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Abstract

Gentrification is described as the process through which previously poor, run-down neighborhoods experience economic improvement as members of the middle-class invest in the neighborhood with the goal of revitalizing the community (Kirkland, 2008); however, does this definition represent a limited perspective of the subject? Common consequences of gentrification for long-term residents include a loss of familiarity with the neighborhood and a feeling of exclusion from the new community (Hagemans, 2015; Twigge-Molecey, 2014). This research addresses the Crosstown community in Memphis, Tennessee, which is experiencing a large-scale revitalization project through the renovation of an abandoned building into a mixed-use vertical urban village. This study is concerned with two questions: (1) Is gentrification occurring in Crosstown? And (2) how do Crosstown community members feel about the changes in their neighborhood? Interviews with nine community members in Crosstown found that people with occupational connections to Crosstown see the developments through an economic lens and feel positively about the direction of the neighborhood, whereas residents not only feel uninformed and excluded from the process, but also fear that gentrification will transform Crosstown into an unfamiliar, white, middle-class community.
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I. Introduction

Gentrification is described as the process by which previously disinvested, economically unstable urban neighborhoods are revitalized and renewed as middle- and upper-class whites move into the area (Kirkland, 2008); however, does this definition reflect a limited perspective of the process? Some people affected by gentrification might argue that it is not a process of renewal and rebuilding. While gentrification can induce an influx of money through the establishment of small businesses, many of the original poorer residents as a result are adversely affected; for example, gentrification often causes a rise in property taxes, which many of the original residents are unable to afford (Lin, 1995). Additionally, the original residents may not have even agreed that their community needed renewal; for example, the culture that unified the original community may be threatened as professionals populate the area and impose facets of their own ideas and cultures. On the other hand, participants of gentrification support the process not for the sake of harming the original residents, but with the goal of settling in an affordable area and improving the community’s living conditions as well as the city’s overall socioeconomic standing.

This project will focus on the Crosstown neighborhood in Memphis, TN, which is experiencing a revitalization effort that began in 2010 with the Crosstown Concourse initiative. Its goals include spurring socioeconomic activity in the previously low-income, highly vacant neighborhood. The neighborhood has since seen some demographical changes that could be indicative of gentrification patterns. For the purpose of the study, I have designated Census Tract 25 as my focus area, ranging from Jackson Ave. on the north, Stonewall St. on the east, Poplar Ave. on the south, and I-240 on the west.
This project assesses the attitudes of Crosstown community members regarding the changes they have experienced and the level to which they feel involved in the revitalization plans. This research is important because there is very little existing research regarding the subject of gentrification in Memphis, so there is no way to address possible concerns that may be present in these revitalizing communities. Members of these communities deserve to have a voice in the public sphere so they can vocalize the challenges they may be encountering, but also so that they can speak on behalf of the successes of the changes so that these assets can be strengthened and reinforced. This research in Memphis contributes to the study of gentrification in a broader context in the sense that it analyzes various perspectives on urban revitalization in.
an area where gentrification is believed to not be occurring. This study will reveal why it is necessary to thoroughly investigate the potentially negative implications of urban revitalization on vulnerable communities, even when the general consensus of a city regarding the project is favorable.

II. Gentrification as a Phenomenon

The concept of gentrification, which is described as a phenomenon in which disinvested inner-city cities are revitalized and reinvested as a middle- and upper-class population moves in, has been a hot topic of conversation in almost every large city as of late (Kirkland, 2008, p. 19). Gentrification is often used as a plan for cities to redevelop and consequently attract more tourists and young professionals who will invest in the city. Gentrification is a long, gradual process and sometimes is hard to detect when it is occurring. For example, Freeman and Barconi (2004) found that in the case of New York City in the 1990s, residential turnover among households in gentrifying neighborhoods occurred slowly rather than rapidly, leading many to believe that displacement was not a concern. However, the consequences of gentrification may make themselves more obvious when the condition of the specific gentrified neighborhood is compared over several decades. In general, gentrification involves middle-class households relocating to run-down and disinvested neighborhoods, and then buying and renovating properties, thus raising their values. As a result, contract rents and property tax bills also are raised, which often causes the displacement of lower-class households who cannot afford such expenses (Baxter 2009). It can be argued that gentrification revitalizes cities, brings in tourism and makes neighborhoods safer and cleaner; on the other hand, it threatens the living conditions and welfare of the original lower-class residents either through physical displacement or a loss of that which is familiar in their communities.
Economic implications

The goal of gentrification and urban revitalization in most cases is to generate wealth and new net jobs by bringing economic opportunities to people. The central issues, according to a study conducted in 1995 by Blakely and Small, should be the “development of employment, creation of a locational advantage, formation of social capital, reduction of welfare dependency, and the creation of local economic institutions.” There is a great deal of debate on whether or not gentrification is effective in itself, as well as for whom it is most beneficial.

Proponents of gentrification argue that economic success in disinvested neighborhoods can only be achieved through the building of mixed-income communities, which would create access to more opportunities (Powell, 1999). In many cases, gentrification has yielded positive socioeconomic impacts on cities and neighborhoods that exemplify many of the goals proponents of the strategy have. For example, a sudden boom of condominium high-rise towers in Toronto during the early 2000s illustrates massive investment of productive capital with many positive outcomes, such as cleaning up the inner city and reintroducing spaces of consumption, luxury housing and new economic uses which would increase overall socioeconomic welfare of the city. However, the same study found that the city was using public spaces for uses such as parking and art to raise property values in the area instead of using them for affordable housing programs that would benefit lower-income residents, which could likely contribute to displacement (Thorben, 2009).

While gentrification can often strengthen pride in a community, the socioeconomic effects on the original residents can take a turn for the worse, even when gentrification does not involve physical displacement (Betancur, 2011). Though it may be easy to assume that gentrification is good for the city if no one is being forced out of the neighborhood, communities
often experience disinvestment or exclusion in the process. As gentrification occurs, vacancies are filled and housing densities increase, which thus expands the total population so that while the sheer number of low-income residents may not decline, the proportion does-- even though gentrification is supposed to improve the overall quality of life for city dwellers (Hagemans, 2015). Instigators of gentrification, due to their higher economic, social and cultural capital, tend to support higher-quality and more expensive shops and services in their neighborhood, successfully push for infrastructure and landscape improvements and draw public attraction to the community. By the very virtue of this occurrence is it evident that the middle-class residents in a gentrifying neighborhood directly or indirectly exclude low-income households through the ongoing loss of affordable housing stock and options (Hagemans, 2015).

One perspective is that poor cities are truly more fearful of losing control of their neighborhood with the repopulation of their neighborhood “foreshadowing white domination” than they are fearful of housing displacement (Powell, 1999). Nevertheless, proponents still maintain that though small-scale gentrification may occur in poorer cities, they will otherwise continue to lose population, thereby suggesting that the benefits of gentrification outweigh whatever costs it may have on low income communities (Powell, 1999). This is relevant to the city of Memphis, where the total population fell from 690,186 to 653,450 between the years 2000 and 2013. Population decline is a major concern of civic leaders, so although the Crosstown revitalization initiative may be met with some displacement in the neighborhood, it could retain or attract people to the city and thus benefit the broader Memphis community.

*The creative class*

Neighborhoods experiencing gentrification often see a sharp rise in their younger populations--often referred to as the “creative class”--due to the relatively low cost of living in
previously disinvested neighborhoods. Florida (2003) describes the creative class as a highly-educated, affluent, burgeoning sector of the workforce sought after for corporate investment and economic success in today’s world. The distinguishing characteristic of this group is that it holds the shared desire to freely exercise creativity, originality, diversity and innovation (Florida, 2003, 17). The creative class is attracted to environments in which they can socialize with people unlike themselves, and are increasingly seen moving to areas noted for their authenticity and uniqueness, specifically finding appeal in neighborhoods with historic buildings, a unique music scene, or cultural peculiarity (Florida, 2003, 22). This creates a mixed community, with urban grit juxtapositioned against renovated buildings.

It is important for a city’s economic development to attract members of the creative class, for they are highly skilled hard workers. Florida (2003) suggests to civic leaders that in order to advance the economic standing of their city, they must concentrate on expanding the population of members of the creative class. In order to do so, they must advertise the city as a diverse environment with lifestyle options tailored to their interests and has low barriers to entry (24). The city of Baltimore, where civic leaders joke that they “would be so lucky as to have the problem of gentrification,” is concentrating its urban renewal strategies on attracting members of the creative class through the installment of mandatory bike paths, creating a “mentoring scheme for creative wannabes,” establishing a street-performers program, transforming vacant industrial buildings into art studios, organizing a city-wide music festival and arts parade, and more (City of Baltimore, 2004). Peck (2005) shows how Baltimore’s program has largely contributed to gentrification in the city:

“In order to be enacted, they presume and work with gentrification, conceived as a positive urban process, while making a virtue of selective and variable outcomes, unique
neighborhood by unique neighborhood. And with almost breathtaking circularity, it is now being proposed that these gentrification-friendly strategies should be evaluated, not according to hackneyed metrics like job creation or poverty alleviation, but according to more relevant measures like . . . increased house prices!"

Lehmann (2004) explains the dangers of this: “the core values that Florida charts as the key to the ‘creative ethos’— individuality, meritocracy, diversity, and openness — are all by now slogans of first resort for the same corporate economy that [he] claims is being displaced by high-tech innovators in no-collar workplaces and edgy neighborhoods.” These concerns of increasing house values and a growing corporate scene raise the question of whether or not low-income residents or local business owners will be able to keep up with the changing socioeconomic narrative of the city, or if they will find themselves unable to pay higher bills and thus be pushed out of the neighborhood.

Race

As we consider the physical, socioeconomic, and cultural aspects of gentrification, it is important to also explore the racial dimensions of the process, which are often prevalent and overwhelming. The connections between race and gentrification are often unspoken and under-researched, though they are visibly manifested in the demographics of the neighborhoods—especially with regards to the long-term lower-income residents. Considering that the residents most negatively affected by gentrification are mostly low-income African-Americans (Boyd, 2005), it is remarkable that there is such a lack of attention paid to the racial aspects of gentrification- especially because research on the subject of gentrification itself is abundant. While race can sometimes prove to be a unifying factor that helps communities to resist displacement, it can often add tensions between the whites and minority ethnicity that adds a
challenge to effectively working with the gentrifiers to combat negative implications (Kirkland, 2008). For example, firms owned by non-African Americans are eight times less likely to employ African Americans than are firms owned by African Americans (Boston & Ross, 1997).

One way to avoid the racial disparities induced by the practice of gentrification is to create a framework for urban revitalization that is more supportive of black business development—thereby empowering, rather than marginalizing their community. According to Boston and Ross (1997), successful black firms often choose to situate in low-income neighborhoods and build their workforce with African-American and inner city employees. Because this tactic directly minimizes the potential for these vulnerable groups to be marginalized in revitalization efforts, black-owned businesses should not be discounted in favor of approaches created with the goal of drawing external and foreign businesses into the city’s industrial localities. Giving black-owned businesses a bigger role in urban revitalization efforts can alleviate the problems of black unemployment and increase their already limited opportunities for financial success (Boston & Ross, 1997).

III. Cognitive Consequences of Gentrification

Perceptions of neighborhoods

The two most widely acknowledged outcomes of gentrification are the positive revitalization of the city and the danger of displacement. However, another more discrete outcome often arises in gentrified areas: the impact it has on how residents—especially long-term residents—perceive their neighborhood. This is important in the context of gentrification because residents place a great importance on neighborhood stability when developing their perceptions of changes in their communities (Aitken, 1990). Gentrification is known to greatly affect the cultures of certain neighborhoods and can significantly alter the relationships residents have with
their surroundings, especially if they have resided in that area for a long time. Sullivan (2007) found specifically that longtime black residents were much less likely than other demographics to approve of neighborhood changes. The research further suggests that this may be because newcomers are less attached to established neighborhood organizations, such as black churches, and therefore do not mourn their loss when they are pushed out of the neighborhood.

A major facet of this issue is the notions people have of “home.” Quiros (2009) used narratives to explore people’s perceptions of home and its meaning with regards to neighborhood transformation and gentrification in downtown Tucson, Arizona. By using firsthand narratives, the research discovered a broader community ideology characterized by nostalgia about the history and cultural foundations of the neighborhood, the roles of insiders and outsiders, and the formation of identity as public social spaces are created. The research gave participants an opportunity to voice their perspectives regarding the transformations in their neighborhood as well as the obstacles preventing them from taking part in community and neighborhood conversations and from building a strong sense of identity and efficiency as a community collectively (Quiros, 2009). Whether or not changes in notions of home are to be considered a positive or negative consequence is subject to opinion, but this study unveils the more inconspicuous, ground-level implications of gentrification that often are not brought to the public’s attention.

_Senses of identity and familiarity_

As notions of home change, senses of familiarity and identity within the neighborhood are also likely to shift. Hagemans (2015), through conducting interviews with low-income residents of secure community housing in two gentrifying neighborhoods, found that gentrification has resulted in a number of consequences beyond displacement. For example, the
transformations of these neighborhoods were characterized by the loss of most meeting places and shops that targeted low-income neighborhoods, with fewer and fewer options for daily goods and services made available to them. Many interviewees in Hageman’s study were affected by a sense of hostility in their experiences at nightspots in particular, the loss or transformation of places to sit and talk, as well as the loss of familiarity with place and people. Furthermore, none of the interviewees offered comments on the improvements to their lives from the various “upgrades” new to their communities, giving little support for the supposed benefits of social mix for the poor beyond the lack of physical displacement.

Physical displacement, therefore, is not the only type of displacement that can occur as a result of gentrification. It is important to note that though people are not visibly being forced out of their neighborhoods due to an increased cost of living, they may experience displacement in other forms that are often intertwined with the “notions of home” previously mentioned. Twigge-Molecey (2014) found that many residents who had lived in a community for more than 5 years, especially low-income residents, reported having most of their strong social ties in the neighborhood. This indicates that neighborhoods can often be very important to some lifelong residents’ social networks. Many of these residents observed that their neighborhood social networks had been damaged and has caused “a shift in the familial neighborhood atmosphere” which, through the dilution of networks of locally-based weak ties, may constitute a form of social displacement (Twigge-Molecey, 2014, p. 10). Another major finding of the study was the interviewees’ shifting “sense of place” due to neighborhood changes; for example, some of the low-income residents lamented the loss of a small, family-owned neighborhood grocery, which was replaced by a much larger and more expensive store. This phenomenon may be considered a form of cultural displacement, though the study noted it only occurred within a few, albeit
significant, neighborhood retail establishments. Despite these negative changes, interviewees in Twigge-Molecey’s study did often note the improvements in neighborhood parks and public spaces. The study suggests that active engagement in neighborhood struggles may “deepen psychological aspects of attachment while entrenching place identity” (Twigge-Molecey, 2014, p. 14).

This study will take a look at how length of residency may be a factor in the attitudes Crosstown community members develop toward neighborhood changes. The tensions that arise between long-term and short-term residents in gentrifying communities have been well-researched in many regions. In most communities, length of residency has been shown to have a positive correlation to level of community attachment, which shapes the aforementioned notions of home held by community members (Baker & Palmer, 2006). As an individual’s length of residency within a community grows, so does the person’s personal pride for the community and their knowledge of their options for recreational and civic opportunities offered to citizens in the neighborhood (Baker & Palmer, 2006, p. 400). Furthermore, the satisfaction with the overall community and its quality of life tend to increase positively with the level to which the resident feels involved in their community. This supports community initiatives that are geared toward including residents in decision-making regarding the future of the neighborhood through problem solving and strategic planning (Baker & Palmer, 2006, p. 400).

IV. Study Area

Memphis

This research will address revitalization efforts in Memphis, TN. The study, primarily through the use of surveys and interviews, will assess attitudes held by residents of the Crosstown neighborhood regarding the community’s changes. The city, with a population of
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646,889 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), is known for its racial and socioeconomic tensions. Whites comprised 29.4% of this number (compared to the national average of 77.4%), while 63.3% of the population was reported as black or African-American (compared to the national average of 13.2%). In 2010, 14% of whites were below the poverty line (compared to the national average of 11.6%), whereas 32.7% of blacks were below the poverty line (compared to the national average of 25.8%). White unemployment rate was at 7.5% (compared to the national average of 7%) while black unemployment rate was at 18.9% (compared to the national average of 13.4%) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Because such significant racial wealth disparities often play a major role in the process of gentrification, low-income blacks who have lived in the Crosstown neighborhood for a long time could have a higher risk of being adversely affected.

Memphis has embarked on several revitalization initiatives in recent years. In 2004, the city focused itself on the recreation of the previously blighted downtown area into a residential community. In 1980, the population for the heart of Memphis—the downtown area—was 2,830, whereas in 2004 it was 12,000. Many of the new Memphis residents complained that there were not enough retailers to cater to their needs, and an increase in commercial development thus followed—a key characteristic of gentrification. Additionally, the police force began to focus more on improving crime rates in the downtown area. These steps all were taken with the expectation that Memphis would continue to thrive as the city attracted more and more tourists (Bouknight, 2004). According to the realtor’s website, Henry Turley pioneered the establishment of several mixed-income housing spaces with the hopes of making the downtown area accessible to a variety of demographics. This effort parallels the development of the mixed-income apartment complex in the Crosstown Concourse (see next section for more information about the Crosstown Concourse).
Similar to the revitalization of the Crosstown neighborhood is the evolution of Overton Square. In the 1960s, James Robinson, along with several other young businessmen in Memphis, sought to transform the area surrounding Madison Avenue and Cooper Street into a hotspot for nightlife, dining and retail (Finger 2008). A few months after opening a successful drinking spot in the area, several retail entities rushed to Overton Square to benefit from the sudden interest the neighborhood had garnered. Though many businesses could not handle the rapid development and turned over ownership several times, the strip along Madison was booming by the 1970s.

“There was a huge sense of excitement about everything,” said Jeanne Arthur in an interview with Memphis Magazine. Arthur, who handled the public relations of Overton Square in the 1970s, continued to say that “Overton Square became the focal point for all sorts of community events” (Finger 2008). These sentiments are similar to many of the attitudes held by Memphians regarding the future of the Crosstown neighborhood, which is experiencing a sudden boom of retail and nightlife activity.

The Crosstown Concourse

Similar revitalization efforts to these have since followed. When a Sears distribution center was built in the Crosstown neighborhood in 1927, it was initially thriving and popular. Dubbed “Sears Crosstown,” the building represented Memphis’ budding identity at the time as a growing economic hub. In a 2011 Commercial Appeal article, a frequent at the former commercial establishment remembered Crosstown as a symbol of “everything that retail stores should be. Shiny floors, merchandise neatly showcased, something for everyone...no sale too small” (Wolff 2011). However, shifting demographics and population depletion in Memphis forced the store to close in 1993 (Crosstown Concourse website). With a major employer of
Memphians gone, the surrounding community suffered. For decades after, Crosstown was plagued with violence, fear, street drug dealing and prostitution (Lepeska 1995).

The building was left abandoned until 2010, when the Crosstown Arts initiative formed to “facilitate the redevelopment of the Crosstown Sears building using arts and culture as a catalyst for change.” The Crosstown Development Team is transforming the building into a “mixed urban village” called the Crosstown Concourse, where space is leased to commercial entities, local tenants and more. The idea of a vertical “urban village” is that by installing grocery stores, healthcare facilities, a school, etc., renters would theoretically never have to leave the building to live. The project’s website states its goal of revitalizing not only the building itself but also the community in which it thrives. The development team is following a model used to repurpose other abandoned Sears buildings in the United States, most notably in Minneapolis. The major difference between these and the Crosstown Concourse is that unlike in other cities, Memphis civic leaders and the developers of the Crosstown Concourse are trying to recruit its base of tenants from the general Memphis/Mid-South region, rather than national corporations. The Crosstown Concourse is emblematic of other urban renewal strategies that have been used in cities across the globe, resulting in gentrification in some cases (Lehrer & Thorben, 2009 in the case of Toronto; Barconi & Freeman, 2004 in the case of New York City); however, an emphasis on maintaining local rather than corporate businesses in the building may alleviate some of the potential damage experienced by vulnerable populations.

_Crosstown: A changing neighborhood_

Located in city with a large population of socioeconomically vulnerable citizens, the Crosstown Concourse is a large-scale revitalization initiative with the likelihood of affecting several demographics in the surrounding area. Crosstown is a diverse region of Memphis that
connects the downtown area to the residential neighborhoods of Midtown. The Crosstown Concourse has the potential to be not only a huge source of employment for many Memphians, but also to be a major tourist attraction. This will have several socioeconomic effects on Memphis as a whole—to the advantage of some but to the disadvantage of others. For this reason I have selected the Crosstown neighborhood to be the study area of my research. I have chosen Census Tract 25 as the focal point of the neighborhood because it is the tract immediately surrounding the Crosstown Concourse; however, I am including data from Tract 36 (immediately south) as well, for it is a residential neighborhood directly affected by revitalization changes, as well has having a remarkably diverse demographic makeup.

The demographics of Crosstown have changed since the commissioning of the Crosstown Concourse Initiative in 2010. Below is a brief overview of the changes:

Table 4.1: Population Change in Census Tract 25 from 2000-2013 (U.S. Census Bureau)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black/African American (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino (%)</th>
<th>Asian (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32.77%</td>
<td>60.36%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>3,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33.12%</td>
<td>50.14%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>3,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+0.35%</td>
<td>-10.22%</td>
<td>+3.83%</td>
<td>+4.00%</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Population Change in Census Tract 36 from 2000-2013 (U.S. Census Bureau)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black/African American (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino (%)</th>
<th>Asian (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>33.22%</td>
<td>27.39%</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
<td>25.63%</td>
<td>3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>59.18%</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>1,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-2.60%</td>
<td>+1.41%</td>
<td>-5.22%</td>
<td>-15.03%</td>
<td>-1,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3: Median Household Income from 2000-2013 (U.S. Census Bureau)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Census Tract 25</th>
<th>Census Tract 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$25,949</td>
<td>$25,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$31,964</td>
<td>$16,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+$6,015</td>
<td>-$9,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics follow patterns of gentrification, suggesting the phenomenon may be taking place in Crosstown. However, one must note that some of these rate changes may not be noticeable enough to be considered significant. Additionally, these statistics and rate changes could be indicative of bigger economic trends reflected in the city and nation, such as improved mobility of minority races in Memphis. At the very least, the decreased proportion of blacks (specifically those below the poverty line) living in the area suggests that not only is it possible that displacement is occurring, but the cultural dynamics of the neighborhood may have also shifted. Though it must be considered that gentrification is not likely the sole cause of these demographical changes, the patterns that have formed are worth looking into so that if problems do exist, they can be effectively combated.

The Crosstown atmosphere seems to have changed as well. According to a 2012 article in the *Memphis Flyer*, Crosstown Arts has been a catalyst in advertising the neighborhood as an arts district. Consequently, the Crosstown atmosphere has been described as having developed a “hip vibe” (Phillips, 2012). These descriptions could be indicative of the nationwide phenomenon of the movement of millennials into previously disinvested communities to pursue artistic endeavors. The Crosstown neighborhood has been described as being particularly attractive to this demographic, due to its being one of the most ethnically diverse districts in the city. Todd
Richardson, co-founder of the development, stated in an interview that their aim is not to make Sears Crosstown “a typical anchor development that would gentrify everything,” but instead to make it inclusive and “for everyone” (Phillips 2012).

Could Richardson’s aspirations be ironic in the sense that the people he is trying to attract to Crosstown are also the same people who are likely to actually impel gentrification? Remember that members of the creative class not only are drawn to communities marketed as “diverse” and “inclusive,” but they also are characterized as highly-educated and well-paid. Richardson’s goals have been met with some dissent in the community: local residents and artists have critiqued Crosstown Arts events for failing to acknowledge the needs of the neighborhood or the role that the arts have assumed in many redevelopment efforts. The events have “raised questions for some about who counts as part of the community and who belongs in the current placemaking effort” (Thomas et al., 2015). Additionally, the development team’s commitment to involving the residents in their plans has been questioned. Town hall meetings have been described as serving the sole purpose of informing residents as opposed to facilitating developmental dialogue (Thomas et. al, 2015). Though the Crosstown Concourse is widely perceived in Memphis to be a positive investment, observations of the neighborhood’s shifting identity call into question what exactly the development team is doing to make it inclusive to residents and community members.

V. Method

Participants

This research incorporates quantitative data through the use of surveys to measure demographical characteristics of the people of Crosstown, as well as qualitative data through the use of interviews and first-hand accounts to measure their attitudes. Participants included nine
interviewees who are closely involved with the Crosstown neighborhood through residency, business ownership or employment. To build a network in the Crosstown community and access potential participants, I visited the neighborhood each day for a week and introduced myself to business owners, churchgoers, and anyone else who would talk to me. The first interviews were conducted mainly with employees in the area, who were then asked for any of their personal contacts who may be interested in speaking with me about Crosstown. Through this snowball-sampling method, I recruited a total of nine participants, including four who are business owners in Crosstown, two who are employed in the area, two who are in employed in but also live in Crosstown, and one whose relationship to Crosstown is purely residential.

Memphians with a variety of complex relationships to the study area were selected with the intention of exploring the role their relationship type may have in the attitudes they form. Due to time constraints and barriers in contacting residents without invading privacy, I was unable to conduct any more interviews, yet the small sample size allowed me to spend more time conducting in-depth and meaningful interviews with the participants I did recruit. The nine participants I did recruit fairly represent the demographics of people with occupational relationships to Crosstown as well as residents of Crosstown. Several racial backgrounds and socioeconomic statuses are represented in this study. A basic demographic profile of the participants can be found in Appendix C.

**Data collection**

This study operates primarily through interviewing and surveying Crosstown community members, as well as through the use of personal observations of the neighborhood. Before engaging in the research, participants were asked to review and sign an IRB consent form to confirm their age of at least 18 years and to allow or withhold permission for the audio-recording
of the interview via cell phone. Once consent was given, the participants were then interviewed using a template of 11 questions. The interview protocol was designed to contextualize the interviewees’ individual relationships to the study area, and to explore their perspectives on the Crosstown community itself, its evolution as a neighborhood in recent years, the level to which they feel involved in revitalization plans, and their hopes and fears for the future of the neighborhood. All 11 questions can be found in Appendix A. Participants were informed that they could choose not to answer any question if they did not feel comfortable doing so. The interviews ranged from about 8 to 35 minutes in length, depending on how each participant chose to answer the questions. In addition to audio-recording the interviews (with the exception of one participant who did not allow me to do so), I took shorthand notes for talking points and future reference. At the end of each interview, participants were asked if there were any talking points I may have missed that they feel are critical to discuss when thinking about Crosstown. This feedback was used to improve subsequent interviews.

Following the interviews, participants were asked to complete a short survey asking for basic demographical information such as race, gender, time they have been a part of the community, and annual income. Participants were again informed that they could leave any field blank if they felt so inclined. Surveys were administered post-interview with the objective of building trust through meaningful dialogue, hopefully resulting in participants feeling more comfortable in sharing their personal information. The survey used in this project can be found in Appendix B. After conducting research with each participant, I made a point to manually transcribe the interview into a computer document the same day it occurred so that the information would be fresh in my mind. All participants have received pseudo-names in this paper to protect their identities.
Observational data collection was utilized in a limited form, solely to supplement the qualitative data. I explored Crosstown in its entirety and audio-recorded my observations including descriptions of the people I saw, the conditions of houses and buildings, and anything else was relevant to this research. I then transcribed the audio of the observations to contextualize the physical landscape of the Crosstown neighborhood and to build a sense of familiarity with the community that is considered a sensitive subject to many of my interviewees.

VI. Findings

Shifting demographics in a diverse community

Crosstown has a longstanding reputation as one of the most diverse communities in Memphis. Due west of Crosstown sits the blighted and impoverished east end of downtown, with a large black population. East of Crosstown is the historic, affluent and predominantly white Vollintine-Evergreen district. Crosstown is neighbored on the north by North Memphis, a community rich in history but plagued by crime and marginalization. South of Poplar is home to one of the largest Vietnamese communities in the Mid-South.

The variety of demographics has come to identify Crosstown: five of the interviewees used the word “diverse” at least once to describe the neighborhood. Many underground groups looking for a safe haven have found comfort in Crosstown, such as immigrants and members of the LGBT community. Jennifer (O¹), a middle-class white woman who for the last two and a half years has worked at the Church Health Center on the central street Cleveland, illustrates the Crosstown dynamics:

“\textit{It’s a little bit of a melting pot, I mean I call this street Cleveland out here the United Nations of Memphis. Everyone out of everything comes through this general area. So the}

¹ Abbreviation “O” refers to community members with occupational relationships to Crosstown.
demographics of the community are pretty interesting because it really is a true cross-section of Memphis. In lots of places in Memphis you have people in extreme poverty budded up next to people with extreme wealth...This is a little more stark because North Memphis is so close and Overton Park is right there and it all just hits in this little cross-section of the community.”

Though Crosstown has historically been known as the home of many minority groups, the demographic makeup of the community appears much different than it was even five years ago. Demographic changes are often a mark of gentrification as the economic base of the neighborhood diversifies. Five out of the nine interviewees commented on the sudden influx of new residents, who are primarily described as young, middle- to upper-class whites. Most interviewees felt neutral about this. Nathan (RO2), a middle-class white male, sees this phenomenon both as a resident and as an employee at the Hi-Tone Café (a bar and entertainment venue) on Cleveland Street, the central strip of the neighborhood. In the past 3.5 years that Nathan has been involved with Crosstown, a great number of houses went from being on the market for years to suddenly being rent or bought by couples in their thirties. Furthermore, the crowd at the Hi-Tone is much younger than what it used to be. Lucy (R3), a middle-class African-American female who has lived just north of the Concourse development site for 25 years, compares her memories of Crosstown to the neighborhood’s landscape today:

“...the generation makeup is gone. I would say about 15 neighbors have all passed away....And most of the [vacant lots] on the street where I live now used to be houses.

---

2 Abbreviation “RO” refers to community members who have both occupational and residential relationships to Crosstown.
3 Abbreviation “R” refers to community members with residential relationships to Crosstown.
You pass through every vacant lot, every one of them represents someone who passed away.”

Millennials are likely populating Crosstown due to the reputation it has acquired as an arts district. The Crosstown Arts initiative offers aspiring artists space to present their work next to well-established artists, which is to encourage the intermingling of people with a variety of backgrounds and experiences (Thomas et al. 2015) As Florida (2003) has observed with the creative class, young professionals are drawn to communities where they can be exposed to a diversity of people and viewpoints. A growing arts scene and an increasing youth presence both are largely tied to instances of urban revitalization in other cities.

In addition to the flood of millennials, Crosstown is changing on racial and socioeconomic levels. Jennifer (O) mentioned that many Crosstown residents may feel as though more affluent whites from nearby communities are taking over the neighborhood—potentially at the expense of more vulnerable groups (see next section). She was enthusiastic about attracting a more diverse economic base to the community, yet also acknowledged that this could result in the displacement of more financially insecure residents and damage their community viability. The growing presence of millennials and whites in Crosstown alone is enough to infer that in the next couple of decades, Crosstown’s more vulnerable populations will either soon be displaced from the neighborhood or will be outnumbered by new demographics. The new demographic makeup of the area also means that the majority of Crosstown community members will believe that the neighborhood is moving in a positive direction, for that is the very reason they have chosen to relocate to Crosstown.

Optimism among the Crosstown Workforce
Interviewees with some type of business or professional relationship to Crosstown were much more likely to express enthusiasm and optimism regarding the transformation of the community. Every interviewee commented at least once on surging levels of activity in the neighborhood, primarily with reference to the growing number of businesses in the area. Jennifer (O) recalled that when the Church Health Center first moved onto Cleveland Street in Crosstown, most of the buildings on that street were vacant. However, several bars and art galleries have been added in the last 2.5 years she has spent in Crosstown. She suspects that “people who have maybe been in the community for quite a while are seeing an opportunity to start a new business or do something new because of all the new interest around here.” Seven participants—the only resident being Nathan (RO)—said they hope that Crosstown will continue to attract more interest. Interviewees often described Crosstown as already “flourishing” or as a neighborhood that “will flourish” in the future. This type of language indicates that the Crosstown Concourse has garnered a great deal of support in Memphis and has even built community morale and pride in the city.

People who are employed in Crosstown see the changes in the neighborhood primarily through an economic lens. Increasing traffic in the area was met with hopes that it would boost commercial success. Such reinvestment of productive capital is the fundamental objective of urban revitalization projects (Thorben 2009). Both Harold (O) and Sal (O) have been members of the Crosstown community for several decades and are optimistic about the Concourse. Research has shown that people who have been involved in a neighborhood for a long time express disapproval of new, unfamiliar business developments in the area (Hagemans 2015), whether they are residents or employees in the area. However, because Crosstown is Harold and Sal’s workplace, increasing fiscal activity in the area would likely have a profitable effect on
their incomes. Therefore, it is understandable that their attitudes toward the growing commercial scene are favorable. Several other participants with occupational relationships to Crosstown expressed the belief that they will benefit from increasing traffic in the area, generally because of the economic nature of their relationships to Crosstown.

Though the attitudes of Crosstown community members regarding new changes greatly depend on the type of relationship they have to the area, there is a disconnect between how the Crosstown workforce believes residents feel about the developments and how the residents actually feel. Interviewees were asked how they think most residents feel about the changes in the communities from their understanding. Seven out of the nine interviewees—all but Lucy (R) and Mark (RO)—said that the majority of residents most likely feel positively about the current state and future of the neighborhood.

Mike (O), a white male who has owned the Hi-Tone Cafe on Cleveland for the past three years, said that the Sears building has a special place in a lot of people’s hearts, so community members are excited to see it come back alive. Additionally, he expects that residents will be pleased when their property values increase. Angela (O), a middle-class African-American female who has been the co-owner of the restaurant Mardi Gras Memphis in Crosstown for the past year, explained that many of the residents have lived in Crosstown for a long time and have seen the best and worst of the community, so they are excited for the area to flourish. As Angela puts it,

“I think they’re very proud of their community and they’re very proud that they were the ones to make the mark to actually land this. They never lost faith in this community even through the trying times, and now good things are coming.”
Other interviewees used simple adjectives like “excited,” “thrilled,” and “positive” to describe the perceptions residents have of the changes.

It should be noted that none of the interviewees with occupational relationships expressed excitement for urban revitalization in the context of strengthening social networks and community intimacy in Crosstown. When talking about the social atmosphere of the neighborhood, participants with occupational relationships primarily referred to their own network within the business scene of Crosstown. The social fabric of occupational community members is isolated from the residents, as is the optimism for the future of the neighborhood. For example, Nathan (RO) was the only participant with an occupational relationship to the community to mention his personal relationship to Crosstown residents, most likely because he was the only occupational participant who was also a resident. However, Nathan (RO) said that although he sees familiar faces in the neighborhood, he personally does not know too many of the people who live around him. Although he does not know people’s names, everyone is friendly to Nathan (RO).

Interestingly enough, this attitude reverberates the language used by Memphians in the late 1920s during the initial developments of the Sears Crosstown building. Sears Crosstown was advertised as a turning point in Memphis history: its task was to make Memphis the “industrial capital of the Mid-South” (Knowles, 2006, p. 48). Such prospects were received with fascination and pride, which “inspired a surge of local patriotism, exalting the modern marvels and futuristic devices operating within the building, alongside its impressive magnitude and record-setting construction time” (Knowles, 2006, p. 49). This is pivotal in understanding the progression of the “Memphis identity” as perceived not only by Memphians but also Crosstown community
members throughout time. Such senses of community and place are evident to have strong ties to
attitudes people develop about their community.

However, this impression is not in tune with the accounts of two Crosstown residents. Mark (RO) said that a sense of resentment has cultivated among residents due to their exclusion from conversation on revitalization tactics. Mark, who frequently discusses matters of gentrification with North Memphis residents, has learned that many people living near the Concourse fear that they will be displaced or that they will no longer feel a part of the community. This is consistent with Lucy’s (R) perspective on the changes:

"I hope that a lot of the gentrification that’s planned will either be slowed down or will not happen at all… I don’t feel like it should take place and that maybe, it won’t… There’s a lot of North Memphis history, and the history will be totally wiped out as they decide to redo everything."

The attitudes of community members with occupational relationships to Crosstown differ significantly from those of residents. Why could this be?

*Threat of gentrification*

Despite general enthusiasm for the evolution of Crosstown, members of the community have concerns about the negative implications revitalization initiatives could pose on vulnerable populations, especially with respect to race, age and socioeconomic status. The likelihood that minority groups could face marginalization in the process of economic renewal was mentioned by three of the interviewees. As young, middle-class whites develop a larger presence in Crosstown, others must leave to make room for them. Mark (RO), who has been involved with Crosstown since 2011, compares his first years in the community to the way it stands now:
“At the time there were a lot of…I don’t like the word underground, but there were businesses, gay clubs and a lot of homosexuals and transsexuals. There was a large Latino population as well as an Asian population and…the only population that’s really remained is the Asian population. All the rest have kind of been pushed out and all of the gay clubs...closed.”

Mark is most likely commenting here on the South Crosstown neighborhood, which is immediately south of the focus area of this study (Census Tract 25). The Hispanic and Latino population in Census Tract 36 (South Crosstown) dropped by 12.31% between 2010 and 2013, whereas it actually increased by 2.47% in Census Tract 25 (Crosstown). Based on these statistics, minority displacement will likely continue.

The term “gentrification” was brought up by the same three out of nine interviewees. Only two participants spoke extensively on this matter—both of whom are residents. Jennifer (O), the only non-resident of the three, expects gentrification to occur on some level but feels somewhat positively about this. Jennifer (O) claims that she is a “bad liberal” in the sense that she has “no problem with gentrification.” Though residents might be pushed out when they are unable to afford an increased cost of living, Jennifer (O) argues that there are still places for people to live in Memphis:

“we just don’t have the problems of homelessness...and home instability that other cities have because there’s a lot of housing. You can live somewhere. It’s probably not particularly desirable, but you can.”

However, data from the National Alliance to End Homelessness suggests otherwise. The 2012 rate of homelessness per 10,000 people in Memphis was 31.7%--compared to the state average of 15%. It is unclear why Jennifer (O) feels this way, though it is possible that it may be due to
her positionality as a white, middle-class, non-Crosstown resident. Lucy (R) has somewhat of a different perspective:

“In the process of wanting to spread out more, other communities will be demolished, forgotten, or go into gentrification...Instead of trying to recreate a new community surrounding the new Sears project, why not do something about the [North Memphis] neighborhood dwindling down or slowly deteriorating, instead of trying to create bars and entertainment areas for the new people of Crosstown?”

Both Lucy (R) and Mark (RO) cited the growing number of vacant lots and abandoned buildings in recent years. Both interviewees also view vacant lots as the physical manifestation of the political neglect that forced many residents to abandon or foreclose their homes. Mark (RO) has seen many people who are interested in moving to these areas because the vacant lots offer somewhat of a “clean slate in a Midtownish area” (Midtown being the general region of Memphis directly east of Crosstown). He said that newcomers can easily purchase the lots at a low price and build $250,000 homes there. For Lucy (R), the vacant lots are a harsh reminder that the land once occupied by her close friends and family are now home to unfamiliar faces with a different vision in mind for her community. Her feelings about neighborhood changes echo the loss of familiarity experienced by many residents in gentrifying areas (see section three).

Similar to Lucy (R) and Mark’s (RO) fear that economic growth will come at the expense of more vulnerable groups, two interviewees worry that corporations may take over the neighborhood. Justin (O) and Angela (O) are the co-owners of Mardi Gras Memphis, a restaurant that opened in 2015 just across the street from the site of the Crosstown Concourse. Though they are big fans of the development, they do realize that sudden interest in the area may attract larger
businesses and corporations. Justin (O) and Angela (O) are concerned that in the future, these establishments may try to buy them out. The pair finds this possibility threatening not just for the sake of the business itself, but also for the sake of the restaurant’s role in the community. Angela (O) explains:

“I know that we’re branded now so we could move anywhere, but I think it would do something to our community of patrons, because they know us. They call us ‘cheers.’ It’s the place they come and hang out, they drink, they know each other, and the thing they ask us all the time is please don’t go anywhere.”

Such personally-oriented establishments are important in the development of community-building in the process of urban revitalization. According to a study by Aitken (1990) on neighborhood perceptions in gentrifying communities, “residential and commercial establishments that had disappeared from the area [post-revitalization] are, on the whole preferred. Residents dislike large new developments, finding them cold, mass-produced and impersonal.” Though Mardi Gras Memphis is a new business that caters primarily to middle-class customers who can afford their menu, it places a strong emphasis on building relationships with the community. While the Crosstown neighborhood has already changed immensely, most community members are likely to prefer the establishment of small locally-owned businesses as opposed to large, powerful corporate businesses.

Property values were also a recurring theme throughout the interviews. Six of the nine participants expect the urban renewal projects to draw more people and businesses to the area, which will in turn increase property values. Four interviewees, all with strictly business-related roles in Crosstown, anticipate that rising property values will be beneficial to neighborhood residents. Sal (O) believes that as property values rise, residents will be able to sell their houses
for a great deal of money if they choose not to remain a part of the thriving community. Either way, he says, money will be flowing in their direction.

Lucy (R) and Mark (RO) spoke about rising property values as a problem and threat to residents, in contrast to the general enthusiasm the prospect received from participants employed in Crosstown. Mark articulated his fear in detail:

“I do fear for that north side because I know that it’s been historically lower-middle class and upper working class, and the average age of the Memphian is near retirement now. So I worry about their taxes, being pushed out. The city in general is going through a big push to demolish or at least snatch back as many properties from older people or families…and they’re trying to sink people in extra charges, like when blight fighters come by and mow a yard and slap a $150-$180 charge onto their tax bill.”

Lucy and Mark’s predictions have merit: house values are indeed rising in Crosstown. In Census Tract 25, where the Crosstown Concourse is located, the median house value rose from $82,400 in 2000 to $151,000 in 2013. In Census Tract 36 (known as South Crosstown), the median house value increased from $104,500 to $181,600 in the same time (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 & 2013). Rising property values are a major indicator of gentrification and are the primary reason that lower-income residents are pushed out of neighborhoods (Baxter 2009). While there is no available census data to suggest that displacement has occurred in Crosstown so far, the neighborhood does have many community members to whom an increasing cost of living poses the threat.

**Barriers to involvement**

Members of the Crosstown community are limited in their involvement in urban revitalization initiatives. The four interviewees who do feel a degree of involvement in
community changes also attributed their participation to their business relationships with the
Concourse. As an employee at the Church Health Center which is in the process of moving
inside the Sears building, Jennifer (O) is associated with the Concourse on a professional level.
Jennifer clarifies that the Concourse is more inclined to include its partners in major decisions,
rather than residents. Justin (O) and Angela (O) feel as though they have a “small voice” in
community transformations: they have been “solicited on a number of occasions as far as the
impact things are having on the restaurant.” When asked if he feels as though he has a voice in
the matter, Mike (O) answered:

“As a business owner, I do. Now that doesn’t mean that it’s always gonna be heard…but
what’s really cool about the Crosstown area is that everyone listens to each other and
works together....The landlords and the other business owners listen to each other and
try to get ideas from one another.”

Four of the participants, however, do not feel involved in the changes to any degree. Sal
(O) and Nathan (RO) said that although the Concourse has not reached out to involve them, they
believe they could engage in revitalization decisions if they were to actively try. Despite having
been a business owner just a block down from the development site for 30 years, Henry (O) said
that no one from the Crosstown Development Team had contacted him or asked for his input.
Lucy (R) said most residents of Crosstown are vastly uninformed on the progression of the
neighborhood:

“Most of the residents I have talked to...are confused, because although there’s a lot of
things going on, we have no idea as to what’s coming, when it’s coming, and you know,
just what. There’s not a lot of information from about 5 years into the actual planning of
Crosstown. It wasn’t until they actually started working on it that residents knew that
they planned to cover all the way down to Jackson, and so everything that is between Jackson and the interstate is going to be gentrified. And the residents who live between Bellevue and Watkins, we just have no idea as to what’s going on.”

Members of the Crosstown community are critical of the development team’s efforts to engage residents in their plans to transform the neighborhood. Among six of the nine interviewees, the Crosstown Concourse failed to actively seek the community member’s participation. Lucy (R) suspects that the developers do not even want involvement from the residents. Mark (RO) believes that residents of Crosstown feel slighted: "they weren’t asked, they weren’t informed, no one came by to tell them anything.” Mark (RO) explains that in order to disseminate information in Memphis, politicians and leaders cannot rely on traditional tactics such as billboards or flyers. Rather, they must approach the community firsthand, for many Memphians rely on their trusted social networks for new information. Mark (RO) speculates that the developers’ failure to engage residents is indicative of their own apathy—they are not personally interested in disseminating information. He worries about the effect that this could have on Crosstown residents:

“Let’s say there’s a couple of vacant lots next to [the residents] and then some white kids move in with their environmentally aware little buildings and suddenly their property value goes up, and the next thing you know, their taxes have tripled and they don’t know what’s happened...I know people would say ‘just go to a meeting,’ but that’s the thing. They just don’t know.”

While it is difficult to say whether this is a deliberate attempt by the government to exclude community members or if is simply due to the ineffective, traditional methods of
disseminating information, one thing is clear: Politicians, civic leaders and developers of the revitalization project could be doing much more to foster an inclusive environment.

V. Conclusion

People with occupational relationships to the Crosstown community experience more benefits from urban revitalization projects than do residents. Consequently, people who work in the community are more likely than residents to describe their perceptions of changes in the neighborhood as positive. Occupational community members are more enthusiastic for the future of the neighborhood for two reasons: (1) they are given more opportunity to discuss plans and vocalize concerns, and (2) increasing traffic in the area will likely be economically advantageous to them, whereas residents are more vulnerable to experience political and economic disenfranchisement as a result of growing commercial interest.

People in revitalizing communities are less likely to be critical of urban renewal strategies if they feel as though their opinions are valued. Community members are more likely to be solicited by organizers of urban revitalization efforts if they have a professional reputation in the neighborhood rather than if their relationship to the community is purely residential. Therefore, people with occupational roles in Crosstown are under the impression that the development is inclusive to the whole community, though Crosstown residents do not feel as though the development wants their involvement.

Increasing traffic in the area is expected to improve conditions and opportunities for vocational community members. Yet while occupational community members are eager to spend their workdays in a thriving neighborhood, residents fear that their needs will be neglected as socioeconomic development is focused on commercial activity. Residents feel specifically at-risk to political sidelining in the process of economic growth, citing gentrification as a primary
concern. The residents are justified in this regard, for they ultimately have little to no influence on large-scale decisions regarding the future of the community. Crosstown’s large minority populations make the neighborhood especially susceptible to gentrification. These residents already lack the political and economic mobility to resist displacement or the loss of their familiarity with the community. If residents of revitalizing communities are to avoid these consequences of gentrification, they need a public platform to address their needs and concerns.

Traditional strategies of disseminating information to the public have not and will not be effective in boosting residential involvement in revitalization tactics. Residents in close-knit communities such as Crosstown are more likely to rely on fellow community members to receive information regarding their neighborhood. Firsthand, personal approaches to increasing residential involvement are thus necessary to facilitate dialogue among residents and urban developers. Urban developers need to focus on expanding their networks to residential communities by showing a personal investment in shared success. This can only be done through direct contact; solely releasing information to the public with the hopes that it will eventually reach residents has not worked in the past.

The revitalization effort in Crosstown is still in its early stages, so it is important to intervene now to address these concerns before community members, especially residents, face irreversible consequences such as displacement. Moreover, this research is significant because while there is plenty of literature regarding the supposed benefits of gentrification as well as the way it is perceived by residents (see literature review), little research exists that compares residential perceptions and occupational relationships or addresses the question of inclusiveness and involvement. This project paves the way for future studies, especially in the Crosstown neighborhood specifically over the next decade to evaluate the progression of the neighborhood.
Future studies should ideally use a larger sample size to more accurately represent the Crosstown population. This would require a longer time frame allotted for the research in order to build networks in Crosstown and schedule more interviews.
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VII. Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

1. Where are you from originally?
2. What does the concept of “home” mean to you?
3. Do you consider Crosstown to be home (even if you aren’t yourself a resident)?
4. How long have you lived in/been involved in the Crosstown community?
5. How would you describe your relationship to Crosstown? (i.e. are you a resident, do you work here, etc.)
6. How would you describe Crosstown as a community?
7. Do you feel that the Crosstown neighborhood has changed at all since you first became a part of the community? If so, how?
8. What do you generally think about the Crosstown Concourse development?
9. From your perspective, how do you think most residents of Crosstown feel about the Crosstown Concourse?
10. Do you feel like you have a voice in the changes being made in the community?
11. What are your hopes and fears when thinking about the future of this neighborhood in light of the changes to come?

Appendix B: Survey

1. Survey: You may decline to answer any field if you choose.
2. Name: _______________________________________________________________
3. Race/Ethnicity: ___________________________________________________________________
4. Gender: _______________________________________________________________
5. Are you a resident of Crosstown yourself? _____________________________________________
   a. If yes, how long have you lived in Crosstown? ____________________________
6. How long has your institution been located in Crosstown? ______________________
7. Place of employment: ___________________________________________________________________
   a. Length of employment: ____________________________
8. Estimated annual income (check the option that mostly closely matches)
   a. Under $25,000 _____________
   b. Between $25,000 and $35,000 _____________
   c. Between $35,000 and $60,000 _____________
   d. Between $60,000 and $100,000 _____________
   e. Between $100,000 and $150,000 _____________
   f. Between $150,000 and $250,000 _____________
   g. More than $250,000 _____________
## Appendix C: Demographic Profile of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Relationship type</th>
<th>Time involved in Crosstown</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Place of employment</th>
<th>Est. annual income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Residential &amp; occupational</td>
<td>At least 2 years</td>
<td>Mixed Hispanic/White</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>School teacher &amp; business owner</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>44 years</td>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Retired (previously Assembly Hall of Jehovah’s Witnesses)</td>
<td>Between $35,000 and $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Co-Owner of Mardi Gras Memphis</td>
<td>Between $25,000 and $35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>White/Euro-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Owner of Hi-Tone Cafe</td>
<td>Declined to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>Declined to answer, but is an immigrant from Iran</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Owner of Glitter &amp; Glamour</td>
<td>Between $150,000 and $250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Occupational</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>White/Euro-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hi-Tone Cafe</td>
<td>Between $35,000 and $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Co-Owner of Mardi Gras Memphis/Behavioral Health Group Treatment Center</td>
<td>Between $100,000 and $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>2.5 years</td>
<td>White/Euro-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Church Health Center</td>
<td>Neglected to ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Retired, but used to work for Memphis City Schools</td>
<td>Before retirement: $79,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>