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Abstract

This paper sets out to explore the relationship between gentrification and residents’ sense of security. In this paper, we will present the background information of the central Harlem neighborhood and its gentrifying process, the significance of sense of security, the past literature on relevant topics, methodologies applied as well as potential future study in this specific question. In order to illustrate that under the condition of gentrification, the sense of security of residents is influenced, data of degree of sense of security and gentrification is needed. By evaluating the degree of sense of security by designing a questionnaire, interviewing people living in the neighborhood about their experience in regards to safety and neighborhood trust, non-participant observation, field experiments and data of ethnicity and income distribution that investigates whether a neighborhood is gentrified or not, we will be able to quantify rather qualitative variables and understand personal stories subjectively at the same time. While objective data is accessible, the study focuses more on the feeling of being safe rather than the objective safety of the neighborhood.
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Background & Significance

“Gentrification” as a word, first came out in Ruth Glass’s book, *London: Aspects of Change*, in which she mentioned middle class invading poor working class enclaves in central London (Glass 1964:141). The definition of gentrification has varied over time. This article will take the definition that gentrification is “The planned or unplanned process by which wealthy or affluent individuals in the middle class displace poorer individuals in traditionally working class or poor neighborhoods by purchasing property and upgrading it through renovation and modernization.” ([http://sociologydictionary.org/gentrification/](http://sociologydictionary.org/gentrification/))

In *Gentrification Reader* by Loretta Lees, Tom Slater, and Elvin Wyly(2008) and *Gentrification in Global Context: the New Urban Colonialism* by Rowland Atkinson and Gary Bridge(2005), the authors consider gentrification as a cause of many things, such as changes in the crime rate, cost of living, diversity, business development and so on. While many of the scholars focus macroscopically on a big social picture, the feelings of individual haven’t been talked about much.

While doing research on Harlem’s gentrification is not a new thing, limited resources could be found on sense of security. Some residents on the internet would think about the safety of themselves in a gentrifying or gentrified neighborhood. Growing up in Brooklyn, another neighborhood that has been in gentrification along with Harlem, Patricia Valoy(2014), a Latino female, wrote about how gentrification hurts people of color. While listing the reasons why she felt that way, she mentioned that “People of color are criminalized because new people feel ‘in
danger.’’ (2014). With such a stereotype, long term residents couldn’t always do things that they considered to be normal, such as sleeping on the bench, because such behavior would be considered criminalized. In other words, gentrification makes both new comer and original residents feel they are under potential danger. On the other hand, some consider that gentrification lower the crime rate as well as the amount of drug dealers (https://sites.google.com/site/gg2wpdermotmitchell/gentrification-impacts 2016) etc., giving residents an objectively safer environment to live in.

Indeed there were few studies directly on sense of security and gentrification, but research on individual senses and feelings were conducted in the past. Shaw and Hegamens (2015) studied gentrification and “sense of place”, stating that the changes in shops and meeting places – “neighborhood resources that enable people to feel a sense of place” (2015:326) – in public live rise to the loss of familiarity of the neighborhood, then causing emotional even mental problems that material benefits couldn’t compensate. Also in a study done by Khadijah White in 2015, relationships between “belongingness” and gentrification were explored. Belongingness, also a more subjective, individualized term, is considered to “counter or facilitate urban gentrification.” (2015:354) On the other hand, belongingness was used by “Harlem Drummer” to protect themselves from class/cultural/racial invaders such as White people and investors.

As an important factor in mental health and one of the basic needs in Maslow’s Theory of Needs, sense of security should be discussed in the process of gentrification, in which a lot of individuals would be involved. A study done by Xue Geng, Ruzhen Wang, and Yunting Lu
(2013) in Beijing institute of posts and telecommunications century, called the quantitative evaluation of security index model, comes up with a measurement for this relative subjective term. In the paper, the authors divide sense of security into three main categories: Social Safety, Self-Condition and Interpersonal Communication (2013:4). Narrowing down the definition of sense of security in the study based on this paper, we aim to focus on two part of sense of security: Personal Safety and Community Trust.

**Design of Pilot Research**

As mentioned above, considering the effect of gentrification exerted to individuals’ wellbeing, we came up with the research question –

*Does the process of gentrification*(x)* influence residents’ sense of security*(y)*? If so, how?*

With gentrification as the independent variable and sense of security as the dependent variable, according to the definition of gentrification, a more gentrified area tend to have more White people living in the neighborhood, higher household income distribution and higher level of education. Therefore, measureable data like racial and ethnic group distribution, income distribution and educational attainment would be the main indicators that help find research site that is going through gentrification. Other than these categories for each concept, observation of level of shops in the neighborhood, the appearance of buildings along the street and so on would be other indicators for gentrification. For sense of security, which is a broad and subjective
concept, it is narrow down into two main categories: Personal Safety and Community Trust.

I. Research Sites

To determine the research site for this gentrification study, online research was done on the gentrification indicators mentioned above. According to several mapping projects published by *New York Times*, we were able to compare household income distribution, ethnic and racial group distribution (Black, White, Hispanic, Asian and Other Groups) and educational attainment of different census tracts. By definition, because of the overall increase in White population, decrease in Black population, larger proportion of high income households and larger proportion of people with bachelor’s or higher degrees in census tract 222(122nd – 126th St., Fredrick Douglass – Lenox Avenue) in the past several years, census tract 222 was selected as the more gentrifying site. A control site was also picked based on the same resource. As an area that has not experienced obvious gentrification, indicated by the data of American Community Service, but in fact has had reverse phenomena for gentrification (increase in Black population, decrease in White population, subtle changes in income distribution and educational attainment) over the same period, census tract 228(134th—138th St., Fredrick Douglass – Lenox Avenue) is used to compare with census tract 222, to find out how strongly would gentrification affect sense of security.

The changes on Racial and Ethnic Group Distribution, Household Income Distribution and Educational Attainment of the two sites are listed below:
### Table 1

**Comparison of Racial & Ethnic Group Distribution, Household Income Distribution and Educational Attainment in census tract 222 & census tract 228**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census Tract 222</th>
<th></th>
<th>Census Tract 228</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racial and Ethnic Group Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Groups</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Household Income Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$100,000-$149,999</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$150,000-$199,999</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$200,000 and up</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor's degree or higher</strong></td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Methodologies

**Observation**

Researchers tried not to appear as researchers until they asked the targeted person, thereby
not intruding people’s usual behavior in the specific area. To achieve this goal, phones instead of note pads were used to take notes; researchers didn’t look around to “target” survey-takers, but walked up to he or she, then revealed the purpose; Survey question forms were not showed but kept in binders/book bags until a person agreed to take the survey. Between each survey being filled, researchers had the chance to observe people’s conversations with one another, and even smile or say hi to passers-by. Even when people rejected to do the survey, researchers were able to take notes of how did the person reject the request. In the 3-day field work, both of the researchers took field notes every day, containing almost every interaction they had with people in the neighborhood.

Survey

To measure sense of security in a more quantitative scale, survey questions were designed (See Appendix I). Pew Research Center’s American and Social Trust project(Paul Taylor, Cary Funk, April Clark 2007) was used as a reference for the survey questions. The first part of the survey is basic information that enables us to either find general pattern of sense of security of different groups (e.g. female, middle-aged) or just categorize our target. The following two parts are designed to correspond to the two kinds of sense of security – personal safety and community trust – in the form of multiple choice questions. In order to measure and compare sense of security, we made the options ordinal corresponding to the level of safety one subjectively feels. For example, for options A-E, the corresponding score would be 5-1; for A-D, it would be 4-1. After adding scores of each question, the quantitative measurement of this study comes up:
Sense of Security Index. The higher the index, the more secure one feels. Last but not least, there is an open-ended question on the general change of Harlem and residents’ impression on it. With the open-ended question collected, we had more subjective view of the issue as well as confirmation of the fact that each site is gentrifying or not. The target of this survey would just be ordinary passers-by that researchers encounter.

In total we received 49 copies of surveys; 24 of them were done in census tract 222, and 25 of them were done in census tract 228. The date of the survey conducted were Aug. 3rd – Aug. 5th, and the time span of the fieldwork are 10:30a.m. – 5:30p.m.

Interviews

Since sense of security is still a subjective concept and is strongly related to personal experience, besides the measurement of sense of security, we also want to focus on concrete experience, so interviews are be conducted. Considering that only with long interviews (at least 20 mins) could we really get details of the story, randomly picking a passer-by is not realistic in short-term. For this reason, we contact people we knew already that lives in a gentrifying neighborhood, but not necessarily in the two census tracts that are chosen as research sites. One of our interviewees, referred to as Chan (pseudonym) lived near 115th St., Fredrick Douglass Avenue, which is located a few blocks lower than census tract 222 but shared similar characteristics with census tract 228, in terms of racial and ethnic group and household income distribution. Another interviewee, Violeta (pseudonym), grew up in another place where gentrification has slowly taken place. We were able to get Violeta’s email address and get in
touch with the person, who agreed to be interviewed on the phone.

With the two interviewees researchers found, not only personal feelings and experience were described, but general perspective on gentrification was also perceived. Also when conducting the surveys, some survey-takers had conversations with us, which were not asked by the survey questions directly but were related to sense of security. Since they were just common conversations, we took notes but not recordings, thus we don’t have a transcribing for them.

With the methodologies mentioned above, we tested the hypothesis that gentrification increase the sense of security of the residents.

III. Data Analysis

Sense of Security Index

i. Overall results

Based on the survey conducted, the options of the questions are in a measureable scale. For each completed survey answer, we added up the score that represents the option (when there are A-E, the corresponding score will be 5\4\3\2\1 while if there are A-D, the score will be 4\3\2\1) and the score was calculated in two parts based on the survey questions (see Appendix I): personal safety and community trust. The scale and range of the result are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>Questions No.</th>
<th>Highest Score</th>
<th>Lowest Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Scoring of Survey Questions

After getting the score on separate sections, we added them together to get the total score. By listing all the accessible scores of each participant, we calculated the mean of the score of each section in the two census tracts. The following is the comparison on the score of 222 census tract and 228 census tract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(I + II)</td>
<td>6 Questions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 1: Comparison of Sense of Security Index in Census Tract 222 & 228

According to the data collected, in census tract 228, the indices of both personal safety and community trust were higher than in census tract 222. Also in the survey, there is a general question on how people feel about safety in the neighborhood: Do you think your neighborhood
has become safer or less safe in the last 5 years? (See Appendix I, Part.II, 3) It turns out that more people feel more dangerous and less people feel safer in census tract 222 than in census tract 228.

![Survey-Part.II-3](image)

Graph.2 Percentage of answers in Survey Question-Part.II(Personal Safety)-3

For the general question in Part.III which is concerned about Community Trust (See Appendix I, Part.III, 1), the percentage of people tend to consider their neighbors are trustworthy in census tract 228 still exceeds in census tract 222.

![Survey-Part.III-1](image)

Graph.3 Percentage of answers in Survey Question-Part.III(Community Trust)-1

At the same time, for census tract 222, 3 of the surveys were only filled in basic information, meaning that no index could be calculated. Also in census tract 222, two
survey-takers didn’t finish the survey completely, leaving indices only available in the second part of the survey. On the contrary, in census tract 228 all the multiple-choice questions in every copy of the survey were answered.

The data collected suggests that non-gentrified areas may have higher sense of security.

**ii. Racial and Ethnic Group Analysis**

With specific blanks of Racial and Ethnic Group for survey-takers to fill in (See Appendix I, Part.I, 5), we could try to find the pattern of sense of security in two census tracts in terms of samples’ ethnicity. By calculating the Sense of Security Index separately, we are able to find that no matter in which census tract people of color tend to score lower in the survey, indicating that they have lower level of sense of security compare to White people.

The calculated results are shown below:

![Graph 4: Sense of Security Index of Different Racial and Ethnic Group](Graph.4 Sense of Security Index of Different Racial and Ethnic Group)
Also when the surveys were collected, the 3 incomplete copies of survey were all done by Black people, implying that they might feel less secure in terms of filling in survey questions. Overall, census tract 228 still has higher index rate than census tract 222. Indices of Asian people varies, but people who get scores higher than the average shown in the graph above has stayed there for at least 2 years, while people with scores lower than the average have lived in the area for no more than a year. Such result may implies that Asian people that live longer in the neighborhood may feel more secure when they get used to the area.

*Rejection Rates*

Even though high rejection rates make the sample of the research not enough, because of the topic chosen, they offer a perspective on sense of security. By taking notes every time researchers got rejected, specifically on how the people rejected the request, we calculated the rate of getting rejected in different census tracts: census tract 222 had a rejection rate of 79% and census tract 228 had a rejection rate of 76%. If we take the rejection rate as an indicator of sense of security -- the lower the rejection rate, the safer the residents feel--, it seems that more gentrifying blocks have less sense of security when it comes to filling in surveys, although both had a high rate of rejection.

The percentages of reasons used by rejecters are summarized and shown below:
With the reason the rejecters gave, we can see that in census tract 222, more people rejected the request by just saying no, while in census tract 228, 10% more people would explain the reason of not taking the survey. Assuming that the reasons provided were not excuses, we may interpret people in census tract 228 feel more relaxed to be asked rather than remaining alert and refusing people immediately.

Some residents filled up the surveys but later demanded to keep them. According to the field notes kept by one of the researchers, Lee (2016) in his first day fieldwork at census tract 222:

Initially, the women sited on the branch in a park. It went well at first and I thought I was really lucky because I successfully finished my first research. However, at the mid period of the research, she stopped and asked me why was I doing that and what's my personal perspective about this topic. I was a little shocked at first actually because it didn't go as I expected……I answered her and all I wanted was to make sure that this lady won't think I am too aggressive and careless. Then, she refused to continue the research and took my survey away because she strongly believed that those questions are sensitive and shouldn't be used by student's research. (Li 2016)
In census tract 228, this type of thing didn’t happen. Our experiences in the two census tracts suggest that people in census tract 222 may be more cautious on handing in their personal information.

Again, this suggests that people in the non-gentrifying neighborhood have a greater sense of security based on our limited research.

Observation

Situation encountered were basically the same in two census tracts. When we were walking on the road, some people would say hi actively to researchers. Most of the time when we smiled at people, we got responses. In census tract 222, two researchers smiled to 80 people total for three days, and 70% (56 people) smiled back, and 26 of the 56 said “Hi” or “How are you doing” in response. People walked fast in that area, and many of them wore earphones, talked on the phone or had conversations with nearby people. It’s understandable to ignore smiles. When in census tract 228, because people were less, in total, researchers smiled at people 54 times, and 75.9% (41 people) of the smile was responded. While the rates of smiles responded are similar between the two sites, census tract 228 still yields a slightly higher rate of smile.

Interviews

No matter which research site interviews took place, the issue of Racial and Ethnic Group was brought up. In a conversation in census tract 228, a bi-racial man (white and black) said that he felt safer because “For the past years more White people moved in.” On the other hand, Violeta stated that White people might felt threatened when first moved to the neighborhood
because people of color appear to be more criminalized for them. This notion makes gentrification connected with racial discrimination. Violeta gave example in her interview on the “double-standard” problem in race: “When we talk about drugs, we associated the drugs with those people of colors in terms of crime, but drugs and white people are the public health issues.” She later concluded that even though people of color were criminalized at first, White people would get used to it but people of color may still feel uncomfortable about their identity and the culture interrupted by White people. Therefore gentrification may from some extent, harm people of color’s sense of security.

Chan, an Asian student who has rented a house in Harlem for 11 months, had such racial stereotypes when he first arrived. He was frightened and overwhelmed at first. “When I first came here, I walked really fast at night. I would try my best to avoid Black people. I would go to another side of the road if I found that I was on the same road with another Black man. I didn’t mean to do that, but because of some stereotypes have left me the idea that I should do the measure to protect myself.” After he stayed longer in the neighborhood, he felt better. He shared an experience of interacting with strangers in his neighborhood that two Black people were dancing on the street and invited him to join. “And I thought, well, in fact, I can do better. They got really shocked and said ’hey man, you're great, thank you!’ after I showed them my locking dance. I think that was really interesting.” Talking about feelings he had today, Chan said that he was actually still a bit afraid, specifically at night with possibility of being robbed and asked for money. During the interview, Chan mentioned the word Black people a lot, to explain his fears
and worries living in the neighborhood.

Having once lived in a not-gentrified area in Brooklyn, Violeta stated that the sense of community is actually stronger and more like family compare with the safer neighborhood she is living in now in Queens. “In where I grew up, even though there was so much violence there, people made really good connection there. Children were playing and being a part of each other. I missed that kind of time.” From her perspective, poorer people help each other more and would be closer while in already gentrified areas, people are not necessarily rich but have income, enabling them to take care of themselves. “It’s not like people look out with each other. It’s that they have their private homes, they have income for their family. We don't need other people.”

The interview suggests that new comers as gentrifiers would feel unsafe moving into neighborhood with people of color. However such decrease of sense of security might be recover after a period of time of breaking stereotypes. But the self-identified people of color may still feel that they are discriminated against to some degree. On the other hand, mentioned by Violeta, the rising income level leads to more attention to privacy and personal space, thus eliminating the close relationship with the neighbors thus might also decrease the level of community trust even though the neighborhood is objectively safer. This interpretation may better explain the result in the survey.

**Conclusion**

With limited time and energy, the samples collected were far less than a scientific research demanded. Considering that the overall sense of security index, the rejection rates, the
smiling respond rate and residents interpretation on sense of security, gentrification might be negatively related to people’s sense of security. Specifically in Racial & Ethnic issue, people of color tend to feel less safe than White gentrifiers, probably because of racial discrimination. On the other hand, time may play a role for gentrifiers to get used to the neighborhood and eliminate the stereotypes.

**Discussion**

I. **Limitations**

*Research Sites*

In the process of choosing research sites, the quantitative indicators considered are limited: only household income distribution, ethnic and racial group distribution and educational attainment were considered. Based on the answers of the open-ended question on the survey (Part. VI) in census tract 228, there are some answers like “more business” “more white people” imply that census tract 228 is in fact experiencing gentrification in a certain extent. Therefore, census tract 228 might not have been a perfect control to compare with the heavily gentrifying census tract 222. Such error further limits the conclusion drawn by the pilot research.

*Randomness*

With personal biases, researchers were not able to choose survey-takers randomly. Researchers (subconsciously) tend to choose people who looked nicer and less likely to reject the request. Also when researchers encountered people waiting at a bus station, listening to their earphones, having conversations with others etc., they presume that the people will reject them,
so they will deliberately not ask those people to fill in the survey. Such biases and presumptions don’t guarantee randomness in sociology research study.

Because of the accessibility of interviewees, we were not able to interview people who live exactly in the same census tracts we selected. Also because of time limits, the two interviewees we had had busy schedules, meaning that there weren’t too many details in the interviews.

*Uncontrolled Variables*

1. *Researchers*

   Since the researchers are different, people may behave differently based on their gender, appearance, style of speech etc., thus creating uncontrolled variables. To solve the problem, two researcher switched sites on the other day. But the difference on how many requests were rejected and how people rejected them are still big. On the research site census tract 222, while two of the researchers got similar reject rate overall in a specific census tract, the percentage of people claiming that there were no time for research rather than just saying “no” in Annabell’s requests was about 50% while for Lee only 7.7% of respondents said they had no time, with 51.3% “just saying no”. So it may be likely that people treat female in a more gentle way, which may even affect the rejection rate.

   The Rejection Rate of two researchers in different sites in different days and percentages of reasons rejecters provided are shown in the form below:
Graph 6&7 Reasons of Rejection in census tract 222 & 228 of Annabell & Lee

**ii. Time**

Time is something that affects sense of security. Every time a survey-taker finished filling up the questions, the researchers marked down the time of the survey. Also, researchers went to the research site both in the morning and the afternoon twice, to avoid the possibility that people may have different attitudes or moods in different time of day. However, considering the problem of safety in Harlem, we don’t have the chance to go to the research site, giving out surveys and observing late at night, which is a time period in the day that can reflect safety very well.

**II. Improvements**

*Samples*

One of the biggest problem of the pilot research was the number of the sample was not big enough to do accurate analysis. When one of the researchers tried to ask a people who asked for money to fill in the survey, she actually bought him food to make him finish the survey. Also when she was asking two women on the street to do the survey, one of them asked “Will I get
anything filling this thing?” In all, the high rejection rate may be largely attributed to the lack of attractions to the passers-by while asking them to do the work voluntarily. To improve that, coupons or other sorts of reward mechanism (such as a gift card to a local sandwich shop) could be used in future research.

Randomness

Because of the personal bias of the researchers themselves, samples selected were not technically random. By using a random number generator, researchers can get a number, such as 3, on the generator, and then ask every third person walks by. Or researchers could decide which sample to choose by throwing dices. If the dice shows “6” at the top, researchers may just count people and ask every 6th people who walks by to fill in the survey.

Longitudinal Research

Since the pilot research was conducted in only 3 days, no longitudinal research could be possibly done, thus what we could do was to compare two census tracts which are in different processes of gentrification. Considering that the two sites chosen may create many uncontrolled variables, such as differences of residential and commercial area distribution, history of the neighborhood etc., focusing on one area that has just begun to experience gentrification may be more rigorous and effective. Through long-term research, we could get in touch with interviewees in different phases of gentrification and have a better understanding of the changes of sense of security overtime.
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Appendix I

Gentrification & Sense of Security in Harlem
Residents Survey

Hi! We are student researchers in Columbia University for summer program and we are interested in learning more about this neighborhood in Harlem and the sense of security you feel. So we conduct this confidential survey to explore the relationship between gentrification and sense of security. Thank you for taking out of your busy schedule. We are interested in your personal feeling and there is no right or wrong answer. If you have any questions at any time about the type of question we are asking or why we are asking them, please let us know. If you encounter questions that make you uncomfortable, you can either skip the question or stop the survey at any time. The result of this specific copy of survey will not be published, but it would be used as raw material for the analysis. The survey will probably take you 3-5 minutes to complete.

PART.I Basic Information
1. How long have you been living in this neighborhood? ____________
2. Age
   - □ 18-29
   - □ 30-39
   - □ 40-39
   - □ 50-59
   - □ 60 or above
3. Gender
   - □ Male
   - □ Female
4. Racial and Ethnic Group _______________

PART.II Personal Safety
1. How do you feel in terms of safety while walking alone after dark (e.g. after 10 pm)?
   - A. very safe
   - B. safe
   - C. need to be alert
   - D. dangerous
   - E. very dangerous
2. How do you feel leaving your bag on the table to pick up your food at a restaurant/go to the bathroom?
A. I always feel safe to leave my belongings on my seat
B. I sometimes feel safe to leave my belongings on my seat
C. I may leave my belongings but I would bring my valuables with me (such as purse, phone)
D. I would take all my things with me
E. I have to grab my things/put them on my lap even when I am eating

3. Do you think your neighborhood has become safer or less safe in the last 5 years?
   A. a lot safer   B. safer   C. no change   D. more dangerous   E. a lot more dangerous
   Why? Can you give us specific examples/reasons? (e.g. public security)

PART.III Community Trust

1. Do you think the people around your neighborhood are trustworthy or untrustworthy?
   A. They are people I can truly trust, even for important things
   B. I can trust them on specific things that are not so important
   C. I trust them a little, but not a lot
   D. I don’t trust them at all

2. If you had a child in the same school with your neighbor, would you let your neighbor pick up your child if you are busy?
   A. Of course
   B. It depends on how well I know the neighbor
   C. maybe, if I have to, but I will feel very uncomfortable
   D. no

3. If a stranger came to your community, how would you feel if he/she started a conversation with you?
A. Very relaxed  B. comfortable  C. no feeling  D. nervous  E. threatened

**PART. IV Open-ended**

Have you ever seen any changes (in terms of gentrification) in your neighborhood since you moved to this area?

(for example: new shops, new neighbors, cost of living etc.)

Thank you for your participation! 😊