policy intervention

Community at T2: Higher participation, Informed attitudes

Category of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Partic.</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Donate $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfAm, Closure ZIPs</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfAm, Non-Closure ZIPs</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Afam</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change (CCES 2010, 2012)
NEAR SCHOOL CLOSURES:
MOBILIZE ON BALLOT MEASURES

2012

2015
NEAR SCHOOL CLOSURES: MOBILIZE OPPOSITION TO MAYOR
THE CITY RE-CENTERED: PEOPLE-FIRST POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY METROPOLIS
RELATIVE VALUE OF CITY REAL ESTATE INCREASES
Associations Between Value Gradients and Select Fiscal and Social Policies in Big U.S. Cities

- Local Revenue (2016)
- Local Revenue (FE)
- Property Tax Revenue (2016)
- Property Tax Revenue (FE)
- Spending (2016)
- Spending (FE)
- HHS Spending (2016)
- HHS Spending (FE)
- Local Minimum Wage
- Inclusive Zoning
- Paid Sick Leave
- Universal Pre-K
- Decommodification Index

U.S. Census, Lincoln Land Institute, cityhealth, Government Finance Database
Cities with steeper land gradients enact more decommodifying policies

Data: Census, Lincoln Land Institute, cityhealth, UCB Labor Center
CONTEXT AFFECTS PARTICIPATION

Recurrent findings about how class inequality and ethnoracial diversity affect civic participation.

Class inequality:

• **Resource theory**: individuals with higher SES will participate more, but overall participation likely to be low.

• **Scope and Bias theory**: where inequality is higher, people more likely to participate because more is at stake and inequality is more salient.

Racial Diversity:
DIVERSITY AND CIVIC PARTICIPATION

Three main schools of thought about how racial and ethnic diversity impacts civic participation.

- **Constrict theory**: diversity makes collaboration more difficult and reduces trust and sense of common purpose.
  - Prediction: Less participation overall

- **Group threat/conflict theory**: diversity heightens awareness of difference and group rivalries.
  - Prediction: More participation, especially by “threatened” group

- **Contact theory**: diversity reduces salience of group difference through collaborative work toward common goals.
  - Prediction: Participation is similar across groups, less "Us-vs-Them" attitudes
WHY STUDY GENTRIFYING AREAS?

Theories of diversity were developed in a different era, characterized by different demographic shifts.
New era defined by reverse threat: more powerful/resourced group is opting in, and less powerful group is threatened
And while there is lots of evidence of partisan and ideological diversity in these areas...
Large potential divides over interests still persist
WHY STUDY GENTRIFYING AREAS?

Large potential divides in interests persist
CMANS G-INDEX

- Over 2000-2015: Got whiter, got more diverse, got more college grads, had real estate increases
- Metro ZIPs only
- Calculate levels of each of following, and subtract 2000 from 2015 level for baseline and change:
  - %Non-Hispanic White (Census)
  - Inverse Herfindahl Index (Census)
  - % with BA or higher degree (Census)
  - % professionals (Census)
  - Mean Housing Value ($Real, Zillow)
- Identified as “Gentrifying” if:
  - Below average income and % white in 2000 AND
  - Above average in at least 3 of those categories
CDP G-INDEX

• Existing measures for Chicago left us cold
  • Voorhees needlessly complicated/overfit
  • Ley only considers SES increase
  • Both older; needed to update for post-2008.
• Want measures robust across units, from BG to ZIP/Community Area
• Factor-based
• Weighted sum of factors 1 (white-richness) and 2 (high-ed newness)
### Gentrification Index Of Indexes (ZIPS)

#### metaGent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,132</td>
<td>83.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CCES 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gentr.</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-G</td>
<td>48,822</td>
<td>97.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent.</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Metro Only)
NATIONAL DATA
Individual and ZIP-level Gentrification scores, USA

2016 CCES respondents
GENTRIFIERS EXPRESS LIBERAL POLICY VIEWS

Gentrifiers tend to be PARTICULARLY liberal on social issues.

Gentrifiers tend to be supportive of redistribution.
...AND SEEM TO PARTICIPATE MORE

"In the last year, did you...

a. Go to a political or government meeting
b. Put out a sign for a candidate
c. Work or volunteer for a candidate
d. Donate money to a candidate

Graphs by Comparison Groups
BUT IT'S A COMPLICATED RELATIONSHIP

Data: 2016 CCES. Markers are OLS coefficient estimates with 95% confidence intervals for covariates at left. DV: Factor-based index of political participation measures. State-level indicators and constant omitted.
BUT IT'S A COMPLICATED RELATIONSHIP

High SES and local inequality associated with more political participation...

Data: 2016 CCES. Markers are OLS coefficient estimates with 95% confidence intervals for covariates at left. DV: Factor-based index of political participation measures. State-level indicators and constant omitted.
**BUT IT’S A COMPLICATED RELATIONSHIP**

High SES and local inequality associated with more political participation...

![Data: 2016 CCES. Markers are OLS coefficient estimates with 95% confidence intervals for covariates at left. DV: Factor-based index of political participation measures. State-level indicators and constant omitted.]

but areas with local diversity (potential gentrifying areas) are not.
Within gentrifying areas, local civic participation is uneven across venues.

\[ \beta(\text{Gentrifier}) \]

- Charity, religion, volunteering, neighborhood
- Sport, business, alumni
- Parents and schools
- Labor, business, religion
- Veterans, seniors, alumni

Point estimates are the point estimates (with 95% confidence intervals) of the coefficient on Gentry indicator in LPM regression of area of participation on right. All models control for general trust, sex, and homeownership.

DO THEY PARTICIPATE?
Predictors of Participation in CNS Sample (OLS Regression)

DV=Additive participation index. Estimates represent OLS regression coefficient for factor at left. Lines are 95% CIs.
CORRECTING FOR SURVEY COLLECTION BIAS WITH WEIGHTS

- Sample response biases especially in oversample areas
- Create post-stratification weights for different pools
- Referenced to true demography using Census IPUMS data

- Use regression, matching, and survey experiment to mitigate this bias
CORRECTING FOR SURVEY COLLECTION BIAS WITH WEIGHTS

• There’s no way to be assured of a perfect representative sample
  • Especially in our oversample target areas
• In this case, especially bad on sex (not enough men), ethnicity (not enough Latinos), and education (too many highly educated)
• **Create post-stratification weights for different pools**
  • Weights include sex, race/eth, income, age, educational attainment (198 cells)
  • Metro area, Chicago city, **Gentrifying areas**, race/ethnic groups
  • Based on Census IPUMS microdata estimates for comparable demography
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighting Group*</th>
<th># obs</th>
<th>Sample Prop</th>
<th>Census Prop</th>
<th>Weight (Gentrification Areas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female, Black, low income, middle age, low education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0050505</td>
<td>0.0055412</td>
<td>1.097156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Hispanic, low income, young, medium education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0050505</td>
<td>0.0025859</td>
<td>0.5120059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Non-Hispanic White, high income, middle age, high education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.030303</td>
<td>0.0275212</td>
<td>0.9082009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Election Showed a Wider Red-Blue Economic Divide

Some partisan differences were scrambled, but places with brighter future prospects swung toward Biden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>GOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% GDP</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% GDP</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Candidate’s share of 2018 Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by county in the 2020 presidential election

- The less-than-500 counties won by Joe Biden generated 70 percent of America’s GDP in 2018
- The more-than-2400 counties won by Donald Trump generated 29 percent of America’s GDP in 2018

LOCALLY RICH, NATIONALLY POOR

National Income

Local Income

Pr(Trump Vote)

Ogorzalek, Piston, Puig (2020)
LOCALLY RICH, NATIONALLY POOR

Marginal Effects of Income on Pr(Vote Trump)
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Ogorzalek, Piston, Puig (2020)
**White RGAs: Locally rich, but not Republican**

![Graph showing density distribution of local income percentiles for different categories.]

- **White RGA**
- **Non-white RGA**
- **White Non-RGA**
- **Non-white, Non-RGA**

(CCES 2016, Metro residents only)
THE CITY RE-CENTERED
THE CITY RE-CENTERED

Residential Real Estate Land Gradients in Major U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1980 and 2010

Knowledge Economy and Real Estate Gradients

U.S. Census

US Census
Civic participation is lower in gentrifying areas but gentrifiers participate more.

Local Civic Partic.

National Civic Partic.

Political Partic.

Points are estimated marginal effects of variable at left on DV at top, using nearest-neighbor matching. Observations matched on race, gender, income, education, homeownership, and local diversity. Models estimated using pools of respondents indicated in legend.