NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION & EMERGENCE OF POST INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY

William A Schwab, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

INTRODUCTION

In the early 1970's there was a grassroots movement known as neighborhood revitalization which was in concert with the direction of national policy. Neighborhood revitalization was also called "gentrification", the "back to the city movement", and "private urban renewal." It involved efforts of young middle class professionals to resettle and revitalize poorer urban neighborhoods. Most of these efforts have been bootstrap operations with little or no help from federal or local government. In a number of cities the change in neighborhoods has been remarkable, and the revitalized neighborhoods have become national showplaces, as models of how private programs can solve urban ills.

Although research on thie phenomenon is far from complete and all the patterns are not yet clear, existing studies consistently indicate three trends. 1) The neighborhood revitalization process is widespread with at least 124 cities of 50,000 population or more with some degree of revitalization (James 1977). The 30 largest cities in the United States have one or more revitalization projects under way (Clay 1978, 1979). These efforts are concentrated in older cities in the south and northeast regions (Black 1975). 2) Revitalization is not a trend back to the city. Central city populations continue to decentalize to the suburbs (Spain 1980a, 1980b). The suburban lifestyle is still preferred by most Americans, and this way of life will probably remain even at considerable cost and inconvenience (Abravanel & Mancini 1980; Levin 1979; Birch 1979). Neighborhood revitalization is actually a "stay in the city" movement rather than a "back to the city" movement. Most new settlers are moving from other parts of the the same central city or from other cities, and not from the suburbs. Most of the new settlers are young, affluent, and well educated. Many are professionals, and they tend to be disproportionately childless (Long 1980; Lasten & Spain 1979; Smith 1979).

Has the "stay ;in the city" movement positively affected net migration or the population composition of central cities? In the short run, these new settlers have had little effect on either process. There has been a growing decentralization of population from central cities for most of this Century. The out-migration from central cities since World War II is not a new phenomenon. What is new is the rate of out-migration. From 1960 to 1970 central cities in the United States lost more than 3.5 million people in net out-migration, and more than 8 million from 1970 to 1977. Considering the three components of population, (births - deaths + migration) the total population of central cities declined 4.6 percent from 1970 to 1977. Larger and older metropolitan areas (over a million population) lost 7.1 percent of their central city population in the same period. Higher income employed persons have led the exodus from central cities. The income levels of in-migrants have been lower than those of out-migrants. As a result, central cities experienced a net loss of $47 billion in aggregate personal income from 1970 to 1977 (Alonso 1978).

A DIFFERENT VIEW ON REVITALIZATION

Numerous explanations for the neighborhood revitalization process have been offered. They include 1) changing lifestyles, 2) escalating costs for housing and energy, 3) shifts in the nation's urban policy, 4) changes in policy by lending institutions, and 5) changing American attitudes about the city. Absent from this list is the notion that cities are dynamic and ever changing. There is a continual change in this nation's system of cities, and in the internal structure of individual cities. Rapid social change has characterized all of our history. What is new is the speed and scope of urban change. Neighborhood revitalization reflects basic changes in the urban fabric of the country, and must be related to more basic economic, ecologic and technologic forces.

Factorial Ecology. Social area analysis, introduced by Shevky, Williams, and Bell more than 30 years ago has become central to the literature of contemporary urban ecology (Timms 1971). Its major contribution has been to sensitize researchers to the close relation between the interal structure of the city and the scale of development of the encompass-

ing society. By societal scale, ecologists refer to the extent of the division of labor ia society and the complexity of its organizations and institutions. As societies advance in scale, changes on the societal level are manifested first and most clearly in specialized land use and the organization of space within cities. In a low scale society with relatively simple organization, there will be relatively little specialized land use, and residential uses are classed along a single dimension of family status. In high scale societies, social and economic organization is complex as reflected in specialized urban and use and a residential mosaic. Cities of industrial societies reguire at least the three dimensions of social, family, and ethnic status for classification. Increase in societal scale also alters the relation of cities within the system of cities (Borchert 1967; Dunn 1980). As the scale of a society increases, there is a complete alteration of the urban fabric of society.

From the ecological perspective, neighborhood revitalization and other changes in city morphology and the growth of urban fringe, and non-metropolitan growth are directly related to an increase in the scale level of American society.

RISING SOCIETAL SCALE TRENDS

Shevky and Bell (1955) postulated that changes brought about by an increase in the scale of society would be reflected in one of three social trends: 1) changes in distribution of skills, 2) changes in the structure of productive activity, and 3) changes in population composition. And these changes would become manifest in the internal structure of the metropolis.

Distribution of Skills. Changes in the distribution of skills is most apparent in the distribution of labor force among economic sectors. In low-scale societies, economic organization is charactrized by family or household enterprises such as subsistence farming, handicrafts, and various unorganized services. Most goods and services are produced and sold locally. In contrast, high-scale societies are characterized by the production of goods and services for national and international markets. In such societies, the distribution of skills is organized by mechanisms of the market rather than by kinship ties.

To analyze these changes, data for 51 countries were grouped into low, medium, and high scale levels on the basis of per capita gross development product (GDP) for 1960. Employment in each sector is expressed as a percent of total employment in the economy. Then for each sector, averages are computed for each group of countries. The calculations are repeated for for 1980 data. Table 1 summarized these date and illustrates the distribution of employment by scale of society, as well as shifts in the sectoral distribution of employment over time.

Basic changes in the distribution of skills in society occur with increasing societal scale. Most notable is the dramatic decline in agricultural employment as per capita income rises. In post-industrial societies agricultural employment is at an irreducible minimum. These data also suggest that declines in agriculture in the early stages of development are absorbed in the service sector. This may reflect the complete reorganization of a society's infrastructure that takes place as the scale level of a society rises. The growth of public institutions such as schools, hospitals, and security forces, and the operation of postal service, and communication and transport systems account for the high levels of service employment.

In the high-scale or post-industrial societies, the service sector surpassed manufacturing as early as 1960. In the two decades ending in 1980, agriculture, construction, and transport experienced little change whereas manufacturing declined slightly, and service sector employment rose substantially from 40 to 48 percent. In high-scale societies, manufacturing has ceased to be the dominant factor in national economic development.

Generally, employment data in the United States exhibits patterns consistent with other high-scale post-industrial societies. Table 2 exhibits data showing sectoral changes in employment in the United States between 1967 and 1976. Over this period there was a 20 percent growth in total employment, but manufacturing did not share in the expansion. Instead, employment in manufacturing declined to about a quarter of the total work force. Rates of decline were similar for both durable and non-durable goods manufacture. Sectors

TABLE 1: WAGE EMPLOYMENT BY ECONOMIC SECTORS, 1960 & 1980 IN 52 COUNTRIES

		1960			1980		
Sector:		I	II	III	I	II	III
(N, Countries		19	10	13	19	10	13
GDP per capita US $ 1000's		.2	.5	1.7	.6	2.1	7.2
Agriculture Hunting Forestry, Fishing	%	37	14	5	29	10	5
Mining, Quarrying	%	4	1	2	1	1	1
Manufacturing	%	13	23	33	16	25	28
Construction	%	7	9	10	8	10	9
Tran sport	%	5	7	8	6	7	7
Services	%	30	43	40	36	45	48
Omitted Activities	%	4	3	2	4	2	2
Total	%	100	100	100	100	100	100

1. GDP per capita is in constant prices.

Sector I (1960 per capita GDP under $300)
Nepal, India, Thailand, Egypt, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Korea, Morocco, Angola, Ghana, Iran, Syria, Liberia, Dominican Republic, Seychelles, Algeria, Columbia, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Portugal, Chile

Sector II (1960 per capita under $700)
Mexico, Spain, Hong Kong, Costa Rica, Martinique, Panama, Malta, Greece, Lebanon, Singapore, Japan, Argentina, Ireland

Sector III (1960 per capita GDP more than $700)
Italy, Puerto Rico, Austria, Israel, Finland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, German Federal Republic, France, United Kingdom, Bahrain, New Zealand, Australia, Sweden, Canada, Kuwait. Source: International Labour Office *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1960, 1961, 1980, 1981 Geneva Switzerland.

providing at least a third more jobs by 1976 include medical services, hotels, state and local government, and fire protection.

As specific skills become functionally more important to a society, the level of education needed to acquire these skills increases, as does the reward for acquiring them. Since residential segregation is a universal urban phenomenon, changes in occupational prestige will be reflected in the use of residential space in cities.

There is a significant lag between the time a social change occurs and the time it affects the city, due to the fixed housing and other physical artifacts of the city, some of which have livespans of decades or centuries. The changes resulting from these factors in the distribution of skills are already apparent in the morphology of cities in the United States. Table 3 gives indexes of residential dissimilarity among employed males in 8 major occupational groups. The most markedly segregated

TABLE 2: U.S. EMPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION

	1976 1000's	Pct Change from 1967
Total employment	79,467	20.0
Mining	800	34.2
Construction	3,340	3.2
Transport, utilities	4,506	5.9
Trade	17,610	27.9
Wholesale	4,292	20.1
Retail	13,318	30.6
Fire	4,359	33.4
Services	14,781	44.9
Hotels	1,031	45.8
Personal	814	-20.7
Medical	4,519	80.8
Education	1,283	18.8
Government	15,130	28.8
Federal	2,730	0.7
State & local	12,400	37.2
Manufacturing	18,941	-1.2
Durables	11,018	-1.1
Nondurables	7,923	-1.3

TABLE 3: RESIDENCE DISSIMILARITY INDEXES FOR EMPLOYED MALES, 1970* & CHANGE FROM 1960 to 1970**

Occupation	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Professional	16	16	28	36	45	40	46
2 Managerial	0	14	30	36	46	42	48
3 Sales	0	0	27	34	44	39	45
4 Clerical	-1	0	3	20	25	22	29
5 Craft	0	1	3	3	20	25	29
6 Operative	-2	-1	1	0	0	19	19
7 Services	-8	-7	-6	-9	-8	-4	19
8 Laborers	-11	-11	-10	-12	-11	-7	-4

* Above Diagonal; ** Below Diagonal
(Averaged across 10 urbanized areas.)

Source:Simkus A 1978 "Residential Segregation in Ten Urbanized Areas, 1950-1970." *American Sociological Review* 43 p84

groups are clustered at the top and bottom of the occupational hierarchy. Occupations in the middle of the hierarchy have fairly low indexes and they tend to be similar in residence. Note that the degree of segregation for each of the six highest occupational categories remained about the same, averaging less than than one percent change. The indexes of dissimilarity between service workers and the six highest categories decreased by an average of 7.6 points. The finding that service workers are less segregated from the five highest occupational categories than operatives suggests that a change on the societal level can now be measured in the residential structure of the metropolis. The rising prestige and income of service workers translates to a greater residential freedom of movement in the city which was heretofore denied them.

CHANGED STRUCTURE OF PRODUCTION

Changes in the structure of production have had a profound impact on the morphology of cities in all high-scale societies. Breakthroughs in transportation, communication, and computer technology have convinced some that a new urban form has emerged since World War II: the cybernetic society (Golany 1978). In low-scale societies, where primary sector activities such as agriculture and mining predominate, the geographic distribution of these activities is dispersed. Except for small towns and villages, the dispersed character of these activities does not lead to emergence of urban centers (Schwab 1982).

As the scale of societies increases, manufacturing and industry predominate and the locational factors for the activities are very different. Manufacturing and industry increasingly become separated from raw materials as large cities develop. The interdependence of many industries means that there are great economies to be gained from close geographic proximity. This is a major factor in transportation, especially when the ratio of product value to transport cost is high. The cost in Pittsburb of transporting rolled steel to durable goods manufacturers is high, so along with steel firms, Pittsburg's local economy is rich in metal fabrication and durable goods manufacture (Dunn 1980).

The economics of proximity for interdependent industries due to communication are also important. Before World War II, when communication technology was less developed, the enormous flow of communication between industries necessary for sales transactions and supply orders, was facilitated by common location.

Several related changes in the past three decades have altered the economy of agglomeration. 1) There has been an increase in the length of the production chain. As the production process lengthens, labor costs increase and relative transport costs decrease, sometimes to an relatively insignificant level, as is the case with computers and calculators. Proximity to materials and parts suppliers becomes less important. The immense expansion of the interstate highway system and the size and efficiency of long distance transport contribute to decentralized manufacturing. 2) Through the revolution in communications, modern long distance communication has reduced the importance of proximity. Long distance telephone, telex, and reliable computer data transmission equipment allow decentralized plants in non-metropolitan areas, a pattern which once was economically impossible (Leven 1979). 3) Interacting and reinforcing the effects of the previous two forces is the growth of the service sector. Since much of this sector involves collection, processing, retrieval and dissemination of information, these activities may locate anywhere with the availability of modern communication technology.

EFFECTS ON THE FAMILY

The transformation of the family from the extended to the nuclear form is a well documented outcome of the evolution of societies from the preindustrial to the industrial form, as are the changing roles of women in society. Freed from large numbers of children and kinship obligations, women have entered the main labor force. In industrial society, with the nuclear family often isolated from relatives in the local community, many lifestyles become possible, including the single, the retiree, the young adult with children, the childless, and the single parent. In industrial societies, each lifestyle may be accommodated by a different part of the city.

Several demographic trends are apparent. 1) In the last decade, there has been a strong trend toward singleness for men and women. More than 54 percent of all women and 58 percent of all men live alone. 2) During the past decade the divorce rate has risen steadily while first marriage and remarriage rates are at an all time low. Between 1970 and 1978 the estimated median age at first marriage increased by a full year for both men and women. Although most people eventually marry, there is less urgency to marry than in the past. As young adults, women are apparently placing more stress on pursuit of an education, establishing a career, and becoming economically independent before marriage, and on remaining single. 3) Labor force participation, more than any other aspect of society, reflects the changing status of women. In the United States, more than one half of all women were in the workforce in

1978, an increase of 10 million from 1970, to over 42 million women. 4) The fertility rate now stands at 1.8, well below the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman. 5) These trends have converged to bring about important changes in the structure of the family. A variety of forms of the nuclear family have emerged. Thus, 19.3 million women and 9.4 men operate households in which no spouse is present. The typical United States family is one in which both parents work, and the average number of children is less than 2 (Census Bureau 1978).

These demographic changes which reflect the broader societal shifts in the nature of productive activity are translated into new and sometimes different housing needs. These changes in turn influence individual, family, and business locational decisions which in turn, influence the structure of the metropolis and the system of cities. The growth patterns in the Sunbelt cities, and the gentrification process are examples of this process, The urban gentry is one group which reflects most clearly the linkage between changes in the structure of production activity and the family, and their impact on the morphology of the city. The urban gentry are generally young, single, or childless married couples with incomes in the middle and upper middle range, who hold white collar and professional postions. They are normally employed in the growing service, professional and office centers of the central business district (CBD), and choose older central city neighborhoods for convenience and accessibility. A changing locational calculus employed by many groups is reshaping the city.

CHANGED POPULATION COMPOSITION

As a society increases in scale, the physical mobility of its populatin increases. This redistribution of society's population in its territory is closely tied to changes in the distribution of skills and changes in the structure of productive activity. With the mechanization of agriculture in low scale society, the demand for farm labor declines and surplus labor migrates from rural to urban areas. In advanced industrial societies, rural to urban migration ceases, but similar readjustments take place within and between cities. As industry declines in one region, opportunities may expand in another. Workers can respond to these opportunities by moving. The movement of people suggests that the labor force is closely tuned to changes in the national economy.

In 1973 the Census Bureau announced that nonmetropolitan growth from 1970 to 1973 exceeded metropolitan growth. This reversed a trend which has lasted for nearly two centuries in the United States. This reversal is explained by the convergence of several trends in high scale societies. Improvements in transport technology, especially the automobile and truck, permitted the massive decentralization of population in the post World War II period. Manufacturing, industry, retail and service sector activities soon followed, leading to the emergence of strong suburban centers for employment, service, and residence. As a result, most suburbanites live and work in the suburbs; only a sixth commute to the central city.

These integrated subcenters also permitted people to live beyond the suburbs in nonmetropolitan areas while commuting to the nearest suburban employment nuclei. Currently, over 60 percent of those leaving the metropolis move into counties immediately adjacent to major urban areas. Thus, expanding urban fields exceed the boundaries of the standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA), but are functionally part of the same urban system. The expansion into the nonmetropolitan periphery appears as part of a more general process of population and economic diffusion (Alonso 1978).

How have these changes on the societal level affected the internal structure of the metropolis? Before World War II, decisions to move to a city or to a different location within the same city were normally job related. The distance between place of employment and place of residence was short because technology for mass transportation was poorly developed.

With the impact of modern transport and communication technology, the decision about where to work is relatively independent of the decision about where to live. Birch and others have shown that most urbanites are indifferent to transport time costs until they exceed 20 minutes (Birch 1979). Economic factors have become less important, as mobility

FIGURE 1: CHANGES IN URBAN STRUCTURE AND FORM BY INDUSTRIALIZATION SCALE LEVEL

Level	Skills Distribution Change	Production Structure Change	Population Change	Urban Structure	Urban Morphology
Pre-Industrial	Distribution of skills organized with household enterprises; manufacturing employment unimportant; service employment sporadic, & unorganized; agricultural employment dominantes; few wage earners, mostly family workers; family & kin ties dominate employment sector; skills unrelated to stratification system.	Agricultural sector dominant; production activity dispersed transport, communication and manufacturing technology low, making dispersal necessary; production activities mostly subsistence farming, handcrafts.	Slow population growth; high birth, death rates; low rates of migration; extended family dominant.	Small scale, concentrated mononucleate form; administrative, commercial centers; urban production limited to crafts; interaction channels sporadic, irregular.	Morphology simple; family dominates all other institutions; family status is the single axis of differentiation.
Industrial	Distribution of skills organized by market mechanisms; dramatic decline in agricultual employment; manufacturing dominant employment source, close followed by service; most are wage workers; few family workers; skills relate functionally to stratification system.	Manufacturing sector dominant production activity concentrated; short production chains; economy of proximity due to prevailing transport & communication technology.	Rapid population growth; youthful populations; nuclear family dominant.	Concentrated mononucleate form; production activity concentrated; urban field matches city limits; regular interaction channels.	Morphology complex; a mosaic of social worlds; social distance appears in physical distance between groups; minimum of three axes to differentiate social, family ethnic & migration status.
Post-Industrial	Agriculture & extractive employment at an irreducible minimum; manufacturing employment no longer dominant factor in society; employment rises in high technology manufacture; service employment dominant; skills of service workers and technocrats reflected in stratification system.	Service sector dominant; high technology industry; revolution in communication & transport technology; long production chains reduce economics of agglomeration; locational decision calculus changed; production decentralized & dispersed.	Slow urban & population growth, possible decline; outmigration from cities to non-urban areas; aging population; rise of single, small & nonfamily households.	Dispersed multinucleate form; decentralized & dispersed production; urban field spans metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas; multiple channels of interaction.	Morphology complex; urban fields expand, take in nonmetropolitan areas; spatial cities; urban & rural distinctions diminish; rise in family & nonfamily households; need at least 4 differential axes: – social, family, ethnic, migration, ex-urban(?)

decisions have been shaped by other considerations. Living space, both indoor and outdoor, climate, schools, personal safety, proximity to friends, availability of shopping and other amenities now play a central role in peoples' locational decisions.

CONCLUSIONS

Cities are dynamic and ever changing, yet the past continues to shape the present. Decisions made generations ago by community leaders on where to locate streets, sewers, parks, schools, factories, and public facilities as well as the locational forces of the past which determined residential location for the wealthy, the poor and the middle class continue to provide the basic template on which the city of the future will be built. Older and larger metropolitan areas were built on an industrial base with a set of assumptions which no longer apply. In the 19th and early 20th Centuries, massive populations of people were concentrated around industrial and manufacturing centers for economy of transport and communication. Today, the shifts from manufacturing to service and the revolution in transport and communication technology reduce the importance of proximity to work and production centers.. The decentralized, polynucleated and highly specialized metropolis is the emerging urban form of the late 20th and early 21st Centuries. The problem lies in the fact that this new urban form is being superimposed on existing cities.

Neighborhood revitalization reflects basic changes in the nature of the larger encompassing city. A change in the skills, production activity, and population dynamics determines the form of the city. Figure 1 summarizes the urban development process and its major components. These trends shape population redistribution as both business and individuals reoptimize locations within the urban field according to new locational forces. The shift of business and population to nonmetropolitan areas, the continued growth of suburbs, declining central city population, and the return of some middle class Americans to older central city neighborhoods is part of this more general process. Urban problems which have emerged result mainly from the enormous time lag built into our urban systems and a structure of city government and finance inappropriate for these new urban forms.

REFERENCES

Abravanel M D, P K Mancini 1980 *Attitudinal Demographic Constraints to Neighborhood Revitalization.* Beverly Hills California Sage

Alonso W 1978 Current halt in the Metropolitan phenomenon. C Levin ed *The Mature Metropolis* Lexington MA Heath

Birch D L 1979 *Behavioral Foundations of Neighborhood Change.* Washington DC Dep of Housing & Urban Development

Black J T, 1975 *Private Market Housing Renovation in Central Cities: Urban Land Institute Survey.* Washington DC Urban Land Institute

Borchert J R 1967 American metropolitan revolution. *Geographical Review* 57 301-323

Clay P L 1978 Neighborhood revitalization: Recent experience in large American Cities. Paper, Cambridge MA MIT Urban & Regional Planning Dep

— 1979 *Neighborhood Revival: Middle-Class Resettlement and Incumbent Upgrading in American Neighborhoods.* Lexington MA Lexington Books

Dunn Jr E S 1980 *Development of the U.S. Urban System.* Johns Hopkins U Press

Golany G 1978 *Urban Planning for Arid Zones.* New York Wiley

James F 1977 *Back to the City: Appraisal of Housing Reinvestment & Population Change in Urban America.* Washington DC Urban Land Institute

Laska S B, D Spain 1979 Urban policy & planning in the wake of centrification: Anticpiating renovators' demands. *J of American Planning Assn* 45 126-137

Leven C 1979 Economic maturity & the metropolis: Evolving physical form. G Tobin ed *Changing Structure of the City.* Beverly Hills California Sage

Long L H 1980 Back to the countryside & back to the city in the same decade. S Laska, D Spain eds *Back to the City: Issues in Neighborhood Renovations.* New York Pergamon

Schwab W A 1982 *Urban Sociology.* Boston Addison Wesley

Shevky E, W Bell 1955 *Structural Area Analysis: Theory, Illustrative Applications and Computational Procedures.* Stanford U Press

Smith N 1975 Towards a theory of centrification: Back to the city movement by capital, not people. *J of American Planning Assn* 45 538-548

Spain D 1980a Black to white succession in central city housing: Limited evidence of urban revitalization. *Urban Affairs Qtrly* 15 381-396

— 1980b Indicators of urban revitalization: Racial & economic changes in central city housing. Laska & Spain eds *Back to the City: Issues in Neighborhood Renovation.* New York Pergamon

Timms D W G 1971 *The Urban Mosaic: Towards a Theory of Residential Differentiation.* Cambridge U Press

United States Census Bureau 1978 *Statistical portrait of women in the United States; 1978. Current Population Reports* Series P-23 No 100 USGPO Tables 3-1; 3-4; 3-5; 4-1; 6-1