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Overall aims of the project

1. Understand the meaning and usage of the term rural gentrification in France, UK and USA through the concept of 'sociologies of translation'.
2. Develop an 'asset-based theorization' of rural gentrification.
3. Map and analyze the geographies of gentrification in rural France, UK and USA.
4. Produce a detailed comparative study of rural gentrification spanning contrasting rural localities in France, UK and USA.
Overview

i. Develop a comparable designation of rural territory across three contexts
ii. Identify comparable sets of gentrification indicators across three contexts
iii. Begin to map the extent of gentrification and how it changes over time.
i. Developing a comparable designation of rural territory
County Designation (metro/nonmetro)

Nonmetropolitan? retain in its entirety
County Designation (metro/nonmetro)

- Metropolitan?
- Nonmetropolitan? retain in its entirety
- Identify rural portions
Unites Urbaines
- Contiguous built up area
- Inhabited by 2000+ people
Aires Urbaines
- Ordinal ranking of urbanized territory
- Includes rural communes with high commuting to core
French Team’s Classification
- Isolated communes not part of a bigger agglomeration (LT 10,000)
- Includes much previously ignored rural territory
- Contains consistent data collection
ii. Identify comparable sets of gentrification indicators across three contexts
Rural Gentrification

Changing Class Composition
- % with bachelor’s degree
- % emp. in prof. occupations

Housing Stock
- median Value
- % built in last 10 years

Household/Age Structure
- % MC no kids
- Aged 45-64
$$\text{Index} = \frac{\%MC\text{no}K\text{ids}_j}{\%MC\text{no}K\text{ids}_\text{RuralStateTotal}}$$

If index $\geq 1.05$, dummy indicator = 1

$$\text{Score} = \sum_{i=1}^{6} \text{dummy indicator}_{i,j}$$

Scores of 4+ indicate evidence of gentrification
iii. Begin to map the extent of gentrification and how it changes over time.
Score of 4+ in at least one decade

evidence at some point
Metropolitan Boundary
Evidence of Gentrification by Decade

Class

Established
Emerged 1990s
Emerged 2000s
Emerged 2010s
MetroAreas

Class

Established
Emerged 1990s
Emerged 2000s
Emerged 2010s
MetroAreas
Relative distribution of Counties with some evidence of gentrification

1.00 = Proportional to share of total counties

- New England
- Mid Atlantic
- EN Central
- WN Central
- S Atlantic
- ES Central
- WS Central
- Mountain
- Pacific
Relative Distribution of Gentrifying Counties by Division

1.00 = Proportional to share of total counties

- New England
- Mid Atlantic
- EN Central
- WN Central
- S Atlantic
- ES Central
- WS Central
- Mountain
- Pacific

Legend:
- Of 'established'
- Emerging 1990s
- Emerging 2000s
Evidence of Gentrification by Urban Influence

- Metro
- Micro
- Noncore, adjacent to large metro
- Noncore, not adjacent, with town
- Noncore, not adjacent, no town
Relative Distribution Gentrifying Counties by Urban Influence

- established
- emerged in 1990s
- emerged in 2000s

- Metro
- Micro
- noncore, adjacent to large metro
- noncore, not adjacent, with town
- noncore, not adjacent, no town

- 0
- 0.2
- 0.4
- 0.6
- 0.8
- 1.0
- 1.2
- 1.4
- 1.6
- 1.8
Conclusions

1. New designations of rural space are possible in French and US contexts.
2. Both include territory previously excluded from rural studies.
3. Conservative estimates suggest ~12% of counties have experienced evidence of rural gentrification.
4. Rural gentrification shows some evidence of dispersion/spread over time.

Next steps

1. ‘Synchronize’ the approaches across all three countries.
2. Compare the geographic extent of gentrification across the three countries.
3. Select locations for more in-depth case study analysis.