

University of New Orleans

ScholarWorks@UNO

University of New Orleans Theses and
Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses

Spring 5-15-2015

Urban Utopias and Suburban Slums: A Demographic Analysis of Suburban Poverty and Reurbanization in American Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Isabelle Notter

University of New Orleans, inotter@uno.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>



Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Notter, Isabelle, "Urban Utopias and Suburban Slums: A Demographic Analysis of Suburban Poverty and Reurbanization in American Metropolitan Statistical Areas" (2015). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 1981.

<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1981>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

Urban Utopias and Suburban Slums:
A Demographic Analysis of Suburban Poverty and Reurbanization in American Metropolitan
Statistical Areas

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Sociology

by

Isabelle R. Notter

B.A. Tulane University, 2012

May, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Abstract	iv
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Data and Methods	23
Results.....	32
Conclusion	42
References.....	47
Appendix.....	52
Vita.....	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, Creative Class Variables, MSA Level, 2000	30
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Creative Class Variables, MSA Level, 2010	31
Table 3. Percent Changes in Creative Class, MSA Level, 2000-2010	33
Table 4. Ratio Changes in Creative Class Percentages, 2000-2010	35
Table 5. Percent Changes in Household Characteristics Variables, 2000-2010.....	37
Table 6. Percent Changes in Socioeconomic Variables, 2000-2010	39
Table 7. Percent Changes in Race and Ethnicity Variables, 2000-2010	42
Table A1. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables, 2000.....	52
Table A2. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables, 2010.....	55

ABSTRACT

This study examines 2000 and 2010 Census data to determine the resettlement patterns of urban and suburban residents in 23 American metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs). Previous research discusses the development of an affluent suburbia, leaving postindustrial cities in decline. However, recent literature suggests the reurbanization of postindustrial cities by the creative class, a Return to the City movement fueled by middle class entrepreneurs, artists, and technocrats. Alongside reurbanization are increases in poverty, and racial and ethnic enclaves in suburbia. The literature shows these trends as two separate, independent processes. This study investigates the relationship between these processes within MSAs. Consistent with existing literature, this study finds that from 2000 to 2010, there are increases in poverty and racial and ethnic diversity in the suburbs, and increases in middle and upper class white populations within central cities. This study reveals quantitative data concerning the future of American urban and suburban demography.

Keywords: Suburbs, poverty, urban sociology, creative class, reurbanization.

INTRODUCTION

American cities are constantly evolving, going through waves of prosperity and periods of decline. We have all seen some of these changes up close in the shapes of local storefronts opening and closing, replaced by bookshops, replaced by cafés, by blight, by new high-rise condominiums. Today, many postindustrial cities, having suffered from the decline and emigration of older, manufacture-based economies, are experiencing reurbanization and revitalization through creative economies. Wicker Park, for instance, an old, blighted Chicago neighborhood with abandoned warehouses and factories, experienced rapid transformation upon the arrival of affluent, artistically inclined, neo-bohemians (Lloyd 2002). The buzzword for these transformations is creativity, the primary component for economic renewal in a number of cities across the United States, such as New York, Austin, and Portland, Oregon (Zukin 2008; 2010; Florida 2010; Grodach 2013).

Concurrent with creative urban renewal literature of the late 1990s and early 2000s, and even preceding it, is literature on increased suburban poverty, and ethnic and racial diversity in suburbs (Gans 1967; Alba et al. 1999; Singer et al. 2008). Until the 1970s, suburban America was characterized in both the media and academic literature by pristine, identical houses occupied by white, nuclear families. However, since then, more has been revealed about the demographic complexity and variety in suburban areas, in particular the sharper increases in poverty in the suburbs than in central cities, and suburban neighborhoods serving as new immigrant gateways in the last 20 years (Berube and Kneebone 2006; Singer et al. 2008).

Suburban poverty and creative reurbanization have been researched independently. Qualitative case studies have predominated much of the literature in both of these areas; and the quantitative work available has mainly focused on national or widespread suburban poverty

trends, with little to no mention of or comparison to urban centers. This study connects these trends quantitatively within metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), using 2000 and 2010 census data to examine the possibility that the processes occur concurrently. The purpose of this study will be to test the theory that suburban poverty relates to creative reurbanization.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Demographically, cities have gone through cycles of urbanization, suburbanization, and reurbanization in a span of a century. While American suburbs that are often associated with white, middle class, nuclear family America, recent research indicates that suburbia is and always has been more diverse than previously assumed (Alba et al. 1999; Singer et al. 2008). Recently, research shows that these suburban neighborhoods form identities independent of their central cities; are full of immigrant and ethnic enclaves and diversity; and are home to some of America's poorest families. In tandem with the changing suburban landscape, urban centers are also transformed. Some postindustrial cities previously in decline have been experiencing disparate, if not citywide, improvements to infrastructure and local economies. Some of these improvements have resulted from an inclination towards cultural, service-based, and creative economies that emphasize tourism, authenticity, and creativity; and the primary consumers and producers of these economies, known in the literature as the creative class or neo-bohemians, in a return-to-the-city movement (Lloyd 2002; Florida 2005). This review provides literature on traditional suburbanization processes, the emerging research on the diversity in suburbia, and finally the creative reurbanization processes occurring most recently in urban centers.

Suburbanization

The Chicago School of Urban Ecology paradigm proposes the natural progression of cities to develop outwards from the concentration of jobs in the center, a model based on the industrial city of Chicago in the early 1900s. Ernest Burgess's (1925/2005) invasion-succession theory of urban growth and expansion was developed from his analysis of the residential and economic changes in Chicago. The theory divided Chicago up into five concentric circles, and in each ring resided a particular population organized by function—from center to middle: the Loop was the central business district, the Zone in Transition was being invaded by business and light manufacture, the Zone of Workingmen's Homes held the residents pushed out of Zone in Transition (II), the residential area wherein people lived in high-rise apartment buildings or single-family homes, and V was the commuter zone, also known as the suburbs, the satellite city (Burgess 2005:76). Burgess contended that no city fit this ideal type. Nonetheless, he described "the general process of expansion" that is the "natural tendency" for cities to centralize towards the business district and to spread outwards once residents can afford to or are forced to move (Burgess 2005:77).

This process of "centralized decentralization" may also have implications for ethnic communities. The idea is that new immigrants move into the city (invasion), but after a generation or two, they succeed in a way that allows them to move to a different, better, farther ring of city (Burgess 2005:78-9). Soja (2000), as well as other urban researchers in the Chicago School, contends that to some extent, all cities are organized around a dominant center and develop outwards, and that suburban development is a natural extension of urban growth. The concept that ethnic and racial communities coincide with socioeconomic outcomes is common

throughout the literature, indicating that economic factors have an effect on the formation and continuation of ethnic and racial communities and neighborhoods (Massey and Denton 1985).

Today's urban and suburban landscapes look very different than the inner city Burgess, Robert Park, and Louis Wirth described in Chicago decades ago, but they still reflect the continuation of the invasion-succession model regarding the ways in which some populations move into an area while others move out (Wirth 1930; Park et al. 1967; Jackson 1985; Burgess 2005). This ecological paradigm runs through much of traditional suburbanization literature. What differentiates post-WWII metropolises from their older counterparts are a number of economic forces and politically driven policies that increased and exaggerated urban growth. The paradigm frames suburbanization as a natural tendency of urban expansion.

The first major economic force was the invention and proliferation of the automobile. By the early 1900s, more than 20 American companies were producing cheap automobiles, making it possible "for the common man to aspire to ownership" (Jackson 1985:159-60). Public transportation became obsolete in some suburbs and was no longer a consideration in building new communities—the automobile had made itself a part of the American middle class experience. By 1941, when the Bureau of Public Roads surveyed commutation patterns, 2,100 communities with populations up to 50,000 were completely dependent on transportation via the private automobile (Jackson 1985:188). Kopecky and Suen (2010) similarly found that no other factor influenced mid-twentieth century urban-to-suburban migration more than proliferation of the manufacture and ownership of the automobile and the roads like interstates to drive them on.

The second suburban boom in the United States was stimulated by post-WWII Federal Housing Administration (FHA) policies, initially created out of the New Deal's National Housing Act of 1934. Housing conglomerates and policies encouraged not only affluent white

residents, but also middle and lower class white residents, to move out into the suburbs (Jackson 1985). Undeveloped land was inexpensive, and it was more affordable for first-time homeowners to buy newly constructed houses in the suburbs than it was to find home improvement loans for urban buildings or to take out a mortgage in the inner city. Redlining and racist mortgage lending policies made it clear which neighborhoods should remain white to maintain or increase property values, and which ones would experience severe declines in property values as a result of multi-ethnic and multi-racial residents and homeowners (Jackson 1985; Wilson 2008). These policies and programs were “devoid of social objectives” and “helped establish the basis for social inequalities” (Jackson 1985:230). Once established and large enough, suburban neighborhoods were allowed to annex and incorporate to separate them from poorer neighborhoods and protect themselves fiscally (Wilson 2008).

Research indicates that the results of such practices and policies that promoted suburbanization not only racially segregated the newly constructed neighborhoods and home ownership, but the migration of individuals and families out of the city towards the suburbs also left cities in decay (Wilson 2009:28-30). Structural factors, from the development of highways and the erosion of public transportation, to the suburbanization of not only residents but of both small and large businesses, all benefited particular people who were able to move with those changes towards the suburbs (Jackson 1985; Murphy 2007; Wilson 2008; 2009). Aside from the aforementioned factors, other structural processes included government-subsidized loans to veterans, which had their own racial discriminatory tendencies with regards to mortgage and education lending practices; as well as the increased involvement of the federal government in highway construction and its decreased involvement in public transportation (Wilson 2009).

The above practices had a tendency to encourage the process often known as “white flight,” which hindered the social and geographic mobility of black residents (Wilson 2009). Not only were white people encouraged to reside in the suburbs, but also political actions functioned to spatially, politically, and economically “trap” poor blacks in increasingly unattractive inner cities (Wilson 2009:28-9). Similarly, Jacobs (1961) argued that overcrowding in impoverished neighborhoods remains or increases, even as wealthier residents leave because those with the means will move out instead of try to improve their surroundings. Research has also shown that sudden and drastic urban decline in conjunction with increased suburbanization also coincided with increases in crime in inner cities (Shihadeh and Ousey 1996; Jargowsky and Park 2009). Further, Szasz’s work (2009) theorizes that suburbia serves as an “inverted quarantine” in which those who flee from the cities can sequester themselves in a safe space in the suburbs; and Wirth (2005) similarly argued that people move out of cities because of how sad, stressful, and detrimental the city is to people’s ways of life, so when people are economically able, they would rationally move out (Shihadeh and Ousey 1996; Wirth 2005; Jargowsky and Park 2009).

Adding to the urban disinvestment and what Jacobs calls the “preslum” conditions of urban centers (1961:276-7), Wilson (2008) further explores the migration of employment and services to the suburbs. Not only did residents of means move out of the city, but soon, it became fiscally responsible to move businesses, large and small, to the suburbs as well. Since 1980, two thirds of employment growth has occurred outside the central city: about 70 percent of manufacturing, and wholesale and retail trade jobs are located outside of the central city, creating employment centers for suburban residents (Wilson 2008). For example, less than 20 percent of the jobs in Detroit, Philadelphia, and Baltimore are located within three miles of the city center (Wilson 2008:566-7). This uneven relationship between inner city residents and suburban jobs is

often referred to as “spatial mismatch” that describes how employment opportunities are disconnected from those who need them the most (Wilson 2008:567).

Economic forces were not the only causes or consequences of the migration of city-dwellers to the suburbs, though they played a large role in the process. There are draws to suburban lifestyle other than the middle class ideal of home-ownership. The amenities available in suburbia include good schools, expansive and private space, and personal safety (Jackson 1985). These neighborhoods made it easier for people to focus on family life: “The single-family tract house...whatever aesthetic failings, offered growing families a private haven in a heartless world” (Jackson 1985:244-5). The great suburban migration coincided with the ideals of normalcy, a middle class sense of the nuclear family and individualism. In moving to the suburbs, there is a lack of consideration for others on the part of the individual residents, as well as businesses that also migrated outwards (Jackson 1985). Jackson contends that the conformist suburban lifestyle is detrimental to extended family connections and serves as an isolating agent for suburban residents.

Contrary to the traditional suburban literature discussed above, there is increasing research on the ways American suburbs are more racially, ethnically, and most importantly to this study, socioeconomically, diverse than previously perceived. The following section examines the literature regarding diversity in suburbia.

Diversity in Suburbia

Thus far in the literature, the distinction between the city and the suburbs could not be clearer: urban life is characterized by decay and is synonymous with poverty, crime, and racial discrimination; while suburbia is characterized by large houses, conformity, the nuclear family,

and affluence. Herbert Gans's 1960s ethnographic work in Levittown, Pennsylvania indicated diversity in culture, class, and even race in suburbia that had not been previously studied (Gans 1967; 2005). He argued that previous work on daily interactions in the city was too limiting: the binary between the primary (daily, face-to-face interactions) and secondary (weaker, impersonal, general) relations was inadequate to describe suburbia. His ethnographic studies show that suburban lifestyles and culture are far more diverse than previously stated. He found that, while most of the residents focused on their families and privacy more than any other aspect of their lives, there was actually a vast diversity when it came to income and class in Levittown (Gans 1967; 2005). The suburbs only seem more homogenous than cities because, generally speaking, newer neighborhoods are more homogenous than older ones (Gans 2005).

In fact, newer white, middle class neighborhoods have often been more likely to experience the immigration of other races and social classes than older neighborhoods that are black or Hispanic, or those that are particularly low income or high income (Logan and Zhang 2010). Logan and Zhang's 2010 mixed methods study tested Burgess's invasion-succession theory to determine whether a multi-racial, multi-ethnic, and economically diverse neighborhood was actually possible. They found that in all-white neighborhoods, Hispanics and Asians served as buffers for Blacks to enter, thus potentially creating stable, multi-ethnic neighborhoods. This is a specific route towards "stable integration" that is different than the classical white or black invasion-succession (Logan and Zhang 2010:1102). However, they found that invasion-succession or white flight still persist in neighborhoods with particularly diverse populations, indicating a particular threshold of diversity before those of means move out again (Logan and Zhang 2010).

Therefore, according to Gans's analyses, suburbia in America is more diverse than previously thought. Conformity, whiteness, homogeneity, sameness—the cultural assumptions of American suburbia might be masked by another cultural attribute—the emphasis on home lives and privacy. Poverty and lower middle class life, along with every other aspect of suburban life, does not take place “on the street or in meetings and parties,” but is “home-centered and private” (Gans 1967:203). Increased employment opportunities, affordable housing, as well as the development of shopping districts, schools, healthcare, and law enforcement systems have helped these areas form a “local sense of place” independent of the surrounding metropolitan area that is self-sufficient economically, culturally, and politically (Hardwick 2008:31). Further, suburbs vary by type just as cities do: white suburbs, black suburbs; and residential bedroom suburbs, industrial manufacturing and employment focused suburbs, and hybrids of the two (Phillips 1996:169; Howell and Timberlake 2013). The proliferation of literature highlighting diversity in suburbia contradicts much of the picture perfect, even monotonous images of suburbia that pervaded much of the academic literature as well as the media and advertisements of the 1940s through the 1960s (Holliday and Dwyer 2009; Howell and Timberlake 2013).

Another layer of diversity in suburbia revolves around ethnic communities and immigrant enclaves. Historically, foreign immigrants to the United States have been from Europe, and they settled in urban centers where manufacturing jobs were plentiful (Soja 2000; Burgess 2005; Singer 2008). After a generation or two of settlement and assimilation, families of ethnic minorities would then move out towards the suburbs (Alba et al. 1999). However, starting in the mid- to late-20th century, immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia altered urban enclaves as gateways for new immigrants (Alba et al. 1999; Singer 2008). Enclaves have not only changed in character, but have also expanded and relocated to the suburbs (Hardwick 2008;

Singer 2008). According to the 1990 census, 43 percent of newly arrived immigrants in the 1980s were living outside of central cities, helping the United States emerge as the first “suburban immigrant nation” (Alba et al. 1999; Hardwick 2008:31).

More immigrants are living in the suburbs than in central cities, bypassing the inner city, and arguably making the neighborhoods new gateways for immigrants into the United States (Singer 2008). The abundance in variety and number of transportation options has deemed the suburbs new “airports of call,” compared to the “ports of call” of older, industrial cities (Singer 2008:16). Singer, Hardwick, and Brettell’s (2008) collection of case studies from 9 cities, including Atlanta, Austin, Charlotte, Dallas, and Portland, Oregon, indicate a number of factors in this phenomenon. Some suburbs are increasingly serving as employment hubs, homes to high-tech corporations, attracting foreign-born employees who choose to live in these neighborhoods, in close proximity to their work, good schools, and affordable housing (Singer 2008). Alba et al.’s (1999) work, using 1980 and 1990 census data, found that ethnic enclaves and immigrant families are opting for faster assimilation in multi-ethnic suburbs that have already developed the services of traditional urban enclaves. That is, suburban ethnic enclaves have only been increasing in size and number as new immigrants move into suburbs that typically have established enclaves and amenities such as affordable housing and good schools. This literature predominantly assumes particular levels of financial stability and English-speaking ability in these immigrant cohorts, as opposed to previous research that focuses on immigrants moving into impoverished inner city neighborhoods that relied on informal social networks for resources and assimilation (Alba et al. 1999; Hardwick 2008; Howell and Timberlake 2013). Although, even immigrants with less human capital are attracted to these

suburban areas to work in fields such as construction, landscaping, and manual labor, while still close to resources that will help in assimilation (Alba et al. 1999:446).

The myth of suburbia is further contradicted by the phenomenon of increased poverty in the suburbs. There is still a small amount of research done on poverty in the suburbs, but it is not a recent phenomenon. Since 1980, census data shows that approximately half of the metropolitan white poor population lived in the suburbs, and the proportion of other races and ethnicities experiencing poverty in the suburbs has only increased since then (Howell and Timberlake 2013). Analyses of 2005 through 2010 census and American Community Survey data show that in 1999, large cities and their suburbs had comparable numbers of poor individuals, but by 2005, the suburban poor outnumbered their urban counterparts by at least one million (Berube and Kneebone 2006). Poverty in both urban and suburban areas rose in that time period, and poverty rates in large cities are still twice that of suburban areas, indicating that poverty rates are still higher in cities (Berube and Kneebone 2006). In 2013, Howell and Timberlake (2013) found that poverty in the suburbs is more concentrated among white populations than among black or Latino residents, while black and minority poverty rates are higher in inner cities. That is to say that poverty is more concentrated in white populations in the suburbs, as compared to poverty's concentration in minority populations in inner cities. Similarly, 95 of the largest American metropolitan areas have experienced a 25 percent increase in poverty from 2006 to 2010, which is five times faster than the growth in central city poverty (Howell and Timberlake 2013:81). Murphy (2007) found similar rates in her studies of poverty in Pennsylvania suburbs in the 1990s: suburban poverty increased at a rate almost three times that of urban poverty, but urban poverty is still drastically more concentrated than suburban poverty.

Some studies have tried to ascertain why poverty in the suburbs has been increasing at a greater rate than in cities. Allan (2014) argues that both rich and poor Americans are trying to flee the inner cities, either in search for the American Dream of bedroom suburbs and middle class ideals, or because they have been priced out of the inner cities. Allan (2014) further predicts that suburbs riddled with unemployment will be the new landscape of American poverty. Other factors contributing to increased poverty in the suburbs include poor healthcare infrastructure and lack of public transportation (Howell and Timberlake 2013). Lee (2011) found that unemployment and the burden of rental housing are the strongest determinants of poverty in the suburbs, and that poor people are most likely to move to the suburbs or within the suburbs to live closer to work, thereby reducing transportation costs.

Holliday and Dwyer (2009) recognize the limitations of previous literature regarding spatial stratification and its direct links to economics. They argue that previous models of invasion-succession and urban expansion are limited and do not match up to the increase in immigration to the suburbs and the changing economies in both the suburbs and the inner cities that might affect poverty, such as the increase in service and tourism sectors. While suburban poverty rates might not be as high as urban poverty rates, the rates outside the cities are changing more quickly and the poor are more dispersed spatially. Singer et al. (2008) argue that one of the reasons for increased suburban poverty is because of a reverse white flight phenomenon—that is, affluent individuals are moving from the suburbs to the cities. The following section describes this “postsuburban” era, coinciding with the return-to-the-city literature and the rise of creative urban economies (Lucy and Phillips 2000:5).

Reurbanization

In tandem with suburbanization of poverty processes, urbanization or reurbanization processes are also occurring among affluent populations. As previously discussed, suburbanization of the affluent occurred alongside urban decentralization and decline. Similarly, as poverty increases in the suburbs, due in part to the immigration of poor, minority, and immigrant populations, many American cities are making a comeback economically with a growing service sector and creative economies and through attracting educated, middle class populations in a return-to-the-city movement.

As Bell predicted (1973), this return to the city has emerged during a period of economic transformation to a service-oriented economy. Bell (1973) theorized the oncoming postindustrial society and the postindustrial economies, characterized primarily by science-based knowledge; creation of new intellectual technologies; spread of knowledge, technical, and professional classes; change from goods-based economies to services-based economies; and increased participation of women [and people of color] in the new labor forces. The increased suburbanization of the mid-twentieth century depleted many urban centers of their industrial-manufacturing economies, necessitating cities to come up with new economies. As Bell hypothesized, these new economies revolve around the creation of what Fainstein and Judd (1999) call “intangibles” (269). These intangibles include financial and legal services, software engineering, customer service, hospitality and food service, information, and entertainment. This economy produces culture and cultural experiences (Soja 2000). The transition of intangible services as compared to manufactured goods was difficult for some cities, however, today most thriving cities rely on it (Fainstein and Judd 1999). As Jackson (1985) predicted, cities are

making a comeback as a back-to-the-city movement picks up, eventually reversing the suburbanization trend all together.

One of the earliest and clearest ways this cultural economy manifests itself in cities and in the literature, is through tourism. Tourism tends to increase the city's aesthetic and built environment, enhance leisure facilities for residents, and provides jobs that are relatively easy and cheap to create (Fainstein and Gladstone 1999; Gotham 2005). For parts of the city, tourist attractions offer the opportunity to recreate or enhance the city's identity through the built environment (Borer 2006). For example, Fainstein and Gladstone (1999) studied the well-known festival marketplaces in Boston or Baltimore and found that they have become must-see attractions because of their vital histories and cultural values in their cities. In another example, Gotham's (2005) analysis of housing markets and tourist economies show that New Orleans's Mardi Gras tourist culture has seeped into the neighborhoods' histories, cultures, and built environments of the city's permanent residents.

The authenticity that draws tourism also serves as a draw for residents to permanently relocate to inner cities (Fainstein and Gladstone 1999; Gotham 2005). Tourism no longer refers to visiting historical monuments and buying souvenirs, but rather the consumption of the authentic experience of the city. Authenticity today reflects an appreciation for the old and dilapidated, the spaces and structures and even experiences that the previous, middle class generation feared and avoided: "New city dwellers said that loft buildings are not decrepit hellholes, they are terrific space. Cobblestone streets are not inefficient for flows of automobiles, they are cool. No longer is seediness ugly, it is now a sign of authenticity" (Zukin 2008:727). Authentic cultural experiences are created and reproduced through everyday interaction and in the built environment in which the city's residents live (Brown-Saracino 2004; Borer 2006).

The cultural economy, also known as the symbolic or creative economy, has been most prevalent in literature and research regarding tourism (Brown-Saracino 2004; Borer 2006). However, it not only refers to tourists or transients, but these themes of authenticity of experience are also reflected in the residents who consume and produce it (Lloyd 2002; Florida 2005; Zukin 2008, 2010). The cultural producers of these economies have proven integral players in the reurbanization of today's cities, such as Portland, New Orleans, Chicago, and Austin (Lloyd 2002; Florida 2005; Singer 2008; Campanella 2014). The creative class is sometimes called the leisure class, neo-bohemians, or the bourgeois bohemians. They tend to have a preference for that bohemian lifestyle, the "authenticity" of dilapidated housing, the rundown and yet chic and quaint neighborhoods in the creative city (Lloyd 2002; Zukin 2010:723-726; Campanella 2014). They tend to come from white, middle class, suburban backgrounds, are highly educated, politically liberal, and interested in tolerance, diversity, and creative expression (Lloyd 2002; Florida 2005; Zukin 2008; 2010). Some of the earliest incarnations of the creative class were identified with LGBTQ gentrification and urban renewal literature as far back as the 1960s in the development of enclaves in dilapidated urban centers (Knopp 1990; Ghaziani 2014). These new-wave bohemians may choose to live in low income or working class neighborhoods, but their dispositions are "decidedly cosmopolitan" (Lloyd 2002:256). Cities that have embraced postindustrial urban economies based on information, technology, culture, and services attract the creative class; and have also been characterized by tolerance and diversity, talent and high educational attainment, and innovative high-technology (Florida 2005).

This is the new urban economy, created and perpetuated by the creative class. Members of the creative class work in a wide variety of occupations such as: high-tech sectors, financial

services, the legal and healthcare professions, and business management (Florida 2005). Their job descriptions entail creative and knowledge-based problem solving and trying new ideas and innovations. In returning to the city, creative people look for and find communities abundant with “high-quality experiences,” diversity, and above all else, “the opportunity to validate their identities as creative people” (Florida 2005:294). These experiences and amenities include boutiques, coffee shops, live shows, and bistros. This class is moving back to the city from the suburbs, sometimes known as the “reverse flow,” changing downtown neighborhoods to their liking, converting what has been previously described as blight to hip, luxury housing (Hardwick 2008:44; Zukin 2008:726-7).

As with suburbanization, reurbanization by the affluent is not completely left up to the individuals moving into these neighborhoods. City policies and programs can often lead the way or further nurture creative economic development in cities. For example, Austin has responded to the city’s music industry by creating committees and subcommittees to focus on creative industries (Grodach 2013). CreateAustin of the Cultural Affairs Division in Austin draws heavily on Florida’s creative class discourse and rhetoric, particularly as it comes to quality-of-life amenities, creative activity, and elements of economic development. It has standardized the rhetoric in a way that suited the city’s needs as a music-focused urban economy, and “channeling growth into the urban core” (Florida 2005; Grodach 2013:1759). Because the creative class rhetoric is so pliable and applicable to so many creative industries and revenue streams, Grodach (2013) argues that creative policy has the potential to work in many kinds of postindustrial cities. For example, Grodach found that Toronto’s creative policy was flexible and reflexive enough to aid in the growth of festival economies in the city. Ryberg et al. (2012) similarly found that

policymakers in Cuyahoga County, Ohio (Cleveland area) were able to redirect local and incoming artists towards blighted and vacant buildings.

One of the major consequences of this creative revitalization is gentrification and displacement. Once the creative class arrives to the city, communities change rapidly—economically, and culturally. Previously derelict spaces become trendy restaurants, galleries, bars, and other places for high-end cultural expression. Sometimes this constitutes “concomitant development” as in the new-bohemia of Lloyd’s Wicker Park in Chicago, an “adaptive recycling” of previously industrial space (2002:522). Zukin (2008; 2010) also uses examples of the rise in farmers markets or niche boutiques to illustrate the changing consumptive landscape that soon prices out residents and redistributes residents by socioeconomic class, race, and ethnicity.

To Richard Campanella (2014), the return of the creative class is nothing new. He argues that it is only one of four steps in the larger process of gentrification occurring in his creative city, New Orleans. He writes about four steps of gentrification and where New Orleans neighborhoods fall on the spectrum. Like New York, New Orleans has had a long ongoing dialogue on gentrification. The first social cohort to pioneer a space is the “gutter-punk,” then the hipsters, the “bourgeois bohemians,” and lastly the *bona fide* gentry—the professionals from the East and West coasts and international immigrants (Campanella 2014). The nature of consumption that these groups or “implants” express does not only reveal their appreciation and consumption of culture, but they are also changing the culture of their city or neighborhood by consuming the culture, usually by means of a process of replacement (Zukin 2008; Campanella 2014). For example, the process by which gentrification has occurred in the French Quarter, the original gentrified neighborhood of New Orleans, will most likely happen in the currently hip,

upcoming, and gentrifying neighborhoods (Gotham 2005; Campanella 2014). City policies promoting art and music festivals in minority neighborhoods in Portland provide another example of how creative-based economies isolate racial and ethnic minorities (Shaw and Monroe Sullivan 2011).

Peck (2005) proposed critiques of creative reurbanization. In particular, Peck (2005) is concerned with the effects of gentrification and this “new and improved” yet inherently neoliberal economy on the “losers.” Much of Florida’s work assumes that there are few to no people negatively affected by creative economies. One of the difficulties that arises in studying these phenomena is how to measure the ways in which neighborhoods are gentrified. Smith (1979) argued that researchers are more likely to find their answers in the rent-gap—that is, the difference between the current rental value of a property compared to the potential value of the property. While income and education are important determinants of changing populations in an area, they are indicators that also reflect general increases in income and education that occur over time, not necessarily changes associated with gentrification.

Some of the earliest literature on creative reurbanization revolves around Richard Florida’s creative class (2002). The creative class is a socioeconomic class, emphasizing a class of people working in the post-industrial creative economy as a driving force in redeveloping the nation’s economy (Florida 2002). The creative class is defined by census occupation codes, described in more detail later in this study, that require high educational attainment, creativity, and problem-solving, generally speaking. However, the breadth of literature since its beginning in 2002 has created cultural and lifestyle assumptions of this class and suggested amenities to draw this class to cities that want to redevelop their economies (Florida 2012). These lifestyle assumptions overlap with other literature, such as the “going solo” literature and other work

describing urban redevelopment by means of cultural consumption and production (Lloyd 2002; Klinenberg 2012). The creative class is by definition highly educated and middle to upper class, and is assumed to be white, live alone, live unpartnered and without children, and are moving back to the city (Peck 2005; Florida 2012).

The critiques, as well as the creative reurbanization literature, contribute to research on the cyclical trends of suburbanization and reurbanization. The literature in the three substantive areas, traditional suburbanization, diversity in suburbia, and creative reurbanization, have typically been supported by qualitative case studies. The quantitative research done in these areas still considers these processes as independent of one another.

Gaps in the Literature

Some research has indicated that the return-to-the-city movement works in conjunction with increasing poverty in the suburbs (Jackson 1985; Murphy 2007; Hardwick 2008). While research has shown that poverty in outer cities and suburbs has increased and that urban incomes have increased as well, little has been done to directly link the two processes within the same metropolitan areas. In my research, I selected 23 metropolitan areas that have shown increases in both urban affluence and suburban poverty. I studied the demographic changes between suburban and urban areas, looking at variables that adequately describe each of the processes. The primary gap I have filled revolves around determining generalizable, quantitative analyses to further explain and explore the relationships between today's urban growth and suburban poverty.

Research Questions

The research questions that arise from the literature and from the gaps in the literature are as follows: What is the relationship between the suburbanization of poverty and creative reurbanization? Are these trends most pronounced within metropolitan statistical areas, or are they independent national trends? Do the cities with greatest increases in reurbanization and creative class exhibit the largest increases in suburban poverty and diversity? Is the displacement of ethnic and racial minorities and the poor to the suburbs indicative of a dark side to the reurbanization by the creative class?

Hypotheses

To capture all of the facets of reurbanization and desuburbanization, the hypotheses are four-fold. I hypothesize that from 2000 to 2010, the proportion of the creative class will increase. This reflects the notion that the nation's economy was still in flux, that is, reconstructing itself from an industrial economy to a more creative, tourism and service oriented economy (Florida 2002; 2012). This increase will be present in all city, suburb, and MSA level data, with the suburbs experiencing the slowest or least pronounced increases in creative jobs.

My next hypothesis speaks to various household characteristics reflected in the literature. As Klinenberg (2012) describes, living alone or "going solo", has been on the rise for decades. Similarly, the reurbanization and creative class literature emphasize the rise of living alone, with roommates, in unmarried partnerships, and without children, particularly in cities and large metropolitan areas (Florida 2002; 2012). Where these trends do not occur, marriage and childbearing are still often delayed if they occur at all. I then hypothesize that the proportion of the population living alone will increase in cities from 2000 to 2010. Similarly, childlessness

will also increase in cities. These hypotheses suggest that such increases might occur in the suburbs, but if so, they occur at a smaller proportion than in cities. Further, the proportion of the population living in married households will decrease in cities from 2000 to 2010, decreasing more so than in the suburbs.

The above hypotheses reflect what we would expect from the creative class and creative reurbanization literature. The following hypotheses are my own, stemming from literature on gentrification, suburban poverty, and suburbanization of ethnic enclaves. My third hypothesis is that poverty will increase in the suburbs and such an increase will be greater than the increase in poverty within the cities. In support of this hypothesis, I further hypothesize that the suburbs will, on average, show decreases in home values, decreases in household incomes, and decreases in average educational attainment. Such decreases refer not only to the period from 2000 to 2010, but also larger decreases than in cities and smaller increases than in cities.

My final hypothesis revolves around the racial and ethnic compositions of the cities and the suburbs. Over the last two decades, more research has been done on the increased proportions of ethnic and racial minorities in suburban neighborhoods, countering previous literature describing assimilation and succession processes occurring primarily in central cities (Alba et al. 1999; Singer et al. 2008). I hypothesize that the proportion of the city's population identified as white will increase in the cities, while populations identified as black, Hispanic, Asian, or other will decrease. Conversely, the proportion of black, Hispanic, Asian, or other populations will increase in the suburbs, while the proportion of the white population will decrease. These hypotheses will support the existing literature on the increasing ethnic and racial minority populations in American suburbs, as well as the literature surrounding the

conflation of racial and socioeconomic measures and the ways in which socioeconomics and racial hierarchies are often intertwined (Berube and Kneebone 2006; Wilson 2008; 2009).

In short, my hypotheses are listed below:

H1: Creative class proportion will increase throughout the MSA from 2000 to 2010.

H1a: Creative class proportion increases will be greatest in cities and smallest in suburbs.

H2: Household characteristics of those involved in creative reurbanization will increase in the cities.

H2a: Living alone will increase in the cities more than in the suburbs.

H2b: The absence of children in the household will increase in the cities more so than in the suburbs.

H2c: The proportion of married households will decrease in the cities more than in the suburbs.

H3: Poverty will increase in the suburbs more so than in the cities.

H3a: Household incomes will decrease in the suburbs more than in cities.

H3b: Educational attainment will increase in both cities and suburbs, but less so in suburbs.

H3c: Home ownership will decrease in suburbs more so than in cities.

H4: Racial and ethnic diversity will increase in suburbs more so than in cities.

H4a: Proportion of white households will increase in cities and decrease in suburbs.

H4b: Proportion of black, Asian, Hispanic, and other race households will increase in suburbs.

DATA AND METHODS

This is a quantitative study of 23 metropolitan statistical areas. The cases are selected to represent a range of poverty rates in metropolitan and suburban areas, and variability of racial, ethnic, and economic disparities. MSAs are selected from Richard Florida's 2012 list of most creative metropolitan areas, as determined by the proportion of the population employed in creative sectors. From his top 60 most creative MSAs, 23 have been selected based on availability of Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) data for years 2000 and 2010 for both MSA and city levels. The MSAs for this pilot study are: Washington, DC/MD/VA; Huntsville, AL; Boston, MA-NH; Ann Arbor, MI; Madison, WI; Seattle-Everett, WA; Denver-Boulder, CO; Fort Collins-Loveland, CO; New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ; Worcester, MA; Des Moines, IA; Rochester, NY; Chicago, IL; Boise City, ID; Richmond-Petersburg, VA; Kansas City, MO-KS; Philadelphia, PA-NJ; Detroit, MI; Austin, TX; Dayton-Springfield, OH; Portland, OR-WA; and Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA. These are also areas with increased suburban poverty within the past decade, and represent a range of poverty rates in metropolitan and suburban areas, as well as variability of racial, ethnic, and economic disparities (Berube and Kneebone 2006; Luhby 2013).

Methods for this study refer to the selection of IPUMS census samples over the 100% census data, as well as the decision between MSA and city level data over census tract data to examine the MSAs. IPUMS data were primarily chosen for the availability of individual and household level data from which measures may be constructed. More research has used census data, allowing for 100% data, particularly as it comes to studying a smaller number of MSAs and using fewer variables (Kopecky and Suen 2010; Howell and Timberlake 2013). However, IPUMS data have often been used when comparing suburban areas to urban areas or central

cities, and is good for examining individual and household level characteristics (Alba et al. 1999). This is will be the approach used in this study. This will allow me to examine a larger number of variables and MSAs of interest in order to speak to broader trends, more indicative of national trends.

Census tract level data as well as block group level data have been primarily used when examining changes over time across suburban and urban areas in the United States (Holliday and Dwyer 2009; Jargowsky and Park 2009; Logan and Zhang 2010; Lee 2011; Ryberg et al. 2013). However, in order to examine longitudinal trends and analyze entire MSAs, I will use the MSA as the unit of analysis, while selecting out cities and suburban areas of interest for comparison.

Measures

Variables used to analyze suburban poverty and the suburbanization of racial and ethnic enclaves are race, ethnicity, income and poverty variables (Alba et al. 1999; Berube and Kneebone 2006; Singer et al. 2008). To examine creative reurbanization, variables will also include race, ethnicity, and income variables, such as poverty, home ownership, and occupation. Further, these variables are commonly used to conceptualize gentrification (Florida 2002; Shaw and Monroe Sullivan 2011; Grodach 2013).

The selection of data, that is, the MSAs of interest, resulted from the availability of Census data for the 60 most creative metropolitan areas (Florida 2012; Luhby 2013; Creative Class Group 2014). From this list, cities were selected to have variability for racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic distributions. These MSAs have been established as examples of creative reurbanization while also experiencing at least a 20% increase in suburban poverty from 2000 to 2011 (Luhby 2013). Overall, analysis will present descriptive statistics that speak to whether

increases in suburban poverty coincide with creative reurbanization processes. Descriptive statistics for all variables are shown in Tables 1 and 2 for 2000 and 2010, respectively. Cities refer to the largest city in the MSA and also the first in the MSA name. Suburbs refer to everything around the city still within the MSA.

The Creative Class

The creative class is measured through census occupation codes. The United States Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (ERS) wrote a report that used Florida's measures to define the creative class using census data (McGranahan and Wojan 2007). McGranahan and Wojan amended Florida's measures to better operationalize occupations that require both the creativity and "skill" Florida claims are required for regional economies to excel in the new economy (Florida 2002; 2012; McGranahan and Wojan 2007). For example, in the original creative class measures, all legal occupations were included. In the 2007 refined measures, most legal occupations were excluded except for occupations that specifically deal with complex and creative problem solving, such as lawyers and law practitioners (McGranahan and Wojan 2007). Another example resides in all of the management occupations. Originally, all occupations in the business and financial operations were included in the creative class measure, but in the newer measure, some are excluded, such as farmers and farm managers, whose creative and fiscal productivity are minimal compared to other occupations in the business and financial fields (McGranahan and Wojan 2007). The revised operationalization of the creative class using census data is now common place in the literature, and has been recognized by Richard Florida, the earliest creator and user of the measure, and used in his more recent research (Florida 2012). The occupational variable in the census asks respondents to indicate

their primary occupation, which is defined as the one the respondent spends most of their time (if they have more than one occupation).

For this project, the occupation variable has been mimicked to create the creative occupation variable (creative) and recoded to follow the ERS guidelines for defining creative class occupations. The creative occupation variable indicates the proportion of the working population of an area working in creative class occupations. In this sample, the means for creative class percentages are 34.6% and 29.1% for 2000 and 2010 respectively. In 2000, Washington, D.C. had the highest with 42% and in 2010 with 37.8%. Refer to Tables 1 and 2 for descriptive statistics.

Household Characteristics

Household characteristics refer to the relationship of the head of household to other members within the household. For this research, the living alone variable has been created from the census's household type variable. The 10 categories and combinations of living with a partner, living alone, living with married partner, etc. have been consolidated to living alone or not. In this sample of MSAs, the mean for living alone was 10.2% in 2000 and 11.5% in 2010. The minimum and maximum in 2000 were in Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (7.7%) and Worcester, MA (11.8%). The minimum and maximum in 2010 were Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (8.6%) and Dayton-Springfield, OH (13.7%).

Similarly, the census's marital status variable has been recoded to only show the difference between married and not married participants. The mean percentage of married households in 2000 was 41.8% and in 2010, 42.3%. The minimum and maximum for 2000 were New Orleans, LA (34.6%) and Huntsville, AL (45.4%). Again in 2010, the MSA with the

smallest percentage of married households was New Orleans, LA (38%) and the largest was Huntsville, AL (46.6%).

Lastly, childlessness refers to whether or not a household has children present. The average for 2000 was 70.8% and in 2010, 72%. In 2000, the minimum and maximum were New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ (68.4%) and Madison, WI (73.8%), respectively. In 2010 however, the minimum and maximum were Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (69.1%) and Fort Collins-Loveland (75.9%).

Socioeconomic Measures

The first poverty measure is the census's poverty variable. It expresses a family's income as a percentage of the Social Security Administration's poverty threshold and is coded from 0 to 501. The means for the sample of 23 MSAs were 327.1 in 2000 and 324.2 in 2010. In 2000, New Orleans, LA had the lowest average (270.4) and Washington, D.C. had the highest (366.5). In 2010, however, the minimum was in Boise City, ID (283.1) and the maximum remained in Washington, D.C. (381.1).

From this poverty variable, another variable was created to represent those actually in poverty. Those coded 0-99 are considered in poverty. This new variable expresses the percentage of the area's population that is in poverty. The mean for these 23 MSAs in 2000 was 38.6% and in 2010, 41.6%. In 2000, the MSA with the smallest percentage of individuals in poverty was Ann Arbor, MI (30.2%) and the MSA with the largest percentage was Boise City, ID (46.3%). Ann Arbor, MI was also the MSA with the smallest in poverty percentage in 2010 with 32.2%, however the largest percentage in 2010 is seen in Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (48.7%).

Other variables also speak to poverty or inequality. Household income is also used. It is expressed in dollar amounts, and its averages in the city, suburbs, or whole MSA are used. The mean for this sample in 2000 was \$70,203 and in 2010, the mean was \$88,825. In 2000, the minimum was \$52,005 in Dayton-Springfield, OH and the maximum of \$90,095 was in Washington, D.C. In 2010, Dayton-Springfield, OH was also the minimum with \$65,121 and Washington, D.C. was also the maximum with \$128,047.

The original education variable is averaged for the area to indicate the average level of education for the area and is described as the comparable census codes. For example an average of 6.8 equates to the census code 6, which equates to the 12th grade. This means that on average the population has achieved a 12th grade education. The mean educational attainment for this sample in 2000 was 12th grade (6.2) and in 2010, the mean was also 12th grade (6.6). In 2000, the MSA with the lowest average was New Orleans, LA with 11th grade (5.6) and the highest average was in Ann Arbor, MI with 12th grade (6.7). In 2010, however, the minimum was in Boise City, ID with 12th grade (6.1) and the maximum was in Fort Collins-Loveland, CO with one year of college completed (7.2).

Lastly, home ownership is a variable that expresses whether an individual owns their home or is on their way to—that is, they are currently paying off a mortgage. The percentage expresses the percentage of the population who owns their residence. The rent variable, sometimes used, is the inverse, showing those who rent their homes instead. For this sample, the average percentage of the population who were homeowners in 2000 was 69.9% and in 2010, it was 72.7%. The minimum and maximum for 2000 were Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (53.5%) and Detroit, MI (76.9%). In 2010, the minimum and maximum were Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (57.4%) and Ann Arbor, MI (79%).

Race and Ethnicity Measures

The race and ethnicity measures used in this research are unaltered versions of the census's race and Hispanic variables. Race has been consolidated from the census's nine categories to four: white, black, Asian, and other. This consolidation allows for comparable ratios geographically, as MSAs have variable Asian or multiracial races and ethnicities, however all MSAs share white and black populations as the two primary racial categories in terms of population size. The census's Hispanic variable has also been consolidated from its original six categories to two: Hispanic and not Hispanic, as typical in such analyses so as to enumerate and speak to trends.

In 2000, the averages for each racial group are as follows: white 76.5%, black 12.1%, Asian 3.8%, other race 7.6%, and Hispanic 9.5%. For the minimums and maximums, see Table 1. In 2010, the averages for each racial group are as follows: white 78.3%, black 10.8%, Asian 5.4%, other race 6.3%, and Hispanic 10.3%. For the minimums and maximums, see Table 2.

For all of these measures, descriptive statistics were calculated and are shown in Appendix Table A1 for 2000 and in Appendix Table A2 for 2010 at the city, suburbs, and MSA levels. Statistics for the samples, such as the means, standard deviations, minimums, and maximums at the MSA level are shown in Table 1 (2000) and Table 2 (2010) below.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, Creative Class Variables, MSA Level, 2000.

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Creative	34.6	3.39	29.4 New Orleans, LA	42 Washington, D.C.
Poverty	327.1	22.01	270.4 New Orleans, LA	366.5 Washington, D.C.
Household Income	70203	9620	52005 Dayton-Springfield, OH	90095 Washington, D.C.
Average Education	12 th gr. (6.2)		11 th gr. (5.6) New Orleans, LA	12 th gr. (6.7) Ann Arbor, MI
Ownership	69.6	6.1	53.5 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	76.9 Detroit, MI
In Poverty	38.6	4.3	30.2 Ann Arbor, MI	46.3 Boise City, ID
Living Alone	10.2	1.0	7.7 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	11.8 Worcester, MA
Married	41.8	2.4	34.6 New Orleans, LA	45.4 Huntsville, AL
No Children	70.8	1.4	68.4 New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ	73.8 Madison, WI
White	76.5	11.4	51.8 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	91.6 Fort Collins-Loveland, CO
Black	12.1	10.1	0.4 Boise City, ID	38.2 New Orleans, LA
Asian	3.8	2.9	1.1 Dayton-Springfield, OH	12.7 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA
Hispanic	9.5	9.5	1.3 Dayton-Springfield, OH	41.9 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA
Other Race	7.6	5.8	2.4 Dayton-Springfield, OH	28.2 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Creative Class Variables, MSA Level, 2010.

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Creative	29.1	4.2	22.1 Dayton-Springfield, OH	37.8 Washington, D.C.
Poverty	324.2	23.0	283.1 Boise City, ID	381.1 Washington, D.C.
Household Income	88825	14470	65121 Dayton-Springfield, OH	128047 Washington, D.C.
Average Education	12 th gr. (6.6)		12 th gr. (6.1) Boise City, ID	1 yr. college (7.2) Fort Collins-Loveland, CO
Ownership	72.7	5.5	57.4 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	79.0 Ann Arbor, MI
In Poverty	41.6	4.5	32.2 Ann Arbor, MI	48.7 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA
Living Alone	11.5	1.1	8.6 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	13.7 Dayton-Springfield, OH
Married	42.3	2.3	38.0 New Orleans, LA	46.4 Huntsville, AL
No Children	72.0	1.6	69.1 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	75.9 Fort Collins-Loveland, CO
White	78.3	10.4	57.5 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	92.2 Boise City, ID
Black	10.8	8.6	0.7 Boise City, ID	31.9 New Orleans, LA
Asian	5.4	3.8	1.9 Dayton-Springfield, OH	16.5 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA
Hispanic	10.3	9.1	2.2 Dayton-Springfield, OH	41.2 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA
Other Race	6.3	4.0	2.4 Madison, WI	19.9 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA

RESULTS

Creative Class

The ERS's creative class measure for all of the MSAs show smaller creative class proportions of each MSA population than Florida's measure (McGranahan and Wojan 2007; Florida 2012). However, the edited measure does not account for the decrease from 2000 to 2010, as shown in Table 3. The result of interest is the change from 2000 to 2010—for each MSA, the creative class proportion decreased over time. This does not show support for hypothesis H1, based primarily on the creative class literature, that the proportion of people employed in creative occupations would increase in these MSAs from 2000 to 2010.

Table 3. Percent Changes in Creative Class, MSA Level, 2000-2010.

MSA	2000	2010	=/-		
Ann Arbor, MI	37.62%	31.08%	-6.54%		
Austin, TX	39.67%	35.13%	-4.54%		
Boise City, ID	31.19%	25.43%	-5.76%		
Boston, MA-NH	38.77%	33.39%	-5.38%		
Chicago, IL	33.57%	28.22%	-5.35%		
Dayton-Springfield, OH	29.46%	22.05%	-7.41%		
Denver-Boulder, CO	38.17%	33.05%	-5.12%		
Des Moines, IA	33.42%	24.32%	-9.10%		
Detroit, MI	31.36%	24.81%	-6.55%		
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	36.07%	30.56%	-5.51%		
Huntsville, AL	36.17%	32.45%	-3.72%		
Kansas City, MO-KS	32.52%	26.24%	-6.28%		
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	33.70%	28.32%	-5.38%		
Madison, WI	34.82%	32.72%	-2.10%		
New Orleans, LA	29.35%	23.74%	-5.61%		
New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ	34.25%	28.98%	-5.27%		
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	32.95%	27.08%	-5.87%		
Portland, OR-WA	34%	29.06%	-4.94%		
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	33.90%	28.25%	-5.65%		
Rochester, NY	30.85%	23.92%	-6.93%		
Seattle-Everett, WA	39.16%	34.67%	-4.49%		
Washington, DC/MD/VA	42%	37.76%	-4.24%		
Worcester, MA	32.03%	27.45%	-4.58%		
				min.	max.
Average	34.57%	29.07%	-5.49%	-2.10%	-9.10%

The next hypothesis directly related to the creative class, hypothesis H1a, predicts that the creative class would be more concentrated in the central cities of the MSAs compared to their suburban counterparts. This hypothesis does not stem from the creative class literature, but from the gentrification and suburban poverty literature. Table 4 shows the creative class percentages for cities and suburbs and their ratios. A ratio of greater than 1 indicates a higher proportion of those with creative occupations within the cities, and a ratio of less than 1 indicates a higher proportion of the creative class in the suburbs. In terms of the overall averages, there is a slight increase in the proportion from 2000 to 2010, which suggests that more creative occupations are being filled in cities than in suburbs over time, which does support my hypothesis regarding where the creative class is choosing to live over time. However, the increase from 0.94 to 0.96 is slight, and the ratio of less than 1 shows a slightly higher proportion of the creative class in the suburbs, which does not support hypothesis H1a. Further, none of the MSAs in this study showed increases in creative class percentages. However, some MSAs, such as Washington, D.C. and Austin, TX had large creative class percentages in 2000 and in 2010 compared to other MSAs. This supports the creative class literature in terms of the areas with constantly large creative class populations.

Table 4. Ratio Changes in Creative Class Percentages, 2000-2010.

MSA	2000			2010		
	City	Suburb	Ratio	City	Suburb	Ratio
Ann Arbor, MI	44.47	35.31	1.26	40.09	28.52	1.41
Austin, TX	40	39.29	1.02	36.59	33.89	1.08
Boise City, ID	35.71	28.01	1.27	30.41	22.66	1.34
Boston, MA-NH	34.55	39.53	0.87	32.06	33.62	0.95
Chicago, IL	29.09	35.34	0.82	29.09	28.59	1.02
Dayton-Springfield, OH	22.09	30.65	0.72	16.04	23.02	0.7
Denver-Boulder, CO	35.09	39.29	0.89	34.09	32.72	1.04
Des Moines, IA	28.72	38.73	0.74	19.05	28.99	0.73
Detroit, MI	19.49	33.94	0.57	12.48	26.36	0.47
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	38.46	33.55	1.15	30.56	29.12	1.05
Huntsville, AL	39.82	32.95	1.21	30.65	33.7	0.91
Kansas City, MO-KS	28.59	34.44	0.83	22.1	28.08	0.79
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	33.25	33.89	0.98	27.88	28.5	0.98
Madison, WI	38.03	32.36	1.18	36.47	30.47	1.2
New Orleans, LA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ	31.63	35.96	0.88	26.96	30.37	0.89
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	26.05	34.83	0.75	20.94	28.49	0.73
Portland, OR-WA	34.38	33.81	1.02	32.18	27.6	1.17
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	31.87	34.36	0.93	28.4	28.21	1.01
Rochester, NY	25.23	32.08	0.79	17.62	25.07	0.7
Seattle-Everett, WA	43.07	38.17	1.13	40.84	32.73	1.25
Washington, DC/MD/VA	38.81	42.44	0.91	40.64	37.4	1.09
Worcester, MA	27.75	37.74	0.74	22.42	33.17	0.68
Average	33.01	35.3	0.94	28.53	29.6	0.96

Household Characteristics

Changes in household characteristics of 22 MSAs between 2000 and 2010 are shown in Table 5. The percentage of married individuals increased in the suburbs slightly more than in the cities, supporting hypothesis H2c. Both childlessness and living alone both increased in the cities more so than in the suburbs, further supporting hypotheses H2a and H2b. These findings indicate, even if slightly, the size and shape of those returning to the city. Those living in the city seem less likely to be married and have children, and more likely to live alone, which

coincides with the creative class, return to the city literatures, and going solo literatures (Lloyd 2002; Florida 2012; Klinenberg 2012).

Some of the outliers are also important to consider. For example, while childlessness generally increased slightly in the cities (0.91%), many cities show a decrease in the trend. Boston, MA-NH, Huntsville, AL, Madison, WI, and Washington, DC-MD-VA all show large increases in childlessness, indicating that the creative class trend might be more prominent in these cities, coinciding with better economies and larger creative class proportions compared to other MSAs in the study. This could also suggest other parallel processes or trends. For example, these MSAs are homes to a number of large colleges and universities, whose students may not have children yet. Their jobs are not creative class occupations yet. The rest of the MSAs might be suffering from high unemployment due to the recession. The variance in the childlessness variable indicates the importance of contextualizing such trends in each MSA and of unevenness in reurbanization trends across all of the MSAs.

Table 5. Percent Changes in Household Characteristics Variables, 2000-2010.

MSA	Living Alone		Childlessness		Married	
	City +/-	Suburbs +/-	City +/-	Suburbs +/-	City +/-	Suburbs +/-
Ann Arbor, MI	1.89	1.29	8.28	-2.47	1.11	1.65
Austin, TX	2.36	1.72	-0.93	1.21	-1.17	-0.51
Boise City, ID	2.86	0.63	-3.57	1.48	-1.79	-0.19
Boston, MA-NH	2.72	0.95	10.18	1.05	-0.31	0.55
Chicago, IL	3.27	1.01	-2.25	0.8	-1.16	-0.17
Dayton-Springfield, OH	0.53	2.73	-1.13	2.85	-2.64	-0.83
Denver-Boulder, CO	2.03	1.31	-1.29	1.04	-0.78	0.88
Des Moines, IA	0.83	2.08	-2.34	1.95	-5.92	0.66
Detroit, MI	5.87	1.32	-2.89	1.48	-3.24	-0.36
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	1.9	3.1	-0.71	4.84	1.93	2.36
Huntsville, AL	3.92	2.05	11.08	-4.49	-0.3	1.04
Kansas City, MO-KS	1.61	1.12	-1.8	2.57	-1.08	0.41
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	1.37	0.71	-1.01	-0.23	-1.25	0.84
Madison, WI	2.98	1.17	10.04	0.98	-0.86	0.26
New Orleans, LA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ	1.45	1.06	-1.51	0.45	-0.79	-0.19
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	3.72	0.86	-2.09	0.97	-0.99	-0.5
Portland, OR-WA	0.5	1.14	-0.47	1.02	0.56	0.56
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	2.8	0.71	-2.29	1.47	-1.44	-0.16
Rochester, NY	2.64	1.06	-2.49	1.5	-1.65	0.06
Seattle-Everett, WA	0.95	0.93	1.6	0.64	4.4	1.3
Washington, DC/MD/VA	2.95	0.82	6.64	-0.13	0.61	0.68
Worcester, MA	1.38	0.03	-1.1	0.55	-1	-2.96
Average	2.3	1.26	0.91	0.89	-0.81	0.24

Socioeconomics

Household incomes increased at a greater rate in the suburbs than in the cities, which does not support hypothesis H3a (See Table 6). However, as suburban areas have experienced increased vacancies in both residential and commercial areas, it is possible that the increased income in households might be due to the increased vacancies—that is, their incomes would not be reported as they have moved elsewhere. More information could be gleaned from

investigating population density in these areas, the decrease in population or the decrease in the number of residents to report income, who were financially able to stay where they are (Berube and Kneebone 2006).

However, also in Table 6, I found that average educational attainment and percentage of homeowners both increased in cities at a rate greater than in suburbs. These findings support hypotheses H3b regarding educational attainment and H3c regarding renting and home ownership. These variables are important indicators in the urban renewal and return to the city literature. While causes and effects, such as the rent-gap theory or gentrification factors may be unclear, cities are improving in these areas at a greater rate than their suburban counterparts, for reasons this study is not able to attribute.

Lastly, the percentage of those in poverty increased slightly in both cities and suburbs, but more so in the suburbs than in the cities, supporting hypothesis H3. To reiterate, the poverty measure is complicated. The original measure from the census is the Duncan Index, a wealth measure from 1 to 501. Those between 1 and 99 are considered in poverty, and those 100 to 501 are above the poverty threshold. The measure used shows the percentage of those in poverty. Though the changes in poverty are slight, they do express changes at the MSA level that require further investigation, and further supports the stagnation of wages due to the recent recession.

Table 6. Percent Changes in Socioeconomic Variables, 2000-2010.

MSA	Household Income		Education		Ownership		In Poverty	
	City +/-	Suburb +/-	City +/-	Suburb +/-	City +/-	Suburb +/-	City +/-	Suburb +/-
Ann Arbor, MI	23957.84	9100.19	-0.01	0.37	3	2.82	2.01	4.35
Austin, TX	14370.87	14503.97	0.45	0.38	2.68	-2.51	-1.07	7.53
Boise City, ID	12645.91	11535.9	0.29	0.34	-2.71	1.34	1.12	3.84
Boston, MA-NH	27242.91	29202.93	0.61	0.40	6.11	3.94	1.26	0.48
Chicago, IL	18580.16	15120.41	0.80	0.41	2.48	2.09	0.40	1.56
Dayton-Springfield, OH	2379.06	5898.68	0.29	0.36	1.27	0.06	-2.02	2.29
Denver-Boulder, CO	19867.05	15078.26	0.67	0.34	2.84	-0.16	1.12	3.34
Des Moines, IA	8426.26	13820.96	0.03	0.31	0.22	4.28	3.75	7.01
Detroit, MI	-3589.44	3817.36	0.49	0.41	0.83	-0.52	5.13	3.07
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	14589.56	16960.12	0.32	0.80	2.33	-1.51	0.42	-2.57
Huntsville, AL	13342.24	31132.72	0.57	0.66	2.65	1.98	5.80	3.62
Kansas City, MO-KS	13285.21	14493.76	0.42	-0.01	0.56	1.63	-0.01	6.09
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	18584.19	20956.62	0.49	0.51	3.39	3.95	3.97	7.32
Madison, WI	18402.09	21870.18	0.49	0.47	5.81	3.18	3.34	0.25
New Orleans, LA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York-Northeastern								
New Jersey, NY-NJ	24362.35	30190.85	0.52	0.41	3.57	4.41	-2.84	0.29
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	12470.42	25321.68	0.61	0.45	-1.95	2.59	3.80	4.37
Portland, OR-WA	19476.38	13611.64	0.61	0.39	4.5	3.38	3.12	2.10
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	16724.35	21109.7	0.66	0.37	0.66	2.54	2.96	6.33
Rochester, NY	4132.98	14936.36	0.43	0.46	5.01	2.88	4.77	7.97
Seattle-Everett, WA	23938.01	19828.2	0.36	0.36	3.44	2.05	3.05	5.78
Washington, DC/MD/VA	43996.34	36897.41	0.96	0.37	6.7	4.09	0.22	-1.37
Worcester, MA	14677.05	18858.2	0.65	0.28	7.36	1.47	3.31	3.14
Average	16448.26	18374.82	0.49	0.40	2.76	2	1.98	3.49

Race and Ethnicity

The descriptive statistics regarding changes in the racial and ethnic compositions of the cities and suburbs from 2000 to 2010 are shown in Table 7. From 2000 to 2010, black and other racial groups actually decreased in proportions in both the cities and the suburbs, however the decreases in the suburbs were smaller than in the cities. The proportion of Hispanics and Asians increased in both cities and suburbs, however they increased more dramatically in the suburbs. These findings support hypotheses H4b. Lastly, the change in the percentage white population was the most drastic, increasing in the cities by 3.71% and decreasing in the suburbs by 0.93%, supporting hypothesis H4a. While all of these changes are slight, they support the initial hypotheses regarding the changing racial and ethnic compositions of suburbs compared to cities.

While the overall changes across all 23 MSAs are slight, some cities and suburbs show great increases or decreases that help tell the story. For instance, the black population in all suburbs decreased 0.27% from 200-2010; however, 17 suburban areas show no change or show increases in black residents, which supports the fourth hypothesis. Large decreases in black population in some suburbs skew the overall average. For example, Rochester, NY shows a 10.82% decrease, which brings the overall average to a negative. Outliers such as this one indicate that while overall data support or do not support my hypotheses, some changes that are occurring are drastic and require further investigation. Similarly, the overall decreases in black population in cities are slight. However, the large decreases in Washington, DC (13.53%) and Richmond-Petersburg, VA (14.12%) suggest a regionally-focused trend, a greater creative class displacement effect, or stagnant economy displacement effect in those two MSAs that are not reflected when looking at all MSAs together. Rochester, NY similarly showed the largest increase in Hispanics in the city (11.35%) compared to the other MSAs in this study, skewing the

average to show a slight overall increase in the cities. Without the Rochester's large increase, the average would be lower or even negative (decrease). Generally speaking with regards to the race and ethnicity data, the overall average speak volumes in my study, however the outliers have told even more compelling stories that support more of my hypotheses.

Table 7. Percent Changes in Race and Ethnicity Variables, 2000-2010.

MSA	White		Black		Asian		Other Race		Hispanic	
	City +/-	Suburbs +/-	City +/-	Suburbs +/-	City +/-	Suburbs +/-	City +/-	Suburbs +/-	City +/-	Suburbs +/-
Ann Arbor, MI	-2.62	-1.03	-3.43	0.01	3.04	1	4.03	0.02	0.86	0.75
Austin, TX	8.71	-0.3	-2.25	0.79	1.54	3.24	-8	-3.73	-0.16	3.12
Boise City, ID	-1.45	6.41	0.68	0.19	1.48	0.6	-0.72	1.81	1.96	-0.24
Boston, MA-NH	2.98	-2.25	-1.59	0.59	1.92	1.77	-3.28	-0.11	-0.28	1.11
Chicago, IL	8.45	0.06	-3.69	-1.14	1.27	1.42	-6.03	-0.35	-2.69	2.34
Dayton-Springfield, OH	3.21	-1.32	-3.68	0.15	0.16	0.71	0.32	0.39	1.13	0.86
Denver-Boulder, CO	8.9	0.62	-1.67	0.21	0.4	0.48	-7.64	-1.31	-5.6	2.7
Des Moines, IA	-2.95	-3.29	-0.25	1.52	1.6	1.41	1.6	0.36	5.28	0.63
Detroit, MI	-0.42	-3.03	1.16	1.51	0.07	1.41	-0.81	0.11	0.41	0.62
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	-0.8	1.02	0.86	0	0.99	0.15	-1.04	-1.22	-1.49	-0.49
Huntsville, AL	4.85	-1.91	-5.28	0.5	-1.22	0.73	1.67	0.67	2.57	2.05
Kansas City, MO-KS	2.96	-1.51	-3.8	0.96	0.95	0.54	-0.12	0.02	2.82	0.94
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	8.92	4.38	-1.72	-1	1.99	4.46	-9.19	-7.83	-0.13	-0.89
Madison, WI	1.95	-0.4	0.51	0.08	-0.96	1.33	-1.49	-1.01	-0.33	0.41
New Orleans, LA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York-Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ	2.55	-0.83	-1.15	-0.87	3.45	2.81	-4.79	-1.14	-1.67	1.42
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	0.15	-2.12	-2.54	0.22	3.01	1.41	-0.62	0.49	2.03	1.49
Portland, OR-WA	3.33	-0.09	-1.62	0.29	0.89	1.37	-2.61	-1.59	-0.14	1.25
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	11.97	-1.48	-14.12	0.48	1.48	1.01	0.66	-0.01	3.09	1.24
Rochester, NY	2.96	-0.5	-0.18	-10.82	1.25	0.81	-4.01	-0.01	11.35	0.82
Seattle-Everett, WA	1.79	-5.26	-1.39	0.43	1.11	4.76	-1.51	0.06	0.52	2.46
Washington, DC/MD/VA	14.88	-2.09	-13.53	-0.67	0.66	3.24	-2.01	-0.19	0.08	2.15
Worcester, MA	1.3	-5.51	1.73	0.71	1.36	4.7	-4.39	0.11	-0.43	0.19
Average	3.71	-0.93	-2.59	-0.27	1.2	1.79	-2.27	-0.66	0.87	1.13

CONCLUSION

This analysis has only begun to explore effects of the creative class phenomenon on changing demographics of urban and suburban areas within metropolitan statistical areas. The analysis indicates vitality of creative class and urban renewal literature, alongside suburban poverty and ethnic enclave literature, and the racial, socioeconomic, and household changes that coincide with such trends. Mixed results of the study also suggest future research that needs to be done regarding this ultimate return to the city movement and the potential to reverse the large-scale suburbanization trend of the 20th century (Jackson 1983).

Counter to predictions of the creative class literature, the proportion of creative class occupations has decreased in the MSAs studied. This may be a reflection of the recent recession, which has affected job creation and job security in all sectors of the economy, which would also have an effect on creative sector. Findings also suggest the growth of the lower wage service economy, in which wages are stagnant due to the recession; and where more low paying jobs are created to serve the creative class than jobs are created for creatives and entrepreneurs.

Further, larger increases in the creative class in the suburbs than in cities can be indicative of a number of things, particularly as it comes to the methodological issues associated with separating out the cities from the rest of the MSA—that is, trying to analyze these data at a smaller aerial unit than the MSA, at which creative class hypotheses are often postulated. Such data also indicate where these people live and not necessarily where they work. For example, an individual may live in the suburbs but commute to work in a creative industry in the city. Such an individual, using these data, would be considered a member of the creative class in the suburbs even though their creative job is located in a city. The lack of intra-MSA work in the

creative class literature is a common critique and needs to be considered in future work (Peck 2005).

Methodological advances and changes must be made to better investigate issues related to reurbanization. For example, since the creative class theory was proposed, there has been a proliferation of literature with suggestions about how to alter measurement of the creative class at the macro level using census data. Initial work on the creative class only allows for measurement based on primary fulltime occupations. The assertions made about the creative class in terms of their day-to-day preferences may not be supported if the analysis is restricted to census data. According to the literature, the only measurable census definitions of the creative class are individuals' occupations, educational attainment, and MSA of residence. Their appreciation for tolerance and diversity can be further evaluated quantitatively at the census tract or census bloc level data and by examination of racial residential segregation.

Similarly, studying the creative class only at the MSA level is difficult. While MSAs are so defined because of their strong economic networks binding neighborhoods together, it does not allow much room for interpretation regarding the creative class using other geographic boundaries. For instance, the claim that increased creative class participation improves MSA economies leaves behind a breadth of questions regarding communities in the MSA that may not be improving at the same rate, such as in suburbs or particular neighborhoods. Studying suburbs on a macro scale is also difficult. Studies have compared suburbs and cities within metropolitan areas, but it is difficult to study, for example, all of the suburbs in a number of MSAs without delving into more micro level data.

Lastly, the use of census data is problematic in studying such trends. While I was able to answer a few questions about the characteristics of suburbanites and urban dwellers in this new

creative economy, there are a number of characteristics that the census just does not collect. For instance, the race and ethnicity questions and answer options can be difficult schemas for Americans and foreigners to identify themselves; some MSAs of interest to this study were just not available using census or IPUMS data; and a number of variables that would help determine the mobility of residents within MSAs, from cities to suburbs, and vice versa, were not available for the years nor some MSAs of interest.

However, moving forward with the findings gleaned from this study, there are a number of questions to be answered and more work to be done. This research could be expanded to include a larger number of MSAs known to have experienced urban renewal and an influx of the creative class, as well as MSAs with increases in suburban poverty, to study these phenomena at a larger geographic scale. Similarly, this research could be elaborated upon to indicate more reasons why desuburbanization and reurbanization trends are occurring. This study has only begun to examine the relationship between the creative class and suburban poverty, and more work needs to be done to describe and define the factors involved in the processes. Current research, including this study, provide a strong theoretical foundation for the cyclical relationship between suburbs and cities, as well as the beginnings of practical and methodological approaches to study such phenomena.

Some of the findings of this study concern the nature and assumptions of the creative class literature. This study suggests that MSAs show variability with regards to demographic trends, and further assumes that the histories and policies of these MSAs also vary greatly. However, heavily quantitative creative class literature assumes that creative policies would affect each MSA positively and similarly, and that MSAs are starting with similar racial, economic, and social structures. For example, Detroit, MI, an MSA with great creative class potential

according to the literature, is one of the poorest MSAs in this sample, has the largest black population out of the 23 MSAs, and yet has the largest creative class population in its suburbs. An MSA like Detroit does not necessarily fit the mold. Compared to Washington, D.C. or Austin, TX, both exemplary of Creative Class literature and creative policies, Detroit, MI has experienced a longer history of poverty and residential segregation. Furthermore, New Orleans, LA was selected for this study as a case of particular interest to me even though it regularly shows in the creative class literature as less likely to succeed, that is, least creative. However, as it comes to the creative class and other demographic measures in this study, it is comparable to the other MSAs.

The variability of the MSAs with regards to the creative class calls for more quantitative research to compare more MSAs to one another and find out where the similarities, if any, are between them as it comes to creative reurbanization. Such research would require a more strategic sampling plan and a larger sample. From heavily quantitative work, qualitative work should be done to further explore the nuances of MSAs that serve as outliers. Further, this research would benefit from the examination of smaller aerial units within the MSAs, such as block groups, for example.

This research has laid the foundation for a number of future studies. A strength of this study is inclusion of race and ethnicity, poverty, and the possibility of uneven economic development throughout a single MSA in the creative class conversation. More particular to the creative class literature, this study calls into question the omission of history of place, and the lack of racial and socioeconomic measures in the large-scale quantitative analysis of the creative class and the creative policy suggestions gleaned from the literature. I look forward to more qualitative studies that further analyze how the creative class literature works in favor or to the

detriment of particular MSAs, including more directed discussions regarding race and socioeconomics, gentrification, and displacement. Further, I expect more research to delve into cities and suburbs that are negatively affected by the emergence of the creative class. That is, this study has shown a dark side of the creative class, particularly with regards to poverty in the suburbs and the implicit racial effects of a purely economic argument. This concept of the dark side of the creative class requires further investigation and lends itself to qualitative work that is more inclusive of a variety of demographic variables and indicators that are lacking in the current creative class literature.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, Brian J. Stults, Gilbert Marzan, and Wenquan Zhang. 1999. "Immigrant Groups in the Suburbs: A Reexamination of Suburbanization and Spatial Assimilation." *American Sociological Review* 64:446-460.
- Allan, Nicole. 2014. "The Suburbanization of American Poverty." *The Atlantic*, January 22. Retrieved October 8, 2014 (<http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2010/01/the-suburbanization-of-american-poverty/34012/>).
- Bell, Daniel. 1973. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Berube, Alan and Elizabeth Kneebone. December 2006. *Two Steps Back: City and Suburban Poverty Trends 1999-2005*. Brookings Institution. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution. Retrieved October 8, 2014 (<http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2006/12/poverty-berube>).
- Borer, Michael Ian. 2006. "The Location of Culture: The Urban Culturalist Perspective." *City & Community* 5(2):173-197.
- Brown-Saracino, Japonica. 2004. "Social Preservationists and the Quest for Authentic Community." *City & Community* 3(2):135-156.
- Burgess, Ernest W. 2005 (1925). "The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project." Pp. 73-81 in *The Urban Sociology Reader*, edited by J. Lin and C. Mele. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Campanella, Richard. 2014. "Gentrification and Its Discontents: Notes from New Orleans," *NewGeography.com*, March 1, pp. A 01. Retrieved May 1, 2014 (<http://www.newgeography.com/content/003526-gentrification-and-its-discontents-notes-new-orleans>).
- CityLab (Eds.). "The Future of Detroit." *The Atlantic*. June 12, 2012. Retrieved December 6, 2014 (<http://www.citylab.com/work/2012/06/future-detroit/2237/>).
- Creative Class Group. 2008. "Who's Your City?" Retrieved December 6, 2014 (http://www.creativeclass.com/_v3/whos_your_city/).
- Fainstein, Susan S. and David Gladstone. 1999. "Evaluating Urban Tourism." Pp. 21-34 in *The Tourist City*, edited by D.R. Judd and S.S. Fainstein. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fainstein, Susan S. and Dennis R. Judd. 1999. "Cities as Places to Play." Pp. 261-272 in *The Tourist City*, edited by D.R. Judd and S.S. Fainstein. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Florida, Richard. 2005 (2003). "Cities and the Creative Class." Pp. 290-301 in *The Urban Sociology Reader*, edited by J. Lin and C. Mele. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Florida, Richard. 2008. "The Buffalo Mega-Region: Bigger Than We Know." *The Buffalo News*. June 15, 2008. Retrieved December 6, 2014 (<http://www.creativeclass.com/rfcgdb/articles/The%20Buffalo%20Mega-Region%20%20Bigger%20Than%20We%20Know.pdf>).
- Florida, Richard. 2010. "Bohemian Index." *The Atlantic*. June 4, 2010. Retrieved December 6, 2014 (<http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2010/06/bohemian-index/57658/>).
- Florida, Richard. 2012. *The Rise of the Creative Class Revisited*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Florida, Richard. 2013. "The Boom Towns and Ghost Towns of the New Economy." *The Atlantic*. September 18, 2013. Retrieved December 6, 2014 (<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2013/10/the-boom-towns-and-ghost-towns-of-the-new-economy/309460/>).
- Gans, Herbert. 2005 (1968). "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Reevaluation of Definitions." Pp. 42-50 in *The Urban Sociology Reader*, edited by J. Lin and C. Mele. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gans, Herbert. 1967. "The Vitality of Community Culture." Pp. 185-219 in *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community*. New York, NY: Random House (Vintage Books).
- Ghaziani, Amin. 2014. *There Goes the Gayborhood?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gotham, Kevin Fox. 2005. "Tourism Gentrification: The Case of New Orleans's Vieux Carre (French Quarter)." *Urban Studies* 42(7):1099-1121.
- Grodach, Carl. 2013. "Cultural Economy Planning in Creative Cities: Discourse and Practice." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37.5:1747-1765.
- Hardwick, Susan W. 2008. "Toward a Suburban Immigrant Nation." Pp. 31-52 in *Twenty-First-Century Gateways*, edited by A. Singer, S.W. Hardwick, C.B. Brettell, and H.G. Cisneros. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Holliday, Amy L. and Rachel E. Dwyer. 2009. "Suburban Neighborhood Poverty in U.S. Metropolitan Areas in 2000." *City & Community* 8(2):155-176.
- Howell, Aaron J. and Jeffrey M. Timberlake. 2013. "Racial and Ethnic Trends in the Suburbanization of Poverty in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1980-2010." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 26(1):79-98.

- Jackson, Kenneth T. 1985. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. "Unslumming and slumming." Pp. 270-290 in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Jargowsky, Paul A. and Yoon Hwan Park. 2009. "Cause or Consequence?: Suburbanization and Crime in the U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Crime & Delinquency* 55:28-50.
- Klinenberg, Eric. 2012. *Going Solo: The Extraordinary Rise and Surprising Appeal of Living Alone*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Kopecky, Karen A. and Richard M.H. Suen. 2010. "A Quantitative Analysis of Suburbanization and the Diffusion of the Automobile." *International Economic Review* 51(4):1003-1037.
- Knopp, Lawrence. 1990. "Some Theoretical Implications of Gay Involvement in an Urban Land Market." *Political Geography Quarterly* 9(4): 337-352.
- Lee, Sugie. 2011. "Analyzing Intra-metropolitan Poverty Differentiation: Causes and Consequences of Poverty Expansion to Suburbs in the Metropolitan Atlanta Region." *Annals of Regional Science* 46(1):37-57.
- Lloyd, Richard. 2002. "Neo-Bohemia: Art and Neighborhood Redevelopment in Chicago." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24(5):517-532.
- Logan, John R. and Charles Zhang. 2010. "Global Neighborhoods: New Pathways to Diversity and Separation." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(4):1069-1109.
- Lucy, William H. and David L. Phillips. 2000. *Confronting Suburban Decline: Strategic Planning for Metropolitan Renewal*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Luhby, Tami. 2013. "Suburban Poverty Soars." *CNN Money*. May 20, 2013. Retrieved December 6, 2014 (http://economy.money.cnn.com/2013/05/20/suburban-poverty-soars/?iid=HP_LN).
- Yellin, Tal. "Increase in Suburban Poor Population" Interactive Graphic. *CNN Money (Brookings Institution)*. Retrieved December 6, 2014 (<http://money.cnn.com/interactive/economy/suburban-poverty/>).
- Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1985. "Spatial Assimilation As a Socioeconomic Outcome." *American Sociological Review* 50:94-106.
- McGranahan, David and Timothy Wojan. 2007. "Recasting the Creative Class to Examine Growth Processes in Rural and Urban Counties." *Regional Studies* 41(2):197-216.

- Murphy, Alexandra K. 2007. "The Suburban Ghetto: The Legacy of Herbert Gans in Understanding the Experience of Poverty in Recently Impoverished American Suburbs." *City & Community* 6(1):21-37.
- Park, Robert E, Ernest W. Burgess, Roderick D. McKenzie, and Morris Janowitz. 1967 (1925). *The City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Peck, Jamie. 2005. "Struggling with the Creative Class." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29.4:740-777.
- Phillips, Barbara E. 1996. "Making Connections." Pp. 167-200 in *City Lights: Urban-Suburban Life in the Global Society, 2nd ed.*, edited by B. Phillips. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ryberg, Stephanie R., Mark Salling, and Gregory Soltis. 2012. "Putting Artists on the Map: The Geography of Artists in Cuyahoga County, Ohio." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 35(2):219-245.
- Shaw, Samuel and Daniel Monroe Sullivan. 2011. "'White Night': Gentrification, Racial Exclusion, and Perceptions and Participations in the Arts." *City & Community* 10(3):241-264.
- Shihadeh, Edward S. and Graham C. Ousey. 1996. "Metropolitan Expansion and Black Social Dislocation: The Link Between Suburbanization and Center-City Crime." *Social Forces* 75(2):649-666.
- Singer, Audrey. 2008. "Twenty-First-Century Gateways: An Introduction." Pp. 3-30 in *Twenty-First-Century Gateways*, edited by A. Singer, S.W. Hardwick, C.B. Brettell, and H.G. Cisneros. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Singer, Audrey, Susan W. Hardwick, Caroline B. Brettell, and Henry G. Cisneros (Eds.). 2008. *Twenty-First-Century Gateways*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Smith, Neil. 1979. "Toward a Theory of Gentrification: A Back to the City Movement by Capital, Not People." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45:538-548.
- Soja, Edward W. 2000. "The Third Urban Revolution: Modernity and Urban-industrial Capitalism (Chapter 3)." Pp. 71-94 in *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*, edited by E.W. Soja. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Szasz, Andrew. 2009. "Suburbanization as Inverted Quarantine (Chapter 2)." Pp. 56-95 in *Shopping Our Way to Safety*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wilson, William Julius. 2008. "The Political and Economic Forces Shaping Concentrated Poverty." *Political Science Quarterly* 123(4):555-571.

- Wilson, William Julius. 2009. "The Forces Shaping Concentrated Poverty." Pp. 25-61 in *More Than Just Race*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Wirth, Louis. 2005 (1930). "Urbanism As a Way of Life." Pp. 32-41 in *The Urban Sociology Reader*, edited by J. Lin and C. Mele. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zukin, Sharon. 2008. "Consuming Authenticity." *Cultural Studies* 22(5):724-748.
- Zukin, Sharon. 2010. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

Table A1. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables, 2000.

Area	Socioeconomics						Race & Ethnicity					Household Characteristics			
	Creative Class	House Value	Household Income	Hours Worked	Education	Home Owned	In Poverty	White	Black	Asian	Other Race	Hispanic	Living Alone	No Children	Married
Ann Arbor, MI (MSA)	37.62	215526.9	81460.75	38.89859	6.677397	75.23	30.22352	85.45	7.32	1.99	3.16	2.23	9.96	71.76	43.04
City	44.47	228086.7	74993.21	36.44406	7.863189	51.55	23.68542	77.07	8.39	10.63	3.9	3.33	15.78	80.28	32.92
Suburbs	35.31	213395.5	83197.9	39.71837	6.320086	81.59	36.41871	87.93	7	2.14	2.93	1.9	8.4	69.24	46.03
Austin, TX (MSA)	39.67	164766.9	74002.71	40.17131	6.296195	65.36	36.29651	72.7	7.34	3.51	16.46	25.93	9.76	71.52	40.99
City	40	163306.8	66481.89	39.53703	6.436483	52.21	36.34006	64.44	9.97	4.63	20.96	31.63	13.06	75.31	35.6
Suburbs	39.29	165786.1	81976.5	40.88851	6.147131	79.3	36.20671	81.53	4.53	2.32	11.62	19.82	6.26	67.48	46.76
Boise City, ID (MSA)	31.19	142191	59190.53	39.55849	5.867645	74.41	46.26649	88.77	0.39	1.27	9.56	10	8.2	70.11	44.49
City	35.71	145737.5	63675.48	39.36097	6.413283	68.61	42.96017	92.64	0.71	1.89	4.77	3.41	11.56	71.93	42.22
Suburbs	28.01	140187.7	56305.05	39.70053	5.506043	78.14	48.16858	86.28	0.19	0.87	3.65	14.25	6.04	68.94	45.96
Boston, MA-NH (MSA)	38.77	280700.2	85431.74	38.9558	6.562472	66.57	33.44191	82.25	6.19	4.98	6.58	6.98	10.85	70.41	41
City	34.55	250460.6	59984.33	39.01992	6.459196	36.04	34.53603	53.66	25.25	7.33	13.74	14.97	15.28	77.41	28.16
Suburbs	39.53	283355.6	89891.27	38.94444	6.58087	71.92	32.96204	87.38	2.78	4.55	5.29	5.54	10.08	69.15	43.31
Chicago, IL (MSA)	33.57	203716.3	76579.1	39.59506	5.966687	71.78	39.54552	67.48	17.91	4.16	10.45	16.28	9.17	68.8	40.89
City	29.09	176664.6	58150.89	39.6342	5.7029	51.64	41.43207	42.38	35.57	4.39	17.67	26.78	11.51	72.3	31.42
Suburbs	35.34	211026.5	84316.19	39.58016	6.076078	80.23	37.35874	78.08	10.46	4.07	7.4	11.85	8.19	67.33	44.89
Dayton-Springfield, OH (MSA)	29.46	122838	52005.43	38.8304	5.871601	71.21	37.06478	82.93	13.54	1.13	2.41	1.26	11.4	71.73	42.9
City	22.09	73265.07	39591.13	37.90793	5.506504	54.95	35.94978	52.37	44.15	0.69	2.79	1.58	16.3	76.47	27.91
Suburbs	30.65	129610.6	62827.56	38.9947	5.941553	74.2	37.69639	88.86	7.59	1.21	2.33	1.2	10.5	70.81	45.81
Denver-Boulder, CO (MSA)	38.17	216452.5	73959.84	39.87222	6.302765	70.4	41.8805	79.29	5.02	3.08	12.61	19.04	11.14	71.58	41.86
City	35.09	197788	61937.89	39.99366	6.293233	57.22	44.37893	65.34	10.61	2.8	21.25	31.94	16.94	76.78	35.07
Suburbs	39.29	221577.8	78295.26	39.82864	6.306199	75.15	40.17148	84.35	2.99	3.18	9.48	14.36	9.05	69.7	44.31
Des Moines, IA (MSA)	33.42	122648.8	66000.53	39.24742	6.186581	75.57	34.36306	88.85	4.62	2.19	4.35	4.1	10.92	71.44	45.26
City	28.72	94836.43	53562.36	38.49384	5.967202	71.03	35.38314	83.61	7.87	2.58	5.95	5.71	13.39	73.48	41.08
Suburbs	38.73	150054.3	79915.51	40.06632	6.436407	80.64	31.36677	94.89	0.87	1.73	2.51	2.24	8.16	69.09	50.09

Detroit, MI (MSA)	31.36	163854.3	71283.51	39.77629	5.851296	76.88	42.32179	72.08	22	2.18	3.73	3.08	10.38	69.42	40.19
City	19.49	73084.05	46300.05	39.11151	5.144529	57.43	43.0991	12.47	80.95	0.93	5.64	5.15	10.66	72.12	23.28
Suburbs	33.94	180296.8	77737.07	39.91235	6.029072	81.9	41.64684	87.54	6.71	2.52	3.23	2.55	10.31	68.72	44.57
Fort Collins- Loveland, CO (MSA)	36.07	200387.9	68022.64	38.17421	6.588308	72.31	35.14055	91.58	0.59	1.57	6.26	8.03	8.67	72.9	43.89
City	38.46	191994.7	65063.84	36.93455	7.005151	61.78	32.20579	90.81	0.88	2.34	5.96	7.62	10.57	76.73	37.96
Suburbs	33.55	205856.8	70561.03	39.5011	6.202976	81.35	43.61194	92.29	0.31	0.87	6.52	8.41	7.05	69.39	49.33
Huntsville, AL (MSA)	36.17	121763.5	62050.13	39.39	6.045637	75.02	40.01348	73.6	21.51	1.33	3.55	2	10.35	69.92	45.41
City	39.82	131880.3	65678.26	38.75249	6.401946	67.72	40.68809	63.77	30.74	1.68	3.81	1.9	13.26	73.54	41.75
Suburbs	32.95	114401.3	58876.2	39.95808	5.729086	81.41	39.27007	82.2	13.43	1.03	3.34	2.09	7.79	66.76	48.6
Kansas City, KS- MO (MSA)	32.52	131183.5	65679.29	39.83004	6.035093	73.84	40.56032	81.87	11.8	1.56	4.78	5.04	10.67	70.46	43.81
City	28.59	96376.37	52916.82	39.61138	5.834603	64.08	40.8669	60.85	29.86	1.66	7.64	9.09	13.3	73.1	36.14
Suburbs	34.44	145289.5	72031.15	39.93372	6.13428	78.7	40.19028	92.38	2.76	1.5	3.35	3.01	9.33	69.14	47.65
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA (MSA)	33.7	271041.5	69305.23	39.27403	5.682538	53.5	45.44865	51.75	7.34	12.73	28.18	41.91	7.74	68.96	38.36
City	33.25	283300.3	61599.29	39.13762	5.589529	41.99	45.77924	46.45	10.52	10.25	32.78	46.81	9.69	71.15	35.28
Suburbs	33.89	267341.2	72536.87	39.33102	5.721142	58.33	45.23245	53.98	6	13.76	26.24	39.84	6.92	68.04	39.65
Madison, WI (MSA)	34.82	181326.6	72234.12	38.30575	6.615231	69.64	31.60485	90.3	2.97	3.09	3.64	3.31	10.63	73.77	44.13
City	38.03	160778.5	64872.55	36.85459	7.153808	55.04	28.92699	83.79	5.09	6.27	4.84	4.55	15.2	80.36	36.74
Suburbs	32.36	190392.8	76889.3	39.40369	6.234233	78.88	41.47654	94.82	1.5	0.88	2.8	2.45	7.74	69.2	49.26
New Orleans, LA (MSA)	29.35	121874.2	52596.35	39.61764	5.641256	64.38	44.15164	56.4	38.22	2.14	3.25	4.64	10.89	70.03	34.56
City	29.32	128908.7	46781.98	38.75	5.786534	48.85	42.39842	29.67	65.83	1.88	2.61	3.29	13.66	73.62	25.45
Suburbs	29.37	119059.2	56056.34	40.10302	5.553776	73.76	46.29344	72.55	21.54	2.29	3.62	5.45	9.24	67.91	40.07
New York- Northeastern New Jersey, NY-NJ (MSA)	34.25	274819.7	81692.97	39.37362	6.116596	56.82	39.98231	62.39	16.99	7.53	13.08	19.39	9.4	68.37	40.44
City	31.63	270039.7	62373.53	39.51615	5.903043	35.77	41.44429	45.36	25.08	9.98	19.51	27.06	11.64	70.54	34.86
Suburbs	35.96	276520.1	95498.35	39.2837	6.266469	71.86	37.4784	74.56	11.21	5.74	8.5	13.91	7.8	66.82	44.43
Philadelphia, PA- NJ (MSA)	32.95	157208.9	73331.73	38.91786	6.036923	76.6	36.94928	75.08	17.43	3.17	4.32	4.85	10.08	69.3	41.6
City	26.05	76497.69	47413.76	38.13711	5.592382	64.79	39.2039	46.4	41.91	4.14	7.55	8.56	13.69	73.28	29.75
Suburbs	34.83	177124.2	81249.22	39.11754	6.173047	80.21	34.85009	83.98	9.84	2.86	3.33	3.71	8.98	68.06	45.28

Portland, OR-WA (MSA)	34	210670.7	66826.31	39.05216	6.205631	66.69	43.95511	83.87	2.84	4.95	8.35	7.24	10.56	71.71	42.6
City	34.38	204074.2	62470.14	38.59318	6.528063	61.02	39.93198	78.07	6.31	6.54	9.08	6.53	14.93	76.45	36.86
Suburbs	33.81	213185.6	68708.09	39.26882	6.059949	69.14	46.91177	86.44	1.31	4.25	8.01	7.55	8.67	69.62	45.15
Richmond-Petersburg, VA (MSA)	33.9	147756.3	67350.4	39.81206	6.079609	71.99	37.94244	65.35	29.59	2.04	3.03	6.27	10.53	70.46	41.89
City	31.87	138834.7	54059.58	39.14402	6.13274	51.03	42.51831	38.97	56.95	1.1	2.98	2.44	16.86	77.63	28.12
Suburbs	34.36	149144.8	70467.99	39.96159	6.06713	76.91	35.17242	71.59	23.11	2.27	3.04	2.23	9.04	68.77	45.15
Rochester, NY (MSA)	30.85	112727.5	62593.83	38.29614	6.032184	74.05	37.79792	84.32	9.58	1.64	4.46	4.33	10.59	71.32	41.78
City	25.23	73327.27	42608.65	38.13454	5.549989	43.55	42.23054	47.04	37.76	2.28	12.92	13.38	15.44	75.97	25.14
Suburbs	32.08	117689.3	67286.86	38.33049	6.143864	81.21	34.52094	93.22	2.85	1.49	2.43	2.17	9.45	70.21	45.75
Seattle-Everett, WA (MSA)	39.16	268670	78970.4	39.30177	6.56472	68.45	41.20901	78.57	4.04	9.63	7.76	5.18	11.3	72.17	42.45
City	43.07	313686.2	76313.99	38.82652	7.381745	55.95	39.03244	70.66	8.09	13.29	7.96	5.07	19.18	80.44	34.46
Suburbs	37.8	258274.5	79761.82	39.46953	6.308244	72.18	42.44874	81	2.8	8.49	7.71	5.21	8.95	69.63	45.01
Washington, DC (MSA)	42	231618	90094.61	40.56741	6.605774	68.08	34.48576	59.83	25.97	6.65	7.56	8.99	9.99	70.05	41.22
City	38.81	238963.4	72217.16	40.0392	6.552178	44.5	31.09288	29.4	61.32	2.54	6.73	7.71	19.91	78.84	24.76
Suburbs	42.44	230998.3	92509.79	40.63654	6.613446	71.27	36.09622	64.14	20.96	6.94	7.67	9.17	8.66	68.8	43.55
Worcester, MA (MSA)	32.03	165082.5	64003.94	38.42447	6.108889	62.69	36.30066	84.69	4.25	3.91	7.14	9.55	11.84	71.63	39.42
City	27.75	132804.6	52090.94	38.06577	5.874711	47.25	36.70366	77.25	6.72	4.85	11.18	15.47	13.66	74.06	33.52
Suburbs	37.74	189819.4	80169.31	38.88858	6.431486	83.65	34.41711	95.15	0.79	2.59	1.47	1.24	9.35	68.22	47.7

Table A2. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables, 2010.

Area	Creative Class	House Value	Socioeconomics			Home Owned	In Poverty	Race & Ethnicity					Household Characteristics		
			Household Income	Hours Worked	Education			White	Black	Asian	Other Race	Hispanic	Living Alone	No Children	Married
Ann Arbor (MSA)	31.08	236540.2	93500.27	36.74342	6.927102	79.01	32.14626	84.44	6.6	5.01	3.94	2.95	11.13	72.26	45
City	40.09	277009.3	98951.05	34.61538	7.85051	54.55	24.944	74.45	4.96	13.67	7.93	4.19	17.67	82.38	34.03
Suburbs	28.52	230772.2	92298.09	37.36618	6.693673	84.41	36.8971	86.9	7.01	3.14	2.95	2.65	9.69	66.77	47.68
Austin, TX (MSA)	35.13	274476	89608.81	38.76654	6.682741	67.16	42.26987	77.65	6.38	5.83	10.14	26.71	11.26	72.03	41.02
City	36.59	293504.8	80852.76	38.01487	6.884115	54.89	41.11103	73.15	7.72	6.17	12.96	31.47	15.42	76.24	34.43
Suburbs	33.89	263800.9	96480.47	39.40765	6.524374	76.79	44.17186	81.23	5.32	5.56	7.89	22.94	7.98	68.69	46.25
Boise City, ID (MSA)	25.43	218317.1	70612.32	37.5293	6.134827	75.05	47.65939	92.2	0.71	2.09	5	11.18	9.2	72.08	44.02
City	30.41	254371.1	76321.39	37.28353	6.704398	65.9	46.2973	91.19	1.39	3.37	4.05	5.37	14.42	75.5	40.43
Suburbs	22.66	203805.6	67840.95	37.6679	5.8505	79.48	48.42155	92.69	0.38	1.47	5.46	14.01	6.67	70.42	45.77
Boston, MA-NH (MSA)	33.39	483361.9	114856.7	37.43308	6.995977	71.38	36.45653	81.19	6.18	6.71	5.91	7.76	11.95	71.45	41.65
City	32.06	473944.1	87227.24	37.48992	7.069849	42.15	35.65741	56.64	23.66	9.25	10.46	14.69	18	79.25	27.85
Suburbs	33.62	484164.6	119094.2	37.42348	6.984217	75.86	36.80006	85.13	3.37	6.32	5.18	6.65	11.03	70.2	43.86
Chicago, IL (MSA)	28.22	321338.7	93291.79	37.85798	6.487977	74.69	45.00796	86.16	15.47	5.54	8.29	16.89	10.71	69.88	40.78
City	27.22	325486.5	76731.05	38.50391	6.501153	54.12	45.39821	50.83	31.88	5.66	11.64	24.09	14.78	74.55	30.26
Suburbs	28.59	320326.9	99436.6	37.62047	6.483091	82.32	44.67938	78.14	9.32	5.49	7.05	14.19	9.2	68.13	44.72
Dayton-Springfield, OH (MSA)	22.05	157129.4	65120.5	37.03488	6.231621	71.83	42.04803	83.06	12.32	1.85	2.77	2.15	13.71	74.22	42.22
City	16.04	87273.6	41970.19	35.31126	5.800667	56.22	38.99587	55.58	40.47	0.85	3.11	2.71	16.83	77.6	25.27
Suburbs	23.02	165366.3	68726.24	37.29437	6.30083	74.26	43.47394	87.54	7.74	1.92	2.72	2.06	13.23	73.66	44.98
Denver-Boulder, CO (MSA)	33.05	316149	90713.92	38.33648	6.719629	71.56	44.22219	82.48	4.53	3.56	12.34	19.21	12.34	72.44	42.66
City	34.09	318146.1	81804.94	38.92261	6.961195	60.06	45.49493	74.24	8.94	3.2	13.61	26.34	18.97	78.07	34.29
Suburbs	32.72	315671.5	93373.52	38.15326	6.64738	74.99	43.51183	84.97	3.2	3.66	8.17	17.06	10.36	70.74	45.19
Des Moines, IA (MSA)	24.32	191200.5	78505.38	37.74294	6.386338	78.37	39.65583	86.32	4.91	3.64	5.12	6.79	12.15	73.35	43.23
City	19.05	151239.9	61988.62	37.34812	5.994479	71.25	41.18345	80.66	7.62	4.18	7.55	10.99	14.22	75.82	35.16
Suburbs	28.99	222119.7	93736.47	38.07449	6.749817	84.92	34.98901	91.6	2.39	3.14	2.87	2.87	10.24	71.04	50.75
Detroit, MI (MSA)	24.81	168410.6	76388.2	37.38085	6.328257	78.3	47.34534	74.72	18.2	3.54	3.55	3.5	12.29	70.85	40.94

City	12.48	64510.87	42710.61	36.2791	5.633278	58.26	46.05457	12.05	82.11	1	4.83	5.56	16.53	75.01	20.04
Suburbs Fort Collins- Loveland, CO (MSA)	26.36	179820.6	81554.43	37.50154	6.434577	81.38	47.97651	84.51	8.22	3.93	3.34	3.17	11.63	70.2	44.21
City	30.56	304895.4	83632.35	36.62246	7.16506	72.07	40.86162	91.64	1.03	2.21	5.11	7.02	11.3	75.85	45.75
Suburbs Huntsville, AL (MSA)	29.12	315829.9	87521.15	38.46972	6.998367	79.84	50.625	93.31	0.31	1.02	5.3	7.92	10.15	74.23	51.69
City	30.56	290961.3	79653.4	34.97479	7.326482	64.11	35.96078	90.01	1.74	3.33	4.92	6.13	12.47	77.44	39.89
Suburbs Kansas City, KS- MO (MSA)	29.12	315829.9	87521.15	38.46972	6.998367	79.84	50.625	93.31	0.31	1.02	5.3	7.92	10.15	74.23	51.69
City	30.65	216507.2	79020.5	37.50723	6.972067	70.37	39.6214	68.62	25.46	0.46	5.48	4.47	17.18	75.92	41.45
Suburbs Los Angeles- Long Beach, CA (MSA)	33.7	199684.6	90008.92	38.66865	6.393682	83.39	46.79924	80.29	13.93	1.76	4.01	4.14	9.84	62.27	49.64
City	22.1	162562.7	66202.03	38.19805	6.25871	64.64	44.66562	63.81	26.06	2.61	7.52	11.91	14.91	74.9	35.06
Suburbs Madison, WI (MSA)	28.08	212576.8	86524.91	38.29873	6.124068	80.33	44.564	90.87	3.72	2.04	3.37	3.95	10.45	71.71	48.06
City	28.32	553470.7	89677.1	37.39593	6.186044	57.43	48.64938	57.5	6.09	16.5	19.9	41.18	8.62	69.07	38.63
Suburbs New York- Northeastern New Jersey, NY- NJ (MSA)	27.88	580368.8	80183.48	37.32307	6.083032	45.38	49.08721	55.37	8.8	12.24	23.59	46.68	11.06	72.16	34.03
City	28.5	545592.3	93493.49	37.42611	6.22744	62.28	48.36747	58.36	5	18.22	18.41	38.95	7.63	67.81	40.49
Suburbs Philadelphia, PA-NJ (MSA)	32.72	297472.2	93416.06	36.78301	7.044941	74.74	33.74074	91.26	3.05	3.34	2.36	3.42	12.11	73.93	44.56
City	36.47	251133.7	83274.64	35.63647	7.646921	60.85	29.33106	85.74	5.6	5.31	3.35	4.22	18.18	80.49	35.88
Suburbs New York- Northeastern New Jersey, NY- NJ (MSA)	30.47	315575.7	98759.48	37.47372	6.702439	82.06	43.03597	94.42	1.58	2.21	1.79	2.96	8.91	70.18	49.52
City	23.24	207383.4	74729.2	71.73	6.234746	70.79	46.82572	60.96	31.89	3.04	4.1	7.42	12.24	71.73	37.97
Suburbs New York- Northeastern New Jersey, NY- NJ (MSA)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Suburbs New York- Northeastern New Jersey, NY- NJ (MSA)	28.98	554862.8	109376.3	38.3785	6.572886	60.81	44.28771	62.9	16.04	10.6	10.45	19.55	10.63	69.27	39.97
City	26.96	636644.3	86735.88	38.7978	6.423573	39.34	46.57535	47.91	23.93	13.43	14.72	25.39	13.09	72.05	34.07
Suburbs Philadelphia, PA-NJ (MSA)	30.37	524468.6	125689.2	38.09352	6.678548	76.27	40.54729	73.73	10.34	8.55	7.36	15.33	8.86	67.27	44.24
City	27.08	304805.7	97233.57	37.83343	6.538686	78.81	39.26001	74.71	16	4.86	4.45	6.3	11.35	70.32	41.54
Suburbs	20.94	188899.6	59884.18	37.40977	6.204362	62.84	42.32741	46.55	39.37	7.15	6.93	10.59	17.41	75.37	28.76
City	28.49	326797.8	106570.9	37.92647	6.622284	82.8	36.9507	81.86	10.06	4.27	3.82	5.2	9.84	69.03	44.78

Portland, OR- WA (MSA)	29.06	328099.2	82210.04	37.05654	6.653885	70.46	43.29258	84.87	2.52	6.17	6.43	8.08	11.47	72.52	43.23
City	32.18	356900.6	81946.52	36.47338	7.138749	65.52	40.15288	81.4	4.69	7.43	6.47	6.39	15.43	76.92	37.42
Suburbs	27.6	317267	82319.73	37.3306	6.446319	72.52	45.53858	86.35	1.6	5.62	6.42	8.8	9.81	70.64	45.71
Richmond- Petersburg, VA (MSA)	28.25	286996.4	88191.14	38.14957	6.492525	74.93	36.82455	66.94	26.77	3.17	3.12	3.81	11.37	71.84	41.97
City	28.4	327858.9	70783.93	37.04859	6.789049	51.69	39.67594	50.94	42.83	2.58	3.64	5.53	19.66	79.92	26.68
Suburbs	28.21	281823.6	91577.69	38.37458	6.434281	79.45	35.46249	70.11	23.59	3.28	3.03	3.47	9.75	70.24	44.99
Rochester, NY (MSA)	23.92	156119.4	76471.95	36.75756	6.505831	78.33	41.25945	85.61	8.39	2.5	3.5	4.86	11.73	72.83	42.1
City	17.62	107939.8	46741.63	36.18012	5.979436	48.56	42.21773	50	37.58	3.53	8.91	14.2	18.08	78.46	23.49
Suburbs	25.07	161502.4	82223.22	36.857	6.608105	84.09	40.60741	92.72	2.56	2.3	2.42	2.99	10.51	71.71	45.81
Seattle-Everett, WA (MSA)	34.67	451554.3	99729.8	37.81559	6.904642	71.1	42.25508	75.03	3.99	13.51	7.48	7.22	12.04	72.13	44.25
City	40.84	555575.6	100252	37.49244	7.738248	59.39	37.01329	72.45	6.7	14.4	6.45	5.59	20.13	78.84	38.86
Suburbs	32.73	429278	99590.02	37.91898	6.671503	74.23	44.74107	75.74	3.23	13.25	7.77	7.67	9.88	70.27	46.31
Washington, DC (MSA)	37.76	487191.7	128047	39.26487	7.042744	72.87	38.47172	60.12	23.28	9.42	7.18	10.94	10.86	70.09	42.18
City	40.64	651385.9	116213.5	40.06435	7.508063	51.2	33.10207	44.28	47.79	3.2	4.72	7.79	22.86	81.7	25.37
Suburbs	37.4	474367.7	129407.2	39.1665	6.985305	75.36	40.44405	62.05	20.29	10.18	7.48	11.32	9.48	68.67	44.23
Worcester, MA (MSA)	27.45	282804.4	81884.15	36.92691	6.615498	68.91	35.88196	83.66	5.25	6.7	4.4	8.78	12.39	72.22	38.15
City	22.42	226952.4	66767.99	36.41162	6.529006	54.61	37.12828	78.55	8.45	6.21	6.79	15.04	15.04	75.16	32.52
Suburbs	33.17	323447.2	99027.51	37.4993	6.714739	85.12	31.84906	89.64	1.5	7.29	1.58	1.43	9.38	68.77	44.74

VITA

Isabelle Notter was born and raised in New York, NY. She completed her degree at the Trevor Day School in New York in 2008. She then entered Tulane University in New Orleans, LA, and received her Bachelor of Arts in sociology and international development in 2012. In August 2013, she began the sociology Master of Arts program at the University of New Orleans.