

5-2017

## **The Effects of Gentrification: Inhabitants, Education, and Displacement**

Marilyn Pineda  
*University of Massachusetts Boston*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umb.edu/honors\\_theses](https://scholarworks.umb.edu/honors_theses)



Part of the [Growth and Development Commons](#), [Public Economics Commons](#), and the [Regional Economics Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Pineda, Marilyn, "The Effects of Gentrification: Inhabitants, Education, and Displacement" (2017). *Honors College Theses*. 28.

[https://scholarworks.umb.edu/honors\\_theses/28](https://scholarworks.umb.edu/honors_theses/28)

This Open Access Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@umb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@umb.edu).

*The Effects of Gentrification: Inhabitants, Education, and Displacement*

Marilyn Pineda

Senior Honors Thesis

Advisor: Andrew Perumal, Economics Department

19 May 2017

## **Introduction**

Locally and internationally, cities that face decades of disinvestment and neglect at one-point experience a resurgence and revival in that location. A city's resurgence and revival is seen in the form of new houses, businesses, and the migration of middle to upper middle class individuals is known as gentrification. Subjectively, Gentrification is beneficial to those who are home owners because they can sell their houses for a higher price than what they bought it for, it is beneficial to the landlord who is able to increase the rents of units (Atkinson 2002). In light of all this, while the homeowners, tenants and middle class individuals enjoy the fresh new city, there are individuals who face negative effects due to gentrification. There will be some renters that no longer are capable of paying the rent and will be displaced. In terms of education, low income families are displaced and that means changing the school the child goes to. With the increase of middle and upper class individuals in a gentrified neighborhood, these families tend to be more involved in the education of their children, and match that with more demands on the local school system (Hankins 2007). The active role of the middle class families is central in driving school improvements, but it is at the expense of all the low income families that have to move from their gentrifying neighborhood and will not be able to take advantage of the resources the schools will offer.

Research has found that the people that are migrating into gentrified neighborhoods are primarily white, professionals and single parents, and it is the lower to working class, the elderly, and unemployed that are being displaced (Atkinson 2000). Beneath this, however, researchers overlook the race of individuals who are being displaced and through one research study it was seen that gentrification displaces blacks and minorities (Kirkland 2008).

The focus of this study is on two cities, the first of them being Harlem, New York.

Harlem was publicly funded during the beginning stages of gentrification and later was privately funded (Smith 1996). Displacement in Harlem, New York was evident. It was low to working

Table 1: Middle School Results

	Lottery RF	Lottery FS	Lottery 2SLS	Distance 2SLS
Math	0.284*** (0.050)	1.240*** (0.075)	0.229*** (0.037)	0.206** (0.092)
ELA	0.059 (0.041)	1.241*** (0.074)	0.047 (0.033)	-0.053 (0.049)
Absences	-2.783*** (0.833)	1.260*** (0.079)	-2.199*** (0.650)	-0.220 (2.544)
On grade level	-0.003 (0.022)	1.240*** (0.075)	-0.002 (0.017)	-0.011 (0.036)
Observations	1,449	1,449	1,449	41,029

Notes: This table reports first-stage, reduced-form, and instrumental variable estimates for the Promise Academy Charter School. The sample for columns 1-3 is restricted to students in the middle school lottery with no sibling preference and who have data for all grades. The sample for column 4 is restricted to students living within 800 meters of the original 24-block HCZ. All regressions pool outcomes for grades 6-8, and control for grade and year of test effects, gender, race, lunch status, previous test scores, previous special education status, and whether the student previously spoke English as second language. Column 3 reports two-stage least squares coefficients using lottery offer as an instrumental variable. Column 4 reports two-stage least squares coefficients using the interaction between cohort and living within the 24-block HCZ as an instrumental variable. The table reports standard errors clustered at the student level in columns 1-3. The standard errors in column 4 allow for two-way clustering at the student and cohort level. Test scores are standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation one by grade in the full New York City sample.

\*\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.  
 \*\* Significant at the 5 percent level.  
 \* Significant at the 10 percent level.

(Dobbie, Fryer, 2011, P.170)

lottery winners that are enrolled in the school perform better than the lottery losers (Dobbie, Fryer 2011). For the case of gentrifying Harlem, the addition of the HCZ is quite beneficial in improving the test scores of students and it is being considered for expansion, with the only limitation being that it is costly. For the case of Harlem, gentrification caused displacement yet, on the bright side, there is a new functioning school program that is enhancing the education of students of lower incomes.

The second case study is of London, England. The term gentrification was coined in

Table 2: Net flows and percentage gain or loss for all 'G' areas between 1981 and 1991

Variable	Net change for all 'G' areas	Percentage gain/loss
Professionals	+ 18 800	+ 20
Inactive	- 38 500	- 46
Working class	- 19 300	- 38
Elderly	- 23 200	- 18
Unskilled	between - 200 and - 1 800	between - 9 and -78
Unemployment	between - 1 600 and + 100	between - 4 and -59
Lone parents	+ 600	+ 4.5

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p.162)

class individuals that were being displaced and the displacees were primarily minorities (Recoquillon 2014). On the topic of education, the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ) originated with the purpose of serving low income families. The core difference of the HCZ was that it integrated a charter school with community programs for the students. Overall, as seen in table 1, the HCZ was able to see that the

England back in 1964 by Ruth Glass.

Gentrification was seen to take place when middle-class incomer families purchased slum properties and transformed them into attractive dwellings (Moran 2007). In table 2, it shows the net flows

for all gentrified areas of London. The first thing to note is the positive net change of professionals and lone parents in gentrified areas. The second thing to notice that is primarily the inactive, the working class and the elderly that are displaced from the gentrifying neighborhood (Atkinson 2000). For London, instead of examining the effects of school systems in gentrifying neighborhood, I examined the parental choice families face when gentrification occurs. It was concluded that parents that are displaced but had their eyes set on sending their kids to a school in the gentrifying neighborhood face the problem of not being able to send them there anymore (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden 2013). There is a divide that is seen in well performing schools versus low performing schools. The middle and upper class individuals send their kids to well performing schools and that leaves the working and lower class families with no option except to send their kids to relatively lower performing schools (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden 2013). Parents who are displaced are not able to apply to schools in the gentrified neighborhood they left because it is not within the designated radius of where they now live. Soon enough, displaced individuals who are elderly, low income, and working class, are on the outskirts of gentrified neighborhoods and they send their kids to school where all the other displaced families send theirs. This is the main negative effect of gentrification in parental choice for education. Schools that are performing well have a heavy population of students who are middle and upper class and displaced families are not able to send their kids to those schools because they will not get in based on their distance from those schools.

Gentrification is multifaceted. It is the seed that is planted and watered, it is financed and once it flourishes there is a neighborhood that is now able to enjoy the new amenities and facilities that come along with it. As idealistic as it sounds, in real life, not everyone will have the pleasure to enjoy the new facilities and live within those neighborhoods. It is time for policy

change, time to bring in a fair system to choose students for a school, a fair chance to allow low and working class individuals to also enjoy the gentrifying neighborhood.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Defining gentrification***

During the 1960's there were neighborhoods that slowly were beginning to revitalize with new homes and businesses. In turn, citizens were moving out from their neighborhoods and relocating to fit their needs. In London 1964, the term gentrification was coined by Ruth Glass as a process where "many working-class quarters of London have been invaded by middle classes-upper and lower" (Smith, 1996, p.31). Glass even noted that when the middle class comes in to reside in the primarily working class town, the working class households are displaced. In the early years, it is noted that gentrification was centered at the heart of class division.

Since the late 1990's the concept of gentrification has broadened and there is a variance in research that attempts to understand the dynamics of gentrification. It has been noted that gentrification harms in other forms alongside class divide. Rowland Atkinson, in the Urban Studies department at the University of Sheffield, defined gentrification as being "the rehabilitation of working-class and derelict housing and the consequent transformation of an area into a middle-class neighborhood" (Atkinson, 2002, p.2). In the article *Does Gentrification Help or Harm Urban Neighbourhoods?*, Atkinson lays out the positive and negative outcomes that arrive from gentrification. Gentrification, according to Atkinson, can be quite subjective depending on people's perspective, interests and what actually affects them. There are citizens that can see that the increases in house prices is good for home sellers but they are not beneficial for home buyers. In the mix of it all, there will be individuals who benefit from gentrification and others who will be affected negatively by it.

The conversation on gentrification has encompassed displacement and homelessness because it has been occurring to people that were not able to afford the high cost of living in gentrifying neighborhoods. Atkinson took notice that although there are some positive outcomes that result from gentrification such as decreased crime, and an improvement on the local shops, the negative results trump the positive outcomes. There are people who are displaced and who can no longer pay their rent, some even become homeless. This is where gentrification becomes an important issue to examine.

Gentrification has undergone a vital transition from focusing on the upheaval of the neighborhoods that were not given a lot of attention and care to a focus on the society and the effects it has on those displaced and those who remain living there. The experience of gentrification is a unique one, where on the surface tourist and visitors admire the neighborhoods for the new local shops and the redeveloped housing. Underneath all of the aesthetics, the negatives of gentrification have become a hidden and neglected issue. The term gentrification is no longer defining the urban landscape, but the extension in the definition has become inclusive of people and their situations after gentrification has occurred. In the early 1960's, gentrification was known as the fluctuation of people being residents in a neighborhood, this is no longer so today. Gentrification no longer is narrowly defined by the housing market. Now, the definition of gentrification takes into account the restructuring of social classes and developments in the urban landscape.

### ***Gentrification and displacement***

With the enhancements that occur in gentrifying neighborhoods, such as remodeling of houses, arrivals of new businesses, and an increase in recreational activities, there are residents that are impacted by it and no longer are able to remain in their neighborhood. There is

speculation in regards to residents being displaced but on the contradictory side, researchers believe that there is no displacement and people are being mobile for their own reasons. Lance Freeman, a professor in Urban Planning at the University of Columbia in the city of New York, conducted a study of whether gentrification was causing displacement or mobility. In the article, *Displacement or Succession? Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods*, Freeman defined gentrification to be consistent with two conditions. The conditions that Freeman applies to a gentrifying neighborhood is that “it must be located in a central city at the beginning of the intercensal period, a median income less than the median (40<sup>th</sup> percentile) for that metropolitan area at the beginning of the intercensal period. The neighborhood must have a proportion of housing built within the past 20 years lower than the proportion found at the median for the respective metropolitan area. The neighborhood must have a percentage increase in educational attainment greater than the median increase in educational attainment for that metropolitan area and there has to be an increase in real housing prices during the intercensal period” (Freeman, 2005, p.471-472). These are the conditions that Freeman prescribed to neighborhoods in order for them to be considered gentrified.

In Freeman’s research, he used the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) which is a longitudinal household survey started in 1968 that collects a large spectrum of socio-demographic data over multiple generations for approximately 5,000 households. Freeman’s research does not focus on a specific state but rather on the nation. There are two ways that Freeman measured displacement; he looked at “all types of residential mobility as a proxy for displacement, and all respondents who give their reason for moving” (Freeman, 2005, p. 468-469). From this, he collected his data and was able to come to a conclusion of patterns he saw in gentrification.



Freeman discovered from his study that displacement and higher mobility does not play a major role in gentrification. Neighborhoods will undergo gentrification but there will not be any displacement that occurs. What Freeman did note was that gentrification was able to increase investment as well as attract middle-class households to neighborhoods that were poorly maintained and not heavily invested in, in terms of housing and community urban landscape. With that in mind, Freeman stated that the positive effects of gentrification could potentially end up enhancing the tax base of many central cities and even “increase the socioeconomic integration” (Freeman, 2005, p.488).

Although Freeman was not able to find a connection between the gentrifying neighborhoods and displacement, there are some limitations in his research that can cloud the view of displacement occurring in gentrifying neighborhoods. Since the PSID looks at data over time, Jeffrey E. Zabel explored the attrition rates in the PSID. In the article *An Analysis of Attrition in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics and the Survey of Income and Program*

Table 3: Number and Percentage of Attritors

Wave	Number in Sample	Number Leaving	Marginal	Exit Rates Cumulative <sup>a</sup>	Conditional
<b>PSID</b>					
1	8,324	1,278	15.4	15.4	15.4
2	7,046	220	2.6	18.0	3.1
3	6,826	152	1.8	9.8	2.2
4	6,674	101	1.2	21.0	1.5
5	6,573	152	1.8	22.9	2.3
6	6,421	140	1.7	24.5	2.2
7	6,281	109	1.3	25.9	1.7
8	6,172	142	1.7	27.6	2.3
9	6,030	104	1.2	28.8	1.7
10	5,926	31	1.6	30.4	2.2
11	5,795	114	1.4	31.8	2.0
12	5,681	101	1.2	33.0	1.8
13	5,580	97	1.2	34.1	1.7
14	5,483	75	0.9	35.0	1.4
15	5,408	88	1.1	36.1	1.6
16	5,320	99	1.2	37.3	1.9
17	5,221	97	1.2	38.4	1.9
18	5,124	116	1.4	39.8	2.3
19	5,008	87	1.0	40.9	1.7
20	4,921	82	1.0	41.9	1.7
21	4,839			58.1	

(Zabel, 1998, p.486)

*Participation with an*

*Application to a Model*

*of Labor Market*

*Behavior, Zabel defined*

*attrition as being the exit*

*of participants in the*

*sample. In table 3, Zabel*

*looks at the Wave*

number and the attrition rate. What was found was that PSID has a high attrition rate when there is a big sample number, the smaller the sample size, the lower the attrition rate. As can be seen,

there was about 8,000 households in the first wave and 1,278 households left the sample. With a big sample it is expected to have higher chance of people exiting the sample. Now in the 20<sup>th</sup> wave, there was a sample size of about 5,000 and the number of households that left the study was 82. What can be seen is that the bigger the sample size the higher the attrition rate, the smaller the sample size the less people exit. Also, the number of people who exit increases when they have to do a lot of interviews or follow-ups. Further, if it is the smaller samples that are used to determine displacement then the findings of Freeman (2005) cannot be generalized to the entire country.

It is also important to note that there is an issue with using the PSID as some gentrifying neighborhoods may be in the early stages of gentrification while other neighborhoods have had many years of being gentrified. The reason that the age of a neighborhood being gentrified matters is because the neighborhoods in the earlier stages of gentrification may not have residents who have experienced displacement just yet. Although Freeman found that displacement did not occur when looking at the PSID, Richard LeGates and Chester Hartman have an opposing conclusion. In *Gentrification-causes Displacement*, Le Gates and Hartman examine how 16 cities experienced gentrification, which caused displacement in some cities and not in others. In their article, they examined the in-movers and out-movers to gentrifying neighborhoods as well as what might have motivated them to move. The age of the in-movers tended to be relatively homogeneous in age and principally young adults (LeGates & Hartman 1982). The Boston Bay Village had 42% of its buyers and 43% of its renters between the ages of 25 to 45 years of age. There is a good population of the people moving into gentrifying cities that are within the ages of a post graduate and someone close to their fifties. LeGates and Hartman made the claim that most in-movers are primarily white and that they fall within the middle to

upper end of the income range. They also found that “the head of most in-mover households is employed in a professional or managerial capacity. 55% of the buyers in Boston’s Bay Village and 57% in West Cambridge were professionals” (LeGates & Hartman 1982). When a neighborhood was under the process of gentrification, the new housing, amenities and revival of the city captured the eye of individuals in their 20’s in the middle to upper income status. Regarding out-movers, LeGates and Hartman found that they tended to resettle close to the neighborhood from which they moved from. In the 1980’s the average out-mover income was between the ranges of \$8,000 to \$14,000. Interestingly enough, the people who are moving into gentrified cities are people who are of middle income and higher while those who are moving out are people that fall at the lower end of middle income. This is a perspective that examines how gentrification causes displacement and for the most part, displaced individuals make below middle income earnings, it is not the upper middle class that are moving out.

Another perspective to take into consideration is this issue about race and gentrification. Freeman was not able to find a connection between displacement and gentrification but Elizabeth Kirkland (2008) made the case that displacement does occur and it is seen when white people take over minority cities. A small sampling of interviews conducted in North Nashville, an area that is close to completely gentrified, raised intriguing conclusions. Both black and white residents saw that there was a racial transformation that came from gentrification. Longtime residents can recall when the residents in the gentrified area were nearly all African American (Kirkland, 2008, P25). It was also noted that there has been a continued rise in white residents and that there is a decrease in racial diversity. Kirkland made the case that “while common lore holds that gentrification is often a fundamentally racial phenomenon- where white in-movers wrest the space from African American displacees or other original residents of color- research

to date fall short in a head-on examination of the racial impact of gentrification” (Kirkland, 2008, P29). To Kirkland, this is a substantial dimension of gentrification that had been overlooked by researchers.

Gentrification is a steady process that over time enhances the physical environment of a neighborhood. It is understandable that gentrification will not happen to all the cities in a state because not all places are equally desirable, and the associated funding is not easily available. Gentrification progressively changes a neighborhood and it is expected for there to be different neighborhoods at distinct levels of gentrification. Even when new houses are built and shops are created, it takes time for there to be an effect on the residents of that neighborhood. It does not happen overnight where cost of living and the housing prices increase. Residents of the neighborhood begin to speculate that their neighborhood is changing and that there are people moving in, and businesses being constructed. Over time the cost of living in that neighborhood increases, both in terms of rent increases, as well as the values of homes. In result, individuals begin not being able to afford living in that neighborhood and decide to leave.

Although Freeman has conducted his study and found that gentrification does not cause displacement, and while other researchers agree on that, it does not conclude that gentrification does not cause displacement. Displacement is the act of a resident unwillingly moving to a different neighborhood because of varying factors. Displacement may not be as evident within the first couple of stages of gentrification within a city, but when higher levels of gentrification is reached there is a couple of reasons why people moving is considered displacement. Referring to LeGates and Hartman, the authors state that different social classes had different impacts from gentrification. For the residents that were making less than middle income, then they were most likely the ones who are displaced because they can no longer afford their current situation and

must move to accommodate their relatively lower earnings. As for the residents who are upper middle class, they have the option of staying in their gentrified neighborhood or moving to a neighborhood or city that is even better. It is also important to be reminded of Elizabeth Kirkland's research, that race is a major point of being able to spot gentrification; there are many white individuals who move into gentrifying neighborhoods while minorities are moving out. Displacement can be seen as the act of driving a certain race or class that rents, out of a neighborhood just to have them go somewhere else to be worse-off in terms of access to amenities and their preferred location. For owners of homes, they are more likely to be moving willingly because as house prices increase in a gentrifying area, they may choose to sell their house and move. Some home owners might stay in the neighborhood to take advantage of the changes to the amenities. Not many people will trade their current situation for one of lesser value unless you can no longer afford the current situation. Gentrified neighborhoods attract 'white' individuals and as soon as the community dynamics alter, the effects of race and class that come from gentrification shows displacement. There are people who are low income that have to move out and readjust while the upper class do not. As for race, the minority groups will be displaced because they can no longer keep up with their expenses. Displacement is the thin line where someone was comfortably living in a home and then the neighborhood is gentrified and they can no longer afford it so they have to move to a neighborhood close by but with cheaper rent. Displacement is also compromised of racial access and how majority of the time minorities move out from their homes in gentrified neighborhoods while whites move in. Unfortunately, this lavish reconstruction of a city cannot be enjoyed by everyone.

### *Gentrification and inhabitants*

When a neighborhood undergoes gentrification, there is speculation about whether there is displacement within the inhabitants. To zone in deeper into that speculation, Jackelyn Hwang and Robert J Sampson performed a study where they look at racial hierarchy alongside gentrification. In the article *Divergent Pathways of Gentrification: Racial inequality and the social order of renewal in Chicago Neighborhoods*, Hwang and Sampson conduct a study where they examine a gentrifying neighborhood and see how over time the neighborhood undergoes changes with the races of the residents and the overall aesthetic of that neighborhood.

Hwang and Sampson do not include displacement in their definition of gentrification. Gentrification is known as “the process by which central urban neighborhoods that have undergone disinvestments and economic decline experience a reversal, reinvestment and the immigration of a relatively well-off middle and upper class population” (Hwang & Sampson, 2014, p.727). In the definition that they used, there are two things to make note of. The first thing is that there is no mention of displacement and the second thing is that there is no mention of racial turnover. Instead the focus is on social classes and the modifications conducted in a neighborhood.

Hwang and Sampson were able to draw out how people of different races have preferences about who resides in their neighborhood. The patterns that is seen in gentrification is that all of the race groups (Black, White, Latino, and Asian) prefer to have a neighborhood that is diverse but also has a substantial presence of their same-race neighbors. Along with that, it was also seen that “whites have the strongest preference for same race neighbors, blacks have the weakest. Latinos and Asians favor integration when potential outgroup neighbors are white. When the outgroup neighbors are black, Latinos and Asians favor co-ethnic neighbors over integration (Hwang & Sampson, 2014, p.727-728). From this research we are able to tell the

preferences of races within a gentrifying neighborhood. Gentrification causes changes in the class structure and it causes minorities to be more susceptible to displacement. Another way to look at gentrification is through the process of studying the urban landscape changes that occur in that neighborhood.

Hwang and Sampson did an experiment where they spent time looking at the gentrifying neighborhoods over time through the google maps feature. What they ended up discovering was that there was a new light shed on the debates of gentrification. It was noted that there was poor reinvestment in some neighborhoods and that caused urban inequality to worsen. Hwang and Sampson state that “white neighborhoods that are gentrified and continue upward offer potential for original low-income residents to be displaced. Nearby minority neighborhoods tend to remain disadvantaged and isolated” (Hwang & Sampson, 2014, p.743). Gentrification poses an issue when there is an imbalance in spending. When white neighborhoods that are gentrified continue to spend money on the beautification of a neighborhood then the low-income residents will become displaced. The low-income residents soon will turn to a neighborhood that is poorly invested in or turn to a neighborhood that is not up to par to the gentrifying neighborhood. This causes certain neighborhoods to be poorly financed while others are being remodeled. Along with that, low-income residents start to move out of the neighborhood they once resided in and have to move to the outskirts where low-income residents all gather. This becomes an issue because instead of prioritizing the neighborhoods that are poorly invested in the attention is on the neighborhoods that are already undergoing gentrification.

With the insight that Hwang and Sampson provided, it is evident that over time gentrifying neighborhoods receive the lime light in regards to funding unlike neighborhoods that are not undergoing gentrification. A good amount of quantitative studies on gentrification

usually end up relying on census and administrative measures that lack direct indicators of a neighborhood upgrading (Hwang & Sampson, 2014, p.726-727). The issue that comes with using a census based strategy is that they overlook changes that the urban landscape undergoes. Census data demonstrates the quantitative values but the quantitative values do not actually represent what physical changes the environment is going through. Quantitative data gives a limited scope of what goes on politically and economically in a gentrified neighborhood. Hwang and Sampson ensured that their study focused on both quantitative and qualitative data in order to get the entire scope of things in a gentrifying neighborhood. It is critical to note other neighborhoods, within a close proximity to those that are gentrifying, would benefit from public investment either by creating schools, opening up new businesses or facilities, to improve the amenities of that neighborhood.

On the topic of inhabitants, race was a topic that Hwang and Sampson addressed. Extending the classification of inhabitants, Jacob Vigdor makes the claim that gentrification does not harm the poor in his article “*Does Gentrification Harm the Poor?*”. Vigdor examines the South End, Boston from 1940-2000 and looks at the census tract to see trends. In table 4, it is clear that the population of tract 708 (South End) has increased over time. The vacancy rate

Table 4: Long-run Demographic Trends in Census Tract 708, Boston\*

Percent unless otherwise indicated							
Demographic characteristic	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000
Population (N)	5,177	5,624	3,728	2,305	2,742	3,274	3,600
Vacancy rate	7.9	0.9	13.6	22.9	16.6	13.2	1.8
Adults with college degree	2.8	3.7	3.5	10.5	26.5	54.0	n.a.
Workers in professional or managerial occupations	9.1	7.6	5.6	10.6	30.3	55.3	n.a.
Ratio of tract median income to city median income	n.a.	0.603	0.618	0.667	0.832	1.037	n.a.
White (non-Hispanic) residents	43.1	24.7	7.9	13.4	29.6	58.6	58.2
Black residents	56.5	74.8	89.8	83.7	63.3	34.9	26.6

Source: U.S. Decennial Census reports.  
 n.a. Not available.  
 a. Before 1970, tract was designated "L-2."

(Vigdor, 2002, p. 137).

decreased and over time the population of the tract consisted of adults with a college degree. Prior to gentrification in 1960,

there was 89.8% of black residents and 7.9% of white residents. In the 2000, there is now 26.6%



of black residents and 58.2% of white residents. It is evident that gentrification resulted in changes to the racial characteristics of that neighborhood.

Vigdor, after examining the dynamics of the South End between 1970-1998, was able to find that gentrification does indeed cause displacement. From the study that Vigdor conducted, he concluded that an absolute decline in living standards can be identified for only a small number of households. Vigdor states that “Gentrification might make central city neighborhoods more attractive to low-status households for several reasons. Employment prospects in the city might improve. Increases in the city’s tax base might promote higher quality public services” (Vigdor, 2002, p171). The poor do not get affected tremendously by gentrification but rather benefit from economic possibilities that gentrification brings to the neighborhood is what Vigdor argues.

When Vigdor makes the claim that the poor will not get affected by gentrification is a bit misleading. Without the appropriate income, gentrification can swallow them in debt from not being able to pay their rent, there could be more amenities but that does not mean that it falls within the bracket of accessibility for low income families. If in gentrified neighborhoods there are some public schools and private schools, the middle class will try to enlist their children in the private school while those who are of low-income will not be able to afford it.

For the inhabitants of a gentrified neighborhood, there are some interesting dynamics that occur. Hwang and Sampson take the approach of examining the race in a neighborhood and how different races have preferences. Extending the idea, Vigdor makes the case that gentrification will not harm poor people. The problem is that if the poor people are no longer able to afford the cost of living in their current residency, then they will have to move out. As noted in table 1, there was a huge drop over time in black residents as white residents moved in. If there are also

low income residents in a neighborhood, then there will be racial divide in accessibility to facilities such as schools or even housing. The families that are low income will have to settle for the public schools for their children, while the upper class has more options right at their fingertips. Although Vigdor claims that gentrification will not harm the poor, I disagree, low-income individuals will become harmed by the poor access they will have to amenities and education as well as to their living conditions. If poor residents have to move out of their gentrified neighborhood, that will also cause them harm because they have to go somewhere else where they do not have the same access to the new facilities a gentrified neighborhood has.

### ***Gentrification and Education***

Gentrification takes an effect on the aesthetics of a neighborhood, as well as the social structure. Along with those effects, gentrification also impacts education. When a neighborhood is undergoing renovations then the neighborhood attracts a different group of people. As people are beginning to move into these neighborhoods then education is impacted. There is now a new group of kids that are going to be enrolled in these schools. If the gentrifying neighborhood is moving out low-income individuals, then middle and upper classes is what remains. With the middle and upper class, there is more of a possibility that prior to moving to a gentrifying neighborhood their kids were in a charter or private school since it is affordable for them, while the low-income families send their kids to public schools. Parents moving into gentrifying neighborhoods look to improve the opportunities for their kids by pushing for a charter school in the area or even enhancing the public school (Hankins 2007).

In reference to the opportunities that low, middle, and upper class have on education in a gentrifying neighborhood is discussed by Reed Jordan and Megan Gallagher. In the article *Does School Choice Affect Gentrification*, Jordan and Gallagher define school choice as being the

arrangement by which parents decide where they want to enroll their child (Jordan & Gallagher, 2015, p.2). In some locations, parents are able to look at their options and decide where they want to enroll their children. In other locations, the students are assigned to a school based on the neighborhood they reside in. In their article, Jordan and Gallagher mention that nonwhite low-income parents do not have the same opportunity to be able to exercise their school-choice options like the white upper-income parents do (Jordan & Gallagher, 2015, p.3). It is evident that middle and upper-class parents have more of a flexibility to decide where they want to send their kids. When the middle and upper class parents send their kids to charter or private schools then public schools begin to lose students from that socioeconomic background and that causes a marginalization of low-income students in public schools. When a neighborhood is undergoing gentrification, it attracts a wide range of people. There are people who want to move there because of accessibility, the new homes, the businesses that are flourishing. Precisely due to middle and high-income families wanting to move into gentrifying neighborhoods, public schools need to focus its attention on enhancing their programs that will draw families of all socioeconomic backgrounds in. That will prevent the gentrifying neighborhood from isolating the low-income residents.

As mentioned before, the middle class living in the gentrifying neighborhood have an effect on the school system by bringing to rise charter schools in the area. Katherine B. Hankins, a professor at the Georgia State University, wrote *The Final Frontier: Charter Schools as New Community Institutions of Gentrification* to lay out the framework of how a gentrified community was able to change the school system in their community. In Atlanta, Georgia, the Neighborhood Charter School opened in August 2002. The charter school was developed through the parents and residents of the neighborhood who raised money and gained school-

district approval for the charter school. The United States public education system has undergone some transformations where public schools are not the first option for middle class parents but rather magnet schools, school vouchers, and charter schools are. A charter school is a publicly funded independent school. Within a charter school, the curriculum is different from that of a public school. What is important to make note of is that charter schools are heavily influenced by decisions parents make as well as the community.

Katherine Hankins, analyzes the Grant Park Neighborhood of Atlanta. By the “1970’s, the area was predominantly dominated by lower-income African Americans. By the 1980s the neighborhood began to experience an economic rebirth, as middle-class residents began gentrifying the area.” (Hankins 2007, p.118). From the 2000 US census, the area is now racially mixed, 57% of the residents were white, 39% were black, and 7% were Hispanic. In Hankins study of the Atlanta neighborhood, she used archival analysis and interviews. Prior to gentrifying Grant Park neighborhood, it was zoned off by five different elementary schools. The schools were populated by low-income, minority families. When Grant Park neighborhood was gentrified, the middle class families did not see the public school as an option for their children (Hankins 2007, p.119). In an effort to keep middle class families in the neighborhood, the charter school started so that families will not try to go live out in the suburbs. Within the course of a couple of interviews, there were some parents who favored the charter school in the area because they felt that it brought the community together. As for other families, there were racial complexities that they faced. There was one parent of a child that was enrolled in the Neighborhood Charter School and was blunt about the organizers “people who started that school are upwardly mobile and white” (Hankins 2007, p. 124). The implication in this parent’s statement is that diversity may be the goal of the school but the founders of the charter school

were not diverse themselves. There is a very thin line of the diverse atmosphere that could be found in a charter school. Hankins makes the case in her article that the gentrifiers of the 2000's are remodifying neighborhoods so that they have a community feel to it. To be able to encourage inner city revitalization charter schools are being constructed. Yet the attempt to unify a community can leave out lower middle classes as well as those who are minorities.

In terms of the public school system, Micere Keels, Julia Burdick-Will, and Sara Keene, conducted a study with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). Keels, Burdick-Will, and Keene studied Chicago, the third largest school district in the United States, and looked at the effects of gentrification on school-level student math and reading in elementary schools. They collected data from 1992-1993 and from 2003-2004 and used the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Testing was done on third graders because any sign of the effect of gentrification was thought to come out of younger children (Keels, Burdick-Will & Keene, 2013, p.244). From looking at the gentrifying Chicago neighborhoods and the testing results from the CPS, "reading and math scores growth and the percentage change in neighborhood income and education are all positive which means that as an area changes and becomes gentrified then test scores increase" (Keels, Burdick-Will, & Keene, 2013, p.247). Schools that were located in neighborhoods with a growing fraction of higher-income residents, but not better-educated residents, ended up seeing a very small annual increase in the test scores of the third graders. Further, there were no significant effects of racial or even ethnic changes in gentrifying neighborhoods. As a final result, from the study conducted, with gentrification there was "no effects on the growth trajectory of low-income students reading and math scores" (Keels, Burdick-Will, & Keene, p.255).

A few of limitations of the study design could have driven its outcomes. The research was focused on the public school system, and it would be interesting to see how much funding

the school receives and what other programs they offer that allowed there to be no major changes in the math and reading test scores of third graders. Another issue that can be taken into account is that their focus was on third graders. The reason that there could be an issue is third graders are still young and parents are more likely to keep on moving to different areas. The kids are also young which makes it difficult to be able to see any huge discrepancies in their math and reading scores. With all this in mind, although gentrification was occurring and there were no effects on the reading and math scores for students, there are some limitations to take into consideration for their study.

### ***Significance and Implications of this Study***

The intention of this study is to make bring to light the underlying processes that take place when gentrification occurs in an area. The underlying processes include but not limited to race, investment, displacement and education. I intend to analyze education and the effects that gentrification has on parental choice and the effectiveness of charter schools. In order to understand gentrification better, I examined two cities, Harlem and London, to be able to paint a better picture of the displacement that occurs along with the changes in their education.

### **Case Study: Harlem, New York**

#### ***Gentrification***

Harlem is a city that is located to the north of New York City. Harlem represented an international symbol of black culture and was known to be a ghetto. When gentrification came around to affecting Harlem, blacks as well as other minority populations were displaced according to Neil Smith in *The New Urban Frontier*. The reason that Harlem was expected to undergo gentrification was due to it being in the proximity of other high rent cities and the other reason was that due to Harlem's sustained disinvestment, Harlem had low rents and land values.

In the 1970's "Harlem represented Manhattan's largest concentration of working-class

*Table 5: Statistical Profile of the Central Harlem (New York) population, 1980*

	Central Harlem	Manhattan
Percentage population black	96.1	21.7
Per capita income (\$)	4,308	10,992
Percentage high-income households (\$50,000+)	0.5	8.4
Percentage low-income households (less than \$10,000)	65.5	37.4
Percentage college graduates (adults with 4+ years of college)	5.2	33.2
Median contract rent (\$ per month)	149	198
Percentage managerial, professional, and related occupations	15.9	41.7
Private property turnover rate per year (1980-1983) (%)	3.3	5.0
Population change, 1970-80 (%)	-33.6	-7.2
Percentage housing abandoned	24.2	5.3

*Sources:* US Department of Commerce 1972, 1983; City of New York, Department of City Planning 1981; Real Estate Board of New York 1985

(Smith, 1996, p.143).

residences with virtually no gentrification" (Smith,

1996, p.141). Table 5 shows a statistical profile of

Central Harlem and Manhattan in the 1980s. The first

point to understand about Harlem is that in comparison

to Manhattan, Central Manhattan it is 21.7%. The per

capita income in Manhattan is double that of Central

Harlem and there is a higher percentage of low-income

households in Central Harlem than in Manhattan. Prior

to gentrification, Central Harlem was a neighborhood

that was made up mostly of black low-income

residents.

One major investment in Central Harlem was a 599-unit condominium that altered the physical, social, and financial composition of Central Harlem. In 1985, the city received a grant to subsidize the condominiums; this project was "by far the largest private residential capital investment in Harlem in decades" (Smith, 1996, p.151). The way that the units were able to be purchased was based on the income of families and the apartments were 70% for middle income residents and 10% for high income earning residents. The cheapest condominiums were still too expensive for the residents in Harlem who were making about \$34,000 (Smith, 1996, p.151). There was a rise in the property markets and it was caused by the socioeconomic changes that Harlem was undergoing in relation to their physical structures.

Harlem was starting to be gentrified in the 1980s and as a strategy to gentrify, the City of Harlem applied limited public funds to bolster areas where the private market was already

becoming active. As a result of the private market becoming more active, private investment became the major driver of the growing disparity. There was a major auction held in Harlem in 1985. There was “194 additional town houses put on the block. 1,257 bids were received and the winners paid between \$2K and 163K” (Smith, 1996, p.156). As a result, the population loss in Harlem slowed down and the non-black population doubled to 7.5% in 1990 and there was an increase in the per capita income in Harlem. Since Harlem was receiving private investment, disparity grew because private investment does not cater to low income minority families and thus it fulfills the expectations that come with gentrification. This was the transition point of where the dilapidated neighborhood was no longer in the ruins and gentrification changed the social and economic aspects of Harlem.

### ***Displacement***

When gentrification occurs in neighborhoods that are poorly maintained, some of the easily accessible amenities become more expensive and soon enough only accessible to certain income brackets. In the article *The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City*, Kathe Newman and Elvin Wyly discuss gentrification in New York City and how some people feel when it occurs. In their study, they conducted 33 interviews with different people from seven gentrifying sub-borough areas. When Wyly and Newman identify the negative impacts of gentrification they define it as “not only of residents who are immediately displaced by gentrification processes but also of the impact of the restructuring of urban space on the ability of low-income residents to move into neighborhoods that once provided ample supplied of affordable living arrangements” (Newman & Wyly, 2006, p. 26). The negatives effects include displacement as well as the modification of the businesses around town that affect who can access it. The reason that residents from their neighborhoods are



displaced is a result from “housing demolition, ownerships conversion of rental units, increased housing costs (taxes, rent), landlord harassment and evictions. (Newman & Wyly, 2006, p. 27). In the case of Harlem, when gentrification occurred, residents had mixed feelings about it. Some residents began to fear that their shopping ways will come with a high price tag and that eventually they will be displaced because they will not be able to afford it. There were some residents of Harlem that were frustrated because they spent years trying to improve their neighborhood during critical times that they would not be able to live there once things become more expensive. According to some neighborhood informants, “many displacees are moving out of the city to upstate New York. Community residents in Harlem described a reverse great migration with many residents” (Newman & Wyly, 2006, p. 46). When Harlem underwent gentrification, not every resident benefited from it, most low income residents suffered from it.

Harlem was nowhere near close to having the population of about 333,000 back in the 1990s. To even go further, when the process of gentrification began in the 1980s, the Koch administration, began a construction and housing rehabilitation program. Under the Koch administration, as houses were being constructed, there was an upgrade in Harlem’s neighborhoods. With the upgrade, homebuyers found interest in living in Harlem for its renovations and a new population of individuals moved in. In the article, *Neoliberalization and Spatial (In)Justice: The Gentrification of Harlem*, Charlotte Recoquillon studies gentrification and displacement in Harlem. During the 1950’s, blacks made up 98% of central Harlem’s 237,467 inhabitants (Recoquillon, 2014, p. 5). Yet, during the 1990’s in Harlem there was a decline in the population to 101,026 residents. This sharp decline shows the number of people who left the neighborhood either due to displacement or because they are looking for a new neighborhood. Table 6 shows the decline of Central Harlem’s black population starting from

1990 to 2010. What can be seen is that there is a decline in the non- Hispanic blacks in the

Table 6: The decline of Central Harlem’s black population since 1990

	1990		2000		2010	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>Non-Hispanic whites</b>	1511	<b>1.5</b>	2189	<b>2.0</b>	11050	<b>9.5</b>
<b>Non-Hispanic blacks</b>	87149	<b>87.6</b>	82750	<b>77.3</b>	72858	<b>63.0</b>

community from 1990-2000, alongside there is an increase in the non-Hispanic white population. This is to say that

7 over time, gentrification is

starting to affect the

population. There are more

individuals who are moving

into the neighborhood and

there is a drop in the black

population and an increase in

the white population. Knowing that Harlem, throughout history, has symbolized black culture caused a lot of black people move into Harlem “for what it symbolizes and to play a social, economic, and cultural role” (Recoquillon, 2014, p. 8). Black people feel proud of their black community that when whites start to move in they feel threatened. Although there is a strong black community in Harlem, it will only be in due time that low-income black people will have to relocate due to the increases in prices of commodities and rent.

Peter Marcuse in his article *Gentrification, Abandonment and Displacement: Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City*, speaks on behalf of gentrification that occurred in New York City and focuses on several boroughs including Harlem. Marcuse stated that the residents of a neighborhood “are displaced when gentrification takes place because the building and neighborhoods are too expensive for them” (Marcuse, 1985, p. 201).



<b>Hispanics</b>	10055	<b>10.1</b>	18019	<b>16.8</b>	25692	<b>22.2</b>
<b>Other</b>	804	<b>0.8</b>	4151	<b>3.9</b>	6123	<b>5.3</b>
<b>Total Population</b>	99519	<b>100</b>	107109	<b>100</b>	115723	<b>100</b>

Sources: Bureau of Census, Census 1990, 2000 and 2010 (NYC City Planning Department)

(Recoquillon, 2014, p. 7-8)

When new businesses move into a neighborhood and take over local shops, the prices of

Table 7: Index of Population Change-College Graduates

Area	Census Tract	Population		College Graduates		Percent Change Compared to N.Y.C.*
		1970	1980	1970	1980	
Clinton	121	5,790	8,271	455	2,079	+ 12.71
	127	8,622	7,158	352	916	+ 4.1
	139	9,617	9,904	1,632	2,822	+ 7.0
Upper West Side	149	2,102	5,345	728	2,593	+ 9.3
Manhattan Valley	153	8,177	7,865	2,198	3,545	+13.6
East Harlem	189	16,021	11,903	913	824	+ 3.3
	195	8,823	8,900	1,731	2,495	+ 3.8
Lower East Side	170	9,840	6,911	321	252	- 4.2
	160.2	3,239	3,024	655	945	+ 6.5
East Side	22.01	8,147	6,487	512	341	- 5.6
	36.02	3,437	3,437	327	385	- 2.9
	38	10,456	8,665	1,137	2,271	+11.0
N.Y.C. All:		7,894,862	7,071,639	506,501	776,557	(+ 4.6)**

\*See *supra* note 41.

\*\* percent change, N.Y.C.

(Marcuse, 1985, P. 220)

are displaced from a unit that they currently occupy, “the other form is when the landlord raises the rent beyond the occupant’s ability to pay, and forces them to move” (Marcuse, 1985, p.205).

Displacement takes form in two manners, according to Marcuse, it occurs when people have to move due to increases in rent and unaffordable cost of living in that area. Some signs of gentrification can be an increase in the college graduates who now reside in that neighborhood and also looking at the higher rents. In table 7 the focus is on the college graduates that have lived in different areas. Looking at the Harlem row, you can see that the population of Harlem has gone down by only a tad bit but there was a 44% increase in the number of college graduates residing there. When there is an increase of college graduates, it means that they are educated individuals who more often than not have a higher paying job than the people who are not a college graduates. That means that their disposable income is greater than the individuals who do not have that background and it can also cause a rise in the cost of amenities in Harlem. In table 8, the focus is on housing and the rent tenants are paying. In Harlem, there was a decrease in the occupied rental units between 1970 to 1980 from 1,117 occupied rental units to 1,211. This table

amenities will increase. When the prices of amenities increase and the cost of rent and home ownership increase, people would not be able to afford it and as a result they have to find a place to live somewhere else. Marcuse stated that displacement occurs when residents

looks at the cost of the rental units, in 1970, 99 of the rented units were over \$250. That is a

Table 8: Index of Housing Change- Tenants Paying Higher Rents

Area	Census Tract	Occupied Rental Units		Units Rented for		Percent Change Compared to N.Y.C.*
		1970	1980	over \$250	over \$500	
Clinton	121	3,281	4,823	142	291	+ 1.6
	127	3,955	3,668	37	8	- 8.6
	139	5,933	6,691	765	1,109	+ 3.5
Upper West Side	149	1,023	3,293	261	1,959	+33.8
Manhattan Valley	153	4,476	4,426	1,311	1,431	+ 2.9
East Harlem	189	5,184	4,316	128	47	- 1.5
	195	3,966	3,883	106	287	+ 4.6
Lower East Side	170	2,385	2,518	17	0	- .1
	160.02	1,117	1,211	99	268	+13.1
N.Y.C. All:	22.01	1,924	1,315	0	0	- .1
	36.02	1,085	994	0	12	+ 1.1
	38	5,271	5,044	22	58	+ .6
N.Y.C. All:		2,167,790	2,136,425	113,776	115,093	(+ .1)**

\*See supra note 41.  
 \*\* percent change, N.Y.C.

(Marcuse. 1985. P. 220)

Harlem are capable of paying over \$500 for a rented unit, and/or it can mean that the landlords raised the prices of their units because their neighborhood is worth paying the price of the rented unit. This sign of increases in the college graduates residing in Harlem and the increase in tenants paying higher wages shows that there is a group of people moving in who are capable to pay a bit more for the commodities of Harlem. This also means that as this group of people are moving in, then the people who are not capable of paying more than \$500 for a rented unit are leaving and being displaced to the outskirts of Harlem. In the grand scheme of things, Harlem is a city known for its rich culture that resonates back to the black community. Over time, Harlem has seen an increase in college graduates moving into the neighborhood and an increase in rent, as a result residents are displaced and have to relocate to a neighborhood that better fits their needs.

**Education**

small denomination taking into consideration that in 1970 there was 1,117 occupied units. What is more astounding, is that there was a drop in the occupied rental units in 1980, but the units rented for over \$500 was double the amount from 1970. This means one or two things, people who are moving into

Specifically, for this case study I examined Promise Academy in Harlem, New York City. Promise Academy is a charter school within the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ). The HCZ is a "97 block area in Harlem that combines no excuses charter schools with a web of community services designed to ensure that social environment outside of school is positive and supportive of children from birth to college graduation" (Dobbie, Fryer 2011, p.159). In the article *Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Increase Achievement Among the Poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone*, Will Dobbie and Roland Fryer conduct a test on Promise Academy to see if the charter school increases the achievement among the poor. One of the first things to note is that anyone is eligible to enroll but only students who live inside HCZ are actively recruited. For the residents that were displaced when gentrification occurred, their children will not be able to enjoy the extra curriculum activities HCZ offers. This is one of the problems with the HCZ, the limited accessibility for displaced individuals.

The data that Dobbie and Fryer used consisted of lottery files, New York City Department of Education, math and ELA test scores (a state wide exam) for both elementary and middle schools. From the data there were a couple of facts they collected. The first thing noted was that students who entered the elementary or middle school lottery were more likely to be black. The first analysis conducted was comparing the background of the lottery winners and losers. Lottery winners are more likely to be 7.8% male and "have math and ELA test scores that are .072 and .075 standard deviations higher than lottery losers" (Dobbie, Fryer 2011 p. 166). The lottery winners that are selected then to be male more often than female and although the statistical deviation is not significant, lottery winners perform a bit better than the students who are not.

The impact of the Promise Academy Charter school on student achievement relies on the test scores in ELA and math. Table 9 reports the middle school results in Math, ELA, absences, on grade level and observations. In the reduced form it is noted that “lottery winners score .284 standard deviations higher in math than lottery losers and .059 standard deviations higher in

Table 9: Middle School Results

	Lottery RF	Lottery FS	Lottery 2SLS	Distance 2SLS
Math	0.284*** (0.050)	1.240*** (0.075)	0.229*** (0.037)	0.206** (0.092)
ELA	0.059 (0.041)	1.241*** (0.074)	0.047 (0.033)	-0.053 (0.049)
Absences	-2.783*** (0.833)	1.260*** (0.079)	-2.199*** (0.650)	-0.220 (2.544)
On grade level	-0.003 (0.022)	1.240*** (0.075)	-0.002 (0.017)	-0.011 (0.036)
Observations	1,449	1,449	1,449	41,029

Notes: This table reports first-stage, reduced-form, and instrumental variable estimates for the Promise Academy Charter School. The sample for columns 1–3 is restricted to students in the middle school lottery with no sibling preference and who have data for all grades. The sample for column 4 is restricted to students living within 800 meters of the original 24-block HCZ. All regressions pool outcomes for grades 6–8, and control for grade and year of test effects, gender, race, lunch status, previous test scores, previous special education status, and whether the student previously spoke English as second language. Column 3 reports two-stage least squares coefficients using lottery offer as an instrumental variable. Column 4 reports two-stage least squares coefficients using the interaction between cohort and living within the 24-block HCZ as an instrumental variable. The table reports standard errors clustered at the student level in columns 1–3. The standard errors in column 4 allow for two-way clustering at the student and cohort level. Test scores are standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation one by grade in the full New York City sample.

\*\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.  
 \*\* Significant at the 5 percent level.  
 \* Significant at the 10 percent level.

(Dobbie, Fryer, 2011, P.170)

ELA” (Dobbie, Fryer 2011, p170). The column labeled “lottery 2SLS” captures the causal effect of attending Promise Academy for lottery winners. Attending Promise Academy for one year is .299 standard deviations in math and .047 in ELA. In relation

to absences, Promise Academy students are less likely to be absent. From table 9, it is clear to see that Promise Academy middle school has a significant impact on math scores but a small impact on ELA scores.

Along with looking at the effects of Promise Academy on middle school students, the same test was done for elementary students. In table 10, for the elementary school there was no significant statistical differences among boys and girls in regards to test scores and free lunch and not free lunch status.

Table 10: Elementary School Subsample Results

	Male	Female	Free lunch	Not free lunch
Math	0.232*** (0.114)	0.132 (0.144)	0.160 (0.114)	0.576 (0.445)
ELA	0.168* (0.096)	0.034 (0.118)	0.094 (0.091)	0.357 (0.331)
Absences	-3.171** (1.541)	-1.341 (1.687)	-2.319* (1.343)	-3.309 (3.383)
On grade level	0.030 (0.035)	0.000 (0.042)	0.012 (0.033)	0.095 (0.111)
Observations	390	371	550	211

*Notes:* This table reports instrumental variable estimates for subsamples at the Promise Academy Charter School. The sample is restricted to students in the elementary school lottery with data on the relevant characteristic. All regressions pool outcomes for grades 3–4 in both groups, and control for grade and year of test effects, gender, race, and lunch status. We report two-stage least squares coefficients interacted with the identified characteristic using lottery offer as an instrumental variable. The table reports standard errors clustered at the student level. Test scores are standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation one by grade in the full New York City sample.

\*\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

\*\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

\* Significant at the 10 percent level.

(Dobbie, Fryer, 2011, P.174)

The racial

achievement gap in

education is troublesome

and it presses concerns

especially in areas that are

in the process of being

gentrified. Although there

were gains in middle school

math and not a significant

growth in ELA, Dobbie and

Fryer concluded that community programs are not necessary to generate large achievement gains but the Promise Academy is made up of the right combination of school inputs which makes it successful.

Dobbie and Fryer also looked at the correlation between Promise Academy and how it affects human capital, risky behavior and health outcomes. Dobbie and Fryer had a treatment group that consisted of youth who were lottery winners and a control group of youth who are lottery losers. The data consisted of youths who entered in 2005 and 2006 Promise Academy sixth grade admission lotteries. The data also consisted of lottery files, administrative records, and information on college enrollment from the National Student Clearinghouse. The survey was answered by 407 lottery entrants and it included questions about educational achievement, attainment, health outcomes and risky behavior. The youths were contacted and were offered financial incentives for participating in the study. In the article *The Medium-Term Impacts of High-Achieving Charter Schools*, Dobbie and Fryer found that “lottery winners increase their

academic achievements .279 standard deviations, increase their educational attainment by .067 standard deviations, .313 standard deviations more likely to reach on time benchmarks. Female lottery winners are 10.1 percentage points less likely to report being pregnant during teenage years” (Dobbie, Fryer, 2015, p. 988). Promise Academy was able to increase education attainment, decrease the pregnancy rate in teen girls but there was no impact found that Promise Academy improves asthma, obesity, mental health and non-cognitive skills. Dobbie and Fryer concluded that youths who were admitted to Promise Academy demonstrated large increases in academic achievement, and a positive correlation in lessening risky behaviors. On the downside it was noted that “youths were no more likely to increase their quantity of schooling” and that “HCZ had no impact on health behaviors” (Dobbie, Fryer, 2015 P.1024).

From the research that Dobbie and Fryer conducted, it was seen that the Promise Academy is effective at increasing test scores but the extracurricular activities and after school programs are not necessary. Dobbie and Fryer make note that it is quite expensive to duplicate the HCZ. A rising concern is that the Promise Academy can be teaching students the test material rather than enriching their knowledge further. The Promise Academy is not diverse and it only accepts individuals who are primarily in the proximity of HCZ. This leaves out a great number of people who are low income and are displaced once gentrification occurs and are no longer able to live in that neighborhood but still want to enjoy the amenities. It is critical to see how gentrification comes with a fresh new set of institutions like the HCZ. When the ex-residents of Harlem are displaced and see opportunities in the education sphere flourish, they would also like to be a part of it, but if they are not low income or within a radius from the school, odds of attending the school is slim. The HCZ is a school system that works in the conditions of Harlem. Donor’s donate to the school and have enriched the education of students



and it should be spread all throughout Harlem and neighboring cities that resemble Harlem so that more students can take advantage of the opportunities that HCZ has to offer. The HCZ performs well and although it is quite an expense to duplicate, it should still expand because it works and it is yielding the results that other schools are not able to meet. The HCZ is unique to Harlem and if mirrored, it might not work in that new state or even country. Yet, this a step forward in realizing that the school systems in place today can take notes in the structure of the HCZ and can better themselves or even put into place a new system unique to that place.

### **Case Study: London, England**

#### ***Gentrification***

London underwent gentrification in the 1980's but this change in the city started decades prior. Post World War II, there were a lot of poorly maintained Victorian houses. In Joe Moran's article, *Early Cultures of Gentrification in London*, he paints a picture of what was going on at the time when gentrification began, as well as prior to the time it did. Moran mentioned that in the "early 1960s onward, middle-class incomers began buying up slum properties and ex-rooming houses and transforming them into attractive dwellings" (Moran, 2007, p.102). The changes in the renovations were signs of a new lifestyle that was uprooting especially for the middle class. During the 1960s, there was a rise in the house prices in the inner area of London. Moran states that "in 1961, 64% of all homes in inner London were privately rented but by the end of the decade home ownership had risen there by 8%" (Moran, 2007, p.111). This increase in the home ownership meant that people were inclined to live in that area either due to the renovation or the feasibility of amenities. By the early 1980s London had entered a new phase where gentrification was in the rise as a socioeconomic process and a culture one as well.

London, aside from the post-WWII changes, was experiencing changes in the economy. In the article, *Gentrification and the Middle-class Remaking of Inner London*, Chris Hamnett states that “London’s economy has undergone a dramatic transformation from an industrial city to a post-industrial city dominated by financial and business services and the creative industries” (Hamnett, 2003, p.2404). This shift after the industrial city meant that there was an increase in the proportion of managerial and professional workers. This explains why the majority of the private house buyers were of the professional, middle-class because they were capable of affording it. In *Gentrification and Displacement in Greater London: An empirical and theoretical analysis* Rowland Atkinson looked at a 1986/7 London Housing Survey. In that survey, Atkinson found that an “estimated 17,000 dwellings were lost annually from private renting in the mid-eighties... It was estimated that 3,000 were sitting tenants and 12,000 were bought from developers or builders. This provides a strong indication of the levels of displacement that would have needed to take place in order to achieve these sales” (Atkinson, 1997, p. 302). London had a good amount of property that was sold to developers and builders who were going to put into place newly renovated buildings. In order to achieve the sales, there were people that were no longer able to live in the neighborhood and had to move out. As for the landlords, “they were willing to take advantage of the new demand and higher prices” (Hamnett, 2003, p.2412). This increase in the property and rent prices caused for the middle class to move in and the working class residents to be moved into residual areas. During the 1980s, gentrification sprouted around inner London and some benefitted from the renovations at the expense of other residents having to be displaced.

### ***Displacement***

Table 11: Percentage point changes for gentrifier and potential displacee groups between 1981 and 1991

	Inner London	Kensington	Camden	Hammersmith
<b>Gentrifiers</b>				
Owner-occupiers	11.2	8.1	9.8	12.2
Professionals	8.3	9.3	7.4	11.6
Degree holders	7.4	8.6	8.4	10.4
<b>Displacees</b>				
Working class	-13.9	-14.6	-12.7	-15.3
Private renters	-4.9	-8.0	-7.0	-8.9
Elderly	-2.3	-1.1	-2.4	-3.8
Unskilled	-1.84	-0.2	-1.1	-2.6

Source: OPCS, 1981 and 1991 Censuses.

(Atkinson, 2000, p. 312)

*The Hidden Costs of Gentrification: Displacement in central London*, Rowland Atkinson argues that extensive gentrification threatens the sustainability of a neighborhood. Atkinson looked at displacement in London from 1981-1991 and the data collected was from three tenant rights projects. Table 11 demonstrates the percentage point changes for gentrifier and potential displaced groups between 1981-1991 (Atkinson, 2000, p.312). The negative changes for the displacee categories would indicate that processes of replacement or displacement had been occurring. Interestingly enough, the middle class was not presented in this data as being a displacee.

Table 12 focuses on the household tenure in the study areas. Looking at the owner-from

Table 12: Household tenure in the study areas

	Residents in households (%)						Professional residents	
	Owner-occupied		Private rented*		Local authority**		(over 16 years)	
	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991
Inner London	29.8	43.9	23.4	20.6	46.7	35.3	24.6	32
Camden	25.9	37.8	31.6	23.9	38.1	38.1	35.1	42.6
Hammersmith	33.9	48	34.5	24.6	31.5	27.2	28.4	40
Kensington	37.4	47.7	45.9	35.6	16.5	16.5	38.9	48.2

Source: OPCS, 1981 and 1991 Census data.

\* Not including renting from a business.

\*\* Not including housing association dwellings.

(Atkinson, 2000, p. 312)

that in all of the four boroughs at one point there was a decent percentage of residents that rented

Displacement in London was a cause of landlord harassment, as well as the changes in the prices of amenities and housing. As mentioned earlier, gentrification started during the 1980s but prior to that there were changes occurring that laid the path for gentrification in London. In the article

1981 to 1991 there is an increase in all of the boroughs listed. In the second column, there was a decrease from 1981 to 1991 in the private space rented. What is seen is

rather than owned their households. It was not until the late 1980s that there was a fall in the private rented households and an increase in the owner occupied homes. The question is raised; what group of people are leaving the boroughs?

Atkinson discusses what group of people are being displaced. Looking at the Office of National Statistics Longitudinal Study (ONS LS), table 13, there are different displacee groups and the total net flows and percentage loss of people in gentrified areas.

The biggest impact seen was that primarily majority of the displaced individuals were inactive,

*Table 13: Net flows and percentage gain or loss for gentrified areas in Greater London between 1981 and 1991*

Displacee group	(1) Net migration for gentrified areas	(2) Percentage loss to gentrified areas	(3) Total migration flow for London
Unskilled	-1,800	-78%	19,100
Inactive	-26,100	-46%	38,500
Working class	-19,300	-38%	121,700
Elderly	-23,200	-18%	20,000

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p.313)

working class, or an elderly. The displacement was not affecting the middle to upper class. Another interesting point to make is that the total migration flow for London was greater than the net migration for

gentrified areas. This suggests that displacement was an active process from 1981-1991.

Alongside studying the numerical changes in regards to displacement, Atkinson also interviewed people within the three central London boroughs. The interviews took place over a three-month period and involved staff from the tenant rights project. The purpose of the tenant rights project was to protect tenants from any harassment or illegal eviction. The tenant rights project was selected to be interviewed because they existed in areas which have been extensively gentrified. Atkinson asked interviewees the question; who are the individuals that are being displaced? A response received was that “the elderly was considered to be disproportionately represented among displaces by all of the project workers. There were two reasons why, the first one was because they were too frail to resist actions by landlords to have them removed and

second, this group was more profoundly affected by social changes around them” (Atkinson,

Table 14: Social and tenure position for non-moving LS members in ROL area

Position for 1981	Position in 1991			
	Professionals		Working class	
	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters
<i>Working class</i>				
Owners	1034	16	2313	18
Renters	29	158	49	157
<i>Professionals</i>				
Owners	4841	55	1399	19
Renters	95	292	27	58

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p. 156)

their current situation” (Atkinson, 2000, p.319). This is the troubling aftermath of gentrification.

The changes in the borough brings about people being displaced and residents who are no longer able to live in that borough move out.

In another study, Atkinson wrote the article *Measuring Gentrification and Displacement in Greater London*, using a longitudinal study to examine displacement in 12 inner London boroughs. The gentrified areas (G1, G2, G3, G4) and the rest of London (ROL) was the

Table 15: Origin of LS professional movers migrating to the ‘G’ areas by 1991

Location in 1981	Location in 1991				
	G1	G2	G3	G4	Total
ROL	77	127	149	146	499
ROSE	58	65	44	96	263
ROEW	79	89	77	62	307
Total	214	281	270	306	1071

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p.157)

Table 16: Origin of LS working-class movers migrating to the ‘G’ areas by 1991

Location in 1981	Location in 1991				
	G1	G2	G3	G4	Total
ROL	23	40	65	55	183
ROSE	9	7	8	8	32
ROEW	5	5	6	9	25
Total	36	52	89	72	249

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p.158)

2000, p.314). Regarding the impact on people who were displaced, the tenant rights projects stated that “there was widespread recognition that a significant number of displaced were made homeless. The other exit was to go to another neighborhood where it was cheaper to rent than

classification they used. The variables used was working class, members who were 18 years old and above, unskilled laborers, elderly, lone parents and unemployed. Table 14 presents the social/tenure position for non-moving

longitudinal study (LS) members in ROL area. 10,3400 LS members were working class owners in 1981 but had become professional owners in 1991. Those people stayed in the same location but there was a shift in their

occupational status. In table 15 and 16, we can see the number of professional and working class individuals moving to gentrified areas (G1, G2, G3, G4).

From the data it is clear that there is a greater proportion of professionals migrating to

Table 17: Flows of working class to and from the 'G' areas

From			To/From	To		
ROEW	ROSE	ROL		ROL	ROSE	ROEW
5	9	23	G1	60	19	13
5	7	40	G2	57	27	16
6	8	65	G3	52	30	30
9	8	55	G4	66	37	26

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p.159)

gentrified areas than working class movers.

The gentrified areas are attracting the professional class as they are able to afford the living cost of that borough. To support the finds in table 17, the number of working

class LS members moving to gentrified areas

Table 18: Net flows and percentage gain or loss for all 'G' areas between 1981-1991

Variable	Net change for all 'G' areas	Percentage gain/loss
Professionals	+ 18 800	+ 20
Inactive	- 38 500	- 46
Working class	- 19 300	- 38
Elderly	- 23 200	- 18
Unskilled	between - 200 and - 1 800	between - 9 and -78
Unemployment	between - 1 600 and + 100	between - 4 and -59
Lone parents	+ 600	+ 4.5

Source: ONS Longitudinal Study.

(Atkinson, 2000, p.162)

is smaller than the number of working class LS members moving from gentrified areas.

The working class is being displaced as they move out from gentrified areas. In table 18,

Atkinson shows a net flow and percentage gain/loss for all

gentrified areas from 1981 to 1991. Gentrified areas gained professionals and lone parents. In all other categories such as the working class, elderly, and unemployed, the gentrified areas were not retaining those socioeconomic groups of people. It goes to show that professionals are a significant displacing force. Atkinson was able to examine different variables within displacees and compare and contrast what exactly occurs within each gentrified area. Professional and middle class individuals move into boroughs and with time displace the lower end of social

classes. While some of the displacees become homeless, others find a place in a different borough but it is not as good as the borough that they resided in prior.

### ***Education***

With gentrification came changes in the way that residents view schools among their borough and others. When there are different groups of people being displaced, the dynamic of education changes alongside. As more middle class individuals move into a borough, they want to send their kids to the best school there is. In some cases, the middle class individuals do not want to send their kids to schools where lower class students go. In the article *Gentrification, Education and Exclusionary Displacement in East London*; Tim Butler, Chris Hamnett, and Mark J Ramsden take a look at inner East London and the process that socioeconomic classes go through when choosing the school for their children. Butler, Hamnett and Ramsden state that “exclusionary displacement can either lead to displacement or feeling forced into accepting a school place at a school they would have previously not have considered because their school of choice is unattainable” (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden, 2013, p. 558). There are many families in London where the school choice is not available so they leave that borough to be in close proximity of other boroughs. The place of study for this research is Victoria Park because it is more gentrified than other areas. The research looked at the annual school census, national pupil databases, took a sample of the school attainment data and a questionnaire survey of 300 parents in the five study areas. Majority of the responders are white and they are established in their professional careers.

In London, the 1988 Education Act was passed which established a right for parents to decide where they would like their children to go to school irrespective of where they might live. This changes the way that parents see school options. Parents are able to search around for

schools with whatever desired radius. Children are not sent to schools that are within a certain radius from their house but instead they can be sent anywhere. With parents having free choice in where they would like to send their children, parents can live where they want, and they will most likely send their kids to schools that are prestigious. In various interviews, Butler, Hamnett and Ramsden discuss with residents on their experience with the 1988 act. A working class individual that was interviewed stated that she wanted her child to go to a well-known school but instead she got the third option where the school did not have a lot of benefits (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden, 2013, p. 569). In this case, the working class was not able to get her child into her preferred school, Lauriston, but instead was accepted into her third choice school, the Orchard. The interviewee mentioned “I think Orchard is actually really trying, and it has improved an awful lot. But I honestly felt- it was not very good at helping and supporting kids who didn’t have any special needs. All the middle class people get sucked into Lauriston and that leaves Orchard similarly skewed. It is ethnically mixed with lots of children on free school meals” (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden, 2013, p. 569). The interviewer shows a concern that her child did not get into Lauriston, a school that a lot of middle class parents send their kids and a school that is close to the home of the interviewee. Her child instead got accepted to a school that was not performing well but it is improving and where kids who get free lunch go to (lower to working class individuals). The issue at hand is that there are not enough well rounded schools that could benefit everyone, so there will be parents who are not content with the comprehensive school that was selected for their child. There was another interviewee who stated that there is a “real separation between the ethnicities and socioeconomic status” (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden, 2013, p. 570). With gentrification and this 1988 Education Act, there was an unwillingness of the white middle class to tolerate schools that are inappropriately mixed (Butler, Hamnett, Ramsden, 2013,



p. 571). The middle class seems to want to stick with the better schools and not be racially inclusive. One last interview illustrated a respondent who had three children and who lived in a well off borough but wanted to move. She wanted to move because there was a rise in property prices and also because of schooling. With additional interviews, it was concluded that gentrification caused there to be socioeconomic issues that translate over to education. The working class are not able to afford sending their kids to well-known schools yet the middle class sends their kids to establish private schools where the diversity is low.

Tim Butler and Garry Robson shine a light on the issue of education in gentrified areas

Table 19: Socio-demographic profile of respondents by area

Area	Telegraph Hill	Brixton	Battersea	Barnsbury	London Fields
Mean age	46.8	41.5	43.4	45.6	47.3
Living with spouse/partner %	78.6	50	54.7	68.9	62.1
Public sector %	39.7	37.9	16.4	27.9	33.3
Private %	18.9	25.8	47.5	36.1	21.1
Voluntary sector %	8.6	8.6	3.3	9.8	7.0
Self-employed %	32.8	27.6	32.8	26.3	38.6
Managers %	13.9	18.5	22.4	22.7	12.3
Professionals %	69.2	60.0	64.2	69.7	73.9
Admin/secretarial %	3.1	9.2	7.5	3.0	0
Artistic %	9.2	9.2	6.0	3.0	13.9

(Butler, Robson, 2003, p.13)

Table 20: School destinations of respondents' children by area

Area	Primary			Secondary			
	State	Private	Comp	Grant Aided	6th Form College	Selective	Private
Telegraph Hill	16	2	8	4	4	11	11
Brixton	9	0	4	2	2	0	4
Battersea	14	3	3	2	0	1	10
Barnsbury	9	7	0	2	1	1	15
London Fields	13	0	5	0	0	0	6
Docklands	1	2	0	0	0	0	2

(Butler, Robson, 2003, p.13)

by looking at socioeconomic classes and where those people are sending their kids. In the article Plotting the Middle classes: Gentrification and Circuits of Education in London, they take a look at 6 areas in London where they do face to face interviews with 75 gentrifiers in each area for approximately an hour each. One thing that is noted is that a lot of people are swayed by where good schools are to decide where they are going to live.

Table 19 shows the areas in London plus a breakdown in the demographics who were interviewed. The mean age of all of the boroughs were in their 40's. More than half of the interviewers per area were living with a spouse or partner and were professionals. The table 20 is

able to show the school destinations of respondents' children by area. For every area except for Docklands majority of parents sent their kids to a primary state school. Once secondary school

*Table 21: Number of children being schooled outside the borough*

Area	Yes	No	Total	% out of area
Telegraph Hill	11	29	40	27.5
Brixton	10	12	22	45.5
Battersea	11	13	24	45.8
Barnsbury	15	14	29	51.7
London Fields	8	12	20	40
Docklands	4	1	5	80

*(Butler, Robson, 2003, p.14)*

rolled around, a lot of the respondents sent their kids to a private school than any of the other options. The private school option was more favorable as the grade level of the child increased.

Butler and Robson also look at the number of children being schooled outside the borough. What table 21 is able to show is the percentage of interviewees that are schooling their student outside the borough. Considering all areas except Telegraph Hill and Docklands, close to half of the interviewees send their kids to school outside the borough. What ends up occurring in situations where parents have free choice to send their kids to school is that the boroughs school will not reflect the demographic of the students living within that area. Tristan, an interviewee from Brixton, stated that house prices seem to be getting out of control and that she might have to move and kids might have to be schooled out of this area (Butler, Robson, 2003, p.19). Jack, an interviewer from Battersea, mentioned that the schools in that area are good but many of them are homogeneous and not racially mixed. In respect to this study of education in different areas a couple of things are seen. The role of education is a prominent one in housing choice. While most middle class individuals move to gentrified areas other are displaced because entrance into a school for their children is hard or over capacity has been reached. This puts a strain on children and the education they are receiving. The education is not multiracial nor multicultural because most middle class individuals will try to send their kids to well performing schools. This causes there to be a

problem with lower class individuals who deserve the same education as everyone else but are not able to afford living in the borough with all the well performing schools to increase their chances of being selected into the school. This discrepancy is an effect that gentrification sprouted and as low income individuals keep on getting displaced from borough and middle class individuals take over education disparities will remain. Instead of London having a comprehensive school selection, they should have a school selection where students are chosen based on their achievements. If there is a huge bias in selecting families based on the proximity of the child, then the school will have a cluster of students that reflect the socioeconomic background of the neighborhood. If the neighborhood is primarily middle class, there will be a greater pool of middle class students selected for the school in that neighborhood. That is not fair to the students who are low income and cannot afford to live in that neighborhood.

### **Policy Recommendation**

Based on the case studies of London, United Kingdom and Harlem, New York, as well as the scholarly articles on gentrification, there is an evident implication that gentrification does not benefit the lower class. The neighborhoods and boroughs that are undergoing gentrification have altered the dynamics of the community by displacing individuals who no longer are able to afford the cost of living in that neighborhood. To prevent displacement, policies need to be enacted to enrich the variety of individuals in gentrified neighborhoods.

I recommend zoning off neighborhoods for different purposes. In the article *Gentrification, Abandonment, and displacement Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City*, Peter Marcuse presents recommendations at the end of his article in response to the gentrification that New York City (NYC) underwent. Marcuse made the suggestion in zoning off NYC into five different zones. I agree primarily with doing “mature development zones

where the city should allow essentially no new development or rehabilitation that would have the effects of increasing rents or prices or of displacing households” (Marcuse, 1985 p.1). With mature development zones, it recognizes that gentrification displaces individuals and zones off areas where that can occur. It is okay to enhance the neighborhood only to the extent where nobody is worse off.

Along with zoning off the land, another way to tame gentrification is to provide resources to renters. In the article *Combating Gentrification through Equitable development*, Kalima Rose states that one way to respond to gentrification is by stabilizing existing renters “This can include assessing displacement rates, creating emergency funds for rental assistance, removing discriminatory barriers that renters face or creating rent stabilization policies such as eviction controls and rent increase schedules” (Rose, 2002, p.7). One of the key issues seen when gentrification occurs is that landlords will increase the rent and the tenants will not be able to afford it so they are displaced. Rose makes the case that saving the renters either by having funds on the side for them or even requiring eviction controls and rent increase schedules is critical in lessening the impact gentrification causes. With rent increase schedules, if renters are not able to afford their unit they have time to be able to look for a new home and will not end up being homeless, which ends up being the case for renters that are displaced without due notice. Another rent control law is one that Deliah D. Lawrence mentions in her article *Can Communities Effectively Fight Displacement caused by Gentrification*. Lawrence states that rent controls are used primarily “to protect residents against rent increases. Under existing ordinances, rent control generally applies to apartment buildings constructed before a particular date but not to new construction. This in effect can maintain rent prices at a reasonable level” (Lawrence, 2002, p.362). With rent control in effect, apartment buildings constructed before a particular date will keep rents at a justifiable

price. This will one, keep neighborhoods more diverse in regards to socioeconomic individuals, two it will give any individual the opportunity to coexist in a neighborhood that is improving its amenities.

As seen, gentrification brings a wave of new professionals into the neighborhood and the poor lower class have to evacuate. The middle and upper class take over the neighborhood and they are active in what they want their schools to represent. The public schools are seen as not meeting their needs so they opt for charter schools. In the case of Harlem, there is a new program the Harlem Children's Zone that is performing well by integrating afterschool programs with charter schools. Data shows that it has improved the performance of students in tests. Yet, this is a school structure that specifically works for Harlem. One of the major issues seen in both Harlem and London with school selecting students is that there is not enough space to house all the students into the best elementary school. A change in the right direction is to implement schools that are unique to the location and that it addresses the needs of the people. It is critical to make opportunity available to every person of any demographic or economic background. It is essential to fine tune a school so that it makes fair the process of selecting kids so that everyone has the same opportunities. Harlem Children's Zone is a success story, while many places are getting gentrified, a new group of middle class individuals move in. The lottery system affects the selection of students and it can worsen the situation for people in lower incomes because it is a mathematical equation that randomly outputs a set of names of students. The selection for schools need to be more thorough so that schools have taken into consideration all students. Along with the change in the process of admissions, less developed schools should be shut down and there should be an expansion of the schools that are improving student's education and it should be accessible to anyone. Education is a long term investment; it is the path that paves opportunities for students.

Despite schools being expensive to recreate or even remodel, the opportunities that it enriches students with is enough to want to spend money on the recreating or remodeling of schools.

In my policy recommendation, I strongly advocate for zoning locations so buildings are not reconstructed and low income residents are not able to enjoy it. Also, providing support to renters who can either have resources to assist them in the process of moving, or even a timely reminder that prices are going to increase so that they can look for other places to rent. Lastly, I recommend that cities should discuss the future of their education system, out with the old in with the new. It is time to bring change to the existing foundation that are shaky and are in need of revamping. Education has to be altered at the pace of community change. As a community gets gentrified and more middle class individuals move in and working class people get displaced there needs to be an education system in place that will promote success. Educational attainment should not be based off of a randomized selection through a lottery system where people are randomly chosen because it is unfair. It allows one student who was picked out of random to benefit from the resources of the school while another student did not get that opportunity. With a gentrified neighborhood where individuals all come from different socioeconomic background, schools are more likely to be improved because of the active voice of the middle class and in turn all socioeconomic backgrounds will benefit. I believe that gentrification should not only be enjoyed by the better off but rather by everyone. A gentrified neighborhood will function better when the middle, upper and lower class members are all able to coexist in that neighborhood. A multi socioeconomic neighborhood is the best functioning one, you get the needs of all in one area for a stronger environment.

The revamping of education is critical in meeting the needs of children of this day and age. School curriculums should undergo changes to increase the educational experience of students. In

the article “Technology in Schools: Future Changes in Classroom” Jane Wakefield talks about how we need to rethink this era’s school curriculum. There is this idea of a flipped classroom which is “inverting traditional teaching methods by delivering instructions online outside of the classroom and using the time in school as the place to do homework” (BBC News). The new cutting edge in education would be to have teachers be a guide in the classrooms while students at home watch lectures at their own pace while communicating with their peers and teachers all online. One example of online learning is Khan Academy, where Salman Khan posts videos teaching people different material ranging from basic math to physics. This is the start of a new kind of learning. Education should expand its horizons and include a new spectrum of learning to fulfill the needs of students. Revamping education is critical in exploring new ways to have students engaged and learning at the same time, and one way to start is to have interactive lessons all online. With this change in education, families do not have to heavily stress where their child goes to school. Instead, online learning can facilitate learning for everyone.

#### References

- Atkinson, R. (2000). Measuring Gentrification and Displacement in Greater London. *Urban Studies* (Routledge), 37(1), 149-165. doi:10.1080/0042098002339
- Atkinson, R. (2000). The hidden costs of gentrification: Displacement in central London. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 15(4), 307-326. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41107148>
- Atkinson, R. (2002) Does gentrification help or harm urban neighborhoods? An assessment of the evidence-base in the context of the new urban agenda. *ESRC Center for Neighborhood Research*, 1-20.

- Atkinson, R. G. (1997). Gentrification and displacement in Greater London: an empirical and theoretical analysis (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Greenwich.
- Butler, T., Hamnett, C., & Ramsden, M. J. (2013). Gentrification, Education and Exclusionary Displacement in East London. *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*, 37(2), 556-575. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12001
- Butler, T., & Robson, G. (2003). Plotting the Middle Classes: Gentrification and Circuits of Education in London. *Housing Studies*, 18(1), 5.
- Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. G. (2011). Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Increase Achievement Among the Poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3(3), 158-187. doi:10.1257/app.3.3.158
- Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. G. (2015). The Medium-Term Impacts of High-Achieving Charter Schools. *Journal of Political Economy*, 123(5), 985-1037. doi:10.1086/682718
- Freeman, L. (2005) Displacement or succession? residential mobility in gentrifying neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40, 463-91. doi: 10.1177/1078087404273341.
- Hamnett, C. (2003). Gentrification and the Middle-class Remaking of Inner London, 1961-2001. *Urban Studies*, (40), 2401-2426. doi:10.1080/0042098032000136138
- Hankins, K. B. (2007). The Final Frontier: Charter Schools as New Community Institution of Gentrification. *Urban Geography*, 113-128. doi:10.2747/0272-3638.28.2.113
- Hwang, J, & Sampson, R.J. Divergent pathways of gentrification. *American Sociological Review*, 79, 726-751.
- Jordan, R., & Gallagher, M. (2015) Does school choice affect gentrification? Urban Institute, 1-14.



- Keels, M., Burdick-Will, J. and Keene, S. (2013), The Effects of Gentrification on Neighborhood Public Schools. *City & Community*, 12: 238–259. doi: 10.1111/cico.12027
- Kirkland, E. (2008). What's Race Got to Do with it? Looking for the Racial Dimensions of Gentrification. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 32(2), 18-30. Retrieved January 29, 2017, from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287842782\\_What's\\_race\\_got\\_to\\_do\\_with\\_it\\_Looking\\_for\\_the\\_racial\\_dimensions\\_of\\_gentrification](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287842782_What's_race_got_to_do_with_it_Looking_for_the_racial_dimensions_of_gentrification).
- Lawrence, D. (2002). Community Development: Can Communities Effectively Fight Displacement Caused by Gentrification? *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law*, 11(4), 357-373. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25782567>
- LeGates, R., & Hartman, C. (1982). Gentrification-Caused Displacement. *The Urban Lawyer*, 14(1), 31-55. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27893097>
- Marcuse, P. (1985). Gentrification, Abandonment, and Displacement: Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City. *Washington University Journal of Urban & Contemporary Law*, 28, 195-248. Retrieved February 26, 2017, from [http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1396&context=law\\_urbanlaw](http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1396&context=law_urbanlaw)
- Moran, Joe. (2007). Early Cultures of Gentrification in London, 1955-1980. *Journal of Urban History*, 34(1), 101-121. doi:10.1177/0096144207306611
- Newman, K., & Wyly, E. K. (2006). The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies*, 43(1), 23-57. doi:10.1080/00420980500388710

Recoquillon, C. (2014, June). Neoliberalization and Spatial (In)Justice: The Gentrification of Harlem. Retrieved February 14, 2017, from

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306263723\\_Neoliberalization\\_and\\_Spatial\\_InJustice\\_The\\_Gentrification\\_of\\_Harlem](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306263723_Neoliberalization_and_Spatial_InJustice_The_Gentrification_of_Harlem)

Rose, K. (2002). Combating Gentrification Through Equitable Development. *Race, Poverty & the Environment*, 9(1), 5-56. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41554331>

Smith, N. (1996). *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*. London: Routledge.

Vigdor, J., Massey, D., & Rivlin, A. (2002). Does Gentrification Harm the Poor? [with Comments]. *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, 133-182. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25067387>

Wakefield, Jane. "Technology in Schools: Future Changes in Classrooms." *BBC News*. BBC, 02 Feb. 2015. Web. 17 May 2017. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-30814302>>.

Zabel, J. (1998). An Analysis of Attrition in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics and the Survey of Income and Program Participation with an Application to a Model of Labor Market Behavior. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 33(2), 479-506. doi:10.2307/146438