STAGE MODELS OF GENTRIFICATION
An Examination

ROBERT KERSTEIN
University of Tampa

Some researchers have contended that stage models are useful to help explain the dynamics of gentrification. Neighborhood change in the Hyde Park section of Tampa, Florida, is analyzed in this article to evaluate empirically the validity of certain components of the stage models and to present some conclusions concerning the general usefulness of the stage models in examining neighborhood change. The models provide a helpful framework within which to examine gentrification, but they must be refined to reflect that gentrification is a more chaotic concept than the models have thus far explicitly acknowledged.

Gentrification, the physical renovation and social-class upgrading of inner-city neighborhoods, has been occurring in sections of many central cities for more than two decades (Black, 1980; Lipton, 1980; Nelson, 1988). Researchers have examined many aspects of this phenomenon, including the reasons for its occurrence, the characteristics of the gentrifiers, the problems of displacement, and appropriate policy initiatives (Laska and Spain, 1980; Palen and London, 1984; Swanstrom and Kerstein, 1989).

Furthermore, some researchers have contended that stage models are useful to help explain the dynamics of gentrification. The suggestion that neighborhoods go through definable stages as they gentrify is not surprising given the history of scholarship regarding neighborhood change. Many authors have argued that neighborhoods change their physical and social characteristics over time, although the dominant theme has been that the

AUTHOR'S NOTE: *This research was supported by faculty development grants from the University of Tampa. I would like to thank Roy Kass, Scott Keeter, David Olson, Rich Piper, and Todd Swanstrom for their comments and Martin Denoff and Clayton Long for their computer assistance.*

URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY, Vol. 25 No. 4, June 1990 620-639
© 1990 Sage Publications, Inc.

from the SAGE Social Science Collections. All Rights Reserved.

change in their class composition generally is downward, rather than upward (see Hamnett, 1984; Johnston, 1971; La Gory and Pipkin, 1981).

Gale (1980), Clay (1979: 57-59), Pattison (1977, 1983), the National Urban Coalition ([NUC] 1978), and the National Association of Neighborhoods ([NAN] 1980) have all presented stage models of gentrification. No consensus appears among these models on all aspects of the process. For example, the NAN and the NUC attribute more importance to the role of private and public institutions in stimulating gentrification than does Gale (1979: 303; 1980: 95-96), who generally describes the change as a "filtering" process in the manner of some of the early ecologists (see Hamnett, 1984). Furthermore, the NAN and the NUC focus more on the problem of displacement caused by gentrification than do the other authors. All suggest, however, that the characteristics and attitudes of people moving into the neighborhood vary depending on when they move in. Thus those purchasing homes early in the gentrification process will differ in various dimensions from those moving in after gentrification has progressed.[1]

Except for the analysis by the NUC, the primary concept advanced by the models to explain the differentiation among the in-movers during different stages is the in-movers' attitudes toward risk.[2] Those moving in earliest are the *risk-oblivious,* willing to chance their financial investment and, perhaps, their personal safety. At the other extreme are the *risk-averse* residents who settle in the neighborhood only after many other professional and managerial households have already located there and rehabilitated their homes substantially.[3] According to results derived from using these models, these differing orientations toward risk are associated with variations among in-movers in some of their demographic characteristics during the different stages, their motivations for locating in the neighborhood, their evaluation of present conditions within the area, and their hopes for its future. The most significant differences are predicted to be between those moving in earliest during the gentrification process and those moving in latest. All of the models, however, also indicate that one or two additional migration waves to the neighborhood occur—the *risk-prone* move into the neighborhood in between the risk-oblivious "pioneers" and the risk-averse group.

During each of the stages, most of the in-movers are professionals or managers. In-movers in blue-collar and other nonprofessional and nonmanagerial occupations become less common as gentrification progresses and housing values increase. Although, inexplicably, predictions concerning educational levels for successive waves of in-movers are not specified in any of the models, one can deduce logically that educational attainment will increase as in-movers increasingly hold professional and managerial posi-

tions. Furthermore, the more risk-averse in-movers are predicted to have higher incomes than the earliest in-movers, and higher educational levels are consistent with this expectation. The models also indicate that the risk-averse in-movers are more likely to have children than the earlier gentrifiers are when they purchase a home in the neighborhood because financially better-off families, more so than individuals and couples, tend to avoid neighborhoods that they perceive as risky. Finally, Gale (1980: 108) and Pattison (1983: 87) suggested that increasing proportions of in-movers will be from the suburbs rather than from other neighborhoods within the city. This final demographic prediction is consistent with the suggestion that risk-averse newcomers prefer a relatively "suburban" inner-city environment.

Initially, the relatively low price of the housing, the demographic diversity of the neighborhood, and the architectural and historical qualities of the area are the major factors encouraging younger professionals and managers to purchase homes in these inner-city neighborhoods. Investment goals, however, become increasingly important, although not exclusive, concerns to in-movers during the later stages (Gale, 1980: 108-109; NAN, 1980; Pattison, 1983: 90-91).

In-movers' hopes for the future of the neighborhood also vary during the different stages. The early newcomers, as noted previously, value the demographic diversity of the area, and they prefer that the neighborhood substantially retain this characteristic. Professionals and managers moving to the area after gentrification is well under way, however, desire that newcomers be occupationally and economically similar to themselves and welcome changes in the neighborhoods that are compatible with a "yuppie" life-style. Thus they are more likely than those residing in the area before gentrification began and the early in-movers to support new condominiums, trendy boutiques, and other land uses that are incompatible with the existing character of the neighborhood. The later newcomers also strongly resist such land uses as halfway houses or subsidized housing (Gale, 1980: 109; Clay, 1979: 58-59) and lobby the government for high-quality municipal services (NAN, 1980; Clay, 1979: 58-59; Gale, 1980: 108-109).

To summarize, the later waves of migrants desire the best of all possible worlds (according to their preferences): They want the "suburbanization" of their neighborhoods regarding the character of the population, the convenience of living close to their jobs, and, perhaps, cultural facilities, and they want to live in a neighborhood that is architecturally more interesting than most suburban subdivisions. Significantly, their goal is to accomplish all this while realizing a reasonable return on their housing investment.

Several studies that were at least partially based upon survey research data are particularly relevant to my evaluation of these models. Pattison's (1977, 1983) study of neighborhoods in Boston and Cambridge and Gale's (1976, 1977, 1979: 297-301) research in three areas at different stages of the gentrification process in Washington, D.C., provided the empirical bases for their models.[4] DeGiovanni's (1981a, 1981b; 1983) study of revitalization trends in 12 neighborhoods in six different cities was an elaborate attempt to evaluate various aspects of the models.

These researchers garnered important information regarding changing characteristics of newcomers to gentrifying areas. There is reason, however, for a further examination of the stage models using survey methods: Pattison interviewed only 10 households who had moved in during each of the stages; although DeGiovanni interviewed a much larger sample of households, he failed to ask questions regarding in-movers' attitudes; and although Gale's studies included detailed interviews with homeowners that provided excellent demographic and attitudinal information, and although he interviewed homeowner in-movers in areas that were at different stages of the revitalization process, it is possible that differing characteristics of the neighborhoods, not just the stage of revitalization that each was in, affected in-mover characteristics and attitudes.

FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY

This study of the Hyde Park area in Tampa is based primarily on interviews conducted with a sample of homeowners in this neighborhood. The primary component of the survey involved interviews with both homeowners who were residing in their present home when revitalization began and in-movers who had purchased their homes during different stages of gentrification. However, Gale's (1977) method of comparing migrants into two areas that were at different stages of the revitalization process also was used. This was possible because revitalization began as early as 1968 in the southern section of the study area but not until about 1978 in the northern section. Thus, during the 1978-1982 period, those purchasing homes in North Hyde Park represented the first wave of in-movers (the risk-oblivious), and those moving into South Hyde Park represented the risk-averse group.

Knowledgeable informants suggested that gentrification began in about 1968 in sections of South Hyde Park and that those moving in from then until 1974 should be considered the risk-oblivious first-stage migrants. Those purchasing homes from 1975 through 1977 were buying during the risk-

prone era, and households moving into South Hyde Park after 1977 represented the risk-averse gentry. On the other hand, home buyers locating in North Hyde Park after 1977 were moving in during a relatively risk-oblivious period because gentrification was just beginning in that neighborhood. Thus those locating in North Hyde Park prior to 1978 were considered "original" residents who had moved there before the onset of gentrification.

Polk City directories (R. L. Polk and Company, 1967-1982) were used to determine when homeowner residents in Hyde Park had moved into their present homes, and a three-quarters sample of homeowners who had purchased their houses before gentrification began and of homeowners who had bought their homes during each of its stages was chosen.[5] Therefore, the total sample included three-fourths of all owner-occupied homes in the neighborhood. Interviews with 347 homeowners, representing a 63% response rate, were conducted during the spring and summer of 1982. Thus this survey goes beyond earlier empirical work on the stage models because larger sample sizes of homeowners are included and demographic and attitudinal characteristics of successive groups of in-movers are examined.[6]

Two caveats should be noted. First, as DeGiovanni (1981a: 66-68) mentioned, there is no certainty that the early in-movers to South Hyde Park who still resided there when these interviews were conducted were representative of all the early in-movers. This problem is insurmountable, however, unless a study of neighborhood revitalization is begun during the risk-oblivious period and continued for a decade or more. The bias of not conducting the interviews until the last stage is that all the respondents were similar in one respect: They chose to remain in the neighborhood. Thus some differences among groups found in this survey may be smaller than those that actually existed among the original stages of in-movers. Second, the years chosen to separate the stages were based upon the opinions of informants. Although some might argue that this method is arbitrary or unscientific, it is probably the most reliable method available unless one contends that certain objective indicators of housing-market activity allow one to delineate the stages precisely.[7] DeGiovanni's (1983) study indicates that this is unlikely.

HYDE PARK

Hyde Park developed between 1892 and 1927 as a residential area less than two miles from the commercial center of Tampa. The southern section housed many of Tampa's economic and civic elite in bungalow-style and other architecturally significant dwellings. After World War II, however,

many of those structures decayed as relatively affluent, younger households began to locate in Tampa's developing suburban communities rather than move to older homes near a declining central business district. A turnabout began in the late 1960s and early 1970s in South Hyde Park as youthful, white home buyers began to purchase and rehabilitate homes. This movement was household led, rather than initiated primarily by developers. Historically, North Hyde Park housed a less well-to-do population than the southern section of the neighborhood, but it also declined after World War II. Gentrification did not begin there, however, until the later 1970s.

Census data for 1970 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1972) show the generally dissimilar characteristics of the two neighborhoods. However, they were similar in one respect—both housed a disproportionate number of elderly residents.[8] In both areas, 24% of the population was elderly, more than twice the percentage of elderly in the entire city. On the other hand, the percentage of individuals in either the 25-34 or 35-44 age ranges was considerably lower than in the rest of Tampa. Not surprisingly, the proportion of families with children under age 18 was also below the citywide average.

Compared with North Hyde Park, South Hyde Park had a larger percentage of single-family units (43% South/17% North) and a higher owner-estimated median value of owner-occupied homes ($14,800 South/$9,600 North). Furthermore, more of South Hyde Park's residents were college graduates (19% South/9% North), and a greater proportion (21.5% South/10% North) worked in professional or technical occupations. Finally, the median family income in South Hyde Park ($8,611) was considerably higher than in North Hyde Park ($5,506) (Hillsborough County-City Plan Commission, 1975).

In fact, the median income in South Hyde Park in 1970 was higher than the citywide level. Although most studies of gentrification have been focused on neighborhoods with incomes below the citywide median, some authors (such as McWilliams, 1975; DeGiovanni, 1983) have examined neighborhoods that were above the average on various dimensions of socioeconomic status before gentrification occurred. Clay (1979: 19) noted that about 5% of the revitalizing neighborhoods that he surveyed were primarily white-collar areas when revitalization began.[9]

Furthermore, the 1980 census (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1983) revealed that gentrification had progressed in South Hyde Park during the preceding decade. For example, 37% of the residents (aged 25 and older) had college degrees, and the median family income had become $22,500. Both of these were much greater than the citywide increases during the 1970s. A change also occurred in the age distribution of South Hyde Park's population

that was similar to the changes that occurred in other gentrifying neighborhoods. By 1980 only about 13% of the population was aged 65 or older, a slightly smaller percentage than in the entire city (14.8%), and the percentage of the population in the 25-34 age range increased dramatically during the 1970s.

A decline in elderly population and an increase in younger population also occurred in North Hyde Park during the decade. The increases in educational levels and incomes in this area, however, were not nearly as great as in South Hyde Park. In fact, although the increase in the educational attainment of its population was greater than the gain for the entire city, the increase in median family income was not.[10]

These census figures illustrate that South Hyde Park, where the vast majority (260/347) of the interviews were conducted for this study, was gentrifying rapidly during the 1970s. The process continued during the early 1980s. North Hyde Park presents a different picture: a more deprived area that was just beginning to gentrify during the later 1970s. Although relatively few (13) homeowner-residents who moved to North Hyde Park after 1977 were interviewed, an examination of their demographic characteristics and attitudes, as well as a comparison of these in-movers with households already living in North Hyde Park and with those moving to South Hyde Park after 1977, is useful in evaluating the merits of the stage models.

STAGES IN SOUTH HYDE PARK

DEMOGRAPHICS

The predictions of stage models that higher proportions of households in stage three than in stages one or two would include adults holding professional or managerial occupations was borne out by the survey (Table 1). Successive waves of migrants included higher proportions of professional or managerial households, and as predicted with the models, an especially large difference appeared between the risk-oblivious and risk-averse households ($tau_b = -.23$; chi-square = 5.2, $p < .02$).[11] Along with having higher occupational levels, risk-averse households also surpassed all other groups in their educational levels. Of these households, 80% included at least one adult with a college degree, and more than 40% included an adult with a graduate, law, or medical degree (Table 1). Again, the largest difference was between the risk-oblivious and risk-averse groups ($tau_c = -.20$; chi-square = 4.5, $p < .10$).

TABLE 1: South Hyde Park Homeowners: Demographics

	Original (Pre-1968)	*Risk-Oblivious (1968-1974)*	*Risk-Prone (1975-1977)*	*Risk-Averse (1978-1982)*
		(percentages)		
Age of oldest household member (1982)				
19-34	–	4	14	38
35-44	–	31	45	36
45-54	13	33	26	14
Over 54	87	32	17	11
(n = 257)	(96)	(49)	(42)	(70)
Occupation of highest-status household resident when moved in				
Professional, technical, and managerial	45	62	71	82
Other	55	39	29	18
(n = 206)	(71)	(39)	(35)	(61)
Kendall's $tau_c = -.34$, chi-square = 20.4 ($p < .01$).				
Risk-oblivious, risk-prone, risk-averse: $tau_c = -.19$, chi-square = 5.2 ($p < .08$).				
Risk-oblivious, risk-averse: $tau_b = -.23$, chi-square = 5.2 ($p < .02$).				
Risk-oblivious, risk-prone: $tau_b = -.10$, chi-square = .81 (N.S.).				
Risk-prone, risk-averse: $tau_b = -.12$, chi-square = 1.4 (N.S.).				
Highest education level in household				
Less than college graduate	52	31	29	20
College graduate	35	45	42	37
Postgraduate degree	13	25	29	43
(n = 260)	(100)	(49)	(41)	(70)
Kendall's $tau_c = .29$, chi-square = 28.5 ($p < .01$).				
Risk-oblivious, risk-prone, risk-averse: $tau_b = .15$, chi-square = 5.2 (N.S.).				
Risk-oblivious, risk-averse: $tau_c = .20$, chi-square = 4.5 ($p < .10$).				
Risk-oblivious, risk-prone: $tau_c = .04$, chi-square = .27 (N.S.).				
Risk-prone, risk-averse: $tau_c = .15$, chi-square = 2.3 (N.S.).				
Number of children when moved in				
0	38	36	44	54
1 or more	61	65	56	46
(n = 237)	(86)	(45)	(39)	(67)
Location of prior residence				
Tampa	71	70	54	51
Hillsborough County (suburbs)	6	13	20	26
Elsewhere in Florida	4	11	12	6
Outside Florida	18	6	15	17
(n = 248)	(92)	(46)	(41)	(69)

NOTE: Tau_b was used for square tables and tau_c for rectangular tables (see Watson and McGaw, 1980, and note 11 of this article).

However, little difference appeared between the risk-oblivious and risk-prone homeowners (tau_c = .04; chi-square = .27, N.S.).

A similar pattern holds regarding the percentage of households in each stage that included two adults who had earned at least a college degree when they purchased their home. Fully 50% of risk-averse households were in this category, compared with 32% of the risk-prone households and 35% of the risk-oblivious families.[12] The trend regarding households in which both adults had earned a graduate, law, or medical degree was slightly different and was actually more compatible with the stage models' predictions. In 20% of the risk-averse households, 15% of the risk-prone households, and 10% of the risk-oblivious households, both adults had obtained this level of education.[13]

These highly educated and upper-status risk-averse newcomers to South Hyde Park were, contrary to predictions in the stage models, the least likely group of in-movers to already have had children when they moved into their present homes (Table 1). This was in spite of the fact that more than 92% of these in-movers were already married when moving in, a slightly higher figure than for the risk-oblivious (85%) or risk-prone (84%) gentrifiers.

One of the most significant predictions from the stage models is that higher proportions of in-movers during the later stages will be migrants from the suburbs than during the earlier years of gentrification. Virtually all of the empirical studies of professionals purchasing homes in gentrifying neighborhoods provided evidence that the vast majority of them had already been residing in that city, frequently in the same neighborhood (see Gale, 1979). Therefore, analysts concluded that gentrification did not represent a back-to-the-city movement. Gale (1980: 108) and Pattison (1983: 87), however, suggested that neighborhoods might attract more suburbanites as the gentrification process continues, and that contention is confirmed in South Hyde Park. There was a steady increase in the percentage of in-movers from suburban Hillsborough County (Table 1).[14]

ATTITUDES

As predicted with the stage models, the risk-averse migrants were more likely to indicate financial investment as their primary motivation for purchasing their home (19%) than were migrants during the risk-prone or risk-oblivious stages. However, little difference appeared between these first two groups (11%, 9%).[15] In fact, the dominant reason that was given by in-movers during each of the stages for buying their Hyde Park home was the architectural or historical character of their home or neighborhood (Table 2).

TABLE 2: South Hyde Park Homeowners: Attitudes

	Original (Pre-1968)		*Risk-Oblivious (1968-1974)*		*Risk-Prone (1975-1977)*		*Risk-Averse (1978-1982)*	
	(percentages)							
Major or second reason for purchasing home	*1st*	*1st or 2nd*	*1st*	*1st or 2nd*	*1st*	*1st or 2nd*	*1st*	*1st or 2nd*
Close to job or central business district	13	20	2	6	7	21	7	20
Price of home	18	22	17	40	16	28	10	24
Financing arrangements	2	7	8	13	2	7	4	10
Historical/architectural character of area/home	24	40	36	57	54	67	50	70
Financial investment	6	8	11	19	9	40	19	50
Other	37	39	26	28	12	14	10	10
(n = 257)	(97)		(47)		(43)		(70)	
Percentage indicating unsatisfactory service								
Public schools	8		13		12		13	
Police protection	14		10		28		24	
Street lighting	10		18		14		24	
Public transportation	36		35		23		45	
Average dissatisfaction per respondent	(.50)		(.65)		(.63)		(.87)	
Percentage perceiving problem								
Heavy traffic	45		35		26		34	
Streets needing repair	19		10		19		9	
Burglaries	78		88		86		76	
Street muggings	6		6		7		5	
Trash or litter	35		20		33		23	
Rundown housing	41		31		52		54	
Average problem per respondent	(2.16)		(1.87)		(2.17)		(2.01)	
Evaluation of neighborhood								
Excellent	44		55		60		53	
Good	46		43		31		26	
Fair	10		2		10		19	
Poor	–		–		–		1	
(n = 262)	(102)		(49)		(42)		(69)	
Opinion of Amlea								
Definitely approve	25		31		26		31	
Generally approve	33		38		29		47	
Generally disapprove	16		7		14		10	
Definitely disapprove	27		24		31		13	
(n = 219)	(77)		(45)		(35)		(62)	

(continued)

TABLE 2 Continued

Kendall's $tau_b = -.10$, chi-square = 10.15 (N.S.).
Risk-oblivious, risk-prone, risk-averse: $tau_c = -.07$, chi-square = 7.3 (N.S.).
Risk-oblivious, risk-averse: $tau_c = -.07$, chi-square = 2.7 (N.S.).
Risk-oblivious, risk-prone: $tau_c = .12$, chi-square = 2.2 (N.S.).
Risk-prone, risk-averse: $tau_c = -.19$, chi-square = 6.4 ($p < .09$).

Over 60% of the respondents also noted a second most important reason for purchasing their homes (Table 2). Examining the differential responses among in-movers who noted a reason as being either of primary or secondary importance in their location decisions produces greater differences among the successive groups. Although investment concerns were mentioned by only 19% of the risk-oblivious households, they were noted by 40% of the risk-prone and 50% of the risk-averse groups. This pattern is compatible with the predictions in the stage models.

This survey was conducted during a period of intense conflict in South Hyde Park over a proposed development by a Canadian firm. The developer was seeking a rezoning to allow the replacement of several existing older homes with upscale boutiques, restaurants, and expensive condominiums. Opponents of the developer's proposal argued that the change would cause increased traffic in the neighborhood and be incompatible with the area's historical character. Although a variety of arguments was offered by the project's proponents, investment concerns were certainly crucial reasons for their support. The data in Table 2 support the predictions in the stage models that the risk-averse homeowners would be the most supportive of the development. More than 75% of the most recent home buyers in Hyde Park approved of the proposal, and only 13% "definitely disapproved." Contrary to the stage models, however, the risk-oblivious gentrifiers were more supportive of the development than were the risk-prone in-movers.

The stage models' predictions that the risk-averse households would be the most critical of the existing neighborhood conditions and quality of service delivery and that the risk-oblivious in-movers would be the least critical are only partially borne out by the survey results. The average unsatisfactory response per respondent in the different groups indicates that the risk-averse group shows a greater tendency than the other in-movers to be critical of neighborhood services (Table 2). In addition, a higher percentage of the risk-averse group rated the neighborhood as fair, rather than as excellent or good (Table 2). However, no clear difference appears between the risk-oblivious and risk-prone groups on these measures. Furthermore, the pattern of respondents' perceptions of neighborhood problems is more diver-

gent from the stage models' predictions. Although the risk-oblivious group was less likely than the other in-movers to perceive problems, the risk-prone in-movers (rather than the risk-averse in-movers) were the most critical of neighborhood conditions.[16]

NORTH HYDE PARK

One might contend that one reason that the risk-oblivious in-movers to South Hyde Park displayed some characteristics not compatible with the predictions in the models (such as that they were more likely than later in-movers to have had children when they purchased their present homes) was that prior to gentrification the residents in the neighborhood were financially better-off than were the residents of most gentrifying neighborhoods discussed in the literature. Furthermore, as noted earlier, one also might suggest that those moving in during that early period who remained in their homes until the time of the interviews for this study were not necessarily representative of all the homeowners who moved into South Hyde Park during the risk-oblivious period. Therefore, it is desirable to look at the in-movers to North Hyde Park.

These home buyers were purchasing dwellings in an area that included more multiple-family housing and a higher proportion of lower- and moderate-income households than South Hyde Park did. Also, unlike South Hyde Park, which housed virtually no blacks, a small percentage (about 5%) of North Hyde Park's population was black. Furthermore, the vast majority of those who purchased homes in North Hyde Park after 1977 were still living there at the time of the interviews for this study, so there is little possibility that the sample is unrepresentative of the in-movers during this period. The number of interviewees was small, including only 13 homeowners. On one hand, this appears to be undesirable. Obviously, one feels more comfortable making conclusions based upon a larger number of respondents. On the other hand, previous research had indicated that there often are relatively few in-movers during the earliest stage. Therefore, a three-quarters sample of these home buyers can provide valuable information.

The demographic picture of risk-oblivious home buyers in North Hyde Park generally fits the dominant description of gentrifiers (Table 3). More than 60% of the risk-oblivious households (8 of 13) included at least one member with a college degree, compared to only 26% of the households who had purchased homes earlier. Furthermore, more than 70% (8 of 11) of the in-mover households included at least one adult employed in a professional

TABLE 3: North Hyde Park Homeowners: Demographics and Reasons for Moving In

	Original (Pre-1978)	*Risk-Oblivious (1978-1982)*	
	(percentages)		
Age of oldest household member (1982)			
19-34	–	54	
35-44	–	31	
45-54	–	8	
Over 54	–	8	
(n = 13)		(13)	
Occupation of highest-status household occupant when moved in			
Professional, technical, and managerial	29	73	
Other	71	27	
(n = 50)	(39)	(11)	
Highest education level in household			
Less than college graduate	75	39	
College graduate	18	46	
Postgraduate degree	8	16	
(n = 69)	(56)	(13)	
Number of children when moved in			
0	44	54	
1 or more	56	46	
(n = 65)	(52)	(13)	
Location of prior residences			
Tampa	80	69	
Hillsborough County (suburbs)	6	15	
Elsewhere in Florida	9	–	
Outside Florida	6	15	
(n = 67)	(54)	(13)	
Major or second reason for purchasing home		*1st*	*1st or 2nd*
Close to job or central business district	–	15	23
Price of home	–	23	31
Financing arrangements	–	8	15
Historical/architectural character of area/home	–	46	62
Financial investment	–	–	8
Other	–	8	15
(n = 13)		(13)	

or managerial position when they first moved in. This figure far exceeds the less than one-third of the original households that included an adult employed in one of these occupational categories.

As the stage models predict, none of the in-movers to North Hyde Park noted that they moved in primarily for investment purposes, and only 8% mentioned investment as either the first or second most important reason for moving into their home (Table 3). However, although they did not cite investment as one of their two most important reasons for moving into the neighborhood, the North Hyde Park gentry did want to see their neighborhood become more like South Hyde Park. More than 75% of the respondents (10 of 13) stated that they wanted to see fewer subsidized low-income housing units in the area, and over half (6 of 11) preferred fewer rental apartments in their neighborhood. On the other hand, more than 80% (10 of 12) wanted to see more space devoted to new single-family homes, and more than 50% (6 of 11) desired new condominiums in their neighborhood (not shown).

COMPARISON WITH RISK-AVERSE HOME BUYERS

Gale (1979: 299) found that the in-movers to his study neighborhood that was still in the early stage of revitalization were more critical of conditions in their neighborhood than were the migrants to the neighborhood that had been gentrifying for a longer period of time. This pattern also is generally compatible with the responses in North and South Hyde Park (Table 4). The average per-respondent dissatisfaction score for both neighborhood problems and services was higher for the North Hyde Park risk-oblivious in-movers than for the South Hyde Park risk-averse gentrifiers. These responses are, in fact, what one would expect given the "objective" differences in conditions in the two neighborhoods.

More important is the different result found in this survey from Gale's (1979: 299) conclusion that the in-movers to a neighborhood in the early stages of gentrification are less committed to remain in the neighborhood than are the in-movers to a more gentrified neighborhood. Instead, a slightly higher percentage of the gentry in North Hyde Park (90%) than the risk-averse group in South Hyde Park (81%) intended to remain in their present homes for the next several years (Table 4).

Why do they have this commitment in spite of their dissatisfaction with several aspects of their neighborhood? The primary reasons probably concern their expectations for the future of their neighborhood. More than

TABLE 4: Comparison of North Hyde Park Risk-Oblivious with South Hyde Park Risk-Averse Homeowners: Opinions of Neighborhood Quality and Services and Moving Intentions

	North Hyde Park Risk-Oblivious (1978-1982)	*South Hyde Park Risk-Averse (1978-1982)*
	(percentages)	
Percentage perceiving problem		
Heavy traffic	39	34
Streets needing repair	31	9
Burglaries	77	76
Street muggings	15	5
Trash or litter	54	32
Rundown housing	91	54
Average problem per respondent	(2.9)	(2.0)
Percentage indicating unsatisfactory service		
Public schools	13	13
Police protection	39	24
Street lighting	50	24
Public transportation	50	45
Average dissatisfaction per respondent	(1.2)	(0.9)
Evaluation of neighborhood		
Excellent	–	53
Good	67	26
Fair	33	19
Poor	–	1
(n = 80)	(12)	(68)
Likelihood of moving in two or three years		
Definitely	–	3
Probably	9	16
Probably Not	54	39
Definitely Not	36	42
(n = 80)	(11)	(69)

three-quarters of the risk-oblivious respondents in North Hyde Park expected that the condition of housing would improve during the next two years, and half of them expected the quality of police protection to improve. Furthermore, a majority of the respondents expected that the social-class composition of the neighborhood would upgrade during the next three to four years. Significantly, nearly all of those with this expectation spoke approvingly of this change (not shown). Thus their expectations regarding the class structure

of their neighborhood are compatible with their desire to have fewer subsidized rental housing units and more new single-family homes and condominium units.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE MODELS

Most of the demographic characteristics of successive waves of in-movers to South Hyde Park were consistent with the predictions of the stage models. The models were not as successful in predicting the changing attitudes among the three groups of in-movers, but they generally were accurate in the description of the risk-averse group relative to the earlier gentrifiers.

The earliest in-movers' hopes and expectations for the future of the neighborhood when they first purchased their homes in South Hyde Park could not be discerned retrospectively from that survey. Data from the North Hyde Park survey, however, showed that although the risk-oblivious in-movers generally fit the demographic profile of gentrifiers regarding age, education, and occupation relative to those already living in their neighborhood, they did not conform to the stage models' portrait of the risk-oblivious newcomers as pioneers who were supportive of diversity within the neighborhood. Although the risk-oblivious in-movers failed to note investment concerns among their major reasons for moving to North Hyde Park, they did prefer both the changing land uses and the differing social characteristics of new residents in their neighborhood – elements that are compatible with investment concerns. In short, to a significant degree, they wanted their neighborhood to become more like South Hyde Park.

In fact, studies of gentrifying areas show a mixed picture relative to the models' predictions about the early in-movers' household composition, motivations, and respect for diversity.[17] These studies lend support to the argument that gentrification is a "chaotic" phenomenon, involving diverse processes in different contexts (Rose, 1984; Beauregard, 1986).

The stage models are useful as a starting point, however, in examining the divergent processes occurring in different neighborhoods and cities. Although inherent in at least two versions of the models (NUC, 1978: 3; NAN, 1980) is the explicit recognition that the gentrification process is likely to vary among neighborhoods with differing characteristics, attempts should be made to establish more explicitly which factors are likely to lead to patterns that either support the predictions of the models or diverge from them. For example, at least two variables are likely to influence the characteristics of the original in-movers.[18] One of these relates to the initiator of the gentrifica-

tion process and a second to the context of the particular city in which it is occurring. It is likely that developer-led gentrification (see Beauregard, forthcoming; Tobin and Judd, 1982) will attract gentrifiers who already display many of the attitudes that the models predict for risk-prone or risk-averse movers, because the risk factor is decreased by large numbers of gentrifiers locating in an area at the same time. When gentrification is primarily a household-led phenomenon, however, the early in-movers are more likely to display the characteristics predicted by the stage models.

Another differentiating factor is the degree of gentrification that had already occurred in nearby areas of the city. In-movers to North Hyde Park were well aware of the changes that had occurred in South Hyde Park and clearly saw the possibilities for their neighborhood changing in the same ways. Professionals moving into an inner-city neighborhood in a city in which little gentrification has occurred, however, are more likely to fit the risk-oblivious characteristics identified in the stage models.

Paradoxically, when the early in-movers display risk-averse rather than risk-oblivious attitudes, the gentrification process is more likely to expand and follow the remainder of the general demographic pattern predicted by the models than if the early in-movers conform to the models' predictions. This is because it is in the neighborhoods in which the early gentrifiers display risk-oblivious characteristics that these in-movers are more willing to support or even advocate governmental policies designed to maintain economic and racial diversity. The rub is that to the extent that in-movers with these characteristics are more likely to be gentrifying neighborhoods in the more distressed cities, they are likely to find that the elected officials of these communities are attempting to promote rapid gentrification in their quest to improve the tax base and image of their city. In these cities, therefore, politics will matter in influencing the course of neighborhood change.

NOTES

1. The models also indicate that the housing market, role of government, activity of the real estate industry, and the magnitude of displacement will vary from one stage to another. See DeGiovanni (1983: 24-25) for a summary of these components of the models.

2. Pattison (1977) was the first analyst to suggest this concept.

3. The models actually indicate that in-movers during the early stages will tend to be professionals rather than managers, but no conceptual basis is offered for this distinction. I aggregate professionals and managers in discussing in-mover occupational trends.

4. Gale (1976, 1977) surveyed homeowners in Mount Pleasant and two different areas of Capitol Hill. The Mount Pleasant residents who were interviewed had moved in between August 1974 and September 1975. Capitol Hill in-movers had purchased homes during 1976.

5. In North Hyde Park, only one stage of gentrifiers was sampled because, as noted in the text, gentrification did not begin until late in the 1970s.

6. As noted in the text, Pattison (1977) interviewed only 10 residents in each neighborhood. Gale (1980: 98) interviewed 57 households in Mount Pleasant and 62 in Capitol Hill. DeGiovanni (1981b: Part B-42) interviewed 91 homeowners in Inman Park and 70 in Spring Garden. He also interviewed 78 renters in each of these neighborhoods. Of the Inman Park homeowners that he surveyed, 70 were in-movers, and 21 were long-term residents. Of the Spring Garden homeowners, 43 were in-movers, and 27 were long-term residents.

7. In fact, Clay (1979: 303) and the NAN (1980) suggested that the boundaries are overlapping, although "relatively distinct." Thus these variations of the model would not predict that a year or so difference in stage cutoffs would dramatically affect the results. The date chosen for the beginning of gentrification, 1969, is compatible with the NUC's suggestion (1978: 4) that the 1969-1970 period was the beginning of revitalization activity in many cities. It also is compatible with Clay's (1979: 59) contention that most of his study neighborhoods began gentrifying in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

8. The NUC (1978: 7) noted that many gentrifying areas included significant elderly populations.

9. It is actually common for gentrifying areas to have a large number of professionals living there before the process begins. Both the NUC (1978: 6) and Henig (1980) emphasized this point.

10. It is impossible to give exact figures because of the overlapping of census blocks beyond neighborhood boundaries.

11. Kendall's tau_b and tau_c were used to measure association between these ordinal-level data because with these measures, unlike with gamma, ties can be accounted for. Tau is a more conservative measure than gamma, resulting in lower scores. For example, the gamma in Table 1 for occupational differences among all four groups was –.48, rather than the tau_c score of –.34. Somer's D also is an unsatisfactory measure because of the manner in which ties are treated (see Nie et al., 1975: 227-229). Chi-square significance levels as high as $p < .10$ are reported because the relatively small sample sizes make statistical significance more difficult to achieve.

12. Of the original households, 18% were in this category.

13. The survey asked the respondents to give their 1982 household income. The pattern suggests that the most recent in-movers had higher incomes when they purchased their present homes than did earlier in-movers when they bought theirs, but it is impossible to specify the exact income categories that households were in when they purchased their homes.

14. Pattison (1977: 160) found this trend among renters in Bay Village, as did DeGiovanni (1983) in one neighborhood that he studied.

15. The residents in the survey were given the same choices that Gale (1977) used in his surveys of gentrifiers in Washington, D.C.

16. Both the neighborhood conditions and services that were enumerated in the survey were the same ones that Laska and Spain (1979) used in their New Orleans survey.

17. In fact, both Gale (1979, 1980) and the NUC (1978) are somewhat unclear concerning the motivations of the pioneers. The NUC (p. 5) noted in one section of its report that some of the initial in-movers were motivated in part by investment concerns, but it failed to note this in its outline of the stages (p. 3). Gale (1979: 303; 1980: 104) suggested that investment potential is a motivator for the initial in-movers, but he also failed to include this in the general presentation of his model (1980: 105). Godfrey (1988: 194) concluded that gentrifiers in Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco wanted social diversity to continue in the neighborhood. In his study of "stalled" gentrification in a Washington, D.C., neighborhood, Williams (1988) suggested that the motivations for the early gentrifiers to move to Elm Valley were complex but that they generally

respected the existing diversity of the neighborhood and wanted it to continue. Williams (p. 138) also speculated that newer gentrifiers are likely to be "less reluctant to seek their own interest and to judge more harshly those who are different." Concerning gentrifiers' family composition, the NUC (1978: 7) reported that several of the gentrifying neighborhoods in their survey attracted families with children early in the gentrification process. Pattison (1977) also found a predominance of families with children in his study of gentrifiers in West Cambridge.

18. Other factors, of course, can also influence the characteristics of early in-movers. For example, as the NAN (1980) and NUC (1978) suggested, the initial characteristics of the neighborhood can be important. A largely middle-income neighborhood, such as South Hyde Park, might attract early in-movers who are not primarily risk-oblivious in their attitudes because they have less fear for their personal safety and perhaps more grounds for believing that their home values will appreciate.

REFERENCES

BEAUREGARD, R. A. (1986) "The chaos and complexity of gentrification," pp. 35-55 in N. Smith and P. Williams (eds.) Gentrification of the City. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

BEAUREGARD, R. A. (forthcoming) "Trajectories of neighborhood change: the case of gentrification." Environment and Planning.

BLACK, T. (1980) "Private market renovation in central cities: an Urban Land Institute survey," pp. 3-12 in S. Laska and D. Spain (eds.) Back to the City. New York: Pergamon.

CLAY, P. L. (1979) Neighborhood Renewal. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

DeGIOVANNI, F. (1981a) Private Market Revitalization: Its Characteristics and Consequences. Research Triangle, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

DeGIOVANNI, F. (1981b) Private Market Revitalization: Its Characteristics and Consequences. Appendixes. Research Triangle, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

DeGIOVANNI, F. (1983) "Patterns of change in housing market activity in revitalizing neighborhoods." J. of the Amer. Planning Assn. 49 (Winter): 22-39.

GALE, D. E. (1976) The Back to the City Movement . . . Or Is It? Occasional Paper Series. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning.

GALE, D. E. (1977) The Back-to-the-City Movement Revisited. Occasional Paper Series. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning.

GALE, D. E. (1979) "Middle class resettlement in older urban neighborhoods." J. of the Amer. Planning Assn. 45 (July): 293-304.

GALE, D. E. (1980) "Neighborhood resettlement: Washington, D.C.," pp. 95-115 in S. Laska and D. Spain (eds.) Back to the City. New York: Pergamon.

GODFREY, B. J. (1988) Neighborhoods in Transition. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

HAMNETT, C. (1984) "Gentrification and residential location theory: a review and assessment," pp. 283-319 in D. T. Herbert and R. J. Johnston (eds.) Geography and the Urban Environment: Progress in Research and Applications, Vol. 6. New York: John Wiley.

HENIG, J. R. (1980) "Gentrification and displacement within cities: a comparative analysis." Social Sci. Q. 61: 638-652.

Hillsborough County-City Plan Commission (1975) Hyde Park Plan. Tampa, FL: Author.

JOHNSTON, R. J. (1971) Urban Residential Patterns. New York: Praeger.

La GORY, M. and J. PIPKIN (1981) Urban Social Space. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

LASKA, S. B. and D. SPAIN (1979) "Urban policy and planning in the wake of gentrification: anticipating renovators' demands." J. of the Amer. Planning Assn. 45 (October): 523-531.

LASKA, S. B. and D. SPAIN [eds.] (1980) Back to the City. New York: Pergamon.

LIPTON, S. G. (1980) "Evidence of central city revival," pp. 42-60 in S. Laska and D. Spain (eds.) Back to the City. New York: Pergamon.

McWILLIAMS, S. W. (1975) "Recycling a declining community: middle class migration to Virginia-highlands." M.A. thesis, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

National Association of Neighborhoods (1980) NAN Bulletin. No. 36 (February-March). Washington, DC: Author.

National Urban Coalition (1978) City Neighborhoods in Transition. Washington, DC: Author.

NELSON, K. P. (1988) Gentrification and Distressed Cities. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

NIE, N. H., C. H. HULL, J. G. JENKINS, K. STEINBRENNER, and D. H. BENT (1975) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

PALEN, J. J. and B. LONDON [eds.] (1984) Gentrification, Displacement, and Neighborhood Revitalization. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.

PATTISON, T. (1977) "The process of neighborhood upgrading and gentrification." M.A. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

PATTISON, T. (1983) "The stages of gentrification: the case of Bay Village," pp. 77-92 in P. Clay and R. Hollister (eds.) Neighborhood Policy and Planning. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Polk, R. L. & Company (1967-1982) Polk's Tampa (Hillsborough County, FL) City Directory. Richmond, VA: Author.

ROSE, D. (1984) "Rethinking gentrification: beyond the uneven development of Marxist urban theory." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 1: 47-74.

SWANSTROM, T. and R. KERSTEIN (1989) "Job and housing displacement: a review of competing policy perspectives." Comparative Urban and Community Research 2: 254-296.

TOBIN, G. A. and D. JUDD (1982) "Moving the suburbs to the city: neighborhood revitalization and the 'amenities bundle.' " Social Sci. Q. 63: 771-779.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census (1972) 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Census Tracts, Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, PHC (1)-212. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1983) 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Census Tracts, Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, PHC 80-2-349. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

WATSON, G. and D. McGAW (1980) Statistical Inquiry: Elementary Statistics for the Political, Social, and Policy Sciences. New York: John Wiley.

WILLIAMS, B. (1988) Upscaling Downtown. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

Robert Kerstein is Professor of Political Science and Urban Studies at the University of Tampa. He has written articles on urban policy and election law reform and is currently working on a historical study of political regimes in Tampa, Florida.