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Abstract

Ethnic enclaves are experiencing demographic and commercial changes, some of which are designed to attract tourism. This dissertation reports four studies. The first looks at 50 U.S. cities and the prevalence of ethnic enclaves in them. It finds that these 50 cities have a history of 369 enclaves, of which nearly two-thirds still exist. It also found that about 120 enclaves out of the 369 total enclaves have formed in those 50 cities in the last half century. These newer enclaves tend to be associated with immigrants from the Caribbean, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. Following this study, the dissertation reports on three case studies of Italian enclaves (The Hill, St. Louis; Little Italy, Cleveland; Little Italy, Schenectady) with each neighborhood experiencing a different degree of commodification. This research looks beyond city-level benefits of branding an ethnic enclave and instead uses surveys and interviews to consider how individual residents of these enclaves feel about the changes or potential changes within their neighborhoods.

The survey of The Hill found that the neighborhood remains a largely traditional Italian enclave with its Italian-ethnic residential population, but this population is changing as younger, non-Italian-ethnic individuals move to the neighborhood. Overall, the residents of The Hill are open to tourism as a concept, although they are resistant to
specific tourism strategies, such as the development of Italian-themed condominiums or non-Italian ethnic restaurants.

By and large, residents of these enclaves are resistant to commercial change that is resulting from a top-down planning approach. This is especially true in Cleveland’s Little Italy, where a development agency has been the main driver of change, as well as in Schenectady’s Little Italy, where the district was newly created through the actions of the city and a development agency. The Italian-ethnic respondents in Cleveland’s Little Italy seem wary of both demographic and commercial changes to their neighborhood.

With Schenectady, survey respondents are the most negative out of the three cities. They indicated that they are resistant to the branding of Little Italy as an ethnic neighborhood and they do not feel that it seems like an authentic Italian-American neighborhood. This suggests that the branding of Little Italy in Schenectady may have been unsuccessful.

Through examining residents’ concerns about demographic and commercial changes, planning professionals can learn the importance of having community support for branding efforts.
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Preface

While I was growing up in northeast Ohio, my mother and I used to visit my grandfather and uncle at their shop in Little Italy, Cleveland. We referred to it as “the shop,” although its name was Cleveland Ornamental Iron Specialty Company, and it was an expansive, two-story workshop where metal shavings covered the downstairs floors, half-finished balusters, finials, and sundials lined the surfaces of tables, and upstairs – my favorite place – drafting tables displayed elaborate designs that my grandfather drew by hand. It smelled of tobacco from my grandfather’s pipe. My grandfather opened the shop in the 1940s and continued working there until the early 1990s, when he was in his 80s. My uncle joined my grandfather in business in 1955 and kept the shop open until 2006.

The shop, which stood at 1969 E. 119th Street on a long, narrow lot of over 60,000 square feet, was on land that was leased from the New York, Chicago, and St. Louis Railroad Company, whose railroad tracks ran parallel to the shop. As of 2011, the land still serves as an easement for the railroad as well as a parking lot for newly built condominiums. The shop itself was demolished to provide for more parking spaces.

Many of my mother’s memories of Little Italy naturally predate my own memories. She tells how my grandfather would walk from his shop to buy lunch (bread, cheese, and salami) on most days at Presti’s Bakery, which has operated at its Mayfield
Road location since 1903. In the 1960s, my mother would take rapid transit from school to meet my grandfather and uncle at the shop. She recalls getting off the train at the Windermere Station, where she would jump the tracks to avoid walking down through the station. During those days, racial tensions were especially high between white Little Italy residents and African-American East Cleveland residents, and both sets of residents used the Windermere Station. Throughout much of its history, Little Italy had a reputation for violence, and its insular, territorial character has not yet been overcome.

Since the 1980s, I have observed the changes taking place in the neighborhood. Some of the old stores and restaurants are now art galleries. Condominiums are new since the mid-2000s. One store in particular sells posters of *The Godfather* and other items from Italian-American popular culture. Some of the changes have been subtle: it is less common to hear Italian being spoken on the streets, and the streets themselves seem cleaner.

After I had moved away from Ohio and visited ethnic enclaves in other cities, seeing them for the first time through the eyes of an urban planner, I began to look critically at Little Italy, Cleveland. I also realized that Little Italy was not the only ethnic enclave where business owners were branding and marketing a neighborhood’s ethnic identity to bring in tourists and new development. At the same time, I was careful not to be too quick to find fault with the redevelopment of the area, which had been losing population and money and where houses were becoming increasingly dilapidated. I wanted to know who was benefitting from the redevelopment; was it the remaining everyday residents, the diverse new residents, the business owners, the city? I also
wanted to know how people felt about the ways in which the neighborhood had changed, and is continuing to change. My desire to understand the changes taking place in Little Italy and neighborhoods like it has led me to study ethnic enclaves at different stages of commodification.

Figure 1 Cleveland Ornamental Iron Specialty Company at 1969 E. 119th Street.

Photograph taken in 2004 by author.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Ethnic enclaves have existed in the U.S. since colonial times. Ethnic enclaves, or ethnic neighborhoods, continue to survive, although the form varies. Traditionally, an ethnic enclave is defined as a physically separated community with a high concentration of ethnic individuals and ethnic businesses when compared to the surrounding region (Waldinger, 1993). It differs from a racial ghetto, which is an involuntary spatial clustering of a racial group because of a lack of options or access to desired neighborhoods (Marcuse, 2005). Some neighborhoods are no longer identifiable as ethnic enclaves; others’ ethnic identities have diminished and may not exist for much longer. Some ethnic neighborhoods have continued to grow and thrive. Still others have changed from being associated with one ethnic group and to being associated with a different ethnic group. Since the 1960s, a new wave of enclaves has emerged as immigrants from countries in Southeast Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean, for example, have settled in the U.S. and formed enclaves (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Increasingly, ethnic enclaves associated with earlier waves of immigration, such as Chinatowns and Little Italys, have been changing in ways to make them more marketable to tourists. These ways include adding thematic street signs, building condominiums that use names associated with the ethnicity, and gaining official status as
historic districts or business improvement districts. Few studies have looked at how local residents have perceived these changes as well as whether these changes exert a positive or negative social force. Even while working for the betterment of a city in general, planners need to look out for the welfare of an enclave’s residents. Planners should balance the potential financial benefits to the city and business owners that could come from marketing an ethnic enclave as a tourist destination against the wishes of the residents of the enclave. This research will be the first to look at enclaves at different stages of commodification to learn about community satisfaction in changing ethnic enclaves and, beyond that, to develop recommendations for planners.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Traditional Role of Enclaves

Understanding the traditional and changing roles of ethnic enclaves requires some understanding about immigrants’ identities. For some theorists, immigrants arrive as foreigners but become blended into the melting pot of American society over the course of generations; for other theorists, descendents of immigrants sometimes retain their cultural (religious, ethnic, linguistic) heritage and traits, helping form a multicultural or pluralist society where there is no one, standard American identity. Classic assimilation theorists were concerned with how immigrants adapted over time to fit into American society and, furthermore, these theorists saw it as necessary – and inevitable – for immigrants to eventually shed their ethnic identities to become American themselves (Alba & Nee, 2003; Castles & Miller, 2003; Gans, 1997; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996).

Regardless of whether one agrees with classic assimilation theory, it is helpful to look at these theorists’ work because they studied how immigrant communities are formed and the purposes that ethnic enclaves have served. As immigrants arrived in the U.S., they settled in areas where their compatriots lived. This process of chain migration gave newcomers easier access to housing, jobs, and socializing, particularly when they spoke little or no English. As the number of immigrants grew, communities rose up
around them. In enclaves, immigrants could find familiar culture – grocers that sold ethnic food; churches and schools where the immigrants’ native language was spoken; and businesses that were based on skills and goods for which the immigrants were well known. In their new country, immigrants recreated the amenities of their former countries and in doing so, created communities (Alba & Nee, 2003; Castles & Miller, 2003; Gans, 1997; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996; Qadeer, 2005; Waldinger, 2001). This trend of ethnic enclaves as providing a landing pad for recent arrivals continues today with new immigrant groups from Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Changing Enclaves

Demographic Changes

Most research on ethnic enclaves discusses either the formation of the enclave or the economic benefits to members of it in the form of ethnic enclave economies (see Qadeer, 2005). Little attention has been paid to the dissolution of enclaves, and although the Chicago School model would explain that acculturation has occurred, this is not always accurate since straight-line assimilation into the American mainstream is not the only explanation for why enclaves fade away (Qadeer, 2005). In the traditional sense, ethnic enclaves consist of both ethnic residents and ethnic businesses (such as restaurants, shops, and grocers). One way that ethnic enclaves change is when the area experiences a demographic shift, and people from outside the ethnic group move their residences and businesses to the neighborhood, resulting in the area becoming diversified in people and businesses. (Occasionally, a second minority ethnic group displaces the original ethnic group, and the enclave transitions into a different ethnic enclave). One notable study
looked at this kind of gentrification in Little Portugal, Toronto (Murdie & Teixeira, 2010), where non-Portuguese-Canadians were moving in and displacing the Portuguese population. As another example, Chinatown in Manhattan is increasingly growing into Little Italy (Roberts, 2011).

A second way that an ethnic enclave changes is when the ethnic group shrinks, but the shops and other businesses remain, resulting in the area becoming diversified in residents but not businesses. In this situation, the ethnic group may have shrunk because members have died off, moved away, or some combination of the two. This situation may encourage commodification and branding of the neighborhood’s ethnic identity.

**Commodification and Branding**

When members of an ethnic group move out of the enclave or their numbers within the enclave thin, but the municipality decides to preserve the enclave’s ethnic reputation for tourism, the municipality has turned the ethnic identity into a commodity. Sometimes this commodification is evident through physical identifiers in the enclaves, such as banners that advertise the enclave’s name, posters, and other forms of traditional advertisement (Ward, 1998).

Consider Chinatown in Washington, D.C. It is no longer where a majority of ethnic Chinese in the District lives; yet, the city uses the marketing of Chinese restaurants and ethno-cultural diversity for tourism dollars (Pang & Rath, 2007). The area is artificially preserved through the actions of city planners and a handful of Chinatown business owners. For example, the design review criteria for new businesses in Chinatown include the “contribution of building design, including signage and awnings,
to the Chinese identity of Chinatown” (District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, section 2400.02b). These shops and restaurants attract tourists who value the cultural or ethnic other, and whose spending offers support for the preservation of the area as well as generating revenue through the city (Pang & Rath, 2007). Tourists, in this sense, refer to both local residents who live outside the enclave as well as people visiting from other cities.

**The role of enclaves for outsiders.**

Mainstream America has held various views of ethnic enclaves over the years. Early on, enclaves were seen as necessary to keep ethnic and non-white individuals separated from white Americans (Alba & Nee, 2003). For some ethnic groups, such as northwestern European groups, enclaves developed wherever the groups chose to settle with few restrictions. For groups seen as non-white (including Jews and Italians, historically), geographical choices were more limited, especially on the city level (Alba & Nee, 2003). These non-white enclaves, particularly Asian enclaves, came to be seen as exotic with the hint of danger, crime, and illicit activities (e.g., prostitution, opium dens), which simultaneously repelled and intrigued white America (Alba & Nee, 2003; Rodriguez, 2000).

Although everyday residents of enclaves have generally been unsupportive of marketing efforts toward outsiders, business owners in enclaves realized long ago they could make a greater profit by attracting these outsiders to their businesses (Rodriguez, 2000; Umbach & Wishnoff, 2008). Rodriguez (2000) notes how, during the 1930s, business owners in Chinatown, San Francisco, supported installing “Chinese-style
storefronts,” and some Chinatown merchants required their shop employees to wear traditional Chinese clothing during festivals (72). These decisions were made as part of a larger marketing strategy to attract non-Chinese tourists to the neighborhood.

Umbach and Wishnoff (2008) specifically address the split between the merchant elites and the everyday residents of Manhattan’s Chinatown. They discuss three city planning initiatives between 1950 and 2005 that, they argue, were attempts to “fashion an urban space that exploited exoticized notions of the quarter and its residents” (214). However, while the everyday residents may have resisted these initiatives, the merchants were in favor of these schemes going forward. Furthermore, each of these planning schemes involved physical changes to Chinatown to highlight the Chinese ethnic character of the neighborhood. Umbach and Wishnoff (2008) refer to these physical changes as “faux-Chinese architecture” throughout their article, and describe how this kind of exoticized architecture was thought to attract tourists, whose spending benefits the merchants. Umbach and Wishnoff (2008) are careful to make the distinction between the merchants and everyday residents. They report on how the everyday residents generally opposed the three planning schemes. For example, one of the planning schemes proposed installing a Chinese-style arch in 2005, but the residents opposed construction that appeared to be directed to tourists and not Chinatown residents.

Mazumdar et al (2000) discuss a different perspective on Asian architecture. In their study of Little Saigon in Westminster, California (which is in the Los Angeles area), they found via interviews that residents there supported having Vietnamese-style architecture in their neighborhood. Whereas residents in Rodriguez’s San Francisco
Chinatown and Umbach and Wishnoff’s Manhattan Chinatown found the Chinese-style architecture to be inauthentic, this was not the case in Little Saigon. Instead, Mazumdar et al (2000) see the physical construction of ethnic identity to be an important component alongside the social construction and maintenance of Vietnamese identity within the enclave. They argue that Little Saigon’s Vietnamese-style architecture “communicates its Asian heritage, reaffirming ethnic identity, expressing nostalgia for places left behind, and ‘engraving’ on the new landscape memories from the past” (323). They further contend that the Vietnamese-style architecture announces the Vietnamese community to outsiders, serving as a welcome form of marketing about the goods and services available within the neighborhood.

**Commodification in Italian ethnic enclaves.**

Commodification has also happened with Italian ethnic enclaves (Hackworth and Rekers, 2005; Halter, 2007). In Little Italy, Toronto, most of the Italian-ethnic residents moved to the suburbs and a different Italian-ethnic neighborhood (Corso Italia) by the 1980s. To a large extent, Portuguese, Chinese, and Vietnamese immigrants repopulated the neighborhood, constituting about half the population of the area by 2005 (Hackworth & Reker, 2005). Yet, the city has bolstered the neighborhood’s Italian identity by investing in a streetscape improvement plan, including thematic street signs that feature the Italian flag. Even though few Italians or Italian-Canadians live there, the area remains home to popular Italian restaurants (Hackworth and Rekers, 2005).

San Diego, California, offers another example. In the early 20th century, Italian fishermen and their families lived in an ethnic enclave, but this neighborhood was largely
destroyed by 1962 with the completion of an urban renewal-era highway through the neighborhood (Kayzar, 2007; Ford, Klevisser, and Carli, 2008). The area continued to decline until the 1990s, when the city invested money into branding the area as Little Italy, which included installing a large, metal “Little Italy” street sign and building Amici Park (Ford, Klevisser, and Carli, 2008). New condominium buildings were given Italian-sounding names (Ford, Klevisser, & Carli, 2008). However, Kayzar calls the Italian theme of the neighborhood an “illusion,” citing how the area is predominantly commercially Italian while few residents are Italian or Italian American (2007, 135).

**The impact of changing roles on stability and transition.**

When ethnic enclaves retain their residential component, they may also be seen as retaining their ethnic identity in an authentic way. For example, Hackworth and Rekers (2005) discuss four Toronto neighborhoods that are also Business Improvement Areas. Each of these neighborhoods is branded as an ethnic enclave, having a strong commercial ethnic identity associated with it, and elite merchants and the city have purposefully maintained these commercial ethnic identities to increase tourism dollars (Hackworth and Rekers, 2005). Thus, it is the commercial identity that attracts tourists, not the residential identity.

Hackworth and Rekers’ research also attempts to describe markers of authenticity in an ethnically identified neighborhood. One marker concerns the residential component of the neighborhood. If the residents of the neighborhood identify with the same ethnicity as that of the neighborhood identity, the neighborhood is thought to be more authentically ethnic. Additionally, if residential real estate in the neighborhood is comparably priced to
other neighborhoods in the metropolitan area, this is another sign of authenticity. Hackworth and Rekers differentiate between two commercially Italian-ethnic neighborhoods in Toronto, one of which maintains an Italian residential component and is thought of as authentic, whereas the other neighborhood is only commercially Italian and is thought to be less authentic.

Hackworth and Rekers (2005) argue that an increase in the number of restaurants and a decrease in the number of grocers is one sign of an ethnic neighborhood that is catering more to tourists than its own residents. In turn, a neighborhood that focuses on attracting tourists more than serving its own residents is thought to be inauthentic as an ethnic enclave. Hackworth and Rekers (2005) go as far as to claim, “Ethnically labeled BIA[s [Business Improvement Areas] package and reproduce ethnicity for consumption, primarily for tourists and nonresident ethnics in the region.” (231-232). Thus, having organizations in place to manage ethnic enclaves, they argue, is partially what is leading to the commodification of these same enclaves.

Enclaves tend to change from being traditional (inward-looking) communities to becoming tourist destinations, but the rate of change varies dramatically. For Hackworth and Rekers (2005), the more traditional of their two Italian ethnic enclaves is thought to be about twenty years behind the less traditional example, but moving along the same path.

**Benefits from commodification.**

Cities can benefit from commercialized or commodified enclaves through increased tourism and taxes where local and out-of-town visitors to the enclave spend
money at neighborhood businesses. Previous research has examined the motivations of the visitors or tourists as being an attraction to the cultural or ethnic “other” (Zukin, 1995; Hall & Rath, 2007). Sometimes, social preservationists – outsiders who move to the enclave – encourage long-term residents to remain because those long-term residents add to the legitimacy of the enclave (Brown-Saracino, 2009). However, value might also exist for members of the associated ethnic group beyond the financial benefits from entrepreneurship. Even when the area is only commercially ethnic, it can still function as a place where members of an ethnic group can go to meet like members. In the case of Chinatown in Washington, DC, the restaurants and shops form a node for Chinese people that they cannot find in a residential area (Pang & Rath, 2007).

**Relevance of Community Satisfaction**

For neighborhoods experiencing demographic and commercial change, it is important to measure how different groups subjectively experience the neighborhood; for example, how the long-time residents feel about the neighborhood versus how newer residents feel about the neighborhood. Planners and communities can benefit from knowledge about how residents view their neighborhood. Neighborhood satisfaction covers a broad range of topics. It is whether respondents approve of the condition of the houses and businesses, as well as how respondents feel about their neighbors and their sense of community. Although Hackworth and Rekers (2005) looked at gentrification in ethnic enclaves, their study did not measure community satisfaction. Murdie and Teixeira (2010) looked at gentrification in Little Portugal, Toronto, through the lenses of “Who benefits?” and “Who is hurt?” Although their study is notable for asking the existing
residents about their feelings about gentrification, the study does not address overall neighborhood satisfaction, sense of community, or thoughts about commodification. Commodification may not be happening in Little Portugal, Toronto, as the gentrifiers instead seem to be replacing the Portuguese identity of the neighborhood with a non-ethnic identity (Murdie & Teixeira, 2010).

**Measuring community satisfaction.**

Neighborhood satisfaction, place attachment, and sense of community are related terms to describe the meaning a place holds for a person and the feelings and thoughts he or she has about this place. Neighborhood satisfaction can be explained by individual characteristics (e.g., length of residence in a neighborhood) as well as by neighborhood quality characteristics (e.g., the level of upkeep in a neighborhood) (Basolo & Strong, 2002; Chapman & Lomboard, 2006). Place attachment takes into account neighborhood satisfaction but is also affected by a person’s sense of connectedness to his or her community and integration within it (Filipovic, 2008). Community place attachment more specifically refers to the feeling of rootedness and belonging to a community (Manzo & Perkins, 2006). Sense of community has many definitions, but can be described as a combination of social ties and attachment (Talen, 2000).

A person can have a high degree of neighborhood satisfaction because of positive attributes of the built environment yet a weak sense of community because of low levels of social ties. Furthermore, previous research has provided evidence that neighborhood satisfaction influences individuals’ quality of life in their neighborhood (Marans & Rodgers, 1975). Some factors that influence neighborhood satisfaction concern social
characteristics of the neighborhood. For example, longer lengths of residence in a neighborhood are associated with greater neighborhood satisfaction (Galster & Hesser, 1981). Higher levels of social ties and social interaction, such as speaking with neighbors on a regular basis for friendly reasons, are also associated with greater neighborhood satisfaction (Potter & Cantarero, 2006).

Both physical and social incivilities can affect neighborhood satisfaction. Physical incivilities include physical elements of disorder, such as graffiti, vacant lots, and litter, and tend to decrease individuals’ neighborhood satisfaction (Accordino & Johnson, 2000; Perkins et al., 1990, 1992, 1993). Social incivilities include social elements of disorder, such as the presence of gangs and groups of loitering teenagers, and tend also to decrease neighborhood satisfaction (Spelman, 2004). Thus, it is useful to assess residents’ neighborhood appraisal, a measure that includes both neighborhood satisfaction and social ties.

Assessing ethnic self-identity.

In determining community satisfaction in ethnic enclaves, it is necessary to simultaneously assess the ethnic self-identity of residents of the ethnic enclaves because community satisfaction may vary among ethnic groups. Traditional U.S. Census categories of race and ethnicity offer one way of classifying people. However, these categories are insufficient for individuals who self-identify, for example, as Chinese-American or as an American of Eastern European Descent. Ethnic self-identity refers to the ethnic label that a person uses for himself. Phinney (1992) constructed a scale (the Multiethnic Inventory Measure, or MEIM) that allows for greater choice in ethnic self-
identity. This scale, designed for use in questionnaires, includes a subscale that assesses how strongly a person feels a sense of belonging to his ethnic group. Both the MEIM and its subscale have been found to have high reliability (Ponterotto, 2003). As a result, this dissertation uses the MEIM subscale to assess survey respondents’ strength of belonging to their ethnic group.

**Problem Statement**

Planners need to know how a community benefits or suffers from tourism (Fainstein & Powers, 2007). The degree to which a commodified enclave serves as a social positive or negative may depend on several factors, such as whether a sense of community has been maintained or created, whether community members as well as tourists perceive the enclave as authentic, and whether residents are generally satisfied with their neighborhood. This dissertation studies how commodification of a neighborhood’s ethnic identity affects these factors. Given that this dissertation looks at three case studies, a natural limitation is that the unmeasured results may not generalize to other enclaves and cities. Furthermore, there may be other factors, such as city-level variables, that influence the results. While acknowledging these limitations, this research attempts to shed light on commodification and neighborhood satisfaction in ethnic enclaves.
Chapter 3: Determining the Prevalence of Ethnic Enclaves in U.S. Cities

Abstract

This study sought to identify factors relating to whether ethnic enclaves thrive, diminish, or fail to survive over time. First, a survey was administered to city planners in the fifty largest American cities from 1950. The analysis used structural equation modeling (SEM) to test a theoretical model against the sample of survey and archival data collected. The findings suggest that planners can use a combination of three factors to help identify variables that are conducive to the maintenance of enclaves: the economic health of the city, the friendliness of the city toward ethnic minorities, and the persistence of conditions that are amendable toward ethnic minorities. Future research should be conducted to strengthen several of the variables used in this study, including the measure of the strength of social ties within a community.

Persistence of Ethnic Enclaves in a City

Given how common ethnic enclaves still are in American cities, planners and communities might want to know what factors account for whether an enclave continues to exist or thrives. Research discusses a variety of city-predictors and individual-enclave-predictors. The persistence of enclaves in any given city is likely to depend on the economic health of that city. If a city is shrinking in population and jobs, then residents
are moving out of the city, and logically, some of those residents may have been living in the city’s ethnic enclaves (Schilling & Logan, 2008). Schilling and Logan looked at shrinking cities to develop recommendations for planners on how to right-size such cities.

The friendliness of the city toward ethnic minorities may also affect the persistence of ethnic enclaves. If a high number of ethnic enclaves continue to exist in any given city, this may indicate that a city is friendly toward ethnic enclaves and that any individual enclave might have a better chance of thriving. One way to assess friendliness is to look at whether the city is a sanctuary city. A new wave of anti-terrorism policies emerged in the early 2000s, where police officers were asked to contact Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) if they detained anyone suspected of being in violation of immigration policies (Ridgley, 2008). Cities that did not agree to this new policy are known as sanctuary cities (Ridgley, 2008). Visible ethnic minorities, whether legal residents or not, may be more comfortable living in such cities. Similarly, cities may be perceived as friendlier toward ethnic minorities if the cities have higher rates of residents who are foreign born or who speak a language other than English at home. Lastly, in 2007-2008, the Democratic Party supported a pro-enforcement but pro-amnesty policy toward illegal immigration, while the Republican Party disagreed with amnesty (Frey, 2008). Additionally, racial and ethnic minority voters have traditionally voted for Democratic candidates (Frey, 2008). Thus, I speculate that a city might be friendlier toward ethnic minorities if it has a large number of ethnic enclaves, is a sanctuary city, has a high rate of residents who are foreign born or speak a language other
than English at home, and a high percentage of its population voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate in 2008.

During the 1950s through 1970s, urban renewal was a common practice in city planning departments, and one result of this policy was the destruction of many minority neighborhoods (Sampson & Wilson, 1995). If an individual ethnic enclave was the victim of urban renewal, it is unlikely that the enclave would have either survived or been rebuilt elsewhere in the city. For example, Boston had a thriving, working-class, Italian-American neighborhood in its West End, which was destroyed by urban renewal in the 1960s, displacing the residents who had lived there (Zukin, 2007). Related to this point, the degree to which members of an ethnicity have strong social networks or ties, which were often destroyed by urban renewal, can be important in whether enclaves exist. In Manhattan’s Chinatown, social networks and ties continue to be strong, and the enclave maintains a clear presence (Umbach & Wishnoff, 2008) and is even expanding (Roberts, 2011).

Lastly, in looking at whether an enclave is likely to still be in existence today, several other factors could be considered. If the enclave has a name that identifies it as being associated with an ethnic minority (e.g., Chinatown), the enclave is more likely to be part of a business improvement district, which can help bring in tourism (Hackworth & Rekers, 2005). Additionally, if the enclave were formed in 1960 or later, I argue that the recent formation of the enclave may increase the likelihood that it still exists since the individual enclave has had less time to fade away. Finally, the ethnicity associated with the enclave may be important for whether the enclave continues to exist, particularly
whether the enclave is associated with northwest European ethnicities or not. This is consistent with research that has shown that earlier waves of immigrants, who were often European in origin, have given up their ethnic identity or assimilated into American culture, depending on one’s view of assimilation (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Method

Recall this study sought to find how prevalent ethnic enclaves are in contemporary America as well as what factors contribute to whether enclaves survive over time. The unit of analysis for this study was the individual ethnic enclave within each city. For this study, U.S. Census data supplied the fifty largest U.S. cities as of 1950, and urban planners working for each city were emailed a survey. The planners were identified by looking at the website for each city’s planning department. The survey asked the planners to list any ethnic enclaves, past or present, in their city. For each enclave, the planner was asked to approximate the decade that the enclave was originally settled and, if appropriate, the decade when the neighborhood ceased to exist as an ethnic enclave. Ethnic enclaves can vary in form, and were described using the following categories:

- A traditional neighborhood has a substantial ethnic residential population and related ethnic businesses (grocers, restaurants, and other stores or services).
- A commercial neighborhood has ethnic businesses but little or no related residential population.
- A tourist destination has ethnic businesses that primarily serve a tourist population and/or the neighborhood is promoted to visitors by the municipality.

1 See Appendix A for the list of cities. The cut-off date of 1950 was chosen as an approximate date when air conditioning first became widely available in American households. This relates to a shift of the
• A diminished enclave may retain some characteristics of an ethnic neighborhood, but is becoming less culturally distinct from the surrounding area.
• A revised enclave fits the definition of an ethnic enclave, but has changed from being associated with one ethnicity and is now associated with a second, different ethnicity.
• Other (please describe).

Thus, I asked planners to describe each ethnic enclave using one or more of those categories. I also asked planners to discuss the formation, development, and changes in ethnic areas of their city over time, especially with regard to whether they retained their ethnic identity. Lastly, I asked them to note any books, articles, or experts on any of the ethnic enclaves in their city. I supplemented information from the survey with archival research from newspapers and community organizations.

**Variables**

I collected five kinds of information. Table 1 shows all variables that I collected or computed. The first variable group includes variables that relate to the geographic and ethnic identity of the enclave. The second group looks at each city’s population, population density, and changes in population and population density. The third group includes variables that relate to how friendly a city might be toward immigrants or visible minorities. The fourth group looks at the presence of social ties or networks in each enclave or city. The fifth group includes three miscellaneous variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Group</th>
<th>Variable Descriptions and Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity of the enclave</strong></td>
<td>• City name (<em>City</em>) and state name (<em>State</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Name of the enclave (<em>Enc_Name</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether the enclave’s name identifies it as an ethnic neighborhood, such as Chinatown (<em>TourName</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Ethnicity or ethnicities associated with the enclave (<em>EthGroup</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether the enclave is associated with northwest European ethnicities (<em>NWEuro</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether the enclave is associated with ethnicities other than northwest European, including southern and eastern European (<em>NotEuro</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and density</strong></td>
<td>• City population rank in 1950 (<em>Rank1950</em>)&lt;br&gt;• City population in 1950 (<em>Pop1950</em>)&lt;br&gt;• City population rank in 2000 (<em>Rank2000</em>)&lt;br&gt;• City population in 2008 (<em>Pop2008</em>)&lt;br&gt;• City population density (people per square mile) in 1950 (<em>Dens1950</em>)&lt;br&gt;• City population density in 2000 (<em>Dens2000</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Percentage change in city population, 1950 - 2008 (<em>PoPerDif</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Percentage change in city population density, 1950 - 2000 (<em>PerDeDif</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendliness toward immigrants and minorities</strong></td>
<td>• City unemployment rate in 2008 (<em>Unem2008</em>)&lt;br&gt;• The percentage of the city that voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate in the 2008 election (<em>Democr</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether the city is a sanctuary city (a city where police and other municipal employees will not ask people about their immigration status) (<em>Sanct</em>)&lt;br&gt;• The percentage of the population of the city that spoke a language other than English at home as of 2008 (<em>NoEng08</em>)&lt;br&gt;• The percentage of the population of the city that was born outside of the U.S. as of 2008 (<em>FoBorn08</em>)&lt;br&gt;• The number of enclaves in the city that are still in existence, either diminished or strong (<em>NumEnNow</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community: presence of social ties</strong></td>
<td>• Whether there is a church/temple/mosque in the city associated with the enclave’s ethnic group (<em>Church</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether there is a festival or parade in the city associated with the enclave’s ethnic group (<em>Festival</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether there is a community or social organization in the city associated with the enclave’s ethnic group (<em>OtherOrg</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether there is a television or radio program, newspaper, or other publication associated with the enclave’s ethnic group (<em>PubRadio</em>)&lt;br&gt;• The number of social ties for members of the enclave’s ethnicity (sum of <em>Church</em>, <em>OtherOrg</em>, and <em>PubRadio</em>) (<em>SocTies</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>• Enclave’s current strength of existence (nonexistent, diminished, strong) (<em>Exist</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether the enclave was affected by urban renewal (<em>Renewal</em>)&lt;br&gt;• Whether the enclave was formed around 1960 or later (<em>1960Plus</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Variables Collected and Computed

Structural equation modeling (or SEM) uses both latent and observed variables. Latent variables are concepts that cannot be directly measured, such as intelligence. Observed
variables can be directly measured, such as a score on a standardized IQ test (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). The variables that I collected (or created from collected variables) each relate to a latent variable. Table 2 lists the latent and observed variables that I initially used in the initial analysis. The first latent variable is the economic health of the city. I assessed health through three measures, changes in population (1950-2008) and density (1950-2000) and city unemployment rate in 2008. If the city populations or density decreased or if the city has a high unemployment rate, it would be less healthy than a city without population, density, or unemployment rate problems.

The second latent variable is the friendliness of the city toward ethnic minorities. For this variable, I looked at the foreign population of the city in 2008, the extent of Democratic voters in the 2008 Presidential election, the status of the city as a sanctuary city, the non-native English speaking population of the city in 2008, and how many ethnic enclaves currently exist in the city. A greater presence of foreign-born individuals, non-native English speakers, and Democrats may indicate a more welcoming social and political climate for ethnic enclaves to survive over time.

Similarly, a sanctuary city is hypothesized to be more welcoming for visible minorities.

The third latent variable is the extent of available social ties within the city. For this variable, I assessed whether there are religious centers associated with the identity of the enclave, whether there is a social or community organization associated with the identity of the enclave, and whether there are newspapers, radio programs, or other media associated with the identity of the enclave. If the city had more available social
connections, then there would be greater support for maintaining the ethnicity or culture of the enclave.

The fourth latent variable is the cultural persistence of the enclave. I measured this by looking at whether the enclave’s name identifies it as a distinct neighborhood associated with a particular ethnicity, the date when the enclave was established, and the ethnicity with which the enclave is associated. Enclaves that have distinct names may be more likely to survive due to a greater likelihood of being a tourist destination. Newer enclaves and non-Western European enclaves may be more likely to survive because the population has yet to acculturate into the American mainstream.

The final latent variable is the existence of the enclave as of 2010, when I researched these enclaves. I measured this variable by looking at whether the enclaves have a strong presence, a diminished presence, or whether they have completely dissolved. This latent variable is the dependent variable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variables</th>
<th>Observed variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **HEALTH:** Economic health of city | • Percentage change in city population from 1950 to 2008 ($M = 6.34, SD = 69.74$)  
• Percentage change in city population density from 1950 to 2000 ($M = -22.02, SD = 34.3$)  
• City unemployment rate in 2008 ($M = 5.7, SD = 1.66$) |
| **FRIENDLY:** City friendliness toward ethnic minorities | • The percentage of the population of the city that was born outside of the U.S. as of 2008 ($M = 19.38, SD = 12.5$)  
• The percentage of the city that voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate in the 2008 election ($M = 69.75, SD = 11.37$)  
• Whether the city is a sanctuary city (where police and other municipal employees will not ask people about their immigration status) ($M = 0.6, SD = 0.49$)  
• The percentage of the population of the city that spoke a language other than English at home as of 2008 ($M = 45.34, SD = 123.96$)  
• The number of enclaves in the city that are still in existence, either diminished or strong ($M = 9.05, SD = 6.5$) |
| **COMMUNITY:** Extent of social ties or networks within the enclave | • The number of social ties for members of the enclave’s ethnicity (sum of Church, OtherOrg, and PubRadio) ($M = 2.33, SD = 1.79$)  
• Whether the enclave was affected by urban renewal ($M = 0.04, SD = 0.2$) |
| **PERSIST:** Cultural persistence of the enclave | • Whether the enclave’s name identifies it as an ethnic neighborhood, such as Chinatown ($M = 0.3, SD = 0.46$)  
• Whether the enclave was formed around 1960 or later ($M = 0.33, SD = 0.47$)  
• Whether the enclave is associated with northwest European ethnicities ($M = 0.21, SD = 0.4$)  
• Whether the enclave is associated with ethnicities other than northwest European, including southern and eastern European ($M = 0.66, SD = 0.48$) |
| **NOW:** Existence of enclave as of 2010 | • The strength of the enclave’s current existence (nonexistent, diminished, strong) ($M = 1.12, SD = 0.89$) |

Table 2 Relationship between observed variables and latent variables.

**Results**

The complete data set included 395 ethnic enclaves in 45 cities. Five cities had no discernible history of ethnic enclaves. From this set of 395 ethnic enclaves, 26 neighborhoods (6.6%) were eliminated from the study because they were identified as...
being African-American neighborhoods. Historically African-American neighborhoods are less like true ethnic enclaves, and more likely to be racial ghettos, where a racial ghetto is an involuntary spatial clustering of a racial group because of a lack of options or access to desired neighborhoods (Marcuse, 2005). Thus, historically African-American neighborhoods were formed and may survive for different reasons than ethnic enclaves. The formation, survival, and dissolution of African-American neighborhoods are equally important areas of study, but would need to be studied on their own. After removing African-American neighborhoods from the sample, the final data set had a total of 369 ethnic enclaves from 45 cities.

Eleven cities in this study account for half of the total ethnic enclaves (184 enclaves out of 369 total enclaves), present and past. These eleven cities are among the largest cities in the U.S., and tend to be older, formerly industrial cities, such as New York, Chicago, and Pittsburgh. When analyzing the data for current ethnic enclaves only, cities ranged from zero to 22 enclaves with a mean of just under five enclaves per city ($SD = 4.84$). Ten cities account for half of the total ethnic enclaves (121 enclaves out of 243 total enclaves) that currently exist in the 50 cities studied. This is consistent with research on immigration where in the 1990s, six states received two-thirds of all immigrants and, as of 2003, three-quarters of immigrants lived in 25 MSAs (Alba and Nee, 2003). Table 3.3 shows these ten cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of Enclaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3 Ten cities with the greatest number of enclaves.*

Additionally, 120 of the 243 current enclaves formed after 1960, and some of these enclaves are revised enclaves. Out of the 243 current enclaves, 49 enclaves (20%) have changed from being strongly associated with one ethnicity to being strongly associated with a second, different ethnicity instead. Furthermore, 74 of the current enclaves (30%) were considered diminished in the sense that the ethnic identity of the neighborhood is less salient than it used to be, whereas the remaining 169 enclaves retain a strong ethnic presence. Current enclaves with a strong presence are more likely to be associated with ethnicities from outside northwest Europe, as enclaves associated with northwest Europe have diminished over time, often to the point of nonexistence. Figure 2 shows the percentages of enclaves that maintain a strong ethnic identity that is the original ethnicity for the enclave, those that maintain a strong ethnic identity but one that is a different ethnicity than the original for the enclave, those that have a diminished but original ethnic identity, and those that have a diminished but changed ethnic identity.
Figure 2 Status of current enclaves (N = 243).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
<th>14.</th>
<th>15.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strength of the enclave’s current existence</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percentage change in city population</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percentage change in city population density</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unemployment rate</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether the enclave was affected by urban renewal</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The percentage of the city that voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whether the city is a sanctuary city</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Current number of enclaves in the city</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Whether the enclave was formed around 1960 or later</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whether the enclave’s name identifies it as an ethnic neighborhood</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The number of social ties for members of the enclave’s ethnic group</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Percentage of the city population that was born outside the U.S.</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Percentage of the city population that spoke a language other than English at home</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Whether the enclave is associated with northwest European ethnicities</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Whether the enclave is associated with ethnicities other than northwest European ethnicities</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4* Correlation matrix of variables used in the structural equation model.
Analysis

To uncover the characteristics associated with the persistence of enclaves, I tested and refined the grouping of variables shown in Table 1 using structural equation modeling. Before I could begin model testing, I established a correlation matrix for the observed variables (Table 4). This correlation matrix revealed a strong correlation between the strength of the enclave’s current existence [nonexistent, diminished, strong] \( (Exist) \) and the number of social ties for members of the enclave’s ethnicity [sum of \( Church, \ OtherOrg, \) and \( PubRadio \)] \( (SocTies) \), and thus, I dropped the variable of \( SocTies \) from further analysis and did not use it in the structural equation model. The strength of the enclave’s current existence \( (Exist) \) is the dependent variable in the model, and therefore it was not possible to keep \( SocTies \) and to drop \( Exist \) instead.

Model Evaluation

I used maximum likelihood (ML) as the method of estimation in the models tested in this analysis. In evaluating the theoretical model and each subsequent refined model, I considered the significance of the factor loadings as well as various fit indices that compared the hypothesized models with the sample data. For each model, the fit indices included: \( \chi^2 \), the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AFGI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the comparative fit index (CFI). Additionally, I considered the structural equation’s \( R^2 \) value.

Model Results
Several rounds of modifications were necessary to find a suitable model. In making an appropriate modification, I gave consideration to: the significance of individual variables, the path coefficients, the standardized residuals, and the modification indices. I made modifications to help refine the model and create a better fitting model for the sample data. For each modification, I considered the \( R^2 \) value of the structural equation and various fit indices for the model. In structural equation modeling, a low chi-square (\( \chi^2 \)) value with a non-significant chi-square p-value shows that the theoretical model fits the sample data well. Thus, unlike in other statistical situations, a low chi-square value with a non-significant chi-square p-value is a sign of a good fit for the model. Furthermore, to be considered an acceptable fit, GFI, AGFI, and CFI should be above 0.90 and preferably above 0.95, and RMSEA should be below 0.08 and preferably below 0.05 (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). As with many other statistical tests, the \( R^2 \) value indicates the proportion of the variance of the data that for which the model accounts; the higher the \( R^2 \) value, the more variance can be explained using the model.

For this final model, chi-square was acceptably low (\( \chi^2_{17, df} = 21.75, p = .19 \)). GFI, AGFI, and CFI were all acceptably high (0.99, 0.97, and 1.00, respectively). Additionally, RMSEA was acceptably low (0.028) and the \( R^2 \) value was satisfactory (\( R^2 = .87 \)).

**Model Modifications**

Before arriving at the final model, I made a series of model modifications. Three variables were not individually significant: the percentage of the city’s population that voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate in 2008 (\( \text{Democr} \)), whether the enclave was affected by urban renewal (\( \text{Renewal} \)), and whether the enclave’s name identifies it as
an ethnic neighborhood (*TourName*). As a result, I removed these variables from analysis. Additionally, I allowed the error covariance of *NWEuro* (whether the enclave is associated with a northwest European ethnicity) and *NotEuro* (whether the enclave is associated with an ethnicity other than northwest European) to correlate. The standardized residual (-10.16) had exceeded the critical value, and the modification indices had suggested this change would result in Chi-Square decreasing by 103.1 from the original model’s Chi-Square value of 232.9. Again, both variables were measured the same (0 or 1) and both variables are dealing with the ethnicity or ethnicities associated with each enclave. However, after allowing the error covariance of *NWEuro* and *NotEuro* to correlate, *NotEuro* and the percentage of the city’s population that spoke a language other than English at home as of 2008 (*NoEng08*) were no longer individually significant as variables, and I removed them from the model.

Additionally, I allowed the error covariance to correlate between the city’s unemployment rate in 2008 (*Unem2008*) and the population change, as a percentage, between 1950 and 2008 (*PoPerDif*). The standardized residual for these two variables (-6.78) exceeded the critical value, and the modification indices suggested Chi-Square would decrease by 43.4. This makes sense given that unemployment rates and population changes are likely to be related.

I also allowed the error covariance between the current number of enclaves in the city (*NumEnNow*) and the population change, as a percentage, between 1950 and 2008 (*PoPerDif*) to correlate. The standardized residual for these two variables (-6.79) was the largest of all standardized residuals, and the modification indices suggested an estimated
decrease to Chi-Square of 27.5. This change made sense since the variables are related – the larger the growth in population for a city, the greater the likelihood that there are more enclaves in that city. Similarly, I allowed the error covariance between $NumEnNow$ and $Exist$ to correlate based on the premise that the greater number of enclaves that currently exist, the greater the likelihood that any single enclave will persist.

Lastly, I allowed the error covariance between the percentage of the city’s population that was foreign born in 2008 ($FoBorn08$) and the unemployment rate of the city in 2008 ($Unem2008$) to correlate (standardized residual = -4.54; estimated decrease to Chi-Square = 26.8) and the error covariance between $NumEnNow$ and $Unem2008$ to correlate (standardized residual = 3.03; estimated decrease to Chi-Square = 10.2).

Although $Democr$ was not a significant variable, both of these changes reflect the idea that social policies may have an influence on the presence of ethnic enclaves. (See Figure 3 for the path diagram).
I made no further modifications past this model because the modification indices’ suggestions were inconsistent with the literature on ethnic enclaves. The statistical software suggested some modifications that could have led to a lower Chi-Square value, which is indicative of a good fit of the model. With structural equation modeling, the researcher must weigh each modification against his or her knowledge of the subject; thus, any modifications that do not make sense should not be used. In this case, I made all modifications that made sense according to my knowledge of the research.

**Model Expectations**
I expected my four latent variables to explain the variation in whether an enclave thrives, survives in a diminished capacity, or fails to survive over time (measured by the variable *Exist*). Specifically, I expected to find that the survival of enclaves would relate to the health of cities (as measured through population and population density changes as well as unemployment rates), the friendliness of the city toward immigrants and visible minorities, the extent of social ties in the enclave, and the cultural persistence of the enclave. After making appropriate modifications to the model, these expectations were fulfilled for all but the extent of social ties. This latent variable was originally measured by two observed variables (*SocTies* and *Renewal*), but I eliminated both of those variables. Recall that I had discarded *SocTies* (the number of social ties for members of the enclave’s ethnicity) before beginning any model testing because of its high correlation with the dependent measured variable *Exist*. I had eliminated *Renewal* (whether the enclave was associated with urban renewal) because it was non-significant as an individual variable.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The descriptive results of the number and type of ethnic enclaves indicate that ethnic enclaves continue to exist in American cities rather than being a fading relic of the discriminatory laws of the early 20th century. However, the ethnic identities associated with current enclaves have changed as immigration patterns in the United States have changed, with an increased presence of non-Western European enclaves, especially Southeast Asian enclaves.
The structural equation model showed that the health of the community, the friendliness of the community, and the cultural persistence of the enclave accounted for the survival of an enclave. The economic health of the community – whether it is growing or shrinking in population, density, and employment – was statistically significant, and this agrees with existing research about shrinking cities (Schilling & Logan, 2008). Similarly, the friendliness of the city toward ethnic minorities was also statistically significant, as demonstrated by the percentage of the population that was foreign born as of 2008, the number of enclaves still present in the city as of 2010, and whether the city is a so-called “sanctuary city.” Also, the persistence of ethnic enclaves could be measured by whether the enclave had formed since 1960 and whether the ethnic members of the enclave were associated with northwest European ethnicities. This agrees with previous findings showing the growth of new immigrant groups from Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the Caribbean (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Unexpectedly, urban renewal (Renewal) did not emerge as a significant predictor. Two possibilities, one statistical and one based on the literature, could explain this. Statistically, there were only 16 enclaves (4.3%) in this sample that were definitely affected by urban renewal (and therefore coded “1”), more in-depth research might uncover that more of the enclaves in this sample were affected by urban renewal, and thus the data could change. Secondly, although it is true that urban renewal affected ethnic minorities, most of the literature focuses on the effects on racial minorities. Since African-American neighborhoods were excluded from this study, the variable of Renewal may have been weakened.
I also expected *TourName* (whether the enclave’s name identifies it as an ethnic neighborhood) to be significant. The literature suggests that increasing numbers of cities are interested in marketing ethnic enclaves for tourism purposes. This process of commodification is an ongoing research area. *TourName* may not have worked as a variable because some enclaves with tourist names (such as Little Saigon) may be thriving communities whereas others may be diminished with only a commercial presence remaining.

A correlational study like this cannot establish cause but can suggest possible variables to test in future studies. The current study was not a controlled experiment, and the results are a product of the variables that I chose to measure. Additionally, the study is limited by the accuracy of the answers I received from city planners, who may have misjudged the current enclaves in their cities or have had incomplete histories of their cities. Nevertheless, the convergence of the findings with previous research suggests that the importance of the economic health of cities, their friendliness toward ethnic minorities, and individual factors related to enclaves, may well be stable in assessing the strength and endurance of an enclave.

Looking beyond the U.S. to enclaves in other countries could add additional valuable information. I would also like to widen my scope to newer cities – that is, ones that were not among the 50 most populous cities as of 1950. A follow-up study will compare these newer cities to the cities in this study to see if enclaves in these cities are similar to enclaves in the older cities.

Lastly, in a future study, I would like to better use the categories that surveyed
planners were asked to use for enclaves in their cities: traditional, commercial, tourist, diminished, revised, or other. In this study, \( \text{Exist} (0 = \text{nonexistent}, \ 1 = \text{diminished}, \ 2 = \text{strongly existing}) \) was used, where traditional, commercial, tourist, and revised were lumped together into one category. I made this decision based on the unclear answers obtained from the planners, where some respondents described the ethnic enclaves in their city but did not categorize them or give enough information for me to be able to categorize them myself. However, in all cases, it was possible to classify the enclaves according to the categories in the variable \( \text{Exist} \).

From this study, we know that hundreds of enclaves still exist in U.S. cities and that they exist at various stages of commodification. Some questions remain, such as is a commodified enclave sustainable in a stable form in the long term? Although the present study shows the breadth of enclaves, it lacks the depth that case studies can provide. How are residents and their community satisfaction by changes to their neighborhood? Under which circumstances should planners consider branding an ethnic enclave? Lastly, is there a future for enclaves aside from becoming tourist destinations?

The next three chapters look at three case studies of Italian-ethnic enclaves at different levels of commodification. By choosing to focus on one kind of ethnic enclave, I was able to minimize the influence of outside variables such as varying degrees of acculturation into the American mainstream. For each of these three enclaves, I surveyed residents to find out about their neighborhood assessments to learn in depth about resident reactions and to get a preliminary idea of the effects of such commodification on residents.
Chapter 4: The Hill, St. Louis, a Traditional Enclave

Background

The Hill is one of two historic Italian ethnic enclaves in St. Louis, and the only one of the two to survive to the present day. Research has looked at the history of The Hill from its founding in 1882 up through 1982 (Mormino, 2002). In the preface to the second edition of his book, Mormino notes how, as of 2002, little of importance had changed in The Hill since 1982. In an age when many other Italian enclaves are experiencing commodification (Ford, Klevisser, and Carli, 2008; Halter, 2007; Kayzar, 2007), The Hill at first glance appears to be surviving as a traditional Italian ethnic enclave. In other words, this neighborhood does not seem to be experiencing the tourism, condominium-building, and branding of the ethnic identity that is seen in other Italian ethnic enclaves. In my research of Italian enclaves in the U.S., I could not find another enclave that was reported to be as traditional as The Hill.

To better understand enclaves that are experiencing change, I sought to find an example of an enclave that is only just beginning to experience demographic change and is wrestling with defining its future goals. This study looks at the neighborhood residents’

---

3 Mormino’s research concluded in 1982; thus, his 100-year history of The Hill was up to date at the time of the first edition of Immigrants on the Hill.
satisfaction with The Hill, their goals and desires for the future of their neighborhood, and their opinions on commodification schemes.

![Map of The Hill](image)

Figure 4 Map of The Hill (approximately 630 acres) in St. Louis

**Objective**

The purpose of this study is to provide a comparison to enclaves that are in transition. To that end, this study provides a benchmark for residents’ current satisfaction with their neighborhood. It also looks at whether they see their neighborhood remaining traditional, moving toward commodification, or changing in other ways. The study
examines three questions:

1. To what extent has there been a demographic (ethnic) or commercial change in the neighborhood?

2. To what extent are there differences in neighborhood ties, satisfaction, and opinions about future commercialization between Italian-ethnic and non-Italian-ethnic residents?

3. Do residents perceive their neighborhood to be changing and, if so, what changes do they perceive to be occurring?

**Study Design**

**Sample**

Participants are residents of The Hill, St. Louis. Only people who are 18 years of age or older were surveyed.

**Measures**

I adapted Likert scales items that concern neighborhood satisfaction from the neighborhood satisfaction survey used by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services and developed by the Vallejo Fighting Back Partnership. I developed other questions to assess the length of residence in the neighborhood, the history of familial connection to it, and the demographics of the participants.

Items concerning ethnicity constitute an abbreviated version of the Multiethnic Inventory Measure (MEIM), which the developer grants open permission to use. The items using Likert scales in this section form a subset of the MEIM that assesses ethnic
affirmation, belonging, and commitment. The MEIM and this subset have been examined for reliability in outside studies.

These measures are explained below and the data collection instrument is presented in Appendix B.

**Demographic information.** The survey asked for the respondent’s age, gender, marital status, years of residence in the area, and family composition.

**Attitudes and perceptions.** Three items ask respondents to rate their satisfaction with aspects of their neighborhood (on a 5-point scale between *very bad* and *very good*). Two items ask about their attitudes towards their neighbors: how frequently they speak with their neighbors (*daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, or never*); and their level of agreement (5-point scale of *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*) with the statement, “If something is wrong in my neighborhood, my neighbors will fix it.” Four *yes/no* items measure the presence of additional social connections to the neighborhood for the respondent.

**Commercialization.** Ten items ask for their feelings about potential commercial changes to the neighborhood on a 5-point scale of *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*.

**Ethnicity.** One open-ended item asks them to self-identify their ethnicity; and another item asked them to self-identify their ethnicity by choosing from a list of possible ethnicities. Two other items ask them to identify the ethnicity of their parents, choosing from that same list of possible ethnicities. Seven items comprise the ethnic affirmation, belonging, and commitment subset of the MEIM, and respondents are asked to state their agreement with statements on a 4-point scale between *strongly disagree* and *strongly agree*. 
Neighborhood satisfaction and change. In an open-ended format, respondents were asked what thoughts and feelings come to mind when they think about their neighborhood and neighborhood changes.

Participants and Procedure

I mailed a letter to a random sample of addresses located in the neighborhood. The letter indicated that only a person 18 years of age or older should answer the survey. The mailing contained a paper copy of the survey, a stamped return envelope, and a link to the online survey. Out of 100 distributed surveys, four envelopes were returned as non-deliverable. In total, 37 people returned the surveys (19 men and 18 women), for a response rate of 38.5 percent.

Data Analysis

For all three case studies (The Hill, St. Louis; Little Italy, Cleveland; and Little Italy, Schenectady), I analyzed quantitative data using descriptive and correlational statistical techniques. I also reviewed qualitative data from the open-ended questions to code for themes.

Results

As a case study, this section reports only on the results for the respondents of this neighborhood. However, a later section of this dissertation will compare results across the three neighborhoods.

Demographic Change

In answer to the first research question, The Hill shows little demographic
(ethnic) change. Most respondents (35 out of 37) answered the open-ended question about with which ethnic group they most closely identify. In response, 62.9 percent listed their ethnicity as Italian or Italian-American whereas 20 percent indicated an ethnic identity that was ambiguous, such as White, Caucasian, or American. It is ambiguous in the sense that these respondents may or may not have Italian ancestry, but the relevance for this study is that they do not self-identify as Italian or Italian-American. Another 14.3 percent answered the question by self-identifying with a non-Italian ethnic group but also mentioning a connection to Italians or Italian-Americans, usually in the form of mentioning an Italian spouse. Only one person (2.8 percent) indicated a non-Italian ethnicity without such a statement.

Of those who responded to the survey, there were few newcomers to the neighborhood. The majority of respondents (75 percent) have lived in the neighborhood for at least ten years and an average length of residence of almost 34 years (SD = 29.03 years). The length of residence reported ranged from six months to 87 years.

Length of residence is related to the ethnic self-identity of the respondents. One group of respondents, which I will refer to using the shorthand name of the Italian Group, includes respondents who indicated an Italian or Italian-American self-identity as well as those who indicated a connection to Italian or Italian-American identity (e.g., married to an Italian-ethnic person). For the Italian Group, a quarter reported having lived in the neighborhood for at least 64 years. Overall, members of the Italian Group reported living in the neighborhood for much longer than the Non-Italian Group members. The Non-Italian Group includes respondents whose self-identified ethnicity was ambiguous (e.g.,
White) and for whom there was no connection to Italians (e.g., not married to an Italian). This difference between groups in length of residency was significant.

Length of residence is naturally related to age, \( r(35) = .764, p < .001 \).

Respondents in the Italian Group tend to be older and to have a greater length of residence than the Non-Italian Group respondents, and to have more family members who live in the neighborhood but not in the respondent’s household (with a range of zero to 40 family members) than the Non-Italian Group respondents’ reported number of family members (with a range of zero to three family members). These differences were all statistically significant (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Italian Group</strong> (( N = 27 ))</th>
<th><strong>Non-Italian Group</strong> (( N = 8 ))</th>
<th><strong>Significance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence (in years)</td>
<td>( M = 42.5 ) (SD), 28.37</td>
<td>( M = 9.64 ) (SD), 9.38</td>
<td>( t(32) = 2.99, p = .005, r = .61 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>( M = 61.65 ) (SD), 18.65</td>
<td>( M = 37.88 ) (SD), 14.14</td>
<td>( t(32) = 3.31, p = .002, r = .58 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Relatives</td>
<td>( M = 7.52 ) (SD), 9.70</td>
<td>( M = 0.38 ) (SD), 1.06</td>
<td>( t(31) = 2.06, p = .048, r = .46 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Demographic Comparison Between Groups.

**Neighborhood Appraisal**

Recall that this study sought to understand how residents feel about their neighborhood. Thirteen variables related to sense of community, attitudes about tourism, and the identity of the community were factor analyzed using principal component
analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation. Some variables were measured with five-point Likert scales while others had three-point Likert scales. To examine the interrelationships between them, I standardized all thirteen variables on a 0 to 1 scale. The analysis yielded four factors explaining 65.85 percent of the variance for the entire set of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Sense of Community</th>
<th>Factor 2: Italian Identity of The Hill</th>
<th>Factor 3: Roots in the Community</th>
<th>Factor 4: Tourism Attitude</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “If something is wrong in my neighborhood, my neighbors will fix it.”</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived upkeep of buildings</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived neighborliness</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact with neighbors</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “I feel a sense of attachment to The Hill.”</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “I would welcome non-Italian ethnic restaurants (e.g., French bistro or Chinese restaurant) to the neighborhood.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “Tricolore (green, white, red) banners and street signs are important to have in the neighborhood.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “I would like the Hill to remain Italian and Italian-American in the future.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents or grandparents live(d) in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “City officials and business owners should encourage tourism.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “The Hill should try to attract more visitors from outside the neighborhood.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>3.96</th>
<th>2.36</th>
<th>1.59</th>
<th>1.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Variance</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variance</td>
<td>71.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Factor Analysis for Neighborhood Appraisal, The Hill, St. Louis.

Note. Factor loadings < .5 are suppressed
Factor 1, labeled Sense of Community, had high factor loadings by feeling of community, perceived neighborliness, agreement with the statement that neighbors would take action if something were wrong, perceived upkeep of buildings, frequency of contact with neighbors, and sense of attachment to the neighborhood. It explained slightly more than 30 percent of the variance. A Cronbach alpha analysis of the inter-item reliability revealed a high degree of internal consistency among the six variables ($\alpha = .82$) suggesting that they are measuring the underlying construct of Sense of Community.

Factor 2, labeled Italian Identity of The Hill, includes disagreement with the idea of welcoming non-Italian ethnic restaurants to the neighborhood, agreement with the statement that Italian-themed signs and banners are important to have in the neighborhood, and agreement with the sentiment that they would like the neighborhood to remain Italian and Italian-American in the future. It explained 18 percent of the variance. An item analysis showed a low level of internal consistency among the variables ($\alpha = .68$).

Factor 3, labeled Roots in the Community, includes attendance at religious services in the neighborhood and parents or grandparents live or lived in the neighborhood. It explained 12 percent of the variance. An item analysis indicated there is an acceptable level of internal consistency among the four variables ($\alpha = .72$).

Factor 4, labeled Tourism Attitude, is composed of two items: agreement with the statements that city officials and business owners should encourage tourism and that The Hill should try to attract visitors from outside the neighborhood. It explained almost 11
percent of the variance. Item analysis revealed a moderately high level of internal consistency between the two variables ($\alpha = .77$).

The communalities of the variables indicate that they are reasonably well related to each other. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.64, above the recommended value of 0.5, and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (78) = 197.63, p < .01$).

The factor analysis shows that there are four patterns of responses for how the survey participants appraised their neighborhood. Additionally, these four patterns are independent of each other. Using the four factors from the factor analysis, I created four composite variables – one for each of the factors – by averaging the variables on each factor. Henceforth, I refer to these composite variables as Sense of Community, Tourism Attitude, Italian Identity of the Hill, and Roots in the Community.

**Differences Between the Italian Group and Non-Italian Group**

**Neighborhood ties and satisfaction.** Both the Italian Group respondents and the Non-Italian Group respondents gave high ratings to their perceptions of neighborhood characteristics. I compared the Italian and Non-Italian responses to Sense of Community and Roots in the Neighborhood.

With Sense of Community, both the Italian Group and the Non-Italian Group gave high ratings (Italian $M = 0.88$, Non-Italian $M = 0.79$, with 1 being very good and 0 being very bad), and these ratings did not differ at statistically significant level. However, while the Italian respondents all reported they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “I feel a sense of attachment to The Hill,” the Non-Italian respondents had
varying levels of agreement (75 percent agreed or strongly agreed, 12.5 percent neither agreed nor disagreed, and 12.5 percent disagreed). Additionally, Sense of Community was strongly correlated to length of residence ($r = .72, p < .01$).

![Figure 5 Typical housing, The Hill; Photograph by Mark Groth](image)

With Roots in the Community, the Italian Group ($M = 0.79, SD = 0.22$) showed more social ties to the community than the Non-Italian Group ($M = 0.28, SD = 0.25$), and this difference was statistically significant ($t(33) = 3.528, p = 0.001$). Four individual questions looked at the strength of social ties to The Hill. For the Italian Group respondents, 81.5 percent attend religious services in the neighborhood, 25.9 percent own or owned a business in the neighborhood, 85.2 percent plan to live in the neighborhood
for five years more or longer, and 70.4 percent responded that their parents or grandparents live or lived in the neighborhood.

The Non-Italian Group respondents showed fewer social ties to The Hill. For this group, 25 percent attend religious services in the neighborhood, 12.5 percent own or owned a business in the neighborhood, 75 percent plan to live in the neighborhood for five years more or longer, and only 12.5 percent responded that their parents or grandparents live or lived in the neighborhood.

Table 8 shows that the Italian Group and the Non-Italian Group have statistically significant differences in their social connections with regard to their attendance at religious services and whether their parents or grandparents live or lived on The Hill. The two groups did not differ in their business ownership or their intentions to remain living on The Hill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (#)</th>
<th>No (#)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian Group</td>
<td>Non-Ital. Group</td>
<td>Italian Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Grand]parents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Social Connections within The Hill, St. Louis, using Yates Chi Square

Three open-ended questions yielded additional data on residents’ feelings and thoughts. One question, which followed the ratings of safety, neighborliness, feeling of
community, upkeep of buildings, and availability of shops and services in the neighborhood, gave the respondents the opportunity to rate “Other” – or another aspect of the neighborhood not already addressed. Two people answered this question. One person responded that the history of the neighborhood is “Very good.” The other person gave a rating of “Very bad” to the parking situation in the neighborhood, explicitly citing “disrespectful restaurant owners” as well as “restaurant tourists [show] no respect for home owners’ needs of parking.” Note that the respondent chose the word “tourists” and not “patrons.”

Figure 6 St. Ambrose Church, The Hill; Photograph by Mark Groth
Attitudes towards branding and commercialization. Both Tourism Attitudes and Italian Identity of The Hill lent further insight into how residents of The Hill feel about their neighborhood.

The Italian Group respondents had a range of opinions about whether The Hill should try to attract more visitors from outside the neighborhood, including 46.2 percent of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed. However, when presented with the statement “City officials and business owners should encourage tourism in The Hill,” more respondents were in agreement (77.7 percent agreed or strongly agreed).

The Non-Italian Group was split evenly on whether the Hill should try to attract more visitors: half agreed with this statement and half neither agreed nor disagreed. However, all respondents in this group agreed or strongly agreed that tourism should be encouraged. For Tourism Attitudes, however, there was no significant difference between the responses of the Italian Group and the Non-Italian Group.

The ethnic identity of the neighborhood is important to the Italian Group respondents. In response to the statement, “I would like The Hill to remain Italian or Italian-American in the future,” 88.4 percent agreed or strongly agreed. The Non-Italian Group showed less support for this statement: 50 percent agreed or strongly agreed.

Respondents were also asked about the kinds of businesses they would welcome in the neighborhood. When asked whether they would welcome non-Italian ethnic restaurants such as a Chinese restaurant or French bistro, opinions in the Italian Group were split equally where one third of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, one third neither agreed nor disagreed, and the remaining third agreed or strongly agreed.
Unlike the lack of consensus in the Italian Group about non-Italian ethnic restaurants, the Non-Italian Group respondents largely support the idea (87.5 percent agreed or strongly agreed to the statement and 12.5 percent disagreed).

However, for Italian Identity of The Hill, there was no statistically significant difference between the Italian Group and the Non-Italian Group.

**Perceptions of Change**

The second open-ended question asked respondents, “What thoughts and feelings come to mind about your neighborhood and neighborhood changes?” Of the 37 people who returned the survey, 20 people (54 percent) responded to this question. Their answers contain a mix of positive, neutral, and negative comments on their neighborhood. I coded their responses using target words and phrases and found that 40 percent were positive, 25 percent were neutral, and 35 percent were negative. An example of a positive statement is, “The Hill is a community, small and friendly.” An example of a neutral comment is, “I would like to see more of the young people who grew up on the Hill return to live here.” An example of a negative comment is, “Too many renters. Renters do not take care of their living areas as well as owners.”

Many of the comments (45 percent) concern demographic change within the neighborhood, but these comments ranged between welcoming change and resisting change. One respondent commented, “The older ‘characters’ are dying and being replaced by younger people not concerned with tradition.” A respondent who recently moved to the neighborhood commented, “I think the demographics are slowly changing. Though a majority of residents are still of Italian descent, some (like myself) moved to
the Hill for the convenience and safety aspect.” A self-identified Italian-ethnic respondent who has lived in the neighborhood for more than 50 years commented, “Things are changing because the older Italian people are passing away and the young ones are taking over. This is life and this is good.”

Another group of answers (40 percent) concerned issues of family, community, and tradition. A resident of the neighborhood for 30 years simply wrote, “Tradition - Family - Citizen - Heritage – HOME.” Other comments relayed personal histories of generations having lived in the neighborhood. One older respondent wrote, “When I was growing up the Hill was just a local neighborhood. As I grew older, it seemed to change into an ‘ethnic’ neighborhood that began to draw ‘tourists’ (many from St. Louis) and it seemed to become an oddity. Many of my friends and coworkers would ask me my favorite place to eat on the Hill. My usual answer was my kitchen.”

The final question on the survey asked respondents, “Is there anything else you can tell me about life in your neighborhood?” As with the previous open-ended question, 20 people (54 percent) responded to this question. A non-Italian respondent wrote, “The Hill is changing – new, young people moving in like the aura of being on The Hill, but they're not involved in the parish or neighborhood association. I want the neighborhood to remain Italian in theme, but always welcoming to the straniero (stranger), like me.”

One negative response and one neutral response concerned restaurants and tourism in the neighborhood; the negative response indicated a belief that the neighborhood is becoming too tourism-oriented, whereas the neutral response indicated a desire for businesses other than restaurants. The only other negative response to this question was from a relatively
younger resident who wrote, “Too many African Americans and white trash are being allowed on The Hill. That NEVER used to be the case.”

However, most of the responses to this question (75 percent) were positive statements. Almost all answers to this question (85 percent) concerned matters of community and the quality of life in the neighborhood. A relative newcomer to the neighborhood commented, “Very community oriented, well known locally, have strong desire to maintain esoteric culture.” A longtime resident answered, “It is a close knit group of people that have been together most of their lives. I married an Italian man and that is how I come to live here.” A middle-aged, longtime resident responded, “The Hill is a way of life that represents my roots, my life, my future.”

**Conclusion**

Is The Hill a traditional Italian-ethnic neighborhood? The majority of respondents to the survey self-identify as being ethnically Italian or affiliated with someone who is ethnically Italian. Both the Italians and non-Italians who responded to the survey largely agreed that the neighborhood remains a traditional community, yet they also believe that the neighborhood is less authentic than it used to be. Their open-ended responses indicate a perception of demographic change as older, Italian residents have died.

Although the Italian Group respondents did not differ from the Non-Italian Group respondents in their sense of community, tourism attitudes, or feelings about the Italian identity of The Hill, the Italian Group did have significantly high scores on the measure of Roots in the Community.

Few respondents noted commercial changes taking place in the neighborhood. A
notable handful of comments were about tourism, increasing numbers of festivals, and prominence of restaurants in the neighborhood. This overall lack of comments about commercial changes may indicate that the neighborhood is not yet experiencing commercialization and commodification of the Italian-ethnic identity to the same extent of other Italian neighborhoods in other cities.

The non-Italians who responded to the survey have fewer social ties to the neighborhood, are less invested in continuing the Italian-ethnic identity of the neighborhood, and showed more support for increasing tourism. For the most part, however, respondents to the survey – including both Italians and non-Italians – are satisfied with the physical and social conditions in their neighborhood.

Although the study used a random sample, inferences about the generality of the results are limited by the small response rate. The respondents who chose to return the survey may differ in some way from those who did not complete the survey. Door-to-door interviews would likely get a better response rate. Inferences are also limited by the reliance on survey data, which may have inaccuracies and biases. Unobtrusive observations of behavior and its traces in the neighborhood could overcome this possible limitation.
This study looked at the attitudes of residents who live in an enclave that has not yet been experiencing significant change when compared to other Italian-ethnic enclaves. This provides an opportunity to assess opinions towards change and commodification as a concept without having concrete changes in place. For example, rather than asking residents about a specific condominium and whether they are satisfied with its introduction to the neighborhood, this study asked about residents’ attitudes about how they would feel about introducing one or more Italian-themed condominiums to their neighborhood in general. This study can serve as a benchmark, especially if the area later becomes commodified.
The next chapter reports on Little Italy, Cleveland, which is an area where there has been demographic change and increased commercialization. This offers a comparison to The Hill by showing what The Hill, or a neighborhood like it, might look like in twenty or so years if changes are implemented.
Chapter 5: Little Italy, Cleveland, a Neighborhood in Transition

Abstract

Cleveland’s Little Italy meets the definition of an ethnic enclave, and many of its residents are descendents of Italian immigrants from the late 1880s, but the neighborhood has been experiencing significant change in recent years (Abrahamson, 1996). In response to fears of losing the neighborhood’s homeowners to the suburbs, prominent residents and business owners commissioned the Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation in 1994 to improve and preserve the area. The goals of the Little Italy Master Plan are reminiscent of the commodification of ethnic neighborhoods (Hackworth & Rekers, 2005; Pang & Rath, 2007). The master plan sought to market the unique character, enhance the public space, program to promote ethnic diversity and attract consumers, and increase residential offerings (Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation, 2005). The fact that business owners have sought to reinvigorate Little Italy is similar to how enclaves in other cities have been marketed (Alonso, 2007). In other U.S. ethnic enclaves, the ethnic majority residents have moved out but the local government has sought to promote the ethnic character of the neighborhood for tourism purposes; such a situation may be happening in Little Italy, Cleveland (Hackworth & Rekers, 2005; Pang & Rath, 2007).

Background
A series of Italian communities were settled in the Cleveland area, but they were distinct in character and separate from each other. Little Italy was one of the major Italian settlements in Cleveland, forming around the turn of the 19th century. Geographically, Little Italy is a neighborhood on Cleveland’s east side, located from East 119th to 125th Streets on Murray Hill and Mayfield Roads. Due in part to its geographic isolation, bordered by a university and a cemetery, Little Italy was an insular community. By the early 19th century, the neighborhood included almost all necessary amenities and services – churches, schools, Alta House for recreation and socialization, a school and library, a theater, Italian grocery stores, restaurants, and drugstores. Little Italy has been called “a once impenetrable cultural island” (Ferroni, 1969, p. 46).

Figure 8 Map of Little Italy (approximately 123 acres) in Cleveland
Concern for Movement to the Suburbs

As early as the 1950s and 1960s, the Italian-American community in Little Italy worried that their numbers were dwindling as residents moved out of the neighborhood (Michney, 2006). Then and now, Little Italy stands out as the city’s most prominent Italian neighborhood, but the total population of the neighborhood had been declining since the 1920s. While African-Americans moved into the other traditionally Italian neighborhoods in Cleveland, Italian-Americans moved away into corridor suburbs like Cleveland Heights, South Euclid, Lyndhurst, and Mayfield Heights. The other traditionally Italian neighborhoods became more diverse; the suburbs grew in population; but Little Italy’s population shrank. However, while the population shrank, it remained almost exclusively white. In the mid-1960s, Little Italy was estimated to be between two thirds and three quarters Italian or Italian-American, counting third and fourth generation descendants (Michney, 2006).

Michney (2006) summarizes the demographic change over these decades by arguing that Little Italy was not threatened to become less Italian because it was becoming more of something else; rather, Little Italy was threatened by losing its population to suburbanization, combined with geographic encroachment from Case Western Reserve University.

Demographic Change in Little Italy

The Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation used U.S. Census data to assess the demographic change within the neighborhood. This data is inaccurate because Little Italy
is located within two census tracts that also include adjacent neighborhoods. Additionally, as of the completion of this study, the data was nearly a decade old and some of the changes in the neighborhood have taken place since the 2000 census. Lastly, although the Census asked about ancestry, it does not assess ethnicity in as complete of a manner as this study requires.

Despite these shortcomings, the following information summarizes the existing knowledge of the demographic change in Little Italy between 1990 and 2000, based on 1990 and 2000 Census data, and according to the Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation in 2005:

- There has been a 41% increase in the number of households, due mainly to the increase in homes being converted to apartments and not to population growth.
- Owner-occupied units have decreased, but renter-occupied units have increased by 48%.
- The largest increase for racial or ethnic groups is the 72% growth of people of Asian decent, perhaps the result of Case Western Reserve University graduate students.
- The largest age group in the neighborhood is young adults ages 20-24, also could be because of students.
- The neighborhood population is half the number it was in 1950.

The Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation (2005) further discusses how the high proportion of renter-occupied units is undesirable, which implies that either renters are
less favorable than home owners or – perhaps more likely – that the presence of students, who make up the majority of the renters, is undesirable.

**Current Redevelopment Efforts**

The overall perception of area leaders was that Little Italy was at risk of losing its homeowners to the suburbs. The fear was not necessarily unfounded; as shown above, the population of Little Italy had been decreasing, and the perceptions of residents of Little Italy was that this population decrease was due to people moving to the suburbs. The underlying fear of losing more and more neighborhood residents to the suburbs was that Little Italy would lose its “Italian-ness” (or *Italianità*).

Any reasonable visitor to the neighborhood would recognize that an Italian character still exists. Italian flags decorate storefronts, and shops such as Presti’s Bakery, which has been operating in Little Italy since 1920, continue to attract customers.
The goals of the Little Italy Master Plan, however, are reminiscent of the commodification of ethnic neighborhoods (Hackworth & Rekers, 2005; Path & Rath, 2007). The goals include:

- Extensive marketing of the neighborhood’s unique character;
- The creation and enhancement of existing public space;
- The development of programming that promotes the ethnic diversity of the neighborhood as well as the attraction of consumers;
- And the renovation of existing buildings and construction of new buildings to expand the residential offerings within these urban neighborhoods (Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation, 2005).

Only the last goal speaks to something other than bringing in tourists, consumers, and
visitors. However, even this point is not without criticism. In spite of the depressed housing market, 27 luxury townhouses were built in Little Italy at prices starting at $299,000 to $499,000 (Jarboe, 2008). This is between three and nearly six times above the median housing price for Cleveland overall. For single-family, owner-occupied homes, the median home price in Cleveland was $88,400 as of 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau).

Figure 10 New condominiums, Little Italy; Photograph by author

Objective
This study sought to assess neighborhood satisfaction for an area that is experiencing real and perceived changes. The study examined three questions:

1. To what extent has there been a demographic (ethnic) change in the neighborhood?
2. To what extent are there differences in neighborhood ties and satisfaction between Italian-ethnic and non-Italian-ethnic residents?
3. Do residents perceive their neighborhood to be changing and, if so, what changes do they perceive to be occurring?

**Instrument and Participants**

For the survey instrument, I used the same measurements to study neighborhood satisfaction and ethnicity as with the previous case study of The Hill in St. Louis, with the exception that this case study did not include the ten statements about branding and commercialization. This case study was completed before the case study of The Hill. The results of this case study led me to develop those ten statements, which I then used when surveying residents in St. Louis and Schenectady. (See Appendix C for the survey instruments).

I distributed surveys to 200 randomly sampled addresses in the Little Italy neighborhood. Fifteen surveys were returned as non-deliverable and 63 people (32 females and 31 males) completed the survey, for a 34% response rate.

**Results**

**Demographic Change**

In response to the open-ended question about their ethnic group in whichever
terms they most closely identify, 37.7 percent indicated a self-identity that was either Italian or Italian-American, 26.2 percent indicated a self-identity that was non-Italian, and 36.1 percent indicated a self-identity that was ambiguous, such as White, Caucasian, or American. Although on average respondents had lived in the area for 17 years, most respondents said they had lived there for five or fewer years. And this related to whether they describe themselves as Italian or not, with the Italian group being older and living there longer than non-Italian-ethnic residents (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian Group (N = 24) M (SD)</th>
<th>Non-Italian Group (N = 39) M (SD)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Residence (in years)</strong></td>
<td>33 (21.84)</td>
<td>3.77 (5.01)</td>
<td><em>t</em>(61) = 5.26, <em>p</em> = .01, <em>r</em> = .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td>52 (16.95)</td>
<td>33.13 (12.75)</td>
<td><em>t</em>(61) = 3.79, <em>p</em> = .001, <em>r</em> = .53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Comparison of Groups on Lengths of Residency and Age

Participants’ length of residence is strongly correlated with their number of community or neighborhood ties (*r* = .815, *p* < .01). Number of community or neighborhood ties also correlates with the respondent’s strength of ethnic affirmation, belonging, and commitment (*r* = .323, *p* < .05). This correlation increases slightly (*r* = .423, *p* < .01) when only White or Caucasian self-identifying respondents are included in the analysis.

Factors Relating to Perceptions of Little Italy
Recall that this study also sought to understand how residents feel about their neighborhood. Nine variables related to sense of community, roots in the community, and perceptions of crime were factor analyzed using principal component analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation. Some variables were measured with five-point Likert scales while others had three-point Likert scales. To examine the interrelationships between them, I standardized all sixteen variables on a 0 to 1 scale. The analysis yielded three factors explaining 51.93 percent of the variance for the entire set of variables (Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived neighborliness</th>
<th>Factor 1: Sense of Community</th>
<th>Factor 2: Roots in the Community</th>
<th>Factor 3: Fear of Crime</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “If something is wrong in my neighborhood, my neighbors will fix it.”</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents or grandparents live(d) in the neighborhood</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to live in the neighborhood for the next five years or longer</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services in the neighborhood</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem of theft in the neighborhood</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem of vandalism in the neighborhood</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem with of safety in the neighborhood</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 3.27 | 2.42 | 1.83 |
| % of Total Variance | 23.35 | 17.27 | 13.10 |
| Total Variance | 53.72% |

Table 9 Factor Analysis for Neighborhood Appraisal, Little Italy, Cleveland.

Note. Factor loadings < .5 are suppressed
Factor 1, labeled Sense of Community, includes perceived neighborliness, feeling of community, and agreement with the idea that their neighbors will take action if something is wrong. This factor explained 23.4 percent of the variance. An item analysis revealed that there is an acceptable degree of internal consistency among the variables ($\alpha = .71$).

Factor 2, labeled Roots in the Community, includes parents or grandparents live(d) in the neighborhood, whether the respondent intends to remain living in the neighborhood for the next five years or longer, and attendance at religious services in the neighborhood. This factor explained just over 17 percent of the variance. An item analysis of these variables again showed an acceptable level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .71$).

Factor 3, labeled Fear of Crime, includes the following four items: perceptions of safety in the neighborhood and whether theft, vandalism, and violence/assaults are problems in the neighborhood. This factor explained slightly more than 13 percent of the variance. These variables also had an acceptable level of internal consistency as demonstrated through an item analysis ($\alpha = .72$).

The communalities of the variables indicate that they are reasonably well related to each other. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.58, above the recommended value of 0.5, and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (91) = 251.49, p < .01$).

In terms of substance, the factor analysis shows that there are three patterns of responses for how the survey participants appraised their neighborhood. Additionally,
these three patterns are independent of each other. From these three factors, I created three composite variables – one for each of the factors – using the means of the variables of each factor. I henceforth refer to these composite variables as Sense of Community, Roots in the Community, and Perceptions of Crime.

**Differences Between the Italian Group and Non-Italian Group**

Were there differences in neighborhood appraisal between Italian-ethnic and non-Italian-ethnic respondents? The two groups did not differ significantly in their ratings of Sense of Community and Fear of Crime. However, the Italian Group had a higher score for Roots in the Community than did the Non-Italian, and this difference was statistically significant (Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian Group (N = 24)</th>
<th>Non-Italian Group (N = 39)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>0.62 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.10)</td>
<td>(not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots in the Community</td>
<td>0.78 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.15 (0.17)</td>
<td>t(61) = 8.04, p &lt; .01, r = .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime</td>
<td>0.72 (0.26)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.18)</td>
<td>(not significant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10 Comparison of Groups for Sense of Community, Roots in the Community, and Fear of Crime**

Two open-ended questions yielded additional data on residents’ feelings and thoughts. One question asked about problematic behaviors in the neighborhood. Some responses included: “parking,” “gentrification,” “code enforcement,” “absentee
landlords,” “nosy neighbors, “students,” and “neighbors are aggressive toward African-Americans and Asians.”

![Figure 11 Holy Rosary Church, Little Italy, Cleveland; Photograph by author](image)

**Perceptions of Change in Little Italy**

One open-ended question asked residents, “What thoughts and feelings come to mind about your neighborhood and neighborhood changes?” Of the 45 people who responded to this question, 80 percent acknowledge that the neighborhood has changed, and only 13.0 percent describe the changes as either neutral or positive. Frequently mentioned changes include: the increasing presence of students, renters, and minorities.
(64 percent); increasing crime (22 percent); and the building of condominiums (17 percent). Some respondents report their own negative feelings towards these changes, whereas other respondents report that their neighbors hold these views or that the community has that majority viewpoint.

One respondent wrote, “There is a clear difference between the people that left the neighborhood and now rent their properties to students; those who have stayed (either by choice or circumstance); those that rent (students); and those that gentrify the area. Of course there is always the racial tensions between the poor whites and the poor blacks (who live nearby).”

Other respondents also remarked about adjacent areas and did so in the context of concern over crime from residents of those areas. An example includes a comment on fear of crime followed by the remark: “Potentially neighboring East Cleveland brings people to our neighborhood.” East Cleveland is a predominantly African American neighborhood.

Another respondent wrote, “It is a great place to live and work. But I do see more people concerned about minorities taking over. I live on [road name] and it is primarily Asian & college students. It is changing, probably for the worse.” Similarly, a different respondent wrote, “Loss of some cohesiveness as the identity of the neighborhood has changed over the years. The neighborhood is less [of] an Italian enclave than a student and arts community.”

Another respondent, the fourth generation of her family to live in her home, remarked that she is considering moving because of the increasing crime and decreasing
number of owner-occupied homes.

One older respondent wrote, “The neighborhood concept as I know it has disappeared” but did not give specifics. Another respondent with mixed feelings wrote, “It makes me sad that African Americans are excluded from the life of the neighborhood, but when I look at other neighborhoods that have ‘changed,’ and the accompanying deterioration in property maintenance, rise in drug traffic, violence, and the ubiquitous urban lifestyle that seems inescapable, I understand.”

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Did Little Italy change from being an Italian-ethnic community? The importance of whether Little Italy is still an ethnic enclave lies not in whether enclaves are something to be encouraged. Rather, since the commercial aspect of Little Italy survives and, arguably, thrives, whether there is an Italian ethnic community is important to know before further studies can take place. For example, to study whether commodification is taking place in Little Italy, a necessary first step is to know whether the ethnic community is diminishing.

The survey indicated that Little Italy is a somewhat diminished ethnic enclave. However, given the small number of responses, the results are only preliminary. I expected that the Italian-ethnic individuals would be older and have lived in the neighborhood longer than the non-Italian-ethnic individuals, and these expectations were supported with the findings.

As planning theorist Michael Brooks (2002) notes, the determination of the goals for a community by the community members themselves “is one of the most important
vehicles for effective citizen participation in the planning process” (p. 147). Residents’ satisfaction helps indicate if public participation is working and if residents’ voices are being heard in this neighborhood. The Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation is made up of business owners, residents, and professional staff, and is funded by a City Council Member, a block grant from the city, and through membership dues and fundraising activities. Their opinions may not represent the majority opinions of the residents of Little Italy, and therefore it was important to ask residents about their neighborhood satisfaction.

I expected that there would be a difference in neighborhood satisfaction between Italian-ethnic respondents and non-Italian-ethnic respondents, but the responses to the questions on safety, neighborliness, and feelings of community did not support this expectation. Spatially, the Asian student renters tend to live in clusters within the neighborhood, and they may have their own enclave within the larger enclave. Their feelings of community and neighborliness may stem from interactions with each other, rather than with the larger Italian-ethnic community.

The qualitative responses gave the best indication that some residents are dissatisfied with the neighborhood and perceive it to be changing away from being a residential ethnic enclave. Although some respondents seemed regretful that their neighbors are not more welcoming toward non-Italian-ethnic individuals, the more common response was one of distrust or dislike of those minorities and students.
Commodification of the Italian-ethnic identity may indeed be taking place and could be a topic of future research in the neighborhood. A follow-up study once the condominium units are occupied may yield significant results. However, an equally relevant study would concern itself with the continued insular character of the neighborhood and its residents’ resistance toward non-Italian-ethnic individuals. This study suggests that some negative feelings on changing neighborhoods may relate to the demographics of newcomers in addition to commercial, structural, and architectural changes to the neighborhood.
As with the study of The Hill, inferences from this sample are limited by the small response rate and by potential biases in response to a survey. Unobtrusive observations of behavior and its traces in the neighborhood could overcome this possible limitation.

Two of the four factors from the study of The Hill, Sense of Community and Roots in the Community, also emerged in this study. The additional two factors from The Hill, Tourism Attitude and Italian Identity, consisted of variables from questions not asked in Cleveland. Recall, that the Cleveland study preceded the other studies, and it was only from analyzing the change occurring in Cleveland’s Little Italy that I developed questions about tourism and commercialization.

One factor in this study, Fear of Crime, was not a factor in the study of The Hill. For the Cleveland study, I asked questions about crime because the area has a reputation of having a problem with crime and hostilities with neighbors. I did not ask these questions about crime when studying The Hill because that neighborhood has no such reputation.

We have seen some differences from The Hill’s stable ethnic enclave and the more commercial and commodified ethnic enclave in Cleveland. Would the pattern continue for a higher degree of commercialization and commodification? For this, the next chapter reports my study of an enclave with a high degree of commercialization and commodification: Little Italy in Schenectady, New York.
Chapter 6: Little Italy, Schenectady, a Newly Created Commercial Enclave

Background

Schenectady, New York, is located about 15 miles from the state capital of Albany, New York, and has a population of around 60,000 people (City of Schenectady, 2008). However, beginning in 2001, the city decided to invest in a Little Italy district, which is a two-block portion of a downtown street, originally with the hopes of completing renovations by 2020 (City of Schenectady, 2008). To accomplish the branding of a Little Italy district, street banners that read “Little Italy, Schenectady,” were installed, new Italian-ethnic businesses have opened, and several Italian business have moved to the district. According to a former city employee, the most significant change to the neighborhood was the improvement of the sidewalks, which were in great need of repair.
The idea behind relocating Italian, family-run businesses to Little Italy may have been to appeal to a sense of authenticity in the way that social preservationists seek to keep the long-term residents in a neighborhood (Brown-Saracino, 2009). Unlike other Italian enclaves, Schenectady’s Little Italy is not an enclave struggling to adapt to the 21st century. Rather, Schenectady’s Little Italy is a venture that has roots in an Italian-American history of the city, but was meant to come together as a new district. Although past ethnic enclaves have formed organically, Little Italy in Schenectady is the creation
of the city, developers, and businesses. Thus, this Italian enclave represents a somewhat unusual example that other cities may seek to replicate.

Success or Failure?

Whether Little Italy has been successful as a new district seems to largely depend on who one asks. One primary objective of this study was to ascertain whether Schenectady residents believe Little Italy has been a worthwhile effort. To get a different
perspective from what the survey could reveal, I also contacted three key informants knowledgeable about the planning and development of Little Italy: a former city employee, the heritage coordinator for the city, and an executive with the development firm that was responsible for the creation of Little Italy. This was clearly a Little Italy created by policy rather an enclave that formed organically over time, such as with Little Italy in Cleveland and The Hill in St. Louis. Thus, it made sense to get these three professionals’ insight on the background for the policy and its success.

The former city employee relayed that local government officials had been concerned about Schenectady’s aging population and the many residents who had been moving to the suburbs. The creation of Little Italy was a revitalization effort, according to both the former city employee and the city’s Heritage Coordinator, Maureen Gebert. Branding a neighborhood as Little Italy was meant to stimulate local businesses and bring in tourism dollars. For local residents, the redevelopment also meant that the streetscape would be improved.

After the initial investment in Little Italy, funds for the redevelopment of the area seem to have disappeared. The former city employee speculated that the funds were redistributed to a different revitalization project in the city. The development executive confirmed that there are no further plans to invest in Little Italy. He noted that the area is attractive and, in general, “spruced up,” but that there was no spillover effect from Little Italy to improve nearby neighborhoods. He also described the project as underfunded and having needed private investment that never materialized.
The biggest success from the attempt at developing Little Italy may be the annual Italian-American festival, which Ms. Gebert described as having come together spontaneously through the interests of local business owners and residents. For the first festival, the goal had been to attract 200 to 300 people, but Ms. Gebert estimated that upwards of 10,000 people participated in the festival. She noted that the festival has grown in each subsequent year. Ms. Gerbert relayed that property values in Little Italy have risen and that the project has been a success.
Objective

This study sought to assess neighborhood satisfaction for residents in a newly created enclave as well as residents in the adjacent neighborhoods. The study examined three questions:

1. To what extent are there differences in neighborhood ties and satisfaction between Italian-ethnic and non-Italian-ethnic residents?
2. Do residents perceive their neighborhood to be changing and, if so, what changes do they perceive to be occurring?
3. Do residents support the branding and commercialization of Little Italy?

Instrument and Participants

As with the previous two case studies, this study used the same measures to assess neighborhood satisfaction and ethnic self-identification. (See Appendix D for the survey instrument).

Participants

Participants were residents of Schenectady neighborhoods that are adjacent to Little Italy. Only participants 18 years and older were surveyed. From the initial mailing of surveys to randomly selected addresses in these neighborhoods, 23 respondents completed the survey and 18 envelopes were returned as non-deliverable. The surveys were returned anonymously; thus, a second mailing of surveys went to all 82 addresses known to be valid. The second mailing yielded an additional four respondents. This gave a total of 27 people (9 males, 15 females, and 3 who did not answer) who completed and returned the survey, for a response rate of 33 percent.
Results

Demographics

Of the 27 returned surveys, 23 people answered the question in which they self-identified their ethnicity. Of these 23 people, two-thirds (65.2 percent) responded that they identify with a non-Italian ethnicity or ambiguous ethnicity (e.g., White or Caucasian) and roughly one-third (34.8 percent) identified as Italian or Italian-American.

Factors Relating to Perceptions of Little Italy

The broad goal of this study was to assess how residents feel about Little Italy. Ten variables related to sense of community and the Italian identity of the neighborhood were factor analyzed using principal component analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation. Some variables were measured with five-point Likert scales while others had three-point Likert scales. To examine the interrelationships between them, I standardized all sixteen variables on a 0 to 1 scale. The analysis yielded two factors explaining 56.62 percent of the variance for the entire set of variables (Table 11).
Factor 1, labeled Sense of Community, includes feeling of community, perceived neighborliness, availability of shops and services, frequency of contact with neighbors, perception of safety in the neighborhood, agreement with the idea that their neighbors will take action if something is wrong, and perception of upkeep of buildings in the neighborhood. Two of these items (availability of shops and services; perception of upkeep of buildings in the neighborhood) seem to be capturing neighborhood satisfaction more than a sense of community. This factor explained 36.4 percent of the variance. An item analysis showed that there is a high degree of internal consistency among the seven variables ($\alpha = .85$).
Factor 2, labeled Italian Identity of Little Italy, includes sense of attachment to Little Italy, agreement with the statement that Italian-themed flags and signage are important to have in Little Italy, and agreement with the idea of welcoming new Italian-themed condominiums to the neighborhood. This factor, the Italian Identity of Little Italy, explained 20.2 percent of the variance. An item analysis showed a low level of internal consistency among the four variables ($\alpha = .68$).

The communalities of the variables indicate that they are reasonably well related to each other. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.59, above the recommended value of 0.5, and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (78) = 146.574, p < .01$).

In terms of substance, the factor analysis shows that there are two patterns of responses for how the survey participants appraised their neighborhood. One pattern concerns the sense of community that respondents feel, regardless of their ethnic self-identity or their feelings about the Italian-ethnic identity with which Little Italy is associated. The second pattern specifically relates to the Italian identity of the neighborhood. Additionally, these two patterns are independent of each other. From these two factors, I created two composite variables – one for each of the factors – using the means of the variables of each factor. These composite variables are Sense of Community and Italian Identity of Little Italy.

**Neighborhood Ties and Satisfaction**

**Differences between the Italian Group and Non-Italian Group.**

Italian-ethnic respondents reporting having more family members living in the
neighborhood than non-Italian-ethnic respondents. This difference was statistically
significant (Table 12), although the sample size is quite small. Italian-ethnic and non-
Italian ethnic respondents, however, did not differ significantly in their number of social
ties or their length of residency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian Group (N = 8)</th>
<th>Non-Italian Group (N = 15)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Relatives</td>
<td>14.5 (10.13)</td>
<td>4 (9.18)</td>
<td>$t(21) = 2.52, p = .02, r = .48$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Comparison of Groups on Number of Relatives in the Neighborhood

All but one respondent answered the question about how long they have lived in
their current location. The average length of residence was about 36 years (SD = 20.309
years) with a range of five to 71 years. Notably, only two respondents indicated they have
lived in their current locations for fewer than ten years. About 70 percent of respondents
indicated they have lived in their current location for more than 20 years.

**Neighborhood Satisfaction.** Respondents differed in how they viewed the social
and physical characteristics of their neighborhood. As one can see in Table 13, most
respondents gave favorable ratings to the level of safety in their neighborhood and to the
shops and services in the neighborhood. They responded less favorably to neighborliness,
whether a neighbor would help fix something and to the upkeep of the buildings.
With the composite variable Sense of Community, respondents indicated that they have a moderate level of satisfaction with their community ($M = 0.62$, $SD = 0.18$).

Additionally, most respondents reported that they speak with their neighbors at least once a week or more often (Table 14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly or Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact with neighbors</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Frequency of Contact with Neighbors

Perceptions of Changes in the Neighborhood

Answers to two open-ended questions (“What thoughts and feelings come to mind...
about Little Italy and changes in it?” and “Is there anything else you can tell me about Little Italy?” give some insight into how the respondents rated Little Italy. Only 12 of the 27 respondents answered the first question and 15 of 27 respondents answered the second question, but some key comments may provide a glimpse into why respondents answered the way that they did. Similar comments were made in response to both questions with the highest frequency comment (40.7 percent) concerning the small size of Little Italy. A representative comment came from a middle-aged respondent: “Two restaurants, one bakery, one coffee shop, and one biker bar… That’s all there is.”

Related to the small size of Little Italy, some respondents described feelings that more investment needs to be made. A long-time resident commented, “The City of Schenectady does not support it and should do more to encourage more Italian businesses to locate here.” Four answers included a positive comment about individual stores or restaurants. An additional three comments concerned the annual Italian-American festival; these were also positive comments. The most negative comment was from a non-Italian-ethnic resident of more than 50 years, who said, “Big waste of money! Little Italy should have been placed in the VanVranken area (Goosehill) where mostly Italians live.”

Overall, two comments seem to summarize respondents’ reactions to Little Italy. The first comment, from a more recent arrival to the neighborhood, was “My feeling is that the ‘Little Italy’ project was a good idea in that it brought some seed dollars in toward revitalization of the neighborhood. Whether or not any investment in the neighborhood is Italian themed is irrelevant to me.” A second respondent, also a relative newcomer to the neighborhood, commented, “I think it is vital that we continue to grow
not only Little Italy but all of the City of Schenectady! Communities only get better with the assistance of its population.”

**Support for Branding and Commercialization**

Recall that respondents indicated their level of agreement with statements about the commercialization of Little Italy. Italian-ethnic and non-Italian-ethnic respondents did not differ in their level of agreement to these statements. With Italian Identity of Little Italy, respondents indicated they have a low-to-moderate amount of support for the Italian identity of the neighborhood \( (M = 0.49, \ SD = 0.25) \). Table 15 shows the level of agreement of respondents with various statements about Little Italy. There was consistent disagreement with four of the five items. Most respondents disagreed with the statement that the city has invested too much money in Little Italy, and the statement that “Little Italy feels like an authentic Italian-American neighborhood.” Yet, many respondents disagreed with the idea that city officials and business owners should encourage tourism in Little Italy,” and most respondents disagreed with the idea of welcoming new Italian-themed condominiums or non-Italian ethnic restaurants (e.g., French bistro or Chinese restaurant) to the neighborhood.
I also looked at correlation among the statements about branding and commercialization (Table 16). Respondents who agreed that Italian signage and banners are important for Little Italy also agreed that they would welcome new Italian-themed condominiums being built in Little Italy and that they that city officials and business owners should encourage tourism in Little Italy, but they disagreed with the statement, “The city has invested too much money in Little Italy.” Similarly, those respondents who support the building of condominiums also want to encourage tourism in the neighborhood.
Discussion and Conclusion

Residents’ responses to the survey in some way mirror the information I gleaned from interviewing three key informants on Little Italy’s development. As Schenectady in general is hurting from recent, national economic troubles, opinions vary about whether
Little Italy is a smart investment. Some locals believe that Little Italy is a success. Others are optimistic that Little Italy could be successful, but they believe the district needs further investment. Still others believe that the Little Italy concept has not been fruitful.

Interestingly, residents’ self-identified ethnicity does not seem to have an effect on whether they want to see further investment in the Little Italy brand. Most respondents to the survey have lived in their current location for more than a decade, but even this length of residence does not seem to correlate with whether tourism development should be encouraged. Overall, respondents indicated that they are not interested in tourism development, but that they see a need for economic development in the neighborhood – or at least in Schenectady in general.

As with the two previous studies, this study was limited by the small sample size. The respondents who chose to return the survey may differ in some way from those who did not complete the survey. Door-to-door interviews would likely get a better response rate. Inferences are also limited by the reliance on survey data, which may have inaccuracies and biases. Unobtrusive observations of behavior and its traces in the neighborhood could overcome this possible limitation.

As Little Italy in Schenectady represents a small, mainly commercial district, it made sense to study the residents who live in the adjacent neighborhoods. A future study may wish to look at whether responses change as the respondent’s distance from the development increases. However, that was not possible to examine with the present data since the surveys were completely anonymously.

The factors had some commonality across the three neighborhoods. One factor,
Sense of Community, emerged in all three studies, suggesting that it is a shared construct across different kinds of neighborhoods. Others were present in two studies. The Italian Identity of the neighborhood, which was present in the St. Louis study, was also present in the Schenectady study. Roots of the Community was present for The Hill and Cleveland’s Little Italy, but did not emerge in Schenectady. This may indicate there is less overall connection to place in Schenectady’s Little Italy as in the other two neighborhoods.

As neighborhoods and former industrial cities struggle to retain their population, government leaders look for ways to create vibrant commercial districts as well as attractive neighborhoods. Branding a neighborhood as an ethnic enclave is one way that some planners are approaching this issue. The branding of an ethnic enclave may be an attempt to keep residents in the city and to attract local and out-of-town tourist money.

In Schenectady, the approach does not appear to be working. Some respondents are optimistic that the approach could work if further investment were made. However, most respondents are not interested in developing the neighborhood for tourism. It should be a warning to city officials that more than half of the respondents felt that Little Italy does not have a positive relationship with the city. A majority of respondents found Little Italy lacking in a feeling of authenticity and a feeling of community.

Officials in Schenectady, as well as officials in other cities where there is interest in branding an ethnic enclave, would benefit from seeking ways to establish strong relations with the existing community. Although certain respondents are clearly satisfied
with the development of Little Italy in Schenectady, the majority of respondents were negative in their appraisal of the district or, at best, they were apathetic.
Chapter 7: Comparison of the Three Enclaves

The Italian enclaves that I studied in Cleveland, Schenectady, and St. Louis represent three places that are negotiating with differing degrees of commercialization. The Hill in St. Louis is the least commercial of the three case studies. Little Italy in Cleveland is beginning to wrestle with commercialization. Lastly, Little Italy in Schenectady is a purely commercial venture situated within a community that has Italian-American roots throughout the region. Across the three case studies, this dissertation looked at how residents feel about their neighborhoods. Given the differences in commercialization, it seems likely that the perception of these places would differ. To test this, I compared the responses to the three neighborhoods with the expectation that The Hill would have the highest levels of community satisfaction and Little Italy in Schenectady would have the lowest level.

Factors Relating to Neighborhood Appraisal

Eight variables that were assessed in all three neighborhoods and that related to sense of community and roots in the community were factor analyzed using principal component analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation. Some variables were measured with five-point Likert scales while others had three-point Likert scales. To examine the interrelationships between them, I standardized all eight variables on a 0 to 1 scale. The
analysis yielded two factors explaining 59.73 percent of the variance for the entire set of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1: Sense of Community</th>
<th>Factor 2: Roots in the Neighborhood</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived neighborliness</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with “If something is wrong in my neighborhood, my neighbors will fix it.”</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact with neighbors</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety in the neighborhood</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents or grandparents live(d) in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at religious services in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to live in the neighborhood for the next five years or longer</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total Variance</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.02</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Variance</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.73%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Factor Analysis for the Three Enclaves

Note. Factor loadings < .5 are suppressed

A two-factor solution explained 59.73 % of the variance (Table 17). Factor 1, labeled Sense of Community, is composed of five items: perceived neighborliness, feeling of community, agreement that neighbors will take action if something is wrong, frequency of contact with neighbors, and perception of safety in the neighborhood. This factor explained 41.7 percent of the variance. An item analysis showed that there is a high degree of internal consistency among the variables (α = .79).
Factor 2, labeled Roots in the Neighborhood, is composed of three items: parents or grandparents have lived in the neighborhood, attendance at religious services in the neighborhood, and plans to remain in the neighborhood for at least the next five years. This factor explained 18 percent of the variance. An item analysis revealed a lower level of internal consistency among the three items ($\alpha = .68$).

The communalities of the variables indicate that they are reasonably well related to each other. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.76, above the recommended value of 0.5, and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (28) = 324.652, p < .01$).

In terms of substance, the factor analysis shows that there are two patterns of responses for how the survey participants appraised their neighborhoods. One pattern concerns the sense of community that respondents feel. The second pattern relates to the roots in the community that the respondents have – in other words, their social ties. Additionally, these two patterns are independent of each other.

**Sense of Community and Roots in the Neighborhood**

Using the means of the variables of each factor, I created two composite variables – one variable for each of the two factors: 1) Sense of Community and 2) Roots in the Neighborhood. These composite variables are scaled from zero to one, with smaller numbers representing less of a sense of community and fewer roots in the neighborhood. Table 18 shows the mean values and standard deviations for the composite variables in each of the three enclaves.
The analysis showed that, with regard to Sense of Community, respondents in St. Louis gave higher ratings than respondents did in either Cleveland or Schenectady, and that the differences in Sense of Community across the three enclaves achieved statistical significance. Post-hoc pair-wise comparisons (with Bonferroni adjustments for multiple claims) revealed statistically significant differences between St. Louis and Cleveland ($p < .01$), as well as between St. Louis and Schenectady ($p < .01$), but no difference between Cleveland and Schenectady ($p = .16$).

Similarly, with Roots in the Neighborhood, there were statistically significant differences across the three enclaves. Respondents in St. Louis reported more roots in their neighborhood than either Cleveland or Schenectady. However, post-hoc pair-wise comparisons (again with Bonferroni adjustments for multiple claims) showed statistically significant differences only between St. Louis and Cleveland ($p < .01$) but not between St. Louis and Schenectady ($p = .13$) or between Cleveland and Schenectady ($p = 1.00$).

### Summary of Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Schenectady</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>$F_{(2,123)} = 16.25, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$ (SD)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots in the Community</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$F_{(2,124)} = 5.31, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$ (SD)</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 Case Study Comparisons for Sense of Community and Roots in the Community
In addition to being the least commercialized of the three enclaves, The Hill also had the highest percentage of respondents who self-identified as Italian or Italian-American. With The Hill, approximately 63 percent of the respondents self-identified as Italian or Italian-American, whereas Cleveland’s Little Italy had 38 percent, and Schenectady’s Little Italy had 35 percent.

The Hill remains a largely traditional Italian enclave with its Italian-ethnic residential population. However, the Italian-ethnic respondents tended to be older and have lived in the neighborhood for longer than newcomers to the neighborhood. This may be a sign that the demographics of the neighborhood are changing as younger, non-Italian individuals move in. This demographic change is reflected in the concerns of the survey respondents who reported their agreement with the statement that the neighborhood is less authentically Italian than it used to be. Nevertheless, most respondents to The Hill survey made favorable comments about their neighborhood, particularly noting the strong sense of community and neighborliness. Although there were some concerns about demographic changes, only a few respondents commented on commercial changes. When asked about whether tourism should be encouraged, most respondents agreed that it should be, but they also mostly agreed that they would like the neighborhood to remain Italian in nature. There was a lack of agreement about whether Italian-themed condominiums or non-Italian ethnic restaurants (e.g., a French bistro) would be welcome in their neighborhood. This suggests that residents of this neighborhood are just beginning to think about commercialization.
Little Italy in Cleveland is experiencing a level of commercialization that may lie ten or twenty years in future for The Hill. As recently as 1994, Cleveland’s Little Italy was a traditional Italian enclave much like The Hill. The difference with Little Italy is that the population had been shrinking due to flight to the suburbs and, thus, an organization (the Little Italy Redevelopment Corporation) was formed to revitalize the neighborhood. Since 1994, these revitalization efforts have spawned new businesses such as art galleries as well as demolishing older industrial buildings to make room for new, high-priced condominiums. These revitalization efforts have brought about demographic and commercial changes in the neighborhood. Compared to The Hill, Cleveland’s Little Italy is less ethnically Italian and less satisfied with their neighborhood. As with The Hill, Little Italy’s Italian-ethnic population is older, has lived in the neighborhood for longer, and has a greater average number of social ties to the neighborhood, whereas newcomers to the neighborhood tend to be younger, non-Italian in ethnicity, and have fewer social ties to Little Italy. However, this non-Italian population in Little Italy is larger than The Hill’s non-Italian population.

Little Italy respondents tended to be more negative in their general comments about their neighborhood than the results for The Hill. Little Italy respondents disliked the lack of upkeep of their buildings, but they also disliked what they have identified as gentrification of their neighborhood. Some respondents disliked the increased presence of students, many of whom are Asian in ethnicity, but other respondents disliked their neighbors’ aggression toward students, Asians, and African Americans. The Italian-
ethnic respondents seemed wary of both demographic and commercial changes to their neighborhood.

Lastly, Schenectady’s Little Italy differs tremendously from The Hill in St. Louis and Little Italy in Cleveland. Schenectady as a city has a long-standing history of Italian immigration and settlement. However, the Little Italy neighborhood was newly created within the first decade of the twenty-first century. In surveying people who live in and around Little Italy, there was no difference in the responses of those who self-identified as ethnically Italian and those who did not. Although Little Italy was a planned and purposefully created Italian commercial district, it has arguably not been a success. Interviews with a former city employee and a development agency executive yielded information that they considered the project to be marginally successful at best. Only the third interviewee, the city’s heritage coordinator, praised Little Italy; she is responsible for the city’s annual Italian festival, which is debatably the most successful feature to come out of developing Little Italy.

Compared to respondents in Cleveland’s Little Italy, and especially when compared to respondents from St. Louis’s The Hill, Schenectady’s respondents were quite negative in their appraisal of their Little Italy. While they expressed concern about needing economic development, they disagreed with the idea of encouraging tourism, they indicated they would not welcome Italian-themed condominiums or non-Italian ethnic restaurants, and they did not believe that Little Italy has a positive relationship with the city. Perhaps the most critical sentiment is that most respondents did not believe that Little Italy feels like an authentic Italian-American neighborhood. Thus, the branding
and marketing of Little Italy as an Italian-American neighborhood may not have been successful.

**The Organically Formed, Commercialized Enclave**

A missing example from these case studies is that of the organically formed enclave that has become primarily or completely commercialized. One such enclave is that of Little Italy in Toronto. Hackworth and Rekers (2005) describe the history of the enclave as well as its eventual conversion to a commercial destination. Although Hackworth and Rekers do not address the neighborhood satisfaction of those residents who remain in Little Italy, the commercial aspect of the neighborhood is well studied. The case studies that I chose for this dissertation are enclaves that have not been studied for their commercial aspects.

**Limitations**

All three case studies involved small sample sizes. As with any small sample size, it is possible that the respondents are not representative of the overall population of those neighborhoods. The respondents who chose to return the survey may differ in some way from those who did not complete the survey. Door–to-door interviews would likely get a better response rate. Inferences are also limited by the reliance on survey data, which may have inaccuracies and biases. Unobtrusive observations of behavior and its traces in the neighborhood could overcome this possible limitation.

Additionally, I only looked at one example of each level of commodification. Although the findings make sense in that they have face validity, one would need to look at a larger sample of each kind of enclave to understand the degree to which they
generalize. There may be local conditions, such as differences in the city’s economy or laws, that are influencing the results. By looking at a broader sample, one could find out how local conditions may affect the outcome.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

This dissertation attempted to establish that ethnic enclaves are still neighborhoods worthy of study in contemporary America. I demonstrated that nearly 250 enclaves are currently in existence in 50 of America’s cities. There are probably hundreds more in other large and small cities throughout the US. I then turned my attention to three case studies of Italian enclaves at different stages of commodification. This research looked beyond city-level benefits of branding an ethnic enclave and instead considered how individual residents of these enclaves feel about changes within their neighborhoods. Through examining residents’ concerns about demographic and commercial changes, planning professionals can learn the importance of having community support for branding efforts.

Prevalence of Ethnic Enclaves

Prior to this research, there had been no attempt at a large-scale study of enclaves. Most previous research (Ford, Klevisser, & Carli, 2008; Hackworth & Rekers, 2005; Mazumdar, et al., 2000; Pang & Rath, 2007; Rodriguez, 2000; and Umbach & Wishnoff, 2008) has looked at one or only several enclaves through using a case study approach. This research approach is invaluable in providing depth to the field’s understanding of enclaves. Indeed, this is also the approach that I used in the bulk of this dissertation.
However, before I could urge others to pay attention to the continued relevance of enclaves, I needed to establish whether enclaves are common enough features of modern cities to be worthy of research.

My research found that American cities have a rich history of ethnic enclaves that continues through the present day. While some ethnic enclaves have faded as their associated ethnic groups (e.g., Germans) have blended into the American mainstream, other enclaves remain vibrant communities. For some enclaves, even though the associated ethnic group has fully assimilated, the enclaves themselves have been preserved with at least a commercial presence, if not an ethnic residential presence. In many enclaves, the original ethnic group has left and been replaced by another ethnic group. In some enclaves, this process has repeated itself multiple times, as the neighborhood plays host to an ethnic group or multiple groups for a decade or two at a time.

**Survival of Ethnic Enclaves**

Not all ethnic enclaves that currently exist are thriving. Some enclaves are merely surviving. In some cases, this relates to the ethnic identity of the neighborhood, where the ethnic community has assimilated or where there is a lack of uniqueness to the ethnic identity of the enclave. In other cases, influences such as urban renewal have destroyed the physical characteristics of the neighborhood itself, such as with Boston’s West End in the 1950s. This Jewish and Italian neighborhood was considered blighted and nearly half of the land was leveled to make room for new high-rise buildings, which resulted in severe damage to the fabric of the existing community (Jones, 2004).
Formation of New Enclaves

In almost all situations where a new enclave has arisen, it has been the result of the arrival of a new immigrant group to the city. This pattern has repeated itself through the decades. Although ethnic enclaves are often associated with earlier waves of immigrants – mainly those who immigrated to the United States in the 1800s – new groups of immigrants continue to arrive and settle in clusters. This clustering results in the formation of an ethnic enclave, especially when the settlers create a commercial presence in their neighborhood. Since the 1960s, immigrants from the Caribbean, Latin America, and Southeast Asia have been the most prolific in founding new enclaves.

In a minority of cases, new enclaves have formed through the purposeful effort of local business owners, prominent residents, development agency executives, and city officials. To my knowledge, in none of these situations is the goal to attract an ethnic residential population. In other words, the goal is not to create a ghetto for a particular ethnic group. Instead, the goal is to create a commercial district associated with a specific ethnic identity. The resulting shops and especially restaurants are intended to spur further economic development.

Ethnic residents’ relationship with these newly created enclaves can be complicated. Creating an ethnic enclave emphasizes that the ethnic identity of those individuals is a cultural “Other” compared to mainstream America. However, even commercial-only enclaves can have benefits for ethnic individuals who wish to seek out other co-ethnic individuals. In some primarily commercial enclaves, such as in
Chinatown in Washington, DC, there are also amenities meant ethnic individuals rather than tourists, such as community centers.

Lessons for Branding Other Ethnic Enclaves

The takeaway message from this dissertation is that planners need to be sensitive to what the local community wants. Branding of an ethnic enclave as a tourist destination seems like a good idea for increasing revenue for the city overall, but planners need to carefully consider the wishes of the residents of the neighborhood in question. With Cleveland’s Little Italy, there is a lot of tension and dissatisfaction with the changes the neighborhood has been experiencing. With both Cleveland and Schenectady, but especially with Schenectady, the branding came out of top-down planning, and understandably the community has not been satisfied with the changes. In Schenectady, there is a lack of support for Little Italy from the residents, and even the development agency is distancing itself from the project. While branding may be a successful economic development tool (e.g., Little Italy in Toronto; see Hackworth & Rekers, 2005), strong municipal support is required and, perhaps more importantly, the support of residents is essential.

Implications for Future Scholarship

This research is particularly relevant as some cities look to market enclaves as tourist destinations. In the middle of my research, an individual who works for a community development agency in San Diego contacted me. Supporters of this community development agency are looking to create a Little Saigon in San Diego, and this person was looking for my advice on how to create it. Sometimes the desire to
commodify seems to be coming from the community itself. If there is community support, branding is much more likely to be successful. The proposed Little Saigon neighborhood in San Diego represents an opportunity to study branding coming from within the community, and to see if this results in a more satisfied residential population than in neighborhoods where branding has come about through top-down planning efforts.

In general, establishing a brand for a neighborhood is a way to give a place a cohesive identity, to help make it a destination. This happens with other kinds of neighborhoods besides ethnic enclaves. For example, in Columbus, there is an area called the Short North, which is the city’s arts and art-gallery district. The district itself has lighted arches that span the main street; at either end of the district, these arches contain the name Short North to clearly show the boundaries of the neighborhood. Branding and placemaking in general have been discussed by others (Ward, 1998), but few researchers, if any, have looked at how residents respond to the idea of a brand, and what planners need to know to make branding successful.

Part of the success of branding may come out of how authentic a neighborhood feels. Hackworth and Rekers (2005) identified certain characteristics that they believe indicate a neighborhood is more traditional or, on the contrary, more commodified. Future research should try to verify these markers of authenticity as well as establish other markers of authenticity. Doing so could allow researchers to pursue a longitudinal study as a place changes or to compare more enclaves at various stages of commodification, at least according to this measure.
Throughout the case studies in this dissertation, residents’ satisfaction with their neighborhood was important. My factor analysis across three different enclaves identified two independent factors (Sense of Community, and Roots in the Community), and the item analysis found at least one as having good inter-item reliability. Together they might be good measures for sense of community and residents’ roots in their community. Future research could test how well they apply to other areas that should differ. In short, I could test these scales for areas that should differ or that have been found to differ and see if the scales hold. Additionally, I could simultaneously test the sense of community scale against other indicators of sense of community. Future testing of the validity and reliability of these scales could show whether these scales are useful tools in measuring sense of community and roots in a community.
Afterword

Few Italians are immigrating to the U.S. Instead, it is the second and third generation of Italian Americans who, along with members of other ethnicities, live in today’s Little Italys. Despite the lack of new Italian immigrants, for many people there is a desire to maintain the Italian identity of these enclaves.

For some, perhaps it is an issue of heritage. *Tricolore* flags and banners remind us of our family and those who came before us. They reinforce our sense of identity and bring us closer to our community. They demarcate a place where we belong. For others, the maintenance – or even creation – of an Italian identity for a neighborhood is an economic development tool. Sanitized Little Italys with safe streets and spaghetti-and-meatball restaurants offer a destination for tourists. These are the kinds of places that appear in the entertainment section of a newspaper rather than the crime section.

Undoubtedly, there is something alluring about ethnic enclaves. They provide a glimpse into another way of life that can range from exotic to nostalgic to seedy. One might find it exciting to imagine that the well-dressed man drinking espresso and eating cannoli is *mafioso*.

But with this sanitation of our enclaves, have we lost something? Although it is difficult to pinpoint, it seems that we have traded some degree of authenticity for tourism.
dollars. In the search for a solution to the population flight from our inner-city enclaves, should we substitute authentic place, though messy and disordered, with an artificial but more orderly creation? The grime and discord of enclaves are part of the history and authenticity of these places, and the removal of these qualities results in something that is less than it was before. The branding of an enclave requires the utmost degree of care and concern for the history of the neighborhood and the wishes of its people.
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**Appendix A. Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places: 1950**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Land area (sq. miles)</th>
<th>Density (avg. population per sq. mi.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>7,891,957</td>
<td>315.1</td>
<td>25,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>3,620,962</td>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>17,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>2,071,605</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>16,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>1,970,358</td>
<td>450.9</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>1,849,568</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>13,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>949,708</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>12,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>914,808</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>856,796</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>14,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>802,178</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>13,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>801,444</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>16,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>775,357</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>17,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>676,806</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>12,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>637,392</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>596,163</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>3,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>580,132</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>14,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>570,445</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>2,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>521,718</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>9,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>503,998</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>6,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>467,591</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>6,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>456,622</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>5,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>438,776</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>434,462</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>3,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>427,173</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>7,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>415,786</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>6,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>408,442</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>5,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>396,000</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>384,575</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>7,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>375,901</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>373,628</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>5,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>369,129</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>9,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>334,387</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>332,488</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>9,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>331,314</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>8,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>326,037</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>4,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>311,349</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>5,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>303,616</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>7,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>299,017</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>23,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>278,778</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Akron, OH</td>
<td>274,605</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>5,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>251,117</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>6,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>250,767</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>7,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>249,276</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>7,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>248,674</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>243,872</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>243,504</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>4,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>230,310</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>6,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>220,583</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>8,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>213,513</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>204,517</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>6,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Worcester, MA</td>
<td>203,486</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Survey Used in The Hill, St. Louis.

Neighborhood Survey: The Hill

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey. Your responses will remain confidential. Each question is optional and you can choose not to answer any question. The survey should take about 5-10 minutes to complete.

This research study is being undertaken by a graduate student, Kate Terzano, at The Ohio State University, under the supervision of Professor Jack Nasar. For more information regarding this study please send an email to terzano.1@osu.edu or nasar.1@osu.edu.

1. How long have you lived in or near this location?  
   _______ months or _______ years

2. How would you rate each of the following in your neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of shops and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. On average, how often do you speak with your neighbors?  
   ____Daily, ____Weekly, ____Monthly, ____Yearly, ____Never

4. “If something is wrong in my neighborhood, my neighbors will fix it.”
5. Please indicate if any of the following items are true for you in your neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I attend religious services in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents or grandparents live or lived in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own or owned a business in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to live in the neighborhood for the next five years or longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you speak a language other than English at home?  ____Yes  ____No  
If so, which language? ______________

7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hill should try to attract more visitors from outside the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like The Hill to remain Italian and Italian-American in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill is a traditional Italian-American neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tricolore</em> (red, white, and green) banners and street signs are important to have in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City officials and business owners should encourage tourism in The Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill is less authentic than it used to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would welcome new Italian-themed condominiums within the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would welcome non-Italian ethnic restaurants (e.g. French bistro or Chinese restaurant) to the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill has a positive relationship with the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of attachment to The Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What thoughts and feelings come to mind about your neighborhood and neighborhood changes?
9. What is your gender? ___Male, ___Female

10. What is your marital status? ___Single, ___Married/engaged/partnered, ___Divorced/separated, ___Widowed, ___Other

11. How many adults (including yourself) live in your household for the majority of the year? ______

12. How many children (less than 18 years old) live in your household for the majority of the year? __________

13. How many family members (cousins, aunts, uncles, grandparents, etc.) also live in the neighborhood (but not in your household)? ______

14. In which year were you born? 19________

The next questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it. In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others.

15. Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be

_______________________________________________________________________

16. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Is there anything else you can tell me about life in The Hill?
Appendix C. Survey Used in Little Italy, Cleveland.

Neighborhood Survey

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey. Your responses will remain confidential. Each question is optional and you can choose not to answer any question. The survey should take about 5-10 minutes to complete.

This research study is being undertaken by a graduate student, Kate Terzano, at The Ohio State University, under the supervision of Professor Jack Nasar. For more information regarding this study please send an email to terzano.1@osu.edu or nasar.1@osu.edu.

1. How long have you lived in or near this location?
   _____ months or _____ years

2. How would you rate each of the following in your neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you’ve lived here 1 year or more, how have each of the following changed in the past few years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Slightly Better</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly Worse</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. On average, how often do you speak with your neighbors?
   ___Daily, ___Weekly, ___Monthly, ___Yearly, ___Never

5. “If something is wrong in my neighborhood, my neighbors will fix it.”
   ___Strongly agree, ___Moderately agree, ___Neither, ___Moderately disagree,
   ___Strongly disagree

6. Please indicate if the following activities are: Not a Problem, Minor Problem, or Major Problem in your neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not a Problem</th>
<th>Minor Problem</th>
<th>Major Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeding Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thefts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash / Litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence / Assaults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please indicate if any of the following items are true for you in your neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I attend religious services in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents or grandparents live or lived in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own or owned a business in the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to live in the neighborhood for the next five years or longer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What thoughts and feelings come to mind about your neighborhood and neighborhood changes?

9. What is your gender?  ___Male, ___Female

10. What is your marital status?  ___Single, ___Married/engaged/partnered,
    ___Divorced/separated, ___Widowed, ___Other

11. Please write down the number of people in each age group who live in your house (include yourself).
    0-6, 7-12, 13-15, 16-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-65, 66+

12. How many family members (cousins, aunts, uncles, grandparents, etc.) also live in the neighborhood (but not in your household)? _____
13. In which year were you born? 19____

The next questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it. In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others.

14. Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be
_______________________________________________________________________

15. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.
SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. My ethnicity is ______
   (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others,
   (2) Black or African American,
   (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others,
   (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic,
   (5) American Indian/Native American,
   (6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups;
   (7) Other (write in): _______________________

17. My father’s ethnicity is (use numbers above) ______

18. My mother’s ethnicity is (use numbers above) ______
Appendix D. Survey Used in Little Italy, Schenectady.

Neighborhood Survey: Little Italy

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey. Your responses will remain confidential. Each question is optional and you can choose not to answer any question. The survey should take about 5-10 minutes to complete.

1. How long have you lived in or near Little Italy?
   _____ months or _____ years or _____ does not apply (check)

2. If you own a business in Little Italy, how long have you owned it at its present location (or elsewhere in Little Italy)?
   _____ months or _____ years or _____ does not apply (check)

3. How would you rate each of the following in Little Italy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of shops and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. On average, how often do you speak with your neighbors in Little Italy?
__Daily, __Weekly, __Monthly, __Yearly, __Never

5. “If something is wrong in the neighborhood, the neighbors will fix it.”
___Strongly agree, ___Moderately agree, ___Neither, ___Moderately disagree, ___Strongly disagree

6. Please indicate if any of the following items are true for you.

| I attend religious services in the neighborhood. | Yes | No |
| My parents or grandparents live or lived in the neighborhood. | | |
| My parents or grandparents own or owned a business in the neighborhood. | | |
| I plan to live in the neighborhood for the next five years or longer. | | |

7. Do you speak a language other than English at home? ____Yes ____No
   If so, which language? _____________

8. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement about Little Italy.
   SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

   | Tricolore (red, white, and green) banners and street signs are important to have in the neighborhood. | SA | A | N | D | SD |
   | The city has invested too much money in Little Italy. | | | | | |
   | I feel a sense of community in Little Italy. | | | | | |
   | Little Italy feels like an authentic Italian-American neighborhood. | | | | | |
   | City officials and business owners should encourage tourism in Little Italy. | | | | | |
   | Little Italy is geared more toward tourists, not local residents. | | | | | |
   | I would welcome new Italian-themed condominiums within the neighborhood. | | | | | |
   | I would welcome non-Italian ethnic restaurants (e.g. French bistro or Chinese restaurant) to the neighborhood. | | | | | |
   | Little Italy has a positive relationship with the city. | | | | | |
   | I feel a sense of attachment to Little Italy. | | | | | 

9. What thoughts and feelings come to mind about your neighborhood and neighborhood changes?
10. What is your gender? ___Male, ___Female

11. What is your marital status? ___Single, ___Married/engaged/partnered, ___Divorced/separated, ___Widowed, ___Other

12. How many adults (including yourself) live in your household for the majority of the year? __________

13. How many children (less than 18 years old) live in your household for the majority of the year? __________

14. How many family members (cousins, aunts, uncles, grandparents, etc.) also live in the neighborhood (but not in your household)? __________

15. In which year were you born? 19_________

The next questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it. In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others.

16. Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be

_______________________________________________________________________

17. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.
   SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Is there anything else you can tell me about living or working in Little Italy?