*** DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OR QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION ***

Where Everybody Knows Your Name: The Reciprocal Roles of Small Businesses and Social Networks in Detroit

Nelson Travis Saldaña PhD Candidate, Department of Sociology Trainee, Population Studies Center University of Michigan, Ann Arbor saldanan@umich.edu

Distributed paper at the 2015 International Sociological Association RC21 Conference The Ideal City: between myth and reality Session E4.2: Changing Landscapes of Leisure and Consumption Urbino, Italy 27-29 August 2015

Extended Abstract

Background and Research Questions

How does Detroit, a city of almost 800,000 people, get constructed as a "small world" where everyone seemingly knows one another? As Oldenburg (1999) observed, "third places"—or social settings other than home and work—are important sites of social network formation and an integral component in the establishment of a sense of place. Hence, the recognition that small businesses are central to the revitalization and redevelopment of Detroit and their promotion as such is not surprising. But despite popular depictions of Detroit as a ruin and amidst continual citywide population loss and massive amounts of abandonment and blight, small businesses continue to endure in a similar fashion to the residents who still remain.

In 2007, there were over 50,000 firms located within the city, with a substantial portion of these falling under the category of small business (defined as employing less than 500 people) and even more that had no paid employees (i.e. those typically associated as mom and pop establishments) (U.S. Census Bureau 2015). And while it is evident from the vacant storefronts that line once thriving neighborhoods that businesses were not immune to the massive disinvestment and social problems plaguing the city, Detroit is not devoid of retail stores, service establishments, and places to eat and drink. In addition, particular areas of the city have seen rapid redevelopment in the form of new businesses opening. One particular neighborhood saw 24 new retail and food service establishments open between 2012 and 2013, the majority of which were independent, non-chain stores (Welch 2013). Therefore, what is puzzling is not their promotion per se but rather the prioritization of specific types of businesses and the failure to recognize that such establishments already exist.

Using ethnographic methods, I studied how current and aspiring small business owners in Detroit understand their role as entrepreneurs in community revitalization. In this paper I focus specifically on how entrepreneurs engage in the process of networking and their perceptions about how small businesses contribute to social network formation. Doing so uncovers the social processes underlying why social networks are important in urban development and neighborhood change. Moreover, I examine individual perceptions about the degree in which small businesses facilitate social interactions, particularly those across racial and class lines. Taken together, the overarching research question is whether small businesses broaden social networks across a diverse group of people or whether they strengthen already existing, highly segregated networks.

Theoretical Motivation

Third spaces have served as the setting and backdrop for a plethora of ethnographic and community studies (Duneier 1992; Grazian 2003; Hannerz 1974; Liebow 2003; May 2001). However, much of this work has focused on individuals who occupy these spaces rather than the persons who run and own them. One exception is Lee's (2002) work investigating the interracial interactions between merchants and customers in inner city stores. Moreover, less is known about the larger impacts these places have on the surrounding community. For example, long time residents of a Brooklyn neighborhood welcomed the new businesses that came along with residential gentrification due to the lack of amenities brought about by historical disinvestment (Freeman 2006). In light of the literature on gentrification and neighborhood change, there is a dearth of knowledge about how such third spaces contribute to demographic shifts. For example, do new businesses lead to more displacement or is it largely driven by residential change? One study examined how the proliferation of upscale restaurants, cafes, and stores (a process called "boutiquing") changed the social class and ethnic character of neighborhoods in New York City (Zukin et al. 2009). While still relatively inchoate, studies of commercial gentrification are beginning to gain traction.

Empirical investigations on neighborhood change and community studies of third spaces rarely examine the processes underlying racial integration (or lack thereof). Here I am referring not to how residents move in to a neighborhood and gentrify it but how they come to live amongst people of different racial and class backgrounds. While we know that racial and class transitions occur, less is known about how these changes arise through processes of social interaction. One notable exception is Pattillo's (2008) study of Black gentrifiers in Chicago in which she chronicled class differences in the use of public space and how these contributed to conflicts between groups. I argue that one reason why there are few studies of the process by which neighborhoods undergo transition and how different groups interact is due to the lack of organizational and social network perspectives.

Organizational paradigms are particularly useful for community studies because as McQuarrie and Marwell (2009) maintain, "organizations are themselves productive of social relations" and studying organizations highlights "the social processes in which organizations are engaged." Hence, organizations in their broadest definition are the spaces in which social interaction occurs. But rather than act as mere backdrops to social action, they also act as instrumental components in the generation of interactions. Recognizing that small businesses are themselves organizations can illuminate the underlying mechanisms in which they facilitate or inhibit cross-racial and -class interactions and how they contribute to neighborhood change.

Understanding these mechanisms requires the examination of the underlying social networks between businesses and residents. However, most studies of social networks focus only on their structure rather than tracing the processes or conditions in which they arise (Neal 2012). We know much less about the process of networking and how it relates to neighborhood revitalization and change. Small's (2010) recent study demonstrates how examining the process of networking from an organizational perspective, rather than simply networks, sheds light on how child care centers generate opportunities and inducements for interaction between parents. I follow a similar approach in the present study, showing how an organization for aspiring and current business owners in Detroit facilitates networking opportunities amongst a limited group of individuals and their perceptions of the role of third spaces in generating social interaction. Incorporating organization and network approaches shows how my case study reproduces exclusionary networks across the city.

Method

Over the course of three years, from October 2012 to April 2015, I used mixed methods to study a community-based organization that holds a monthly networking event for current and aspiring small business owners. The organization began in 2007 as a small group of local entrepreneurs who met over Happy Hour to discuss problems they

encountered, propose solutions, and share resources. Since then it has become a formal organization with paid staff and funding from numerous foundations.¹ I chose this organization as a case study to conduct participant observation because of its implicit focus on brick and mortar establishments. While there were other organizations I could have followed, such as a business incubators focused on tech or sustainability, the types of businesses these organizations supported were less likely to have daily, face-to-face interactions with the community since they were not open to the public. I conducted participant observation during seventeen events, which consisted of informal networking amongst attendees and formal panel discussions of specific topics featuring three to four experts. Table 1 shows a list of topics discussed during the events I attended.

During my third year of field work, I collaborated with the leadership of the organization to collect demographic data at each session to better understand who attended these meetings. At each session, I handed out paper surveys to attendees as they entered and as I mingled amongst the crowd. Participation was completely voluntary and anonymous. I also disseminated the survey online through a link that was included in monthly e-mail reminders to the organization's constituents. In total, I received 223 responses with an overall response rate of 42.77 percent.²

Results

Who are current and aspiring business owners in Detroit? Table 2 presents summary statistics of attendees who chose to participate in the survey. While the results are representative of entrepreneurs engaged in a specific organization, the discrepancy between attendees and the actual demographics of Detroit residents as a whole is striking. On the face, it appears that attendees are racially diverse, however, less than 40% were African-American; lower than the over 80% that comprise the city (U.S. Census Bureau 2015). Race relations in the city have been historically tense between African-Americans and Whites (Sugrue 2005). The city and surrounding suburbs continue to be bifurcated by race, making recent redevelopment efforts with respect to the influx of new businesses racially charged on a number of dimensions. For example, newer businesses tend to be owned by White entrepreneurs and are perceived as catering to a predominantly White and newly arrived clientele. In addition, both the media and those who have recently moved to the city often overlook longstanding Black-owned businesses.

Moreover, the socioeconomic make-up is largely skewed towards collegeeducated and wealthier individuals. About three-quarters of the sample had household incomes over \$30,000 whereas the median income in Detroit is a little over \$26,000 (U.S. Census Bureau 2015). Lastly, and perhaps most surprising, is the fact that only half of attendees lived within the city limits and a vast majority of those who lived in the city

¹ It is important to note that the site differs from organizations traditionally examined within the organizational studies literature. As the event is open to the public, it is more akin to a community forum or Town Hall meeting. Membership is not enforced and while I saw many people attend the event regularly, the individuals who attended were not static.

 $^{^{2}}$ The response rate was calculated only for the in-person surveys received, using the number of attendees at each event as the denominator.

had moved within the past five years and live near or around the downtown core. An assumption inherent in the meaning of third spaces is that the proprietors are intimately familiar with the surrounding community and know their customers well, even if they may not necessarily live in the immediate neighborhood. The fact that attendees are relatively new to Detroit or live outside of the city calls into question whether they are simply proprietors offering a good or service or if they are emotionally and socially invested in the lives of their customers. Taken together, it appears that attendees do not reflect the average Detroit resident, foreshadowing the circumscribed social networks I observed in my fieldwork and pointing to the limited degree in which third spaces can promote cross-racial and -class interactions.

In the paper, I use my ethnographic data to illustrate two things. First, I unpack how current and aspiring entrepreneurs understand the role of small businesses in community development and broader revitalization efforts ongoing in Detroit. Collectively, all of the entrepreneurs involved in this network express the need for more small businesses and stress their importance for the future economic growth of the city. However, African-American and White participants have fundamentally different views on the function of small businesses and their role in social integration. While White entrepreneurs stress the need for more places with a "Cheers mentality," African-American entrepreneurs see these places as sites of division where they are not welcome. Further, the perception of current businesses in Detroit that fulfill these roles differs by race.

Secondly, during my time in the field, references to Detroit as a "small world" occurred on multiple occasions. In talking about the functions of small businesses it became apparent that these spaces allow Detroit, despite it's large population, to appear to be a place where everyone knows one another. On one hand, this is one of the benefits that are expected to arise from a third place—individuals who would not normally interact are given the opportunity to get to know one another informally. However, accounts of interactions between individuals of different racial and class backgrounds by participants did not reflect this. Instead, many African-Americans pointed to the fact that the newer businesses opening were highly segregated by race and class. At the same time, the isolated nature of social networks seemed to be lost on White participants. Rather than see the potential for these places to be perceived as exclusionary, their myopic view of their own social networks prevented them from seeing how disconnected they were to particular groups in the city. By examining the limited ways in which social actors engage their networks on the ground, I demonstrate how the process of exclusion occurs and its implications on larger race relations in the city.

Discussion

I use my ethnographic results to develop a theory of neighborhood change and social integration that incorporates how social networks shape these outcomes. My observations point to the application of market fundamentalist ideals to social interactions. In other words, White business owners are not purposely creating exclusionary social networks, but rather they are a byproduct of the way social life is organized in Detroit. Third spaces are an integral component of this process. While new business owners may think of their social networks as arising due to non-racially motivated desires to meet likeminded others, they fail to see that while they may seem random, they are often a product of a number of both structural features and individual choices that are built into everyday life. In summary, this paper seeks to highlight how place entrepreneurs construct a delimited version of Detroit that enable particular groups to engage with the city in a manner that prevents social integration across lines of race and class. More broadly, it suggests that even as the trajectory of Detroit begins turning upward, many residents will be excluded from reaping these benefits.

References

Duneier, Mitchell. 1992. Slim's Table. Chicago: University Of Chicago.

Freeman, Lance. 2006. *There Goes the Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up.* Temple University Press.

Grazian, David. 2003. Blue Chicago. Chicago: University Of Chicago.

- Hannerz, Ulf. 1974. "Research in the Black Ghetto: A Review of the Sixties." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 9(3-4):139–59.
- Lee, Jennifer. 2002. *Civility in the City: Blacks, Jews, and Koreans in Urban America*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Liebow, Elliott. 2003. *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men.* 2nd ed. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- May, Reuben. 2001. Talking at Trena's: Everyday Conversations at an African American Tavern. New York: NYU Press.
- McQuarrie, Michael and Nicole P. Marwell. 2009. "The Missing Organizational Dimension in Urban Sociology." *City & Community* 8(3):247–68.
- Neal, Zachary P. 2012. The Connected City: How Networks Are Shaping the Modern Metropolis. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Oldenburg, Ray. 1999. The Great Good Place: Cafés, Coffee Shops, Bookstores, Bars, Hair Salons, and Other Hangouts at the Heart of a Community. Da Capo Press.
- Pattillo, Mary. 2008. *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. University of Chicago Press.
- Small, Mario L. 2010. Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sugrue, Thomas J. 2005. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Revised. Princeton University Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2015. "State and County QuickFacts." Retrieved (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/26/2622000.html).
- Welch, Sherri. 2013. "Midtown Magnet: Nearly 24 Businesses Have Opened in Past Year." Crain's Detroit Business. Retrieved January 6, 2015 (http://www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20130804/NEWS/308049980/midtownmagnet-nearly-24-businesses-have-opened-in-past-year).

Zukin, Sharon et al. 2009. "New Retail Capital and Neighborhood Change: Boutiques and Gentrification in New York City." *City & Community* 8(1):47–64.

Table 1. Discussion Topics

| | 1 | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Do It In Detroit: Hear the | Beyond the Bottom Line: | Thank You, Come Again: |
| Stories of Local Business | How to Build a Sustainable | Customer Rapport and |
| Owners | Business | Inviting Spaces |
| Show Me The Money: | Lean on Me: The | Failure Fest: If at First You |
| Creative Funding for Small | Importance of Mentorship | Don't Succeed, Tweak, and |
| Business | | Try Again |
| Brick by Brick: Building | Detroit Biz-Grid: A | Loca-vesting: Exploring |
| Community Through Small | Resource Map for | Alternative Funding Models |
| Business | Entrepreneurs | _ |
| Who's the Boss? | The Leap: Take Your | Pop-Up Detroit: Starting |
| Considering Alternative | Business to the Next Level | Slow and Small |
| Ownership Models | | |
| Rock The Red Tape: Tips | It Takes a Village: Working | Crowd Power: Where |
| for Navigating City Hall | Together to Grow Your | Dollars and Dreams Meet |
| | Business | |
| Be the Change: Social | Bricks to Bits: Connecting | Location, Location, |
| Entrepreneurs Making a | Your Business with the | Location: What's the Deal |
| Difference | Digital World | with Commercial Real |
| | _ | Estate? |
| It's in the Details: Why | | |
| Good Design is Good | | |
| Business | | |

| Age | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------------------|
| 18-24 | 34 | 15.25% |
| 25-34 | 104 | 46.64% |
| 35-44 | 29 | 13.00% |
| 45-54 | 28 | 12.56% |
| 55-64 | 20 | 9.42% |
| 65+ | 21 | 0.90% |
| Missing | 5 | 2.24% |
| Gender | 5 | 2.2170 |
| Male | 101 | 45.29% |
| Female | 101 | 45.29% 54.71% |
| Race | 122 | 54.7170 |
| Latino | 8 | 3.59% |
| White | 106 | 47.53% |
| | 89 | 47.33% 39.91% |
| Black | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 5 | 2.24% |
| Other | 14 | 6.28% |
| Missing | 1 | 0.45% |
| Born in the US | 210 | 04170/ |
| Yes | 210 | 94.17% |
| No | 13 | 5.83% |
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 56 | 25.11% |
| Living with partner but not married | 24 | 10.76% |
| Separated | 3 | 1.35% |
| Divorced | 18 | 8.07% |
| Widowed | 1 | 0.45% |
| Never married/Single | 119 | 53.36% |
| Missing | 2 | 0.90% |
| LGBT | | |
| Yes | 19 | 8.52% |
| No | 194 | 87.00% |
| Missing | 10 | 4.48% |
| Lives in Detroit | | |
| Yes | 111 | 49.78% |
| No | 110 | 49.33% |
| Missing | 2 | 0.90% |
| Year Moved (Detroit Only) | | |
| Past 5 years | 80 | 72.07% |
| 6-10 years ago | 9 | 8.11% |
| 11-15 years ago | 5 | 4.50% |
| 16-20 years ago | 5 | 4.50% |
| 21+ | 8 | 7.21% |
| Missing | 4 | 3.60% |
| Education | | |
| Less than HS | 0 | 0.00% |
| HS or equivalent | 6 | 2.69% |
| Some college | 29 | 13.00% |
| Associates | 12 | 5.38% |
| Bachelors | 100 | 44.84% |
| Graduate | 71 | 31.84% |
| | | · · · · · |

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of attendees

| EmploymentWorking now 172 77.13% Looking for work 24 10.76% Retired 2 0.90% Homemaker/Keeping house/Stay at 0 0.00% Student 17 7.62% Missing 8 3.59% Household Income $<$ $<$10K$ 19 8.52% $$10K-$29,999$ 38 17.04% $$30k-$49,999$ 46 20.63% $$50k-$69,999$ 43 19.28% $$70k-$89,999$ 19 8.52% $$90k-$119,99$ 22 9.87% $>$120K$ 21 9.42% Missing 15 67.3% Frequency of Attendence 152 68.16% $1-2$ per year 38 17.04% $3-5$ per year 21 9.42% All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events Yes 123 Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner Yes 111 Yes 1111 49.78% No 109 48.88% Missing 3 1.35% |
|---|
| Looking for work24 10.76% RetiredRetired2 0.90% Homemaker/Keeping house/Stay at0 0.00% Student17 7.62% Missing8 3.59% Household Income8 3.59% Household Income19 8.52% $\$10K$ 19 8.52% $\$10K$ 19 8.52% $\$10K$ 19 8.52% $\$0K$ - $\$29,999$ 46 20.63% $\$0K$ - $\$49,999$ 46 20.63% $\$0K$ - $\$49,999$ 43 19.28% $\$70K$ - $\$89,999$ 19 8.52% $\$90K$ - $\$119,99$ 22 9.87% > $\$120K$ 21 9.42% Missing15 6.73% Frequency of Attendence152 68.16% 1-2 per year38 17.04% $3-5$ per year21 9.42% All of them10 4.48% Missing2 0.90% Attend Other Events Yes 123Yes123 55.16% No96 43.05% Missing4 1.79% Current Business Owner Yes 111Yes111 49.78% No109 48.88% |
| Retired2 0.90% Homemaker/Keeping house/Stay at0 0.00% Student17 7.62% Missing8 3.59% Household Income $<$10K$ |
| Homemaker/Keeping house/Stay at home00.00%Student177.62%Missing83.59%Household Income $<$ $<$ \$10K198.52%\$10K-\$29,9993817.04%\$30K-\$49,9994620.63%\$50K-\$69,9994319.28%\$70K-\$89,999198.52%\$90K-\$119,99229.87% $>$ \$120K219.42%Missing156.73%Frequency of Attendence151st time15268.16%1-2 per year3817.04%3-5 per year219.42%All of them104.48%Missing20.90%Attend Other Events2Yes12355.16%No9643.05%Missing41.79%Current Business Owner1048.88%No10948.88% |
| home00.00%Student177.62%Missing83.59%Household Income $<$ < $$10K$ 19 8.52% \$10K-\$29,9993817.04%\$30K-\$49,9994620.63%\$50K-\$69,9994319.28%\$70K-\$89,99919 8.52% \$90K-\$119,9922 9.87% >\$120K21 9.42% Missing15 6.73% Frequency of Attendence15 6.73% Ist time152 68.16% 1-2 per year3817.04%3-5 per year21 9.42% All of them10 4.48% Missing20.90%Attend Other Events 2 Yes123 55.16% No96 43.05% Missing4 1.79% Current Business Owner 4 Yes111 49.78% No109 48.88% |
| Student177.62%Missing8 3.59% Household Income19 8.52% $<10K$ 19 8.52% $$10K-$29,999$ 38 17.04% $$30K-$49,999$ 46 20.63% $$50K-$69,999$ 43 19.28% $$70K-$89,999$ 19 8.52% $$90K-$119,99$ 22 9.87% $>$120K$ 21 9.42% Missing15 6.73% Frequency of Attendence151st time152 68.16% $1-2$ per year38 17.04% $3-5$ per year21 9.42% All of them10 4.48% Missing2 0.90% Attend Other Events 2 Yes123 55.16% No96 43.05% Missing4 1.79% Current Business Owner 109 48.88% |
| Missing83.59%Household Income-<\$10K |
| Household Income<\$10K |
| |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ |
| $\begin{array}{ccccccc} \$50\text{K}-\$69,999 & 43 & 19.28\% \\ \$70\text{K}-\$89,999 & 19 & \$.52\% \\ \$90\text{K}-\$119,99 & 22 & 9.87\% \\ >\$120\text{K} & 21 & 9.42\% \\ \text{Missing} & 15 & 6.73\% \\ \hline Frequency of Attendence \\ 1st time & 152 & 68.16\% \\ 1-2 \text{ per year} & 38 & 17.04\% \\ 3-5 \text{ per year} & 21 & 9.42\% \\ \text{All of them} & 10 & 4.48\% \\ \text{Missing} & 2 & 0.90\% \\ \hline Attend Other Events \\ Yes & 123 & 55.16\% \\ \text{No} & 96 & 43.05\% \\ \text{Missing} & 4 & 1.79\% \\ \hline Current Business Owner \\ Yes & 111 & 49.78\% \\ \text{No} & 109 & 48.88\% \\ \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccc} >\$120 \mathrm{K} & 21 & 9.42\% \\ \mathrm{Missing} & 15 & 6.73\% \\ \hline Frequency of Attendence \\ 1st time & 152 & 68.16\% \\ 1-2 \ \mathrm{per} \ \mathrm{year} & 38 & 17.04\% \\ 3-5 \ \mathrm{per} \ \mathrm{year} & 21 & 9.42\% \\ \mathrm{All \ of \ them} & 10 & 4.48\% \\ \mathrm{Missing} & 2 & 0.90\% \\ \hline Attend \ Other \ Events \\ \mathrm{Yes} & 123 & 55.16\% \\ \mathrm{No} & 96 & 43.05\% \\ \mathrm{Missing} & 4 & 1.79\% \\ \hline Current \ Business \ Owner \\ \mathrm{Yes} & 111 & 49.78\% \\ \mathrm{No} & 109 & 48.88\% \end{array}$ |
| Missing 15 6.73% Frequency of Attendence 152 68.16% 1-2 per year 38 17.04% 3-5 per year 21 9.42% All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| Frequency of Attendence 1st time 152 68.16% 1-2 per year 38 17.04% 3-5 per year 21 9.42% All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events 7 7 Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 7 Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| 1st time 152 68.16% 1-2 per year 38 17.04% 3-5 per year 21 9.42% All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events 7 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 7 Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| 1-2 per year 38 17.04% 3-5 per year 21 9.42% All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events 2 0.90% Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 7 Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| 3-5 per year 21 9.42% All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events 2 0.90% Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 7 Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| All of them 10 4.48% Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events 2 0.90% Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 7 Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| Missing 2 0.90% Attend Other Events - - Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner - - Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| Attend Other Events Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 7 Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| Yes 123 55.16% No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 78% Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| No 96 43.05% Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner 78% Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| Missing 4 1.79% Current Business Owner |
| Current Business Owner Yes 111 49.78% No 109 48.88% |
| Yes11149.78%No10948.88% |
| No 109 48.88% |
| |
| Missing 3 1.35% |
| |
| Business is Located in Detroit |
| Yes 68 30.49% |
| No 42 18.83% |
| Missing 1 0.45% |
| n 223 |