Segregation Begins at Home: Gentrification and the Accomplishment of Boundary-work

Judith N. DeSena
(St. John's University)
desenaj@stjohns.edu

Studies on social segregation typically focus on groups separated according to a particular social characteristic. A major part of the discourse on social segregation analyses residential segregation by race and/or ethnicity. Social class is also a residential separator. This paper argues that gentrification creates segregation by social class through the development and operation of 'parallel cultures' within a community. This paper analyses these processes between working class/ lower income residents and newer gentrifiers in Greenpoint, Brooklyn, a community in New York City. Through these separate networks based on social class, boundary-work is accomplished. This occurs primarily through the everyday lives of children. The research presented here is part of a larger study on gentrification. It was carried out mainly through participant observation.
Keywords: segregation, gentrification, social class, social values, boundary-work

Studies on social segregation typically focus on groups separated according to a particular social characteristic. Sociologists view segregation as occurring either voluntarily or involuntarily. A major part of the discourse on social segregation analyses residential segregation by race and/or ethnicity. Investigations examine the various ways that racial groups are institutionally and informally segregated in neighbourhoods. Studies in the U.S. have focused primarily on black-white and white-Hispanic separation (Tauber and Tauber 1965, Farley 1987, Massey and Denton 1993, Charles 2003). Although the U.S. is racially and culturally diverse, an examination of U.S. cities and neighbourhoods up close indicates the continued prevalence of residential segregation by race. On a neighbourhood level, segregation has been accomplished through the work of local institutions (Pearce 1979, Yinger 1995), and has also been conceptualized through informal strategies such as ordered segmentation (Suttles 1968) and the defended neighbourhood (Suttles 1972), and has been maintained by the use of restrictive covenants (Krase 1982), violence (Rieder 1985), and local networks (DeSena 2005). Through these approaches, inequality in America is reproduced and sustained.

Social class is also a residential separator. Increases in income inequality result in greater spatial separation among those affluent and poor (Massey and Fischer 2000: 670). Thus, those wealthy, affluent and poor occupy different social and physical spaces. Neighbourhoods once avoided because of their ethnic flavour or lower socio-economic statuses of residents have become

attractive to gentrifiers. Residential segregation by social class within neighbourhoods occurs as the process of gentrification progresses.

Framing the Study

The concept of gentrification is being defined as 'the conversion of socially marginal and working class areas of the central city to middle-class [and elite] residential use' (Zukin 1987: 129). Although the literature refers to gentrifiers as middle class, this analysis considers them upper middle class with more money and job security than the traditional middle class. Research on gentrification focuses primarily on the causes and consequences of this urban process. Analyses fall into two major theoretical perspectives, ecological theory and critical theory (Wittberg 1992). The ecologists examine the needs, tastes, and desires of populations, which are responsible for precipitating neighbourhood change in the form of gentrification (Laska and Spain 1980; Friedenfels 1992, Bourdieu 1984). Included are studies that examine the strategies used by the middle class to create and produce gentrification in specific neighbourhoods (Kasinitz 1988, Krase 1982). Moreover are research studies focusing on gentrification and school choice. LeGates and Hartman (1986) discuss the preference of gentry parents for private schools in city neighbourhoods, and point to the poor quality of city schools as an explanation for this preference. Gentry families either move to the suburbs or pay for private education for their children. Robson and Butler's study of London (2001) contends that 'the significance and role of education in gentrification processes cannot be generalized. What is crucial is the examination of cases, in particular the interaction between local educational infrastructures and the varying middle-class strategies designed to exploit them' (p. 72). Critical theorists, on the other hand, view the causes of gentrification as manufactured by actions taken by the political economy, namely the investments of capital and the policies of the state (Abu-Lughod 1994; Fitch 1993; Smith 1996; Zukin 1982, 1987).

Some scholars discuss a change in the process of gentrification in the 1990s. Smith (1996) contends that due to the 1987 stock market crash and ensuing recession, degentrification has occurred. For Smith, upper middle class and elite gentrifiers found themselves with lowered property values and forced interactions with minority groups, immigrants, and women as they competed for the urban terrain. Hackworth's study of three gentrifying neighbourhoods in New York City (2002) argues that a major change in gentrification is that the state is investing in the

process more directly than in the past. In addition, corporate developers are the initial migrants prior to gentrifiers more so than before when they followed pioneers. Moreover, the actions by ordinary people against gentrification have been marginalized in that their concerns are dismissed by those in power.

The discourse on gentrification documents the benefits and costs of this process on the local community. The literature profiles most gentrifiers as affluent, young, single, urban professionals, and young, married couples who are both wage earners and have no children, or small families. This segment of the population is credited with revitalizing older, city neighbourhoods, and by extension, the city itself through housing improvements and loft conversions, service upgrades, and an expansion of the local economy with the introduction of new restaurants and retail establishments. Studies dealing with the consequences of gentrification on neighbourhoods examine primarily housing, and present increasing housing costs and displacement of existing populations as outcomes (Cybriwsky 1978, Marcuse 1986, LeGates and Hartman 1986). Thus, in general, the major consequence of gentrification documented in the literature is the displacement or 'replacement' (Freeman and Braconi 2004) of ordinary people and small businesses to more affluent groups, sometimes elites, as well as the transition of 'mom and pop' businesses to retail chains and boutiques.

There is a debate in the literature regarding the extent and effect of displacement. Some scholars minimize dislocation as a 'natural' consequence of competition over residential space (Ellen and O' Regan 2011, Freeman 2006, Freeman and Braconi 2004, Hamnet 2003). In addition, policy makers who promote gentrification, argue that the process creates social mixing among various classes, perhaps leading to social integration. This article and additional empirical evidence (Lees 2008) suggest otherwise. The result of gentrification is not increased social mixing or diversity. In fact, another outcome is that ordinary people have fewer choices regarding places of residence and industrial work, since affordable neighbourhoods with viable industry are diminished by gentrification. Moreover, classic market protections, such as public housing and rental housing with regulations are diminished by proponents of gentrification through condominium developments and altered social policy (Newman and Wyly 2006).

The literature on gentrification analyses both, the gentrifiers and those residents most directly affected by gentrification. Of this last type, most investigate low income, black neighbourhoods experiencing gentrification by whites. In some cases, tensions and disagreements

between established residents and newcomers are presented (DeSena 2009); however, this is balanced by some of the positive benefits brought by gentrifiers, such as the use of their social and human capital to bring about local improvements (Freeman 2006). In other cases, renters and longtime black residents are less likely to have a positive view of gentrification (Sullivan 2007). Additional studies examine white gentrification to mostly ethnic and immigrant neighbourhoods (Betancur 2011, Martinez 2010, Murdie and Teixeira 2010). For these groups, gentrification created not only spatial displacement, but also the dissolution of the ethnic community.

Gentrification is a process of neighbourhood change which is presently occurring globally. World cities, such as London, New York and Toronto have been a focus of research. More recent studies have examined and compared other cities as well. Krase (2005, 2012) compared gentrification in neighbourhoods in Krakow, Poland and Greenpoint, Brooklyn indicating many historical similarities and visual connections. His analysis suggests that gentrification stems from global forces. In Paris, the focus is on 'bobo' (bohemian-bourgeois) areas ('Shop by Shop, Paris Reclaims Bagnolet' 2012) and increasing gentrification in neighbourhoods in various arrondisement of the city (Keramitas 2010, Santucci 2012).

This paper argues that gentrification creates segregation by social class through the creation and maintenance of 'parallel cultures' (DeSena 2009) within a community. This concept is used to suggest that the working class and gentry operate in their own social groups within the neighbourhood, while co-existing with the other. They experience physical proximity as well as social distance (Simmel 1950). Within each local culture, residents live by a series of social values, some of which are revealed in this paper. These values are acted upon and played out by residents in the course of their everyday lives. This paper analyses these processes in Greenpoint, Brooklyn between working class/ lower income/immigrant residents and newer gentrifiers. Through these separate networks based on social class, boundary-work is accomplished. Boundary-work refers to the maintenance of social distance between groups. This occurs primarily through the everyday lives of children indicating the different social values embraced by each group.

Doing the Study

This is a qualitative study of gentrification in Greenpoint, which means that years have been spent engaged in various community settings with both gentrifiers and working class residents. This investigation was carried out through participant observation. An urban, ethnographic

investigation allows this researcher to analyse the everyday dynamics among and between groups of residents. The methodology applies classic anthropological methods (Pardo and Prato 2012) which are shared by some urban sociologists. Gentrification has been this researcher's focus since 1996 and was investigated by moving around playgrounds and playgroups within the neighbourhood with my children, and meeting many (mostly) mothers and children who were relatively new residents, and lacked the social ties and attachments of long-term residents. Unlike working class residents, the professional and technical status of gentrifiers surfaced as discussions ensued regarding work, experiences in college and graduate school, residential history, and aspirations for our children's education. The research style was unobtrusive and employed listening closely to daily conversations among parents, and asking questions of them as a neighbour and 'new' mother. The same technique was used with working class/lower income/immigrant residents. This was accomplished by moving in and out of various local settings which allowed opportunities to engage with each group for comparison. For example, my children played both, soccer and basketball. As will be discussed later in this paper, in Greenpoint, each sport league is primarily comprised of gentry and working class families, respectively. Field notes were assembled immediately following interactions.

The Neighbourhood

Greenpoint is a peninsula at the northernmost tip of Brooklyn. Greenpoint lies across the river from Manhattan. The Empire State building and the Chrysler building are visible from Greenpoint, looming far above the low scale buildings in the community. Greenpoint is also connected to neighbourhoods in Queens (Long Island City, Sunnyside, and Maspeth) by the Pulaski, the Greenpoint Avenue and the Kosciusko Bridges. The Kosciusko Bridge also links the Brooklyn—Queens Expressway with the Long Island Expressway.

Adjacent to Greenpoint in Brooklyn, lying just across its southern boundary is Williamsburg. Greenpoint and Williamsburg share the administration of many municipal services, and together, they make up Brooklyn's Community Board 1, an extension of New York City government in the community.

Gentrifying Greenpoint

Greenpoint is also home to people of a variety of social classes. Residents are poor, working class,

middle class, and upper middle class. Among the higher socioeconomic status groups are gentrifiers. Greenpoint has been a working class community for most of its history. Greenpoint's poor and working classes are being displaced by a very expensive housing market driven by gentrification.

In 2010, the total population of Greenpoint was 33,863 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Tract Data, 2010). Like New York City as a whole, the population exhibited small increases since 2000. There were few changes in the racial profile of the neighbourhood in that a majority of the neighbourhood remained white. However, in 2010 there was a decline of Hispanic residents. This is in contrast to a decrease of non-Hispanic whites and an increase of Hispanics citywide. The formal education of Greenpoint's residents has increased from 2000 to 2010. By 2010, the largest group of residents held Bachelor's degrees. This is a dramatic change since 1980. By 2010, the median household income in Greenpoint also increased. In terms of occupation, in 2010, management and business professionals constituted the largest group, followed by service occupations. This is in contrast to 1980 when the largest occupational group was in technical and sales followed by operators and labourers. The persistence and growth of a mostly white community, coupled with an increase of formal education and income among the population, and a shift to significantly more professionals and less labourers than in the past are indicators supporting the growth of a gentrifying neighbourhood (Mason 2011).

In terms of housing in 2000, 81 per cent of households in Greenpoint are renters, and about a quarter of these are not rent regulated (Scott 2003). Furthermore, 'The percentage of affordable housing in Greenpoint is dropping faster than it is in New York City as a whole. The percentage of rental units in the most expensive category is skyrocketing' (Scott 2003: 7). The notion of affordability is defined as being no more than 30 per cent of a household's income going toward rental costs. In Greenpoint in 2000, 'about 40% of households paid more than 30% of their income on rent' (Scott 2003: 9). Market rate rents for a two bedroom apartment in Greenpoint in 2002 ranged from $1500 to $1900 (Scott 2003: 16). This represents a 50 per cent increase since 1997. Additional indicators of gentrification within the housing sector are featured in articles in the local newspapers discussing 'skyrocketing rents', and 'loft regulations urged' (Greenline 2001). Houses are selling for $600,000 (for a two family) and upwards, especially in the historic district (Mooney 2009).

Greenpoint has been a community envied. It was historically white, stable, affordable, physically well kept, with high occupancy rates, low crime, high levels of social capital, and a high degree of neighbouring relative to other neighbourhoods in Brooklyn. Its low scale, small town charm, and relative affordability were appealing to gentrifiers as a place of residence.

There are clear social class differences between gentrifiers and long-term residents of Greenpoint. Long-term residents are relatively less educated and occupy relatively lower paying jobs than the gentry. Many life-long renters are experiencing great difficulty in the housing market. Rents are too expensive and the demand for housing is great. They are looking in other communities.

In Greenpoint, there are a couple of ways that segregation by social class is done. One is through school selection for children (DeSena 2006). In general, there is division between local public education and Catholic school education (since these are the only private schools in the community). Working class and relatively low income families choose among them. Often, the outcome of this public-private school division in local communities is racially segregated schools in which the children of affluent families, who are primarily white, attend private schools, while those from relatively low income backgrounds, who are ethnically and racially mixed, enrol in public schools. Social class differences are often translated into racial differences. Currently in Greenpoint, the Catholic schools are experiencing declining enrollments forcing the closing of one school and discussions of consolidating others. The local public elementary schools are highly regarded from the standpoint of safety, and City and State testing. Families are taking advantage of them. One observes racial diversity in the local public schools. Another level to the segregation of children in schools involves gentrifying families. To a large extent, gentry families remove their children from educational institutions within the community. They do not select either Catholic schools or public schools in Greenpoint. Instead, they select among public schools within the entire City of New York. Thus, this paper indicates how gentry families in Greenpoint negotiate the public school system city-wide and search for public schools for their children that they deem acceptable.

Ordinary Residents and Ordinary Schools

I use the concept of 'ordinary' to refer to the quotidian, that which is the typical, everyday life of working class and low-income residents of Greenpoint. These are the people who attempt to work on a regular basis, have little if any disposable income, and maintain a cohesive neighbourhood

through high levels of neighbouring and active participation in community organizations and neighbourhood institutions. They lived in Greenpoint and were active in the community prior to gentrification. As mentioned earlier, working class and low-income residents of Greenpoint, for the most part, choose between both local Catholic and local public schools for their children. They do not consider any other options.

For some working class families, Catholic schools are selected because of the teaching of religious values and perceptions of superior quality, more discipline, and safety when compared to public schools. As one mother said about choosing a Catholic school for her son, 'the kids are nicer, better behaved [in a Catholic school]'. In some instances, the decision is based on where other children in one's immediate geographic area attend school. 'We chose [St. Mary's] because that's where all the kids in the neighbourhood would go. It was a communal thing for us]'.

The selection of local public schools is based on perceived quality, more resources in the form of free books and computers, and no required tuition payment. Some residents see value with no additional cost. Having three children enrolled in a local public school, one woman said,
'Why should we pay? Mrs.[Kelly] said that St.[Susana's] School is terrible now, and she use to teach there!' Another woman, who presently teaches at a public school, but whose four children attended Catholic school, recommended that her sister select public education for her young children. She contended, 'I think the public schools are better'.

Interestingly, for working class and low-income families, there was no consideration of enrolling children in schools outside the neighbourhood. In some cases, residents may be unaware of available alternatives within the public school system. As one immigrant woman said, 'God will find the right middle school for him [as she pointed to her son]'. For 'ordinary' families who know that they can apply, on behalf of their children, to schools outside Greenpoint, the sentiment expressed is, 'It's hard to go to Manhattan'. These families want to school their children locally.

Gentry Families and Gentry Schools

A major issue for gentry families is their dissatisfaction with local schools. Although a few of the local elementary schools are highly rated based on City-wide and State test scores, and others are academically average, gentry families are critical of them. The local schools are negatively judged because of their traditional approach including 'teaching to the tests'. In fact, in 2003, two elementary schools in Greenpoint scored between 90% and 95% on State tests for fourth graders. If

one only considers test scores, some gentrifiers select relatively inferior schools for their children. When asked why a school outside the community where only 45% of fourth graders met or exceeded State standards was selected, one mother replied, 'we wouldn't even consider that Shaw shank place [a public school in Greenpoint]. I went to a PTA meeting because they don't hold a tour. I snuck in. It was like a prison'. This mother viewed her son's assigned local school to be too rigid. As this woman indicated, the fact that the schools in Greenpoint do not readily allow resident families to tour them was a concern.

Prior research indicates the tendency by the gentry, upon having families, to leave city neighbourhoods because of the poor quality of public schools (LeGates and Hartman 1986). In Greenpoint, however, the gentry prefer public education over private education. Catholic schools are not an option because as a group, gentrifiers are more secular than their lower income neighbours who support the local religious institutions. Furthermore, tuition in private, non religious elementary schools in New York City can cost upwards of $20,000 annually. The move away from private, secular schools and toward public schools suggests that Greenpoint's gentry with families have acquired a relatively affluent lifestyle, but they are not wealthy.

A major strategy developed by the gentry in Greenpoint to remedy their displeasure with local schools is enrolling their children in talented and gifted (TAG) programs and alternative education programs in public schools primarily in Manhattan and to a lesser extent, other parts of the City. They have learned to 'work the system' to their advantage. Groups of small children and parents crowd subway platforms headed for Manhattan. Car pools of parents and numerous children attending the same school leave various blocks every morning from Greenpoint en route to the Queens-Midtown Tunnel, the Williamsburg Bridge, or the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway and return in the afternoon in possibly a different car or minivan driven by a different parent. To a much lesser extent, another strategy for children's education is home schooling. Parents who select this option believe that they can do a better job educating their children than local schools because a lot of time is wasted in school, and they can teach the curriculum in creative ways. For the most part, these are professional families who attempt to function in a traditional way in which a parent stays at home or has the flexibility to work at home or report to work later than is customary, or leave work early, to be available to tend to children's schedules.

The majority of gentry children are admitted to schools outside of their residential district in a number of ways, including a lottery system. Alternative education programs, which take a

progressive approach to elementary education (such as Montessori and Waldorf), admit students by lottery. There is a preference for this type of schooling by gentrifiers in Greenpoint. If a child is not accepted, they remain on waiting lists and mothers call the schools on a regular basis to keep abreast of their status, and express their deep interest in the school. They behave like the proverbial 'squeaky wheel', promising to be an 'involved parent', and hope their child gets admitted. Another type of admission policy involves testing for a TAG program for a kindergarten class within a particular school. Although kindergarten is not mandatory in New York State, once a child is accepted, he/she is guaranteed a place for the next 6-8 years. Thus, many children from Greenpoint were admitted to TAG programs in schools in Manhattan on the proverbial 'ground floor'. Siblings of children in attendance are given admission priority. If they are not admitted to the school's TAG program, they are accepted into the regular program in the same school. Another tactic developed to insure admission is best described by one parent who said, 'We'll rent an apartment for a few months in that school's area. Once she [my daughter] is accepted, we'll give it up'.

One of the first generations of children from Greenpoint attending elementary school in Manhattan has advanced to middle school and high school. They are attending some of the 'best' (Hemphill 1999) public middle schools and high schools in New York City. One questioned how these children were admitted to middle school in Manhattan, since one school official stated that 'they had not accepted students from outside their Manhattan district in years'. It seems that because the children attended elementary school in the Manhattan district, they were given priority for applying to middle schools and then high schools in the same district. Thus, one finds that gentry families are quite clever in their approach to schooling their children. In this case, they were 'tracking' their children to highly rated schools with their initial kindergarten placement (DeSena and Ansalone 2009). Ultimately, gentrifiers use schools to assert the boundary between themselves and their working class and poor neighbours (see Martin 2008 for similar findings).

Kids Activities

Another area of segregation by social class focuses on the activities of children and teens in the neighbourhood of Greenpoint. Presently in Greenpoint, one observes both informal play among school-age children 'on the street', as well as adult organized, supervised, and structured recreation in the form of play dates, team sports, and birthday celebrations in 'party places'. Implicit in a discussion of children's play is the intention of parents relative to their social

values, who direct that play (either by design, routine, or tradition). In the end, this discussion is about parental boundary-work regarding their children's peer group and activities in which social class plays a part.

Ordinary Kids

Greenpoint's ordinary kids are from working class and lower income families, some of whom are relatively recent immigrants. Most of the American born children are from families with multiple generations living in the community. They experience generational continuity, inheriting a legacy of Greenpoint as their 'home'.

Children old enough to be outside on their own roam the streets, visiting local establishments like parks, the library, and pizzerias, using the neighbourhood as their playground. They ride bicycles, skateboards, and scooters, play basketball, stickball, handball and more sophisticated versions of games like tag and hide and seek. Some observers think that these children, who wander the local streets, have nothing to do, but while they are doing 'nothing', they engage in verbal exchanges, decision making, problem solving, and endless negotiation. They create, maintain, and participate in the community.

To an unwitting onlooker, children wandering the streets, changing locales and activities, appear to be unsupervised. For ordinary kids in Greenpoint, that is seldom the case. There are multiple social networks operating in which adults, sweeping sidewalks, hanging or gazing out of windows, or simply passing by, keep an eye on children. As one resident said, 'I know that [my son's friend] climbs the fences into the abandoned factories. My son knows he better not go there. I tell him, "We're watching"'. Interestingly, in this family, both parents work full-time. So the idea of 'we're watching' is actually a reference to an assorted collection of local family, friends, and neighbours.

Residents will also utilize their relationships when warranted. Children are sometimes confronted directly or their parents are contacted when an incident occurs. One resident explained, 'we were out for a walk and noticed these kids sitting in my wife's car. It was parked near the factory. My brother happened to be approaching us. I signalled to him and we ran toward the car. They saw us coming and got out and started running, but I recognized one of the kids. I went to his house and spoke to his father. They paid us for the broken window'.

Ordinary children in Greenpoint have the freedom to explore the neighbourhood terrain, while subject to the scrutiny of adults. With the emergence and widespread use of cell phones, there is more ongoing contact with parents. One mother said, 'we have him [her son] call in'.

Ordinary children in Greenpoint are given the same allowances as their parents were given growing up in the community. They are following the established tradition. One mother remarked, 'Groups of us would go camping for days. You want your kids to have experiences in life'.

Organized Sports

Another type of activity for ordinary children in Greenpoint is organized sports. Adults and children have mainly participated in two athletic traditions in the community, baseball and basketball.

Baseball

Baseball instruction and play are offered through three community organizations, namely the YMCA, Little League, and Police Athletic League (PAL). The Greenpoint YMCA presents a 'Junior Mets' program which is sponsored by the YMCA of Greater New York and the New York Mets. It is free to boys and girls ages 5 to 14 during July and August (Greenpoint YMCA, Summer, Fall I, Fall II 2006 Catalogue).

Greenpoint Little League is a major outlet for baseball. This local organization is part of the National Little League Association. In Greenpoint, it is mostly boys who participate.

The Police Athletic League (PAL) also sponsors a baseball league in Greenpoint. Parents who opted for this league over Little League said that 'it was less competitive and more instructive'.

Basketball

Basketball is offered through two neighbourhood institutions. The local YMCA forms teams of 'Junior Knicks', which stems from a collaboration between the YMCA of Greater New York and the New York Knickerbockers. Boys and girls ages 7 to 18 can participate in instructional and league play from January to May. It costs $25.00, but is free of charge to those 12 to 18 years old because of a special grant (Greenpoint YMCA, Summer, Fall I, Fall II 2006 Catalogue).

Basketball is also offered through Catholic Charities, sponsored by the Catholic Youth Organization (CYO) and organized through Catholic parishes within the Brooklyn-Queens Diocese. Parishes within Greenpoint and some elsewhere would compete in basketball. Play takes place in gymnasiums belonging to each church, and some teams travel, constituting 'home' and 'away' games. Adults volunteer to serve as the parish athletic representative to CYO, coach teams, as well as set-up, work as time keepers designating play time, and sell refreshments during games. Officials, such as referees, are paid.

One major participant in basketball, St. Anthony/ St. Alphonsus Church, ended its more than half a century of play. One mother, whose children played for St. Anthony's explained,

CYO basketball at St. Anthony's is no longer in existence. The Parish Athletic Representative resigned after years of service, and no one came forward to volunteer to take his place. CYO basketball still exists at St. Cecilia's and St. Stan's. Kids can join those teams.

The end of youth basketball at this parish may symbolize the current state of the local Catholic Church in gentrifying neighbourhoods. About a year later, St. Anthony/ St. Alphonsus School was closed because of dramatically declining enrolment. Gentry newcomers used neither the school nor the basketball league for their children.

Gentry Kids

Like ordinary children in Greenpoint, the children of gentry families are also seen roaming the streets of Greenpoint, visiting the video store, the library, riding skateboards, and playing kickball. However, local children are segregated by social class. Gentry children play with other gentry children, and ordinary children play with peers like them. On the streets, in the parks, and engaged in more formal arrangements like a local swim club, the children are not integrated with each other in the community. In fact, one gentry mother commented about the children of her working class neighbours, 'They are boys in need of supervision!' As was indicated earlier also holds regarding play, grouping by social class remains intact, and there is no outreach outside of one's in-group.

The children of gentry families also participate in organized sports, but they have not joined a community sponsored baseball league, or basketball team. Instead, their parents have formed the Greenpoint/Williamsburg Youth Soccer League (GWYSL). GWYSL was established in 1999. It originated with a group of gentry families whose children attended the YMCA

preschool. These families organized 'pick-up games', informal soccer games among the children. From there they researched various leagues and joined the American Youth Soccer Organization (AYSO). AYSO was chosen because of their guiding principles: everyone plays, balanced teams, open registration, positive coaching, good sportsmanship (GWYSL Newsletter, November 2005). On Saturday mornings from September to December, a multitude of children ages 4-14, wearing various coloured uniforms designating different teams, engage in playing their game of the week at McCarren Park in Greenpoint. For the most part, these are the children of gentrifiers. One mother expressed, 'It's nice after 6 years; the kids are off in different middle schools but get to see each other in soccer'. In terms of both play and organized sports, gentry children are segregated from their ordinary neighbours.

Compared to ordinary children, the lives of gentry children take them outside of the neighbourhood. In addition to schools, there are other activities which remove them from the neighbourhood, one of which is enrichment classes. In some cases it is to learn a musical instrument, various types of dance, gymnastics, and language and culture. Many of these classes are outside of Greenpoint.

Some gentry families leave the community for leisure on a regular basis and even for extended periods of time. One example includes families who own second homes outside of the City and use them on weekends and vacation periods. In an attempt to schedule time for two preteen boys to 'hang out', a gentry mother remarked, 'We're away every weekend and holidays and vacations. And he takes lessons at our other place. He's quite good!'

Time for the boys was not scheduled since one was away a lot. Some gentry families pack up in June and leave for the entire summer, returning for the start of school. One woman explained, 'we're leaving tomorrow for this [place]. We go every summer. I [work] there and my children are able to attend free'. Thus, through second homes and summers away, gentry families disinvest in Greenpoint and participate in the activities of other communities.

Conclusions

This paper suggests some of the social values at work for working class and gentry residents of Greenpoint. Like the popolino and bourgeois residents of the quartiere in Naples, Italy (Pardo 1992), differences placed on the meaning of 'the home' point to dissimilar social values. In this paper, the social values of residents are revealed through the everyday lives of children. Working

class residents emphasize community, while the gentry stress enhancement. The working class highlight for their children participation in the community life of Greenpoint through schooling, and traditional social institutions. As adults, they 'keep an eye on' local children as part of maintaining community. Gentry residents, on the other hand, convey that Greenpoint is the place in which they reside, but look outside to satisfy their desire for their perception of quality education and enrichment for their children, and to nourish their social status by schooling their children in more upscale places like Manhattan. This contrast is reminiscent of Lareau's (2003) notions of natural growth and concerted cultivation in her analysis of class, race, and family life.

There is also a contradiction between the ideology that gentry families publicly present, and the ways in which they guide their children. For example, a youth soccer league with values of fair and equal play was selected, but those values seem to pertain to their group. In general, separation and divisions are maintained and boundary-work is accomplished. The clear segregation of children by social class in Greenpoint explains why most gentry children are not playing other organized sports, or engaged in activity spots, such as the local public library. They have simply not socially integrated into the larger community of Greenpoint.

The actions presented here have consequences for community life. One major consequence is the segregation of children by social class within schools, which locally, are seemingly reserved for working class and immigrant families. This outcome is similar to neighbourhoods in which private schools are patronized by the gentry. In both cases, a consequence of gentrification is that the local public schools in Greenpoint experience a segregated student body by social class and possibly ethnicity and race by extension. In the aftermath of Brown vs. Board of Education, this analysis indicates how the segregation of schools continues, and how ultimately, social class privilege is reproduced. The gentry are more accustomed to relative privilege and have made a judgment about what constitutes quality education. Their focus is on formal education and not community. As a group, they are more opportunistic than their working class neighbours. Working class residents are more accepting of local public schools, and believe that their only other choice is to pay tuition at a local Catholic school. To an extent, they are unaware of and possibly not interested in the options within the public school system, such as entrance by lottery or applying to specialized schools for music, science, performing arts, etc., and the additional strategies used by their gentry neighbours. Working class families are more committed to community than the gentry. They want their children schooled with other local children to form friendships and perpetuate

community. Through these practices, boundary-work is realized and parallel cultures ensue. In the final analysis, the outcome is social segregation.

One must ask why gentry residents with children stay in Greenpoint given their dissatisfaction with children's recreation and local schools? Many gentry took up residence as singles and childless couples. Children's needs were not a consideration. They stay because 'the lifestyle for sale is defined by a place- the city' (Mills 1993: 154), in this case, New York City. Residential choices were made based on housing options in which more space could be acquired for a relatively affordable price. These findings raise a question, why do gentry families choose other public schools outside of the community instead of using their many resources, such as their human and social capital (like in the creation of a soccer league), to gain control of local schools and change them to better represent their wishes and lifestyle? A simple explanation is that it is probably easier to commute children to and from school and 'work the system' to their advantage, than it is to mobilize change within the New York City public school system. A more meaningful explanation, however, is that school selection is a reflection of the gentry's social status. Their social status as artists and professionals, with more affluence and formal education than their working class neighbours, gets expressed by sending their children to schools in more upscale places, like areas of Manhattan. In this way, the gentry are 'doing' social class and social status. They also live in a trendy, changing neighbourhood in which they 'do cultural work with symbols of working class culture…stigma and status' (Mills 1993: 158). The stigma is living in a working class place; the status is creating a lifestyle and community within that place thus, making it trendy.

This article also represents one way that social stratification is reproduced by the process of gentrification. Through strategies for acquiring a relatively privileged, segregated life, social class and social status are maintained. Butler (2003) noted in his work on London, Gentrification in Barnsbury (and probably London) is therefore apparently playing a rather dangerous game. It values the presence of others—that much has been seen from the quotations from respondents—but chooses not to interact with them. They are, as it were, much valued as a kind of social wallpaper, but no more (p. 2484).

Similarly, by attending activities and school outside of Greenpoint, the children of gentrifiers are removed from the community. They are separated from their working class and immigrant peers with whom they live. Both operate within parallel cultures. This practice accomplishes boundary maintenance and diminishes social integration and the subsequent

formation of social networks outside of one's social class-group within the community. The preschool network of gentrifiers remains intact in that the children of the gentry socialize in the community with other children who are just like them. In addition, the local community of gentry (parents and children) form friendship networks because children attending specific schools often travel together, have established a youth soccer league and annual parades, caroling troupe at Christmas, planting events at McCarren Park, and have formed new community organizations. They maintain a cohesive community with each other, but are not participants in the larger, more ethnically and economically diverse community. They experience homogenization. In these ways, gentry parents articulate and convey their social status, desire for upward mobility, and power in a global city that is increasingly white and affluent. Thus, gentry children are taught that they are privileged relative to their working class and poor neighbours. Gentrification, through boundary-work and the formation and maintenance of parallel cultures, contributes to increasing social segregation ultimately producing greater social inequality.

References

Abu-Lughod, J. L. (1994). *From Urban Village to East Village: The Battle for New York's Lower East Side*. Blackwell.

Betancur, J. (2011). Gentrification and Community Fabric in Chicago. *Urban Studies*, 48, 2, 383-406.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Routledge and Kegan and Paul.

Butler, T. (2003). Living in the Bubble: Gentrification and its 'Others' in London, *Urban Studies*, 40 (12): 2469-2486.

Charles, C.Z. (2003). 'The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation', *Annual Review of Sociology,* 29:167-207.

Cybriwsky, R. (1978). Social Aspects of Neighborhood Change. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 68: 17-33.

DeSena, J.N. (2005). *Protecting One's Turf*. University Press of America.

DeSena, J.N. (2006). 'What's a Mother to Do?': Gentrification, School Selection, and the Consequences for Community Cohesion, *American Behavioral Scientist* 50 (2): 241-257.

DeSena, J.N. (2009). *Gentrification and Inequality in Brooklyn: The New Kids On the Block.* Lexington Books.

DeSena, J.N. and Ansalone, G. (2009). Gentrification, Tracking, and Inequality. *The Educational Research Quarterly,* 33 (September): 60-74.

Ellen, I. G. and O'Regan, K. M. (2011). How Low Income Neighborhoods Change: Entry, Exit and Enhancement, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 41: 89-97.

Farley, J.E. (1987). Segregation in 1980: How Segregated Are America's Metropolitan Areas?, in G. Tobin (ed.) *Divided Neighborhoods*. Sage Publications, pp. 95-114

Fitch, R. (1993). *The Assassination of New York*. New York: Verso.

Freeman, L. and Braconi, F. (2004). Gentrification and Displacement: New York City in the 1990s, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70:39-52.

Freeman, L. (2006). *There Goes the Hood.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Friedenfels, R. (1992). Gentrification in Large American Cities from 1970-1980, in R. Hutchison (ed). *Research in Urban Sociology: Gentrification and Urban Change,* pp. 63-93. JAI Press.

Greenline. (2001). Loft Regulations Urged, March: 1.

Greenline. (2001) Skyrocketing Rents, March: 1.

Greenpoint YMCA, Catalogue. (2006). Summer, Fall I, Fall II.

GWYSL Newsletter. (2005). November.

Hackworth, J. (2002). Postrecession Gentrification in New York City, *Urban Affairs Review*, 37: 15-843.

Hamnett, C. (2003). *Unequal City: London in the Global Arena*. London: Routledge.

Hemphill, C. (1999). *Public Middle Schools: New York's Best*. New York: SoHo Press.

Kasinitz, P. (1988). The Gentrification of 'Boerum Hill': Neighborhood Change and Conflict over Definitions, *Qualitative Sociology* 11 (3), 163-182.

Keramitas, D. (2010). Brave New Paris: Greenification or Gentrification, *Bonjour Paris*. http://www.bonjourparis.com [accessed July 18, 2012].

Krase, J. (1982). *Self and Community in the City*. University Press of America.

Krase, J. (2005). Poland and Polonia: Gentrification as Ethnic Aesthetic Practice and Migratory Practice, in R. Atkinson and G. Bridge (eds). *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Krase, J. (2012). *Seeing Cities Change: Local Culture and Class*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life.* University of California Press.

Laska, S. and Spain, D. (eds) (1980). *Back to the City: Issues in Neighborhood Renovation*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Lees, L. (2008). Gentrification and Social Mixing, *Urban Studies* 45: 2449-2470.

LeGates, R. and Hartman, C. (1986). The Anatomy of Displacement in the United States', in N. Smith and P. Williams (eds). *Gentrification of the City*, pp. 178-203. Allen and Unwin, Inc.

Marcuse, P. (1986). Abandonment, Gentrification, and Displacement: The Linkages in New York City, in N. Smith and P. Williams (eds). *Gentrification of the City* (pp.153-157). Allen and Unwin.

Martinez, M. (2010). *Power at the Roots: Gentrification, Community Gardens, and the Puerto Ricans of the Lower East Side.* Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Mason, L. (2011). Mapping a Changing Brooklyn, Mapping a Changing World: Gentrification, Immigration and Outmigration in Brooklyn 2000-2008. Paper presented at the annual

meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, February 24-27, Philadelphia.

Massey, D.S. and Denton, N.A. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Harvard University Press.

Massey, D.S. and Fischer, M.J. (2000). How Segregation Concentrates Poverty, *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 23: 670-691.

Mills, C. (1993). Myths and Meanings of Gentrification, in J. Duncan and D. Ley (eds). *Place/Culture/Representation*, pp. 149-170. Routledge.

Mooney, J. (2009). Polish is Still Spoken, but Industry is History, *The New York Times*, May 29.

Murdie, R. and Teixeira, C. (2011). The Impact of Gentrification on Ethnic Neighbourhoods in Toronto: A Case Study of Little Portugal, *Urban Studies*, 48 (1): 61-83.

Newman, K. and Wyly, E. K. (2006). The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City, *Urban Studies*, 43(1): 23-57.

Pardo, I. (1992). 'Living' the House, 'Feeling' the House: Neapolitan Issues in Thought, Organization and Structure, *European Journal of Sociology*, 33 (2): 251-279.

Pardo, I. and Prato, G. (eds) (2012). *Anthropology in the City: Methodology and Theory*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Pearce, D. (1979). Gatekeepers and Homeseekers: Institutional Patterns in Racial Steering, *Social Problems*, 26: 325-342.

Rieder, J. (1985). *Canarsie*. Harvard University Press.

Robson, G. and Butler, T. (2001). Coming to Terms with London: Middle Class Communities in a Global City, *International Journal of Urban and Research* 25 (1), 70-86.

Santucci, B. (2012). Working Class Parisian Neighborhoods Feel the Squeeze of Gentrification, *Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs.* http://www.berkleycenter.georgetown.edu. [accessed on July 18, 2012].

Scott, R. (2003). Inclusionary Zoning: A Proposal for North Brooklyn and New York City, Unpublished report.

Shop by Shop, Paris Reclaims Bagnolet, (2012). *The New York Times*. Sunday, June 10.

Simmel, G. (1950). *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. The Free Press.

Smith, N. (1996). *The Urban Frontier: Gentrification and Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge.

Sullivan, D. M. (2007). Reassessing Gentrification: Measuring Residents' Opinions Using Survey

Data, *Urban Affairs Review*, 42 (4): 583-592.

Suttles, G. (1968). *The Social Order of the Slum.* University of Chicago Press.

Suttles, G. (1972). *The Social Construction of Communities*. University of Chicago Press.

Tauber, K. and Tauber, A. (1965). *Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change*. Chicago: Aldine.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Census of population and housing*, generated by Judith DeSena; using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder.census.gov>; (accessed 6 June 2012).

Wittberg, P. (1992). Perspectives on Gentrification: A Comparative Review of the Literature, in R. Hutchison (ed). *Research in Urban Sociology: Gentrification and Urban Change (pp. 17-46)*. JAI Press.

Yinger, J. (1995). *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Zukin, S. (1982). *Loft Living*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Zukin, S. (1987). Gentrification: Culture and Capital in the Urban Core, *Annual Review of Sociology,* 13:129-147.