

GENTRIFICATION OF AN INDIANAPOLIS COMMUNITY: THE CITY PLANNING
PROCESS AND RESIDENT NARRATIVES ON CHANGE

A thesis presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Applied Sociology
University of Indianapolis

In Partial Fulfillment of the Degree of
Master of Arts

by
Angela Calvert

May, 2019

APPROVED:

Dr. Timothy Maher, PhD

Thesis Director

Dr. Colleen Wynn, PhD

Reader

Abstract

This research examines shifting perceptions of community in the gentrifying Indianapolis neighborhood of Fountain Square. It explores the roles that media and non-profit agencies play in development of a low-income neighborhood, while adding resident narratives of community change. This project uses several methods including analysis of newspaper article portrayal of Fountain Square over a 20-year span, studying local planning documents, and collecting resident narratives, and provides a comparison between outside and neighborhood agencies from a sociological macro perspective and a micro perspective through individually lived experiences.

Analysis of texts contributes documentation of outside and organized inside influences leading to gentrification and the involvement level of Fountain Square residents as change agents. Texts were found through online data bases and libraries throughout Indianapolis. Semi-structured interviews contributed documentation of life-long residents' lived experiences in their home neighborhood. The Snowball Research Method was used, starting with personal connections of the researcher to find participants interested in sharing their experiences. Interviews took place in informal spaces, like a home and a local bar. The informal setting was intentional to make interviewees comfortable to share their personal experiences and matches the informal character of Fountain Square before gentrification. Analysis of interviews included identifying feelings/experiences of community, social ties, third places (places people meet outside of home or work place), and feelings/experiences of loss/gain from changes. Patterns were identified among participants to understand individual and communal experiences.

Reflective Statement

My experiences as a resident and community organizer in Fountain Square led me to research the gentrification process that has changed my community. My maternal grandmother and paternal grandparents settled in the neighborhood in 1950s as migrants from Appalachian areas in East Kentucky and Tennessee. For over five decades in the area, my immediate and extended family lived, shopped, and frequented third places in and around Fountain Square. I became a local community organizer and employee of non-profit agencies starting in 2006 and I continue to currently be involved in neighborhood groups. I was involved in many efforts to disseminate residential resources and gather input for neighborhood plans. I have been a member and board member of neighborhood associations, organizations, and the local charter school my children attend. I took part in creating the Southeast Neighborhood Quality of Life Plan and forming the Southeast Neighborhood Congress. Both platforms were meant to act as agencies for resident-driven change in Southeast Indianapolis.

My involvement as a resident, family member, parent, and community organizer led me to recognize the detrimental effect gentrification was having on low-income Fountain Square families and spaces they interact. I have witnessed displacement of my neighbors and children's friends. I have experienced change in third places that helped form community identity. I began to analyze the role I had in slow, then rapid, changes occurring in my neighborhood. The devastating realization of no longer feeling like I belonged began to take a toll on my emotional health.

Sharing my experiences with other residents, friends, family, and neighbors helped me relate my personal experiences to a larger societal issue of splintering social networks, resident displacement, and feelings of not belonging caused by gentrification. I wanted to gain knowledge on how and why changes occurred in the neighborhood and who has benefited or not from the process. This led me to examine city planning processes in Indianapolis and seek resident narratives to understand gentrification on a sociological macro and micro-level.

Statement of Problem

Much has been written in efforts to examine the gentrification of urban neighborhoods. Upon searching for scholarship on the topic, I found much on the relationship between gentrification and minority communities, as well as articles written on global gentrification. There is a lack of material on the dynamics between media portrayal of a predominately white working-class community with a comparison to resident perception.

Literature Review

Gentrification is not an unplanned or “natural” occurring process of inner-city communities. Slow and intentional efforts are made to rebrand, reinvest, and replace the undesirable aspects of Fountain Square, Indianapolis. Using Conflict Theory of Karl Marx as a sociological framework, this project involved analyzing neighborhood planning documents, newspaper articles, and resident narratives to track middle and upper-class (the bourgeois) dominance over the working-class residents (the

proletarians). Class conflict is reflected in the struggle over homeownership, neighborhood character, and eventual displacement of lower-income residents, many from Appalachian descent. Outlined in *The German Ideology* (1845-1846) and *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx and Friedrich Engels explain how the use of capitalistic manipulation in the form of objects works to alienate and dominate the working-class. In the case of the working-class Fountain Square resident, this was done through using the housing market to raise the cost of living to exclude the existing working-class resident.

When a city government wants to displace old residents and replace them with higher educated and well-paid taxpayers, they must first create desirable places for middle-upper class people to live within poor neighborhoods they would consider undesirable. Governmental and nonprofit agency plans like, “Fountain Square Historic Preservation Plan” mapped out efforts to change ownership of properties in Fountain Square to create a neighborhood driven away from the needs of long-term resident and towards those of middle-upper class residents. These plans document step-by-step processes that create convincing arguments for change needed in poor inner-city neighborhoods. The existing poor community narrative is omitted, while the potential for “improvement” is emphasized in the plans.

Part of the planning process that creates a gentrified neighborhood is changing policy that incentivize the changing of ownership in property to investors outside a poor neighborhood. Sharon Zukin discusses the influence of public policy on gentrifying a neighborhood in her article, “Gentrification in Three Paradoxes.” This point is relevant to

the study of gentrification in that it pinpoints the cause of the change in changing neighborhoods. Zukin states:

“Land prices are still low enough to attract developers—marginal investors initially, followed by big institutions. New laws are passed to facilitate investment. Zoning laws, tax credits, transportation systems, and direct subsidies to developers create institutional scaffolding for investment in the built environment, while policing policies raise the level of confidence that the structure will not collapse. If you think of this process as fueled by returns to capital investment rather than consumption choices, you can see that supergentrifiers are put in place by “super-rents.””

An examination of third places in Fountain Square for the study uncovered how integral they are in creating and disassembling a sense of community. Neighborhood third places are agents of cohesion inside urban communities like Fountain Square. Ray Oldenburg discussed how neutral spaces outside of homes and workplaces allow time for relationship building between members in a community who may not have immediate commonalities. Many benefits come from participating in a third place, including gaining a sense of belonging (Oldenburg, 269). Third places in Fountain Square mirrored the working-class population of the neighborhood before gentrification. They offered spaces for working-class men and women to participate in social interaction in the form of affordable neighborhood stores, restaurant, and pubs. Local folklore, events, and gossip is/was shared amongst participants, helping to foster a sense of belonging outside of self-interest (272). This shared history allowed for residents of Fountain Square to celebrate

their identities in ways not tolerated in places outside the neighborhood. Storytelling was a common type of non-discursive symbolism used in neighborhood third places.

Participants used a shared language to tell stories about their lives and those around them. There were innuendos, terms, and analogies used in these stories that were inclusive to the Fountain Square resident, while weeding out those who do not share the same history of the storyteller. This study attempts to capture the unique “banter and chatter” of third places that once were or still hanging on in Fountain Square.

Third places of old Fountain Square uniquely offered spaces to interact with others outside of their immediate families or workplace. This interaction enabled residents to intertwine personal and practical relationships with those in their community. Unlike the home and work life relationships, built on commonalities and kinship, third places created spaces to bond personally with those with different perspectives and skills (275). Networks formed within these spaces spilled into lives of participants at third places. For example, two men meet each other at a local pub. One is a mechanic and one is a plumber by trade. The two sit weekly at the pub and have a beer after their separate work. While getting to know each other, the plumbers’ work van breaks down. He knows the mechanic from the bar and asks him for advice. The mechanic offers to “take a look” at the van on the spot. He knows what will fix the van and offers to trade his skills in return for the plumber fixing a leaky sink he’s been meaning to get around to fixing. In this way, third places solidified bonds while providing means of meeting household needs.

Along with studying planning documents and third places as a means of understanding gentrification, a textual analysis of Indianapolis Star articles identified a pattern of depicting Fountain Square as less and more desirable over time. Starting in 2009, writers critique the neighborhood as “up and coming” at the same time as devaluing who and what was there before. Analysis involved searching over 3,000 Indianapolis Star articles from the beginning of 1997 to the end of 2018 for positive and negative terms that were used in conjunction with the term “Fountain Square.”

Statements, like the one below, were also analyzed as persuasive methods in driving more affluent people to visit and live in the neighborhood, while claiming the neighborhood had little to offer before the new restaurant ventures.

*“As Linton Calvert grew up on Indianapolis' Near Eastside, his parents forbade him to visit Fountain Square, because it was **“too rough and tough.”** In 1993, Calvert and his wife, Fern, arrived in a big way by purchasing the landmark Fountain Square Theatre Building, 1105 Prospect St., with an eye toward **reviving the blue-collar neighborhood.** “I always believe in the **light at the end of the tunnel,**” said Calvert, president of the Fountain Square Merchants Association. “It is probably right **within our grasp right now.**” (Thomas, Sep 2009)*

Research Plan

Study Approach/Design:

My research involves quantitative methods used to create historical context and macro-level analysis of instigators and drivers of economic change in the Fountain Square community. Inspection of neighborhood documentation regarding plans to gentrify the neighborhood lay groundwork for understanding beginning processes of gentrification. Analysis of newspaper articles provide a city-wide perception of Fountain Square as changes occurred. As a qualitative measure, semi-structured interviews of Fountain Square residents or past residents were conducted to collect ethnographic material. Layering a resident narrative allows for the study to compare the macro processes with a micro-level perspective of an individual, family, and community See “Appendix A – Consent Form” for the form and process I used to gain consent from interviewees

Participants:

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with residents or past residents of Fountain Square who have experienced gentrification. Collecting ethnographic material through personal narratives added perspectives on the toll gentrification has on individuals, families, and communities. In-depth interviews took place in a three-month period between February - April 2019. Perspectives of 9 residents with unique experiences within local schools, third places, neighborhoods, and non-profits before and during the span of gentrification in Fountain Square were gathered for the study. Most interviews took 2 hours or more to conduct. Each interviewee had lived, worked, and/or frequented

third places in the neighborhood and contributed perspectives on the value they place on each part of the Fountain Square community.

Criteria of interviewees was originally set to long-time or life-long residents. However, as the snowball method pointed me to others outside the criteria who had a feeling of loss during gentrification of Fountain Square, I opened the criteria to anyone with life experience they wanted to share. There were no set criteria for sex or race. All participants were white (which reflects the long-term racial composition of the neighborhood) and there was a mix of males and females. The age of the participants was the most diverse demographic of participants. Participants were 30 -- 70 years old and had grown up or lived in Fountain Square during different decades. Exclusion criterion of participants was based on level of participation in social networking within the area and willingness to share experiences. Several interviews were excluded from the study because the participants were not able to make time to share their experiences, although they were interested in participating.

I attempted to avoid biases during the interviews with Fountain Square residents. My main objective during my interviews of people who had lived experiences of Fountain Square was to let them tell their stories and for me to listen while documenting. I would participate in the discussion during interviews but tried to not sway the interviewee into any opinion other than their own. I did refrain from interviewing close friends or family of mine to avoid biases, although their stories are valid accounts. I tried to interview people I did not know or know well before the interviewing process in attempt to not transfer my experiences onto them.

Materials/Measures:

It was intentional to make the interviews informal to allow interviewees to be comfortable to share their personal experiences and this approach matches the informal character of Fountain Square before gentrification. I conducted the interviews through an informal conversational process. I took written notes during the interviews to ensure accuracy.

I gained entrée to interviewees through Snowball Sampling. I started interviews with people I casually knew and followed up on recommendations through friends in the neighborhood. Starting with residents I knew personally allowed me to start the project because trust and relationships already existed between me and interviewees. Using recommendations of interviewees, allowed other residents I know to be gate keepers to other interviewees by vouching for me as a trusted researcher and neighborhood activist. Without my personal connections to the neighborhood and some of the interviewees, I likely would not have been able to collect the data I was as it can be difficult for residents to trust outsiders, especially since gentrification.

Interview Questions:

Research questions, like the ones below, were asked during the interviews:

- What brought you to Fountain Square?
- What kind of social networks did you have in Fountain Square?
- What were the important places outside the home and work did you, family members, or friends frequently visit?
- What changes have you noticed in Fountain Square since you moved here?

Analysis of interviews included identifying feelings/experiences of community, social ties, third places (places people meet outside of home or work place) and feelings/experiences of loss/gain from changes. Patterns were identified among participants to understand individual and communal experiences.

Storage of Interview Data:

All data gathered from the interview process will be kept in a locked file cabinet drawer within the Sociology Department at University of Indianapolis for a minimum of three years. After three years, all documents pertaining any identifying information of research participants will be shredded.

Textual Data Gathering:

Textual data gathering was used to gain insight on the gentrification process.

Neighborhood planning documents and newspaper articles were retrieved online or at libraries throughout Indianapolis. Newspaper articles from the Indianapolis Star and academic articles were retrieved from University of Indianapolis online library database. The Indiana State Library and Indianapolis Public Library were used to retrieve historical texts and relevant books unavailable online.

Questions like the following were used to analyze retrieved data:

- Who was involved in the planning of “improvement” of Fountain Square?
- What were the goals of early “improvement” efforts of Fountain Square?
- What was the role of residents in the change process of Fountain Square?
- How was Fountain Square perceived city-wide before and after the gentrification process?

Data Analysis and Findings

It's Easter Sunday in Fountain Square. The sun is shining and it's the first warm day from a drawn-out winter had that turned the neighborhood gray and dreary. The bare trees have begun to bloom beautiful shoots of magenta and cream, giving hope for the coming spring. Tufts of green are breaking through cracked sidewalks where hundred-year-old trees are stretching their underground limbs. Many yards are sectioned off with an array of fencing marking where one property starts and another begins. A chain link intertwined with brown vines, dead from the winter cold. A dog-eared picket that used to be white has changed to gray. Half a knee-high makeshift concrete block wall divides a dirt yard from the sidewalk.

Chubby brown and white kids play tag through a few fenceless yards with bright dandelions and sprinklings of wild violets, while moms watch from the stoop or porch listening to loud Spanish music. A bearded old man wearing a Nascar ballcap mows his grass across the street. A black teenager on a souped-up bicycle mimicking a crotch rocket motorcycle is followed by a white teenager riding a kid-sized bike. The young men leave a trail of blaring hip-hop from a low-quality speaker attached to one of their bikes. Heads turn to follow the louder music for a few seconds as they cruise past ten-year-old vehicles lining the street. Then, the kids go back to playing, moms go back to chatting, and the old man continues mowing.

Almost one-hundred-year homes painted in dull colored hues of off-white, gray, or light blue stand behind the collection of yards. An occasional bright red, deep blue, or even a fluorescent orange painted home pops up. Their peaks point toward the sky, roof

shingles missing or sliding down the sharp slopes. Gutters are dangling from their corners, burdened by too many years of heavy rain and snow. Plastic that kept the winter wind out has yet to be stripped from front windows that overlook porches filled with makeshift indoor or outdoor seating.

In the middle of all the music, cracked sidewalks, laughter, mismatched fencing, mowing, peaked roofs, chatting women, slipping shingles, playing children, and plastic covered windows stands a giant box-like house jutting out further than the other homes. The smaller older homes huddle under the towering right-angled structure made with vertical sheet metal mixed with splashes of bright colored textured wood. Windows are covered by shades or open to show sparkling chandeliers hanging from the front raised ceiling. The small yard of neatly rolled out uniformly growing sod gleams bright green but has little room for outdoor activity. The small unenclosed cement porch is barely raised above the ground with only room for a lonely small fashionable chair. There is no sign of life at the house, except the chair, a waving flag donning a local private college emblem, and a new car parked in front. A privacy fence begins down the back of the property.

The new house singles itself out. It's bold, big, and shiny. The collective buzz on the street comes to a halt when passing the home. It is abrupt with its looming features and lack of social outdoor front space. The bare furnishings, although neat, make the house seem vacant and unapproachable. The tall privacy fence does not make for easy relationship building. There will be no over-the-fence chance meetings to catch up on the happenings in the neighborhood. In fact, the six-foot expensive barrier communicates

that the new resident is not interested in their neighbors. Furthermore, they even want to ignore their existence and enjoy their predictable individual lot that mirrors the suburb from which they came.

This typical Fountain Square block in the beginning stages of gentrification that has already completely changed surrounding blocks depicts the danger lurking for the existing long-term residents of the area. The example of the disruption from the new residential atmosphere on the block is representative of a culture clash happening between existing and incoming residents. Many existing residents share a unique working-class culture created from a great Southern migration to the neighborhood beginning in the 1950's. The Appalachian migrants from mostly Kentucky and Tennessee moved to the area for close proximity to factory and manual labor jobs. The "solid working-class German character" of the neighborhood was replaced with the rowdy mountain character of Appalachian mountain regions. As Germans moved to surrounding suburbs, Appalachians moved into the near Southside urban area, creating a village mirroring their rural homelands. They brought with them a rich culture that confused outsiders who began to perceive the area negatively (Indiana University 2019).

The Appalachians set up a close-knit network in Fountain Square with relationship building as the urban villages' nucleus. As the initial migrants settled into the area, their family and friends also migrated north. The mostly white residents set up a series of networks and mechanisms for identifying outsiders as a means of survival in an unfamiliar urban terrain. They relied on existing and forged relationships to meet their social and basic needs. Services needed in the community were provided inside by

nearby residents of Fountain Square. All the needs of the Appalachians were met by their neighbors' skills, innovation, and caring. Children were kept in friends and family's homes, instead of formal institutions, while their parents worked. Back yard mechanics fixed neighborhood vehicles. Locals took care of the elderly and sick. Neighborhood kids groomed lawns. Self-taught carpenters maintained homes in the manner learned from having little resources in isolated mountain areas of their past. Commercial businesses that existed were mostly owned by local residents as well.

During the last half of the 1900's, Fountain Square was viewed outside the neighborhood as a dangerous place where outlaws and hillbillies resided. The generations of Appalachians living there still talked with southern accents, used a shared language, and had many ways of making a living that were deemed illegal by city standards.

The Fountain Square community had its own set of often contradictory laws and moral codes, some brought with them from the south and some created in Indianapolis. Parking on the sidewalk was acceptable but taking your neighbors parking spots was not. Violence was acceptable but bullying was not. Differences were settled "in-house" and publicly, yet folks valued their privacy. Terms of endearment inside the neighborhood, like "my old man," were insulting from an outsider perspective. What was acceptable child rearing techniques of the neighborhood, like "switching" children with small limbs from a tree, were not acceptable to outsiders.

Abiding by the Fountain Square codes of conduct by adhering to the accepted cultural and social behaviors identified those who belonged in the neighborhood from

those who did not. Those who didn't adhere or respect the codes could cause harm to an individual family, thus disrupting a whole network. For example, a visit to a single family from a social worker sent by the school could cause upheaval to not only the family, but the community, too. The visiting social worker, representing an institutional school system, could see transactions taking place between a parent and another that seem suspicious from an outsiders perspective. They notify the police. The police investigate and find the parent to be running an "illegal" mechanic shop in the family's garage. They fine the family and shut down the shop. Now, the community view of outsiders (social worker and police) being dangerous to the fabric of their society is further validated: neighborhood service that many relied on for their mechanical needs has been eliminated. The school is deemed an unsafe place and children are taught to mistrust their teachers. This set of consequences does not apply to only one family or community school. Tight networks disseminate this knowledge and is shared through communal gatherings and individual relationships. Over the years opposing outside forces have caused Fountain Square Appalachians and their descendants to become more insular over generations of living in Indianapolis.

As long as they had their space in the city and their internal codes to live by, networks were able to survive. Gentrification has threatened relationships and scattered networks as the cost of living in the area exploded, pushing residents to find living spaces outside the area. Indianapolis residents gained news and knowledge from local media sources that the area was now a "better" place to live and the proximity to all the downtown amenities was a perfect place for young professionals to invest their social

and/or economic capital. An analysis of identified Indianapolis Star articles depicting Fountain Square as less or more desirable over time identified changing city-wide perceptions of the area over a 20-year span.

Conducting the analysis involved searching over 3,000 Indianapolis Star articles from the beginning of 1997 to the end of 2018 for positive and negative terms were used in conjunction with the term “Fountain Square.” Using the Indianapolis Star website engine search, the analysis found the most mentions of “Fountain Square” to be in 2009. The use of words like “art”, “cultural”, “good”, “music”, and “improvement” all soared beginning around the same time (See Appendix B for more details).

Exerts from the articles (like below) were used to evaluate article writers’ critique of the neighborhood as “up and coming” at the same time devaluing who and what was there before. Quotes like the two below were used to describe the area as a “better” place to visit, safer and more valuable than the reputation of the neighborhood in the past:

“Not much was happening in Fountain Square then, but these days, the hopping neighborhood offers plenty of dining options” (Ketzenberger, Jan 2009).

“Fountain Square’s restaurants, shops and art galleries for years have been destinations for people from across the region. That’s great, but the key is raising the area’s per-capita income by attracting new residents” (Ketzenberger, Feb 2009).

These statements are persuasive methods in driving more affluent people to visit and live in the neighborhood, while claiming the neighborhood had little to offer before new ventures.

Mary, a life-long resident of Fountain Square, described her experience in Fountain Square very differently than described in the media. I met Mary through a mutual friend. I invited her over for an interview around my dining room table. She is a married white woman in her 40s with a sixteen-year-old son. Mary has lived in Fountain Square almost her entire life, excluding a five-year gap when she lived outside the neighborhood. She lives in a smaller house next to her aging father who lives in the two-story house she grew up in. Her family migrated to Fountain Square from Virginia and Kentucky around what she thinks was five generations past.

When describing the Fountain Square she remembers before gentrification, Mary said, “When my husband moved to Fountain Square, he said it was a town within a town.” She explained the neighborhood had everything families needed within walking distance. Small mom and pop stores were on corners with owners who lived in the neighborhood. There was a shoe store, huge thrift store, pet store, grocery store, pharmacy that even had a post office off the side, and schools. The shops, especially small corner shops, were used as hangout spots for adults and children alike.

From the beginning of our interview Mary was clear about how she defines her neighborhood. “People from Fountain Square don’t divide the neighborhood into to smaller neighborhoods, like North Square, Bates Hendricks (neighborhoods in Southeast Indianapolis). If you’re from Fountain Square, it’s all considered Fountain Square.”

Mary remembers a Fountain Square where nearly 25% of the folks living there were related to her somehow and everyone watched out for each other. She explains that she felt safe as a kid anywhere in the neighborhood because it didn't matter who you were, adults were going to make sure you are safe...and disciplined. She explains that there was a code around the neighborhood that if a kid did something wrong, the nearest adult would set her straight before calling or finding her parents to let them know what happened. There was a sense of unity among residents.

“The unity has been sucked out of Fountain Square. New people moving in don't care. I felt much safer in the old “hillbilly” Fountain Square than what it is now. If you got hurt then, someone would help. Now they'd peak out their windows and ignore it.”

Mary gives example of the changing culture brought in by new residents. One of her neighbors takes up five parking spaces on the street in front of their house. They have space in the back to park some of their vehicles yet refuse. “That wouldn't have happened in the old Fountain Square. People had respect for each other. There was unity.”

The Fountain Square that Mary remembers had a mix of ages. The old would take care of the young by watching out for them and the young would help the old by doing chores for them. Mary remembers when she was young the elderly residents of Fountain Square would pay her a few dollars to do errands for them. The neighbor kids would cut the elders' lawns for free. Now, she sees the kids seemed to have disappeared. New residents aren't starting families in the neighborhood.

Mary remembers a neighborhood event that drew hundreds of Fountain Square kids, Santa on the Square. The neighborhood association and businesses in the area would organize an event where kids could get their picture taken with Santa, receive a new set of hats and gloves, and take a horse drawn carriage ride around the block. “Look at it (the event) now. No one comes out for it because they don’t want to be looked down upon by the new residents.”

When Mary’s son began wanting to ride his bike a few blocks to school on his own, she mapped out the route for him. She notified several people on each block she knew to let them know he was biking and to watch out for him. She had set up a community safety net for her son while he felt a sense of independence.

Mary says that safety net no longer exists because people are being scammed for their properties and moving out. Investors contacted her cousin to buy a property in the neighborhood for \$8k. He sold the property because he thought it was a good deal. Mary says the property could have sold for much higher and they took advantage of his lack of education on the housing market. She thinks investors are looking in the County Assessor’s records and finding the houses that were bought during a time when residents could buy a house in the neighborhood for under \$30k. Investors target those home owners and hassle them to sell their properties for cheap, knowing they can make a big profit. The home owner that is low-income will think the offer is good but has no idea how much money it would take to buy another home in the city. People who bought in the neighborhood before gentrification don’t know how much property values have changed around the city.

Mary says she and her dad have been offered \$300k for their properties, but they aren't for sale. She and her dad want to live out the rest of his life in the neighborhood they love. She recalls a situation where the new neighbors wanted one of her family members to move. Her sister-in-law's paralyzed father who lived in the neighborhood was ruthlessly bullied into trying to make him sell. The new neighbors harassed him to sell and when he wouldn't, they called the City of Indianapolis Health Department to enforce code violations on his home. Mary's family had to rally together to find \$8K to pay the fines that were given to the elderly man on fixed income.

Along with newspaper analysis, planning documents for Fountain Square were evaluated to gain a better understanding of processes used to change the culture of the neighborhood. The analysis found a slow and intentional city-wide effort made to rebrand, reinvest, and replace the undesirable aspects of the neighborhood. Gaining a comprehensive understanding of the process entailed researching change instigators in infrastructure, housing, and documenting community narrative of those who are at risk of displacement.

When local entities want to displace old residents and replace them with higher educated and well-paid taxpayers, they must first create desirable places for middle-upper class people to live within poor neighborhoods they would consider undesirable. Non-profit agency plans mapped out efforts to change ownership of properties in Fountain Square to create a neighborhood catering to middle-upper class residents and driven away from providing needs of long-term residents. These plans document step-by-step processes to create convincing arguments for change needed in the poor inner-city

neighborhood. By focusing on the dominant society standards of beauty and function the existing poor community narrative is omitted, while the potential for planned “improvement” is emphasized. While the generational Appalachian acceptance of used car lots, thrift stores, and local pubs as staples of the community, planning documents detailed a need for pleasing ascetics for commercial buildings and services that could attract higher paid visitors and residents.

Analyzing neighborhood planning documents established a groundwork for understanding beginning processes of gentrification. I drew primarily on the “Fountain Square Historic Area Preservation Plan,” that documented Fountain Square in 1980s and a community effort to change and preserve neighborhood historical physical structures. This text provides an analysis of neighborhood conditions before gentrification and non-profit drivers of area change.

Viewing neighborhood development through a lens of class structure allows researchers to develop an understanding of players in gentrification of an area. Questions of who change is created for and who are the beneficiaries of changes in an area can be answered by looking at development documents through this lens. While studying the Fountain Square Historic Area Preservation Plan, I became aware of these answers not by what was stated in the plan, but by what was omitted. The Preservation Plan tells the narrative of a need for change in the area spoken through an outsider’s perspective from a middle-upper class tone claiming the need to “increase public recognition and foster pride in the historical and architectural significance of the district” (Introduction). This language begs the class-conscious reader to ask how much creators of the plan knew

about already existing residential pride and whether increased public recognition of their working-class neighborhood was an important factor in their lives.

The Fountain Square Historic Area Preservation Plan (1984) was meant to document the origin and current conditions of historic architecture in the commercial corridor in Fountain Square. The plan was constructed by a team of staff from the Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission and paid for by the Community Development Block Grant Program, a government fund. Described as an “important step for the renaissance of the area,” the purpose of the plan was to “protect the historic fabric and character of the area, and to encourage new development, which will enhance that character” (Introduction). However, the beginning of the plan describes a “decline” in the area partly due to a “change in the economic base of the community” (Introduction). Already does the reader understand who the creators of the plan blame for what they claim to be a deteriorating neighborhood – its current (at the time of the plan) low-income residents.

The Preservation Plan details the history of the Fountain Square commercial corridor. It mentions the middle-class and “educated” working-class German population, responsible for the unique architecture, settling and creating commercial space in the area in the 1870s (H-3). Later, it touts the area as being a theater and entertainment district in Indianapolis from 1910-1950 (H-10). The Plan mentions the significance of the fountains in the area that were integral in establishing a name for the neighborhood (H-19). That completes the history of the neighborhood told by the Plan committee. The reader is left to ponder the historical significance of the population after the 1950s. By omitting this

history, one could only conclude the planning committee of the Preservation Plan found this population void of culture and heritage that had no significant value to the story of Fountain Square.

The “Architecture” section of the Preservation Plan details every building remaining in the Fountain Square commercial corridor up until the 1950s (A-1 thru 67). Each structure is photographed with a brief history of who built the building and its historical use. The photographs show some historical buildings as vacant with boarded windows. Most of the buildings are occupied with what appears to be locally-owned stores needed in a low-income neighborhood. For example, East Prospect Street, a main neighborhood thoroughfare had a book store, paper service store, used clothing, barber shop, pizza restaurant, and used furniture store (A-14,15). The omission of current use of the buildings, although they clearly show in the photos, creates a compelling argument that the current commercial use is insignificant in the scheme of “revitalization” of the space.

In the “Current Condition” of the Preservation Plan, the committee finally addresses what is evident in the plan – the current population and building use in Fountain Square must be replaced. In one sentence, the Commission briefly acknowledges migrant workers from Kentucky and Tennessee that populated the area after 1950. This is the population of the area at the time of the plans’ creation. Directly after the acknowledgement of the population, the plan states:

“The Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission does not want to encourage the displacement of long-term residents and businesses from historic districts. At

the same time the Commission recognizes that changes in ownership patterns are likely to occur, particularly among rental properties. A policy of encouraging a gradual mix of new and existing businesses would give Fountain Square the flexibility necessary to grow and yet maintain its distinctive character.” (C-10)

This statement is two-fold: The Commission appears class-conscious and fair to the current residents and owners of businesses, but also recognizes their instigation will change the community power structure through change in ownership. The business that rents a space and offers needs to the poor community will most-likely not survive the “revival” in the area. The plan is clear by the detail omission of the people or commercial use in Fountain Square after 1950s, that the current culture of the neighborhood is of no significance. However, the Commission claims to want to keep the “distinct character” of Fountain Square. The character the plan must be referring to is characteristics of the area before 1950, almost completely ignoring the 30-plus years afterwards.

At no time does the plan mention asking residents if their needs are being met by the commercial corridor to even warrant such focus on commercial development. After the acknowledgement of the current population’s origin and admission to the future replacement and displacement in the area, the Commission lays out government and non-profit agency preservation programs to help the “gradual mix of new and existing businesses.” If the Commission had known the current population more intimately, they would know the hesitance in taking part in such programs. Appalachian migrants from mountainous isolated areas were not likely to seek partnership with such agencies due to their high value on independence.

The Preservation Plan does make clear what type of residents the detailed actions are meant to attract to make Fountain Square “what it once was, a viable community within a community with its own commercial focus” (AN-11). Determining from the rest of the plan “what it once was” points to the time before the 1950s and the Appalachian migration. The plan describes suburbanites as wanting “desirable” inner-city neighborhoods due to the shortened commutes to Downtown and lack of suburban “cultural amenities” (AN-11). Again, it is not the current resident culture that is desirable, but a culture that existed before the Appalachian movement.

The neighborhood that Dave, a long-time resident of Fountain Square throughout the 1950-80s, describes was a thriving “shopping Mecca” where all needs were met for residents. I met Dave through reaching out to the local high school alumni group that was arranging a reunion for class of 1963. Dave, a white 72-year-old man volunteered for an interview as a long-time resident of Fountain Square. Although he now lives in a suburb outside of Indianapolis, he spent his youth living, working, and attending a local elementary and high school in Fountain Square.

Dave started his interview discussing the jobs he did around Fountain Square as a young man. In the 1950-1960s, he was the paperboy for 3 different areas in the neighborhood and worked at a local drug store making errands for management and pharmacists. He sold different goods on his own, like one time trying to sell rhubarb from his back yard for extra cash. He also mowed lawns and shoveled walks for income. He felt being in a lower economic state gave him the motivation to work. He remembers

other kids and teenagers being in the same boat as him growing up. He doesn't remember a lot of difference among social strata when he was growing up.

Dave never rode a bus in his elementary or high school career. He always walked to school. He remembers traffic boys as being "figures of authority" as they manned each corner, ensuring safe travels for the walkers making their way to schools. The boys, never girls, wore a sash and badges that identified them as someone able to report traffic infractions to the school authorities. As an older boy in his preteens-teens, Dave became a traffic boy himself.

He remembers a Fountain Square where kids walked home from school and eat lunch. Women who were mothers generally were homemakers for the family. Although a parent was always available for their children, constant supervision wasn't deemed necessary. He remembers pitching tents out of blankets and clothes lines in back yards of his buddies and sleeping under the stars. Other local boys would play pranks on each other and set booby traps during the night. Kids enjoyed trick-or-treating on their own. Feelings of safety were high in the neighborhood.

While growing up in Fountain Square, Dave was familiar with the local business owners. There was Ray, the corner grocer, who had lost fingers in his wood shop. According to Dave, Ray's shop was not one you'd send in your wife or daughter to pick up items. Ray had "Roman hands and Russian Fingers," according to Dave and priced his products according to the income of the shopper. Another man who had lost his legs took the local kids to sell produce around Indianapolis sidewalk markets. There were three local drugstores, a shoe store, bank, a thriving library, and theatre kids could pay

\$0.35 to attend a movie. A local building hosted a “shopping Mecca” where you could buy anything from housewares to candy.

Dave remembers the local high school as a wonderful school with excellent teacher and highly disciplined culture. He was a member of the ROTC, where he was able to shoot real rifles at campus practices. He joined the military after school because he was sure the draft would force him in anyway. He opted to join the Air Force with several of his high school friends. After four years, he was able to attend college and buy a house, in part because of the G.I. Bill.

Dave, who wrote a handbook on basic financial budgeting, attributes a lot of the change in culture of the neighborhood to the change in access to resources. He thinks people are able to get credit and no longer bother waiting to buy things they want when they can afford it. To him, he sees growing up working-class gave him the “opportunity” to be poor early. Now, Dave enjoys a comfortable home in an Indianapolis suburb. Similar to the early working-class Germans, Dave left Fountain Square for a more affluent area after achieving financial stability and no longer needing the safety net of the neighborhood relationships that provided his needs as a young man.

Because commercial spaces and third places were emphasized so heavily during the interviews and analysis of the Historical Preservation Plan, it was imperative to investigate local public spaces and their mechanisms that kept the Appalachian character alive. Analysis of Fountain Square “third places” uncovered how integral they are were in creating and disassembling a sense of community. Neighborhood third places are agents of cohesion inside urban communities by providing neutral spaces outside of homes and

workplaces that allow time for relationship building between members in a community who may not have immediate commonalities. Many benefits come from participating in a third place, including gaining a sense of belonging (Oldenburg, 1997). Third places before gentrification in Fountain Square mirrored the working-class population of the neighborhood. They offered spaces for working-class men and women to participate in social interaction in the form of affordable neighborhood stores, restaurant, and pubs. Local folklore, events, and gossip were shared amongst participants, helping to foster a sense of belonging outside of self-interest (Oldenburg, 1997).

Along with capturing the unique characteristic of third places within Fountain Square before gentrification, this research examines social consequences when they change to serve a higher income population. Third places began to change character as the neighborhood became increasingly gentrified. Neighborhood pubs became establishments favored by outside visitors. A previous honky-tonk became a jazz bar. Breweries and boutiques popped up along the main corridor. The neighborhood grocery store was sold. The longtime neighborhood thrift store was closed, with the site planned to be another brewery. This study argues change in third places from blue to white collar establishments left little room for communal spaces where poor residents could congregate to visit outside their homes and workplaces.

Peppy's Grill is an example of a popular Fountain Square third place that encouraged and maintained the Appalachian culture. Residents regularly dined at the greasy spoon, a place to go where everyone seemed to know each other, staff asked about family connections, poked fun at each other and customers, and cared about the

neighborhood's wellbeing. The character of Peppys was contradictory, just like the code of conduct for Fountain Square residents. As comfortable the restaurant was to insiders, to outsiders the environment was hostile, service subpar, food is unappealing, and tables not always clean.

The old white cinderblock building of Peppy Grill was trimmed in blue that matched the blue in the signs. It's not a light or dark blue, somewhere in-between. We'd sometimes be greeted by staff and regulars sitting on the 4 picnic tables outside who stopped for a smoke and a chat. The windows were always brightly decorated with the nearest holiday greetings, but year-round one window read in red, white, and blue letters: **BREAKFAST SERVED ALL DAY. 24HRS SHORT ORDERS. 24HRS BISCUITS -N- GRAVY ALL DAY.**

Inside the restaurant, customer booths overlook the cooks' prep and grill area. Beyond the grilling area and booths on the right are the entrance to the grill and working station, a counter containing 4 stools and a cash register, one two-seater booth in the very corner of the dining area, and finally the women's bathroom. Directly to the left of the entrance, there is a newspaper stand where customers discard their paper after reading and the next person can grab it. Behind the stand are three two-seater booths, a door leading to the shack-like expansion, a regular sized booth, two bubble gum machines, a juke box, and finally the men's bathroom.

The women's bathroom is tiny and leave little room for maneuvering. The door nearly hits the trashcan when you enter. Above the trashcan is a manual paper towel dispenser. Along the tiny wall behind the door is a 2x2 mirror. The toilet is tucked back

into a corner, where you can hear the dishwasher working on the other side of the thin paneling wall. Customers have carved names, quotes, insults, and other potty humor throughout the small room. The sinks have either cheap bottled soap in a store-bought dispenser or sometimes there is an industrial kind that hangs on the wall. The linoleum on the floor is old and peeling. There are ceiling fans and speakers placed around the ceiling in both parts of the restaurant. Sometimes someone plays a tune on the jukebox. At first the music is jarring and unexpected, mirroring the daily activities on any given block of Fountain Square before gentrification. The volume is unusually loud for a small diner. When a customer plays heavy metal, diners can forget about sharing conversation.

The food at Peppy's is not what keeps the regular customers coming, but it is affordable. It is typical comfort food for people of southern roots. Greasy hamburgers and fries, omelets, pancakes, or sandwiches. Daily specials often included beef stew and lasagna. The food is not what draws people, even though it is familiar to the regulars. They could probably make it better at home. I knew how each cook made my cheeseburger. I knew when I walked in if Tangie, a cook that recently retired after 30+ years at Peppy's, was cooking, my burger would be slightly burnt. I continued to order the burger.

It is the casual environment that draws in the regulars at Peppy's. In the small confines of the rough building is the feeling of being inside your grandma's kitchen (if you grew up poor and from the south). The smells, sounds, and appearance reminded me of my grandma's trailer tucked back in the hills of Eastern Tennessee. My Grandma was

a tough old woman who spoke with a thick southern accent, had a mean sense of humor, poor housekeeping habits, and cooked everything with lard.

At Peppy's the cooks and servers poke at regulars as they take their seats, loudly joking about the appearance of men or teasing women about their husband. Laughter would fill the restaurant as the customer pokes back. I witnessed someone asking Tangie, past part-owner who worked the grill to get her a coffee. She replied, "Do I look like the coffee gettin' person?" as she walked away, long red ponytail swinging behind her. She slowly wandered over and got the customer coffee, grumbling about being interrupted at the grill. It is a tough yet warm kind of humor, like my Grandmas', familiar to me and other Appalachian descendants.

Regulars at Peppy's shared some common physical characteristics, interests and style. Regulars, folks who have been around for 10 years or more, usually have an ailment or two. They might have walked with a limp, have trouble moving around, have a hacking cough or other noticeable sign of sickness. Loud talking and laughing, use of curse words, and southern accents were common amongst regulars. Topics of conversation ranged from news to family issues. Both men and women addressed each other with what they mean to be endearing terms, like "sweetie or old man" and other nicknames that are currently considered sexist.

People who were not familiar with the culture and characteristics of Peppy regulars and staff, are sometimes visibly uncomfortable. They were confused about staff's frequent smoke breaks and not receiving refills. They were not accustomed to the way customers and staff communicate. No one instructed them that they had to pay at

the cash register, leaving them to sit and wait for a tab that never came. The slacked cleaning practices made outsiders worry about contamination.

As Fountain Square changed, so did Peppy's. Ownership of the restaurant changed a few years ago. The City of Indianapolis recently fined the restaurant a sum rumored to be \$2,000 for lack of permit for the picnic tables frequented by the regulars. Rather than paying the fine, the tables disappeared, and the regulars had no outside seating to pass the day away. The new owner shut the restaurant down for a renovation over six months ago.

I met Jimmy, a life-long resident, at Peppy's over 10 years ago. He was a waiter there and over the years switched to working at another restaurant in Fountain Square. I ran into him over the last year and he agreed to be interviewed when I approached him about this study. I met Jimmy and his brother, Tom at a neighborhood bar to interview them about their lived-experiences in the neighborhood. Jimmy came of age in Fountain Square during the 1970-80's, attending local schools. His and Tom's father was an Army Green Beret who served 4 tours in Vietnam; his family came to Fountain Square from Illinois. His mothers' family came to the area from Mississippi. The interview was the first time I'd met Tom, a tattooed white man in his late-30's. Although their father lived in Fountain Square most of his adult life, Tom was raised in Arizona with his mother. He moved to Fountain Square when his and Jimmy's father got sick about 20 years ago.

Like Mary, Jimmy remembers and still experiences a tight network among Fountain Square residents and business owners. As a young man, he could not get into trouble without his parents being notified by the time he got home. Jimmy would be

warned by adults “What’s your dad going to think?” whenever he was caught in misconduct. He recalled a time when he set off a smoke bomb in a local (no longer existing) pet store. As he was running from the scene an elderly woman screamed “Son of a bitch! Jimmy, I recognize you!” By the time he made it home, his sister was at the door letting him know his dad knew about his misdeed.

When he was fourteen years old, he and a friend were skipping school and the local grocer, Bud, caught them in his businesses parking lot smoking marijuana. Bud slapped the back of Jimmy’ head sternly stating, “Get your ass in the car!” referencing the grocers’ own car. In the car, Bud asked Jimmy why he wasn’t at school and why he smelled like pot. He told Jimmy he knew the young man didn’t want to stay home, so he reasoned with Jimmy to work at the grocery to stay out of trouble. Bud offered Jimmy a deal that he would give him \$5 for each A, \$4 for each B, \$2 for each C and Jimmy would have to pay him for each D or F he got in school.

Jimmy experienced the same tight networks as an adult in Fountain Square. After a stint in prison for stabbing a man who robbed his home, he was always able to secure a job in local businesses because of his relationships. Although Jimmy lived by another code in the neighborhood of settling differences personally without involving police, he was not known as a violent or undependable man. In fact, business owners often lived by the same code. Jimmy recalled an instance at his job at the grocery store when a man tried to take a cart off the parking lot. The original owner’s son, who then ran the grocery for his dad, was struggling with the man when his dad arrived at the grocery store. The elder of the two grocers punched the cart thief square in the face and started to go for

another jab before his son interrupted. The elder composed himself and continued onto his business in the store, leaving the cart thief laid out on the parking lot. Jimmy, who witnessed the commotion, asked if he should drag the punched man off the premises. He was instructed to leave him sprawling and he would come to his senses on his own.

Jimmy spent his summers mowing yards and winters shoveling sidewalks for neighbors; and like Mary, his dad made it clear that he was not to charge older citizens. However, the seniors repaid him for his services in other ways. One widow repaid him in food and knitted winter wear. She would bake him cookies and never let him by the house without a sack lunch. When the weather turned cold, Jimmy had an abundance of handknitted scarves and hats from the senior citizen.

The kind of solidarity amongst neighbors carried over into Jimmy's friendships at school. He always lived by the code of the neighborhood to protect the weak from harm. He recalled his two best friends from grade school having bad eyes and being bullied. Jimmy was more of a fighter and could protect his friends from the cruelty of others. His friends repaid him for his protection by teaching him strategy games like Risk and Monopoly.

Tom has a life-long career in construction. When asked what he thinks of the new modern or contemporary houses taking the place of the older, smaller houses, Tom shares his construction expertise stating "These contemporary houses are going to look terrible in a few years. They are being built with material that basically equates to cardboard. There's a house that was built 5 years ago down the street from us that has siding falling off and looks rundown already."

The brothers both comment on how ridiculous they think the newer houses look. Jimmy mentions a modern house on his block with a chandelier on the balcony. The worst part he thinks is that he has only seen a dog on the balcony. In a porch community, the new residents don't enjoy their porches or outside spaces. They shy away from conversation with long-time Fountain Square residents. Porches have always been a big part of community in the area.

Tom has his children in a local school that emphasizes community outreach and involvement. He loves how friendly everyone at the school is to him and his family. When asked where they would go if he and Jimmy had to move because of the rising cost of living, Tom shares his experience at a nearby southern suburb. "It was affordable there and the neighbors were friendly, but the cops were a problem. I drove an old work truck and got pulled over several times. The cops told me to drive a less 'conspicuous' truck." Tom adds that Jimmy wouldn't move anyway. Jimmy agrees. He is not leaving the place he calls home no matter what happens in the neighborhood.

The class conflict in Fountain Square has reached a point now where the middle-class residents who moved to the neighborhood 5-10 years ago are starting to be threatened by incoming people of greater wealth. Like Marx and Engels' theory of class conflict the bourgeoisie in the neighborhood continue to eliminate its own kind with the use of the free housing market (Appelrouth and Dasfor Edles 2015).

I met Sarah, a middle-income resident, through a mutual neighborhood friend. Around 2015, the mutual friend had called a meeting of a few Fountain Square residents that were active in community organizing and development. She had noticed, as a

resident, gentrification was now starting to threaten the middle-class resident's ability to stay in the neighborhood because of the rising cost of housing. Sarah was one of the attendees of the dining room meeting because she had a career background in city zoning. I approached her for an interview because I had heard from mutual friends that she had an account of changing power dynamics on a neighborhood level. She and I met for the interview at a local bar where she worked part-time. Her "day job" is in a zoning department outside of Indianapolis, but she has continued to call Fountain Square her home since 2014.

Sarah moved to Fountain Square mainly because of the networks she had made during visits to the neighborhood. Sarah was attracted to the area because of the friendly residents and affordable living. She liked what the neighborhood was and wanted to adapt to its character. When she moved into the community, she felt the socioeconomic class structure in Fountain Square was still somewhat balanced. She had bought an affordable home on a middle-class income. At the time, the area was considered a destination area for people around the Indianapolis to visit yet not live. There was still a mix of low-income residents and higher-income visitors in the local gathering places, but the high-cost restaurants and bars had not become dominate third places. However, Sarah feels she was in the last group of middle-income people who bought homes in the neighborhood. She witnessed the costs of houses soaring from around \$80-100,000 to over \$300,000 within a few months of buying her home. Sarah stated, "The gentrifiers got gentrified." The values of the homes and costs of entertainment soared in short

amount of time. Not only did the cost of living explode, she found the wealthier visitors at her local workplace became ruder to staff.

In 2015, Sarah visited her local neighborhood association and began volunteering on as a board member for the organization. When she became the president of the organization between 2016-2018, there was not a lot of interest from long-term residents. She thinks by then residents had already become jaded because decision-making power was being transferred to wealthier folks moving into the neighborhood. Conflict began arising between longer-term and new residents. New residents became angry when variance voting for new modern houses being built in the area took place. Sarah, having zoning experience in her professional life, knew proposed new builds were too large for lots in a neighborhood planned around smaller housing. When tested, new residents became irate and wanted special privileges for their investor networks connected to the projects.

Over the last year as President of the neighborhood association, Sarah received threatening emails and even harassing visits to her job at the local restaurant from new residents wanting to dictate the neighborhood decision-making process. The volunteer role became more than she had bargained for as the new residents wanting power began accusing her of theft from the organizations' small funds. When it came time to vote on a new slate of officers, Sarah stayed the course and decided to run again for president. She didn't want the manipulative new residents to take advantage of the more unexperienced residents in the city planning process. She won the vote but Sarah discovered newer residents counted the votes and claimed a newer resident had won.

Sarah quit volunteering for the neighborhood association after all the cheating and harassment from the newer residents with more resources and time to claim power. She began to feel unsafe on her block and the stress became too much. She felt physically threatened by the residents who had come to her work seeking unwanted dialogue and sending harassing emails on the happenings within the neighborhood association. These particular gentrifiers lived a few short blocks from her home and she felt vulnerable to their verbal and written attacks to her character. When asked for advice to other gentrifying Indianapolis neighborhood residents, Sarah said, “Start early. Even if residents don’t feel threatened by changes coming, have a plan in place early in the process.”

Conclusions

The on-going class conflict is continuing to threaten the livelihood of the generations of residents who came to the neighborhood, whether in the 1950’s or the 21st century, seeking an unpretentious and affordable place to live. The settlers of the southern migration created a village that protected families, fostered relationships, and enabled survival proletarian survival in an urban space. The adaption of rural Appalachians molded an urban space that allowed the migrants to keep their identity and form a neighborhood based on the character of its’ people. Over time, a Spanish and hip-hop culture was folded into some pockets of the neighborhood. The mixing of cultures did not threaten the existence of existing or incoming residents because residents were not from a different economic class.

Middle-income residents who moved into the neighborhood between 1990-2014 did not cause a pressing class conflict in Fountain Square because the incoming residents came to the area wanting to be part of the social fabric. It was not until new homes were built with distinct modern features and more than triple the selling value of existing homes that the class conflict Marx predicts in his theory took hold. New bourgeois residents do not wish to integrate with existing proletarian residents. They wish to eliminate them using their economic dominance. Every year that passes allowing gentrification to run rampant in Indianapolis communities, like Fountain Square, erases a community history and working-class network mechanisms of survival.

Appendix A – Interview Consent Process:

The following consent information was presented orally or in writing by the me, Angie Calvert, the interviewer, before the ethnographic interviews begin. A copy was given to each participant at the beginning of the process as well. I noted participation after reading the consent form to participants. I gave the to include identifiers, such as the participants name, will be used on the consent form. Participants were able to opt out of including their name and were given the choice of pseudonym as their name in the study. I anticipated that participants of interviews would want their name associated with their shared narrative. I felt it would be considered disrespectful to not give participants an option to have their name included in the study. I thought they may want their name attached to the study as it could be a unique experience of being included in a study about their neighborhood. I thought they could see the opportunity as an avenue to share their memories of the neighborhood and opinions of changes happening to outsiders of the areas. The participants experience of sharing their own stories as experts on their neighborhood may be a source of pride and want readers to know their identity.

Most interviewees did not mind having their names included in the study. I decided to change their names after the interviews because of the sensitive material that was gathered. Some of the interviewees shared information that I felt could be harmful to themselves or careers in the future.

Consent Forms:

KEY INFORMATION FOR POTENTIAL RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

The Fountain Square neighborhood has changed over time, due to the gentrification or raised cost of living causing people to move out of the area. I am interested in finding out more about the experiences of long-term or life-long residents of the area, so I am conducting a research study, and would like you to consider participating. The study will take between 30-90 minutes, during which time you will be asked to discuss your personal experiences in Fountain Square and feelings about the changes that took and are taking place. There are no risks involved, and it won't cost you anything besides your time. There are no direct benefits, and no compensation, but you will be contributing to capturing history of Fountain Square. If you aren't interested, or don't feel comfortable participating, that is totally fine with me. If you would like to volunteer, please listen carefully to the following information before providing your consent.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH STUDY

STUDY TITLE: GENTRIFICATION OF AN INDIANAPOLIS COMMUNITY: THE CITY PLANNING PROCESS AND RESIDENT NARRATIVES ON CHANGE

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Angie Calvert, Graduate Student University of Indianapolis

CONTACT DETAILS: Tel: 317-480-7285

Email: calverta@uindy.edu

PURPOSE AND DURATION: This study involves research on lived experiences of long-term or life-long residents of Fountain Square, Indianapolis. The purpose of this study is to investigate feelings on changes in the neighborhood. We expect that it will take approximately 30-90 mins of your time.

PROCEDURES: You will be asked questions about your experiences in Fountain Square. The questions will be asked in a conversational method. Angie Calvert will take notes of your input to include in the study.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORT: There are no foreseeable risks or discomfort associated with this study.

BENEFITS: There are no direct benefits to you besides the educational experience of participating in research. However, we expect that the results of this study will add to the body of knowledge on gentrification in Fountain Square.

COMPENSATION: You will not receive any compensation for participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The results of this study may be published in a scholarly book or journal, presented at professional conferences or used for teaching purposes. However, identifiers will not be used in any publication, presentation or teaching materials, unless you want to include your name in the study.

FUTURE RESEARCH: Your data will not be used or distributed for future research studies even if there is no way for your data to be linked with any information that could identify you.

WITHDRAWAL OF PARTICIPATION: Your participation is voluntary. Should you decide at any time during the study that you no longer wish to participate, you may withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation without penalty.

REQUEST FOR MORE INFORMATION: You may ask more questions about the study at any time. Please e-mail the principal investigator at calverta@uindy.edu or call either 1 (317) 480-7285 with any questions or concerns. In addition, if you have questions about your rights as a participant or any other pertinent questions, you may contact the Director of the Human Research Protections Program, Yvonne Wakeford, by either emailing hrpp@uindy.edu or calling 1 (317) 781-5774 or 1 (800) 232-8634 ext. 5774.

CONSENT:

I confirm that I understand the purpose of the research and the study procedures. I understand that I may ask questions at any time and can withdraw my participation without prejudice. I have read this consent form. My signature below indicates my willingness to participate in this study.

I want my real name to be used in the study. Yes No.

I want the following name to be used in place of my real name

_____.

I want my photograph used in the study. Yes No

PERSON OBTAINING CONSENT: Angie Calvert

Contact Number: 317-480-7285

APPENDIX B – Indianapolis Star Newspaper Analysis:

Terms in Conjunction with “Fountain Square” over 20 years

Terms	1998-2002	2003-07	2008-12	2013-17	Total articles	Peak Year
abandoned	8	19	32	33	92	2011
active	18	256	306	148	737	2008
art	109	307	573	270	1259	2009
bad	38	35	59	88	209	2009
beautification	starts in 2001 - 3	9	4	10	26	2004
beautiful	15	78	124	127	345	2014
blight	1	8	5	6	19	2007
clean	17	26	34	30	107	2010 & 2013
crime	21	46	49	45	161	2011
cultural	18	98	199	122	432	2009
culture	27	46	98	105	271	2014
decline	4	9	16	15	44	2011
drugs	10	19	22	19	70	2009
gangs	5	5	5	1	16	2012
gentrification	starts in 2000- 3	1	1	7	11	2017
good	92	272	441	369	1174	2013
hip	17	28	66	77	190	2016
improve	20	33	89	27	169	2009
improvement	starts 1999 - 9	29	51	18	107	2009
involved	16	131	159	105	411	2011 & 2013
low income	15	15	34	11	75	2010
music	115	277	532	388	1312	2009
police	47	109	150	105	411	2008
poor	9	52	70	46	177	2012 & 2014
poverty	5	9	18	13	45	2012
professional	33	138	199	114	484	2010
property value	0	0	0	5	5	2013 & 2015
renewal	9	12	42	6	70	2008
safe	17	26	56	28	128	2009
urban	34	116	121	120	391	2006
vacant	15	24	39	37	115	2007
working class	3	5	14	8	30	2010
Fountain Square	705	820	1197	928	3650	2009

REFERENCES

Appelrouth, Scott and Desfor Edles, Laura, eds. 2015. "Karl Marx" pp.39-60 in

Sociological Theory in the Classical Era: Text and Readings. 3rd Ed. California

State University: Sage

- Indiana University. 2019. *Fountain Square: Narrative History*. Retrieved from <http://polis.iupui.edu/about/community-culture/project-on-religion-culture/study-neighborhoods/fountain-square/>
- Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission. 1984. *Fountain Square Historic Area Preservation Plan*. City of Indianapolis Indianapolis, Indiana
- Ketzenberger, Jolene. 2009. "New Taste on the Square," Indianapolis Star, Jan 02, G.23.
- Ketzenberger, John. 2009. "Neighborhood on Right Path to Blossoming," Indianapolis Star, Feb 22, D.1.
- Oldenburg, Ray. 1997. *The Great Good Place: Cafes, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. New York: NY: Marlowe & Company.
- Thomas, Jason. 2009. "Fountain Square Revival Goes On," Indianapolis Star, Sep 17, S.1.
- Zukin, Sharon. 2016. "Gentrification in Three Paradoxes" *City & Community* 15(3)