Chapter 1

Introduction

This dissertation combines quantitative and qualitative approaches to begin

exploring the impact of recent public- housing policy and urban development on the

health of low-income African American communities. This project focuses on

experiences of both 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' relocation that have occurred in the

context of widespread public-housing demolition and the concurrent revitalization of

central city areas, and seeks to understand how these experiences of residential mobility

may affect access to critical social-ties and the social support that they provide.

Relocation from public-housing developments and other high-poverty urban areas may

offer low-income families an escape from neighborhood conditions and environmental

stressors that contribute to the high rates of morbidity and mortality that exist in these

communities. However, given the importance of social integration for health and well-

being, relocation that disrupts social ties may also have significant consequences for

relocated individuals.

The important contribution of social integration to health is well-established

(Berkman, Glass, Brissette, & Seeman, 2000; Cohen, 1988; Shaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus,

1981) and social support resources may be particularly important for socially

marginalized and socioeconomically disadvantaged populations such as African

American residents of high poverty neighborhoods (Geronimus, 2000). For example,

ethnographic literature indicates that the pooling of risks and resources across social networks is a critical survival strategy that may mitigate the health costs of material hardship and limited economic opportunity (Edin & Lein, 1997; Mullings & Wali, 1999; K. Newman, 1999; Stack, 1974). In addition, social networks may provide important psychosocial resources that help buffer the negative health effects of racial exclusion (Geronimus & Thompson, 2004; S. A. James, 1993). According to Geronimus and Thompson (2004) extended kin-networks and community-based social ties provide, for many African Americans, alternative cultural frameworks that serve to contest demeaning and harmful racial stereotypes that pervade dominant cultural institutions. James (1993) posits that the manner in which minority women respond to race related environmental stress may depend on the size and strength of their social networks and on their access to such identity affirming alternative frameworks. Research suggests that the health benefits of social integration are significant and may rival in strength the health costs of known risk factors such as cigarette smoking (S. James, Schulz, & van Olphen, 2001).

Although absent from many popular images of public-housing developments and other high-poverty urban areas, a significant body of evidence describes the presence of extensive social resources in these communities, as well as the critical role that these resources play in mitigating structural disadvantage (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Mullings & Wali, 1999; Stack, 1974; Venkatesh, 2000). For example, ethnographies conducted in public-housing communities point to tenants' organizations, church groups, neighborhood crime-watch initiatives, youth mentoring projects, collective monitoring of children, and informal networks of exchange and support as examples of such resources

2

(Bennett & Reed, 1999; Greenbaum, 2002, 2008; Venkatesh, 2000). In his ethnographic

description of Robert Taylor Homes, one of Chicago's largest public housing

developments, Venkatesh (2000) says that,

> The tenants of Robert Taylor Homes must be acknowledged for their impressive
> efforts to cope and make life meaningful amid a dearth of resources. From day-
> care provision to street gang interventions, the tenant body devised innovative
> techniques and fought when necessary to ensure their own safety and welfare
> (p.274).

It is also important to acknowledge evidence suggesting that social networks themselves

are constrained by the dearth of resources that Venkatesh cites, and may be limited in

their capacity to do anything more than keep their members afloat. Additionally, dense

social ties that are critical to helping residents of high poverty areas "get by", may offer

little opportunity to get "ahead" given that any accumulation of resources is likely to be

distributed across networks of exchange (Briggs, 1998; Stack, 1974). However, without

broader changes to the political, social and economic structures that constrain opportunity

for many African American residents of high poverty urban areas, these resources may be

critical and their loss may present significant health costs that may or may not be off-set

by benefits associated with relocation from high-poverty urban neighborhoods.

Much of the academic and policy discourse that surrounds high-poverty urban

minority neighborhoods has overlooked the significance of social networks, despite the

fact that the benefits of social support are widely accepted among other populations

(Greenbaum, 2002). Over the past few decades, researchers have increasingly considered

programs and policies that aim to reduce the concentration and isolation of low income

families (particularly in predominantly African American urban neighborhoods and in

federally owned public housing developments) through relocation initiatives that are

3

likely to affect the integrity of social support networks (Goetz, 2003b; Imbroscio, 2008).

Such deconcentration initiatives have taken two dominant forms. The first, includes

voluntary assisted mobility programs that provide public -housing residents with rent

assistance vouchers to secure private-market units in presumably less poor and less

segregated neighborhoods. The most well-known of these initiatives is the US

Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Moving to Opportunity

Program (MTO), which between the years 1994 and 1998, provided over 3,000 volunteer

public-housing residents in five cities with rental assistance vouchers and the opportunity

to leave public housing (Orr et al., 2003)[1]. A second strategy has facilitated poverty

deconcentration through the demolition of federally owned public-housing developments

that are considered to be a structural cause of concentrated poverty and racial segregation

(Bickford & Massey, 1991; Massey & Kanauaypuni, 1993). In 1992, HUD initiated a

nationwide grant program called HOPE VI to fund the demolition of public-housing, the

relocation of public-housing tenants, and the construction of mixed-income communities

at the sites of demolished developments (Kingsley et al., 2003). Because the majority of

relocated public-housing tenants are not eligible for newly constructed mixed-income

housing, HOPE VI has resulted in the permanent relocation of thousands of public

housing tenants in cities across the country (National Housing Law Project, 2002). In

most cases, relocated HOPE VI tenants are given vouchers to subsidize replacement

housing in the private market. In this sense, the HOPE VI program has contributed to

HUD's broader goal of reducing concentrated poverty by replacing place-based rental

---

[1] According to Goetz (2003) current deconcentration efforts can be viewed as "second generation"
programs that follow a series of court ordered desegregation initiatives implemented in the 1960's and
1970's.

assistance with tenant-based assistance in the form of vouchers.[2]

The rationale for deconcentration initiatives described above has considered both the structural and cultural features of high poverty urban neighborhoods that are thought to restrict economic opportunity for their residents. Stemming largely from the influential work of sociologist William Julius Wilson (1987; 1996), analysts have pointed to the suburbanization of manufacturing and other low-wage jobs that has limited employment opportunities for residents of high-poverty areas (Fernandez, 1994; Kasarda, 1990). Others have pointed to the poor quality of under-resourced urban schools which limit the accumulation of human capital and life chances for children who grow up in high-poverty urban areas and public-housing developments (Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2003a). In addition to considering this dearth of adequate resources, several analysts have also considered the social and cultural environments of high-poverty urban areas that are thought to magnify the effects of structural factors and contribute to the perpetuation of poverty (Anderson, 2000; Massey & Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1996). According to this perspective, the social structures that exist in high poverty urban areas are themselves detrimental to well-being, undermining individual and common welfare through the perpetuation of norms and behaviors that are considered barriers to upward mobility (Wilson, 1996). For example, Massey and Denton (1993) describe the development of an oppositional culture where joblessness, crime and the "the failure to meet the ideals of American society" (p 172) are destigmatized and normative. According to Goetz (2000), this emphasis on a "culture of segregation" (Massey & Denton, 1993)

---

[2] In outlining HUD's 1995 public-housing reforms, HUD secretary Henry Cisneros cited "highly concentrated poverty as one urban America's toughest challenges".(cited in Goetz 2000). However, it is important to note that other motivations likely contributed to the proposed shift toward tenant based assistance. Among them, is an increasing reliance on market-based strategies of social service provision.

coincides with popular views of 'ghetto' communities and has received widespread support. This perspective also necessitates what Bennett (2006) refers to as the "relocation imperative" of deconcentration initiatives. In other words, if the causes of perpetuated urban poverty are hypothesized to be located within the social networks of the poor, rather than in the larger social, political and economic structures that produce inequality, there is no logical alternative to dispersal. According to this view, place-based strategies that bring resources to high-poverty areas and leave social ties intact are likely to be constrained by the existing social environment.

While poverty deconcentration initiatives have received widespread support, existing evidence regarding their benefits for the well-being of relocated families is inconclusive (D. Acevedo-Garcia et al., 2004; Imbroscio, 2008; Orr et al., 2003). In particular, the health effects of these programs and initiatives are also not well-understood (D. Acevedo-Garcia et al., 2004; Manjarrez, Popkin, & Guernsey, 2007). Despite a large body of public-health literature that has examined the effects of neighborhood context on health, often focusing in particular on high poverty urban areas (Diez Roux, 2001; Ellen & Turner, 1997; Galea & Vlahov, 2005; Geronimus, Colen, Shochet, Ingber, & James, 2006), there has been insufficient attention focused on the health effects of programs and policies that move residents out of such areas. Existing evidence suggests that residence in high poverty urban neighborhoods is associated with high rates of morbidity and mortality and that this association persists after accounting for individual level factors (Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, Lochner, Osypuk, & Subramanian, 2003; Diez-Roux et al., 1997; Geronimus, Colen et al., 2006). A few public health scholars have pointed to relocation initiatives and deconcentration efforts as a potential

strategy to improve the extremely poor health that exists in these areas (D. Acevedo-Garcia et al., 2004; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2003b). Others have questioned the ability of such spatial interventions to address deeply rooted social inequalities and have raised concerns about the potential health consequences of programs that may fragment critical networks of social support (Fullilove, 1999; Geronimus & Thompson, 2004; Gomez & Muntaner, 2005; McAllister, Thomas, Wilson, & Green, 2009; Thompson, 1998).

A useful framework to understand the potential costs and benefits of such relocation and deconcentration initiatives is the concept of "weathering", conceptualized by Geronimus (2000; 2001; 2006) as the role that cumulative exposure to psychosocial and material stressors have played in the early health deterioration that is observed among African Americans, and in particular African American residents of high poverty urban areas. In these communities, stress associated with environmental exposures, dilapidated housing, exposure to crime and violence, lack of employment opportunities, lack of neighborhood resources, caretaking obligations and the psychological stress associated with segregation and exclusion are likely contributors to weathering. From a weathering perspective, relocation out of public housing developments and other segregated high poverty areas may affect exposure to stressors as well as access to social resources that mitigate the effects of these stressors on health. Some of the ways that relocation may contribute to or protect against weathering are discussed below.

A central goal of deconcentration initiatives is to offer public-housing residents access to improved physical environments and neighborhood resources. While some analysts and activists have advocated "place-based" strategies of development that

improve the conditions in high-poverty neighborhoods for (and often in collaboration

with) their current residents (Imbroscio, 2008)[3], others have supported relocation as an

effective strategy to accomplish this goal (Austin Turner, Popkin, Kingsley, & Kaye,

2004; Goering, 2003). If relocation programs are successful in providing access to better

quality housing and less disadvantaged neighborhoods, they may reduce exposure to

material and psychosocial stressors that are likely contributors to weathering. Many

urban public-housing developments have suffered greatly from decades of disinvestment

and have fallen into disrepair. Ethnographic studies conducted in public housing

developments indicate that the physical condition of these buildings is a significant

source of stress for public housing residents (Mullings & Wali, 1999; Vale, 1997;

Venkatesh, 2000). Additionally, relocation to less disadvantaged neighborhoods may

provide access to better educational opportunities for children, improving their life

chances and ultimately their health (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000; Harkness & Newman,

2003; S. Newman & Harkness, 2000). Such relocation may also reduce stress that is

associated with crime, drugs and gang activity found in many high poverty urban areas

(Sampson, Morenoff, & Raudenbush, 2005). Furthermore, some research suggests that

relocation from public-housing developments will increase work opportunities and

alleviate stress related to unemployment through increased geographic proximity to jobs

(U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1998). However, other analysts

have pointed to the fact that many public housing developments are located in central city

areas with prime access to jobs and transportation, suggesting that relocation may have

---

[3] For examples of organizations that have advocated for development without displacement, see the
Chicago Rehab Network (http://chicagorehab.org/), Policy Link
(http://www.policylink.org/EquitableDevelopment/default.html) and the Anti-Displacement Project
(http://www.a-dp.org/)

little impact on geographic barriers to employment (Bennett, 2006; Goetz, 2003a).

It is also possible that relocation to less disadvantaged neighborhoods will produce new stressors that contribute to weathering. For example, rents in such neighborhoods are likely to be more expensive, requiring families to spend a greater proportion of their income on housing, perhaps at the expense of other material needs. Public-housing residents who move into private market rental units, may also experience increased material hardship as a result of having to pay for utilities that are covered in public-housing developments (Venkatesh, Celimli, Miller, Murphy, & Turner, 2004). More socioeconomically advantaged neighborhoods are also less likely to contain resources (such as food banks, discount stores and public transportation) that low income families rely on to get by. Winkelby et al (2006) cite this mismatch of needs and services as one potential explanation for the finding that among low SES individuals, residence in a high SES neighborhood is associated with increased rates of mortality. Additionally, ethnographies of mixed-income and gentrifying neighborhoods find that stigmatization and marginalization is a significant source of social stress for low-income minority residents (Jackson, 2003; Pattillo, 2007). Relocation to neighborhoods that have a larger proportion of white residents may also increase exposure to race related discrimination that contributes to weathering (Geronimus & Thompson, 2004).

It is also possible that the demolition of public housing through programs like HOPE VI may not produce anticipated improvements in neighborhood and housing quality for relocated tenants. According to Thompson (1998), relocation initiatives do nothing to address the underlying racism that produced segregated housing patterns in the first place, and therefore are unlikely to improve neighborhood outcomes for relocated

families. Indeed, evidence suggests that most households end up in neighborhoods that are equally disadvantaged as the ones from which they were relocated (Venkatesh, Celimli, Miller, Murphy, & Turner, 2004). From this perspective, stressors associated with neighborhood disadvantage, and their contribution to weathering, are likely to persist.

In many urban areas, widespread demolition of public housing has occurred in the context of gentrification and urban revitalization that have contributed to affordable housing shortages that are compounded by demolition itself (Bennett, 2006; Crump, 2002; National Housing Law Project, 2002). Such shortages may lead to the relocation of low-income families who are not directly displaced by demolition, but are no longer able to afford to live in their current neighborhoods (Kathe Newman & Wyly, 2006). Additionally, as a result of affordable housing shortages and well-documented landlord biases against voucher holders (Beck, 1996), some relocated individuals may face challenges in finding any source of rental housing (Beck, 1996; Daskal, 1998; Fischer, 2001) . For this population, stress related to homelessness or doubling up with family members is likely to contribute to weathering.

Regardless of whether relocating individuals experience improvements to neighborhood and housing conditions, research suggests that relocation itself is likely to produce stressors that contribute to weathering (Moyle & Parkes, 1999). Moving in general is costly and stressful, and evidence suggests that it may be particularly so for low income families who are less able to absorb moving expenses (Bartlett, 1997). For example, the cost of having to pay multiple application processing fees while searching for a private market rental unit may impose a significant financial burden on families who

are struggling to make ends meet (Comey, 2007). Additionally, relocated public-housing

residents may experience psychosocial stress as a result of discrimination and rejection

from prospective landlords who are under no obligation to accept Section 8 vouchers

(Beck, 1996).

Whatever the net effects of relocation on exposure to psychosocial and material

stressors, the health effects of such stressors may be contingent on access to social

support resources that help mitigate their consequences (Geronimus, 2000). Both

voluntary and involuntary relocation may pose threats to the integrity of these social-

networks and the support resources that they provide. While voluntary and small-scale

mobility programs such as MTO may leave social networks relatively intact, demolition

of public housing as a result of programs like HOPE VI may lead to the dispersal of

entire communities and the geographically rooted social ties that they contain. Studies of

urban renewal initiatives that displaced hundreds of African American communities in

the 1960s and 1970s suggest that the disruption of ties to both people and place may

contribute to psychosocial and material stress and reduce coping capacities in ways that

have longstanding health consequences (Fried, 1963; Fullilove, 2001, 2004; Wallace &

Wallace, 1998). Some analysts have suggested that current urban revitalization and

demolition initiatives may have similar impacts (Fullilove, 1999; Gomez & Muntaner,

2005; Keating, 2000; McAllister et al., 2009).

Many questions remain as to how the demolition of public housing and the urban

redevelopment that surrounds it will contribute to or protect against weathering among

those who relocate from high poverty urban areas. These questions are timely given the

persistent shortages of affordable housing that exist in many cities and are likely to

increase as a result of the recent economic downturn (Crowley, Pelletiere, & Foscarinis, 2009). In light of the vulnerable health of residents in high-poverty urban areas and public housing developments (Manjarrez et al., 2007), it is crucial that future housing and development policies targeted at low-income communities consider the costs and benefits of relocation from a weathering and health equity perspective. Quality housing, safe neighborhoods and access to resources are certainly necessary prerequisites to health and persistent racial segregation and concentrated poverty are no doubt fundamental causes of excess morbidity and mortality in high-poverty urban areas (Williams & Collins, 2001). However, whether or not demolition and relocation initiatives will succeed in ameliorating these conditions and avoid introducing other significant affronts to health and well-being remains unclear. This dissertation contributes to the public health discourse on this question by considering the social networks that are a central component of the weathering framework described above, and that are likely to play a key role in mediating the relationship between relocation and health. The specific inquiries presented in Chapter 2-4 are outlined below.

Dissertation Outline

Chapter 2 is a critical literature review of the HOPE VI program and its impacts on relocated public-housing residents. This chapter has three distinct components. The first describes the evolution of HOPE VI, situating this initiative within the historical trajectory of public-housing policy. The second section of the chapter critically examines existing evidence regarding the impact of HOPE VI on relocated residents. Specifically, this section examines whether relocated HOPE VI tenants have been able to access improved neighborhood and housing conditions, and whether such moves have led to

improvements in adult economic well-being, educational attainment among children and mental and physical health outcomes. The final section discusses the role of social networks in public-housing communities and the potential consequences of network dissolution for relocated individuals.

Chapter 3 adds to our understanding of how recent shifts in federal housing policy may affect public-housing residents, and how social support may mediate this relationship. Using a nationally representative sample of rent assisted households from the Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), I estimate the relationship between type of housing assistance and reports that neighbors count on each other, watch out for each others' children, help each other out and can trust each other to intervene in the face of danger and harm.   The central hypothesis is that among a sample of all African American rent assisted households, residence in a federally owned project will be positively associated with measures of social support. In comparison to other forms of rent assistance, public-housing confers greater residential stability and also access to tenant organizations and other formal institutions that may provide an increased opportunity for the formation of social ties. In a second set of analyses, I examine the relationship between the above mentioned social-support measures and self-rated health (among adults) and educational outcomes (among children). To my knowledge, this is the first attempt to quantify the presence of support resources and their relationship to well-being in a nationally representative sample of public-housing residents. In this sense, the study provides an important addition to the current policy-debate surrounding the future of public-housing by providing some insight into the social-resources that may be at stake as a result of widespread demolition and dispersal.

As discussed above, the demolition of public-housing through programs such as HOPE VI has raised many questions about where residents will go and how they will fare. Much of this conversation has focused on the city of Chicago where public-housing has been particularly widespread (Ranney & Wright, 2000). Under the city's ten year Plan for Transformation (2000-2010) the public-housing stock will be reduced by more than one third. This reduction in assisted housing coincides with rapid rent increase in the private rental market and may severely limit housing options for low-income families (Bennett, 2006; Ranney & Wright, 2000). It is important to understand not only how the Plan for Transformation will affect public-housing residents and other low-income families (who may now face an even tighter rental markets as a result of decreased supply), but also the strategies that residents employ in order to negotiate the challenges and opportunities that are presented in this context. Qualitative methods are ideally suited for this goal given their ability to explore the ways that structural factors are experienced, understood and acted upon within local settings.

Evidence suggests that in response to demolition and urban redevelopment at least some former public-housing residents and other low-income families have left Chicago's center city neighborhoods for its margins on the South Side or its more affordable inner ring suburbs. Others have left the state of Illinois altogether. Through in-depth interviews and participant observation, Chapter 4 examines the experiences of 25 low-income African American women and men who have relocated from Chicago to Johnson County, Iowa. Many of these men and women were directly displaced by public-housing demolition. Others were looking for jobs, safe neighborhoods, and educational opportunities that were also perceived to be unattainable in the city. In this chapter, I

focus on how such moves affect access to social support, as well as a sense of rootedness

that is located in geographically stable social ties.

References

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Lochner, K. A., Osypuk, T. L., & Subramanian, S. V. (2003). Future Directions in Residential Segregation and Health Research: A Multilevel Approach. *Am J Public Health, 93*(2), 215-221.

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Osypuk, T., Werbel, R., Meara, E., Cutler, D., & Berkman, L. (2004). Does Housing Mobility Improve Health? *Housing Policy Debate, 15*(1), 49-98.

Anderson, E. (2000). *The Code of the Street: Decency, Violence and the Moral Life of the Inner City*.

Austin Turner, M., Popkin, S., Kingsley, G., & Kaye, D. (2004). *Distressed Public Housing-What it Costs to Do Nothing*. The Urban Institute.

Bartlett, S. (1997). The Significance of Relocation for Chronically Poor Families in the USA. *Environment and Urbanization, 9*(1), 121-132.

Beck, P. (1996). Fighting Section 8 Discrimination: The Fair Housing Act's New Fronteir. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, 31*.

Bennett, L. (2006). Downtown Restructuring and Public Housing in Contemporary Chicago: Fashioning a Better World Class-City. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), *Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities* (pp. 282-301). New York: ME Sharpe.

Bennett, L., & Reed, A. (1999). The New Face of Urban Renewal: the Near North Redevelopment Initiative and the Cabrini-Green. In A. Reed (Ed.), *Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality* (Vol. Without Justice for All, pp. 176-192). Boulder: Westview Press.

Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. E. (2000). From Social Integration to Health: Durkheim in the New Millennium. *Social Science and Medicine, 51*(6), 843-857.

Bickford, A., & Massey, D. (1991). Segregation in the Second Ghetto: Racial and Ethnic Segregation in American Public Housing, 1977. *Social Forces, 69*(4), 1011-1036.

Briggs, X. (1998). Brown Kids in White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate, 9*(1), 177-214.

Cohen, S. (1988). Psychosocial Models of the Role of Social Support in the Etiology of Physical Disease. *Health Psychology, 7*(3), 269-297.

Comey, J. (2007). *HOPE VI'd and on the Move*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Crowley, S., Pelletiere, D., & Foscarinis, M. (2009). *Renters in Crisis*: National Low

Income Housing Coaltion

Crump, J. (2002). Deconcentration by Demolition: Public Housing Policy, Poverty and Urban Policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 20*, 581-596.

Currie, J., & Yelowitz, A. (2000). Are Public Housing Projects Good for Kids? *Journal of Public Economics, 75*(1), 99-124.

Daskal, J. (1998). *In Search of Shelter: The Growing Shortage of Affordable Rental Housing* (Report). Washington DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Diez-Roux, A. V., Nieto, F. J., Muntaner, C., Tyroler, H. A., Comstock, G. W., Shahar, E., et al. (1997). Neighborhood Environments and Coronary Heart Disease: A Multilevel Analysis. *Am. J. Epidemiol., 146*(1), 48-63.

Diez Roux, A. V. (2001). Investigating Neighborhood and Area Effects on Health. *Am J Public Health, 91*(11), 1783-1789.

Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage.

Ellen, I. G., & Turner, M. A. (1997). Does Neighborhood Matter? Assessing Recent Evidence. *Housing Policy Debate, 8*(4), 833-866.

Fernandez, R. M. (1994). Race, Space, and Job Accessibility - Evidence from a Plant Relocation. *Economic Geography, 70*(4), 390-416.

Fischer, P. (2001, 2001). *Section 8 and the Public Housing Revolution: Where will the Families Go?* Paper presented at the Woods Fund, Chicago.

Fried, M. (1963). Greiving for a Lost Home. In *The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis* (pp. 151-171).

Fullilove, M. (1999). Building Momentum: An Ethnographic Study of Inner-City Redevelopment. *American Journal of Public Health, 89*(6), 840.

Fullilove, M. (2001). Root Shock: The Consequences of African American Dispossession. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 78*(1).

Fullilove, M. (2004). *Root Shock: How Tearing up City Neighborhoods Hurts America and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Balantine Books.

Galea, S., & Vlahov, D. (2005). Urban Health: Evidence, Challenges, and Directions. *Annual Review of Public Health, 26*, 341-365.

Geronimus, A. T. (2000). To Mitigate, Resist, or Undo: Addressing Structural Influences on Health of Urban Populations. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*(6), 867.

Geronimus, A. T. (2001). Understanding and Eliminating Racial Inequalities in Women's Health in the United States: the Role of the Weathering Conceptual Framework. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association, 56*(4), 133-136, 149.

Geronimus, A. T., Colen, C. G., Shochet, T., Ingber, L. B., & James, S. A. (2006). Urban-Rural Differences in Excess Mortality among High-Poverty Populations: Evidence from the Harlem Household Survey and the Pitt County, North Carolina Study of African American Health. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 17*(3), 532-558.

Geronimus, A. T., Hicken, M., Keene, D., & Bound, J. (2006). "Weathering" and Age Patterns of Allostatic Load Scores among blacks and Whites in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 96*(5), 826-833.

Geronimus, A. T., & Thompson, J. P. (2004). To Denigrate, Ignore or Disrupt: Racial Inequality in Health and the Impact of a Policy Induced Breakdown of African American Communities. *Du Bois Review, 1*(2), 247-279.

Goering, J. (2003). Comments of Future Research and Housing Policy. In J. Goering, Feins, J. (Ed.), *Choosing a Better Life: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Social Experiment*. Washington DC: Urban Institute Press.

Goetz, E. (2000). The Politics of Poverty Deconcentration and Housing Demolition. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 22*(2), 157-173.

Goetz, E. (2003a). *Clearing the Way*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Goetz, E. (2003b). Housing Dispersal Programs. *Journal of Planning Literature, 18*(1), 3-16.

Gomez, M., & Muntaner, C. (2005). Urban Redevelopment and Neighborhood Health in East Baltimore, Maryland: The Role of Communitarian and Institutional Social Capital. *Critical Public Health, 15*(2), 83-102.

Greenbaum, S. (2002). Social Capital and Deconcentration: Theoretical and Policy Paradoxes of the HOPE VI Program. *North American Dialogue, 5*(1), 9-13.

Greenbaum, S. (2008). Poverty and the Willful Destruction of Social Capital: Displacement and Dispossession in African American Communities. *Rethinking Marxism, 20*(1), 42-54.

Harkness, J., & Newman, S. (2003). The Interactive Effects of Housing Assistance and Food Stamps on Food Spending. *Journal of Housing Economics, 12*(3), 224-249.

Imbroscio, D. (2008). "United and Actuated By Some Common Impulse of Passion": Challenging the Dispersal Consensus in American Policy Research. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 30*(2), 111-130.

Jackson, J. (2003). *Harlem World: Doing Race and Class in Contemporary Black America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

James, S., Schulz, A., & van Olphen, J. (2001). Social Capital, Poverty and Community Health: an Exploration of Linkages. In J. P. T. a. M. W. Susan Saegert (Ed.), *Social Capital and Poor Communities*. New York: Russell Sage.

James, S. A. (1993). Racial and Ethnic Differences in Infant Mortality and Low Birth Weight: A Psychosocial Critique. *Annals of Epidemiology, 3*(2), 130-136.

Kasarda, J. (1990). Structural Factors Affecting the Location and Timing of Urban Underclass Growth. *Urban Geography, 11*(3), 234-264.

Keating, L. (2000). Redeveloping Public Housing: Relearning Urban Renewal's Immutable Lessons. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 66*(4).

Kingsley, G. T., Abravanel, M., Cunningham, M., Gustafson, J., Naparstek, A., & Austin-Turner, M. (2003). Lessons from HOPE VI for the Future of Public Housing. *The Urban Institute*.

Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003a). Children in Neighborhood Contexts. *American Psychological Society*, 27.

Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003b). Moving to opportunity: an experimental study of neighborhood effects on mental health. *Am J Public Health, 93*(9), 1576-1582.

Manjarrez, C., Popkin, S., & Guernsey, E. (2007). *Poor Health: Adding Insult to Injury for HOPE VI Families* (Report No. 5): The Urban Institute Press.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Massey, D., & Kanauaypuni, S. (1993). Public Housing and the Concentration of Poverty. *Social Science Quarterly, 74*(1), 109-122.

McAllister, C., Thomas, T., Wilson, P., & Green, B. (2009). Root Shock Revisited: Perspectives of Early Head Start Mothers on Community and Policy Environments and Their Effects on Child Health, Development and School Readiness. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(2), 205-209.

Moyle, P., & Parkes, K. (1999). The Effects of Transition Stress: A Relocation Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(5), 625-646.

Mullings, L., & Wali, A. (1999). *Stress and Resilience: The Social Context of Reproduction in Central Harlem*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

National Housing Law Project. (2002). *False HOPE: A Critical Assessment of the HOPE*

VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program (Report).

Newman, K. (1999). *No Shame in My Game*. New York: Russell Sage.

Newman, K., & Wyly, E. (2006). The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies, 43*(1), 23-57.

Newman, S., & Harkness, J. (2000). Assisted Housing and the Educational Attainment of Children. *Journal of Housing Economics, 9*, 40-63.

Orr, L., Feins, J., Jacob, R., Beecroft, E., L., S., F., K. L., et al. (2003). Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program: Interim Impacts Evaluation.

Pattillo, M. (2007). *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Ranney, D., & Wright, P. (2000). Race, Class and the Abuse of State Power: the Case of Public Housing in Chicago. *SAGE Race Relations Abstracts, 25*(2), 3.

Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Raudenbush, S. (2005). Social Anatomy of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Violence. *Am J Public Health, 95*(2), 224-232.

Shaefer, C., Coyne, J., & Lazarus, R. (1981). The Health Related Functions of Social Support. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*(4), 381-406.

Stack, C. (1974). *All Our Kin*. New York: Basic Books.

Thompson, J. P. (1998). Universalism and Deconcentration: Why Race Still Matters in Poverty and Economic Development. *Politics and Society, 26*(2), 181-219.

U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1998). *Welfare Reform Impacts on the Public Housing Program: A Preliminary Forecast*. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD.

Vale, L. (1997). Empathological Places: Residents' Ambivalence Toward Remaining in Public Housing. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 16*, 159-175.

Venkatesh, S. (2000). *American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Venkatesh, S., Celimli, I., Miller, D., Murphy, A., & Turner, B. (2004). *Chicago Public Housing Transformation: A Research Report* (Report). New York: Center for Urban Research and Policy Columbia University in the City of New York.

Wallace, D., & Wallace, R. (1998). *A Plague on Your Houses: How New York was Burned Down and National Public Health Crumbled*. London ; New York :: Verso.

Williams, D. R., & Collins, C. (2001). Racial Residential Segregation: A Fundamental Cause of Racial Disparities in Health. *Public Health Reports, 116*, 404-416.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When Work Disappears: The New World of the Urban Poor*. New York: Vintage Books.

Winkelby, M., Cubbin, C., & Ahn, D. (2006). Low Individual Socioeconomic Status, Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Adult Mortality. *American Journal of Public Health, forthcoming*.

Chapter 2

The HOPE VI Program: Relocation, Social Networks and the Health of African American Public-Housing Residents

In response to growing public and political dissatisfaction with public housing, in 1992 congress launched the Urban Revitalization Plan which subsequently became known as HOPE VI. HOPE VI is a department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) program that has funded the demolition and revitalization of public-housing projects through block grants that are awarded to municipal housing authorities. The HOPE VI program sought to transform public-housing developments that were considered "islands of despair" into "vital and integral parts of the surrounding neighborhoods" and to "create mixed income environments that encourage and support movements toward self sufficiency" (GAO 1998). While HOPE VI was initially intended to fund the demolition of a small portion (6%) of public-housing units that had been identified by a 1989 federal investigation as distressed, the program quickly expanded its reach beyond this goal. By 2007, HOPE VI had funded the demolition of nearly 90,000 public-housing units (Cabrera, 2007), including a large portion that were not initially identified as distressed, and had come to play an important role in a broader national shift from project-based low-income housing to tenant-based rental assistance in the form of vouchers (Crump, 2002).

The central goals of HOPE VI as stated by HUD are: improving the physical quality of public-housing, promoting self-sufficiency among public-housing residents, and reducing the isolation of low-income families. This latter objective has led to what Bennett (2006) refers to as the "relocation imperative" of HOPE VI. At the majority of HOPE VI sites, poverty "deconcentration" is facilitated through the relocation of original tenants (particularly very-low income tenants) and the marketing of newly developed units to higher-income subsidized households and unsubsidized market-rate renters. Thus while HOPE VI has successfully led to many physical improvements at HOPE VI sites, the original tenants have not necessarily benefited from these changes. This critical literature review examines the potential impacts of HOPE VI for the large number of public-housing tenants who have been relocated as a result of this program.

Relocated HOPE VI tenants are given the option to either receive a housing-voucher (to subsidize a private-market rental unit) or to relocate to another public-housing development. Many questions remain as to how such moves will affect the well-being of relocated individuals and families. Some analysts have suggested that relocation from distressed public housing will result in improved health and economic well-being by allowing families to escape areas of concentrated poverty and distressed housing conditions, and by granting them improved access to human and social capital (Austin Turner, Popkin, Kingsley, & Kaye, 2004; Popkin, 2007). However, others have argued that increasing shortages of affordable housing compounded by discrimination against voucher holders may limit HOPE VI relocatees to housing and neighborhood conditions that are no better (or worse) than those that they left behind (Fischer, 2001; Ranney &

Wright, 2000). Additionally, analysts have raised concerns that the relocation process itself may disrupt vital sources of social support that exist within public-housing communities (Greenbaum, 2002; Manzo, Kleit, & Couch, 2008).

While public housing in this country serves a racially diverse population, the vast majority of those displaced by the HOPE VI program are African American (National Housing Law Project, 2002; Popkin, Levy, Harris, Comey, & Cunningham, 2002b). African American public-housing residents may face particular challenges in relocation as a result of racially segregated housing markets and discrimination from prospective landlords (Austin Turner, 1998; Beck, 1996). Additionally, in light of a large body of evidence indicating the important role that social networks play in mitigating the combined challenges of economic disadvantage and racial exclusion, African American public-housing residents may be particularly affected by the disruption of social networks (Geronimus, 2000; Geronimus & Thompson, 2004). Given high rates of morbidity and mortality found among low-income urban African Americans (Geronimus, Bound, Waidmann, Colen, & Steffick, 2001), it is important to determine how HOPE VI relocation affects not only economic and neighborhood outcomes, but also the physical and mental health of this particular population.

This paper has three distinct components. The first describes the evolution of HOPE VI, situating this initiative within the historical trajectory of public-housing policy. The second section of the paper critically examines existing evidence regarding the impact of HOPE VI on relocated residents. Specifically, this section examines whether relocated HOPE VI tenants have been able to access improved neighborhood and housing conditions, and whether such moves have led to improvements in adult economic

well-being, educational attainment among children and mental and physical health outcomes.[4] The final section discusses the role of social networks in public-housing communities and the potential consequences of network dissolution for relocated individuals.

A Brief History of Public-Housing Policy

It is not possible to fully understand the evolution of HOPE VI and its role in the larger national shift away from project-based housing without consideration of the 70 year history of federally financed rent assistance in this country. Below, I describe the initial creation of public housing in the 1930's and the policies and political contexts that have shaped its physical and political demise, paving the way for the HOPE VI program and for what Crump (2003) refers to as "the end of public-housing as we know it" (p.179).

<u>1930s: A two Tiered Federal Housing Policy is Born</u>

In the 1930s two important pieces of public-housing legislation worked to create what became a two tiered federal housing policy (J. Smith, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006b). First, the 1934 Federal Housing Act provided mortgage assistance to homebuyers leading to a dramatic increase in home ownership. Because the option to buy was restricted by barriers of class and race, the 1934 Public-Housing Act was an important building block of housing inequality and residential segregation based on race (Massey, Gross, & Shibuya, 1994). The second piece of legislation, the 1937 Public-Housing Act resulted in the first federal ownership of housing for the poor by creating a system of local public-housing authorities that were charged with constructing and managing

---

[4] Given the methodological limitations of most HOPE VI relocation studies, this section also draws cautious inference from HUD's Moving to Opportunity Program. This program has a more rigorous quasi-experimental design.

subsidized low-income housing (J. Smith et al., 2006b). The Public-Housing Act of 1937

also introduced the idea of affordable housing as a right and the idea that residents should

not spend more than 20% of their income on housing. These ideas emerged during the

Depression when poverty was widespread and public-housing served a predominantly

white population and a mix of employed and unemployed residents. Marcuse (1998)

argues that this earliest version of assisted housing was less stigmatized and more

politically popular than its successors precisely because it served such a large (and

predominantly white) segment of the population.

1950s: Slum Clearance, Urban Renewal, High Rises and Racial Segregation

In the post New-Deal era of the 1950s, a series of events changed the face of urban

public-housing, both architecturally and demographically. It was during the 1950s and

1960s that large high-rise public housing projects that served predominantly African

Americans were constructed in many large cities. While public housing up to the present

day serves a diverse population in buildings of varying size and design, the high-rise

structures of the 1950s and 1960s have come to represent the dominant public view of

public-housing (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Crump, 2003; Venkatesh, 2000). The public-

housing high-rises of the 1950s and 1960s have had a profound impact on the trajectory

of public-housing policy in this country and in some respects have laid the foundation for

HOPE VI.

The 1949 Public-housing Act, which declared that every citizen had the right to a

decent home, played a key role in the transformation of public housing that took place in

the decades following its implementation (J. Smith et al., 2006b). This act authorized a

process of "slum clearance": the demolition of housing that was deemed inadequate in

urban areas that were considered "blighted" (Fullilove-Thompson, 2004). "Slum

clearance" opened the door for urban renewal in the form of new construction and urban

revitalization in cleared areas (Fullilove-Thompson, 2004; Gans, 1962; Keating, 2000).

Gans (1962) argues that this redevelopment was the primary motivation for "slum

clearance" and that in fact, two-thirds of the dwellings demolished by this program

provided decent housing for their inhabitants.

Urban renewal affected many low-income white ethnic neighborhoods[5], however

two-thirds of those displaced by slum clearance were African American, and the program

was thus alternatively referred to as "negro removal" (Gans, 1965). The clearing of urban

neighborhoods and increasing rents in renewal areas led to a severe shortage of

affordable housing for low-income families, particularly for African Americans whose

housing options were limited by racial segregation (Gans, 1965). In efforts to house those

displaced by "slum clearance", the construction of high-rise housing (which allowed for

many units to be constructed quickly and on small pieces of land) became the norm in

large urban areas (Crump, 2003).[6] These high rises came to house entire communities

that had been fragmented through the process of displacement (Fullilove, 2001; Fullilove,

Green, & Fullilove, 1999). A large body of literature has documented the effects of

urban renewal on these communities and points to deepening poverty and distress as

previously vibrant social networks and social organizations were fragmented (Bennett &

Reed, 1999; Fullilove-Thompson, 2004; Keating, 2000; J. Smith et al., 2006b).

Recounting the experience of urban renewal, one African American man stated, "We

---

[5] See for example, Gans' 1962 ethnography of Boston's Italian West End neighborhood and Urban
Renewal (Gans, 1962)
[6] The Public-housing Act of 1949 called for the construction of 810,000 new public-housing units in order
to house those displaced by renewal, however, this ambitious goal was never met (Gans 1965)

used to have a community here, now it is just buildings." (Fullilove 2001, p. 70).

The process of urban renewal in the 1950s and 1960s is relevant to the current HOPE VI initiative for several reasons. First, as discussed above, it changed the demographics of public housing in large urban areas to house a predominantly African American population that was more economically, socially and politically marginalized than previous public-housing populations. Second, urban renewal set a precedent of displacing poor minorities in the name of urban revitalization. In many cases, the public-housing residents who are being forced to leave their homes as a result of HOPE VI are members of the same communities who were displaced by urban renewal three or four decades ago (Keating, 2000). Several scholars (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Ranney & Wright, 2000; Reichl, 1999) have raised the question of whether, with complete disregard for the overwhelmingly negative impacts of urban renewal, HOPE VI is simply a repackaged version of this policy, and is "yet another chapter in displacing low income people of color in the interest of city revitalization" (Reichl 1999, p. 183). Finally, it is important to recognize that many communities vehemently resisted urban renewal with civic action and protest (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Gans, 1965; Hyatt & Shenk, 1995; Sugrue, 1996). While it has received little attention in academic and political discourse, similar activism and resistance has taken shape in the face of HOPE VI revitalization (Goetz, 2003a; Wright, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006).

1970's and 1980s: Budget Cuts, Benign Neglect and Deterioration

By the 1970s, the dominant image of public housing had shifted dramatically. While nationwide, public housing still existed in many architectural forms and served a demographically diverse population (including large numbers of whites) the

28

predominantly black high-rise public housing projects of the urban renewal era had come to represent the dominant view of public-housing. This view, combined with ideological shifts away from social welfare spending, led to a drastic decline in political support for low-income housing projects (Crump, 2003; Marcuse et al., 1998).

At the end of the 1960s, landmark events in Chicago set the stage for national changes in public-housing policy. In 1966, Chicago's high-rise housing projects were implicated as causes of racial segregation and were the target of a landmark lawsuit filed by Chicago's public-housing residents, *Gatreaux vs Chicago Housing Authority* (CHA). As a result of Gatreaux, the CHA was required by law to desegregate its projects and to cease construction in segregated areas. However, in the face of strong resistance from white residents, rather than carry out a plan to build scattered site housing in predominantly white neighborhoods, Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley responded by abruptly halting construction of new units (Ranney & Wright, 2000). In the decade following the court order only a few hundred units were built (W. Wilen & Stasell, 2006). The existing stock of Chicago's high-rise public-housing deteriorated and subsequently became notorious on a national scale. The infamy of Chicago public-housing bolstered the decline in public and political support for public-housing developments that occurred across the nation (J. Smith et al., 2006b).

The deterioration of housing stock that occurred in Chicago was mirrored on a national level when the Nixon administration enacted the Housing Community Development Act of 1974 (Goetz, 2003b; J. Smith, 2006). This act came on the heels of a national experiment, the experimental housing allowance program, authorized in 1971 to test the viability of tenant based assistance (in the form of vouchers that could be used

29

to subsidize private market units) as an alternative to project based housing. It was hypothesized that tenant-based housing would be cheaper, offer more choice to residents and reduce levels of segregation that had resulted from public-housing construction in the preceding decades (Goetz, 2003b). While the experiment was intended to last a decade, the Nixon administration did not wait for the results and in 1974 placed a national moratorium on the construction of project-based housing and created the first major national shift towards tenant- based rent assistance with the Section 8 program.

When first introduced, the Section 8 program was comprised of a project-based and a tenant based component. The former provided subsidies to private developers for the construction of subsidized low-income units. Because the subsidy remained with the unit, project based Section 8 helped to maintain a stock of affordable housing for low-income households.[7] By bringing in private sector developers, project-based Section 8 was considered as an approach to improving the stock of subsidized low income housing with less federal investment risk (J. Smith et al., 2006b). The project-based component of Section 8 produced nearly 1.5 million units of subsidized housing before it was phased out in 1983 (Bratt, 1987).

The tenant-based portion of Section 8 provided rent subsidies to low-income families which could be used to secure a non-subsidized unit in the private sector. Families were responsible for paying rent that was equal to 25% (today it is 30%) of their income, and the Section 8 certificate covered the remainder. In 1983, Congress created the Section 8 voucher, which is similar to the certificate, except that it had fewer restrictions. For example, it can be used throughout the US and not just within the confines of the issuing

---

[7] The Section 8 new construction and rehabilitation subsidies replaced Section 235 and 236 funding. The latter two programs, enacted in the 1960s, provided subsidies to developers to build low-cost housing. Many section 235 and 236 projects were poorly managed and quickly fell into default (Smith 2006b).

housing authority. The tenant-based Section 8 subsidy, which was renamed and

redesigned as the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program in 1998, has become primary

source of government housing assistance to the poor (Goetz, 2003b).

A central goal of the HCV voucher was to offer more options to low-income families

who were, according to conventional wisdom, previously restricted to undesirable

housing projects (Marcuse et al., 1998). However, the reality of this choice is constrained

by existing limitations of the rental housing market and for many households, finding a

rental unit is a challenging and sometimes impossible task (R. Smith, 2002). Landlords

are under no obligation to accept HCVs and many do not, particularly in areas where

rental markets are tight and it is easy to find unsubsidized tenants who will often pay

more than fair market rent (Fischer, 2001). Furthermore, well documented racial

discrimination in the housing rental market creates additional obstacles for minority

voucher holders whose search for available units may be restricted to non-white

neighborhoods (Beck, 1996; South & Crowder, 1998). Minority voucher holders may

also face overt discrimination from landlords whose refusal to accept Housing Choice

Vouchers may be a hidden expression of racial prejudice (Beck, 1996). Thus, while the

HCV program aimed to provide increased choice for low-income families, its reliance on

market availability does not provide the same guaranteed safety net as project-based

public housing (Crump, 2002, 2003).

The HCV program was also significant in that it augmented the role of the private

sector in providing subsidized housing for the poor (Goetz, 2003b). This partnering was a

beacon of the impending neoliberal era of downsized government and a reliance on the

private- market that would increase in the years leading up to HOPE VI (Ranney &

Wright, 2000)[8].

As other forms of housing assistance began to dominate subsidized housing, the existing federally owned stock of housing projects deteriorated even further. Not only did construction virtually cease on new projects, funding to up-keep existing ones was cut sharply (Ranney & Wright, 2000). Policies of neglect in the 1970s and 1980s were another nail in the coffin for public housing. The distressed conditions that they produced in a small number of projects were upheld as an example of the overall failure of federally owned project-based housing in a climate where other forms of assistance to the poor were already under attack (Crump, 2003). While the majority of public housing remained in good condition (and in many cases superior to what was available to low income families in the private market), in the 1990s HUD would play upon an exaggerated sense of crisis that had developed as a result of the preceding neglectful decades (National Housing Law Project, 2002).

The early-1990s: Growing Concern over Concentrated Urban Poverty

The popularity of the HOPE VI program was fueled by an atmosphere of growing concern over the increasing concentration of poverty in urban areas (Crump, 2003). The academic discourse surrounding concentrated poverty stems largely from the influential work of William Julius Wilson[9]. Wilson (1987) argues that as manufacturing jobs and middle class black families left central city areas, the very poor became concentrated in

---

[8] For example, the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) created in 1980s, provided tax credits for developers to develop affordable housing. However, given the financial incentive for developers to house higher income families, and given that LIHTC subsidies are extended to households that earn as much as 60% of the area median income (significantly more than the majority of public-housing residents), this form of assisted housing is unavailable to a large segment of assisted households (Crump, 2003)

[9] While Wilson is perhaps the most well-known advocate of poverty deconcentration, his theories of concentrated poverty stem from a long line of 'Chicago School' sociologists and economists. His concept of "ghetto related behaviors" has also been connected to Oscar Lewis's earlier and now largely repudiated "culture of poverty" theory Bennett and Reed, 1999).

neighborhoods with high rates of joblessness. In isolation from the middle-class and the employed, he argues that the social organization of these communities broke down and "ghetto related behaviors" developed. Wilson describes disadvantaged urban communities where a presumed lack of self-efficacy and work ethic, the decline of the nuclear family and increased rates of teenage child-bearing, are said to prevent residents of high poverty neighborhoods from pulling themselves out of poverty through gainful employment.

Wilson's arguments are echoed by another influential sociologist, Douglass Massey. Massey and Denton (1993) attribute the rise of concentrated black urban poverty primarily to racially segregated housing markets that have restricted blacks to high poverty neighborhoods[10], but like Wilson implicate an oppositional "culture of segregation" (p.169), that developed in the face of isolation from middle class whites, in the perpetuation of an urban "underclass". Drawing on the work of other urban ethnographers (Anderson, 2000; Ogbu, 1981), Massey argues that this oppositional culture destigmatizes joblessness, crime and the "failure to meet the ideals of American society"(p.172), normalizing behaviors that prevent economic upward mobility. In particular, Massey and Denton emphasize low marriage rates and teen pregnancy as central causes of perpetuated poverty. While Wilson and Massey's arguments have been refuted on many levels[11], they have been adopted by policy makers and scholars who

---

[10] Massey et al refute Wilson's idea that segregation was created by an out-migration of the black middle class (Massey et al., 1994).

[11] See several counter portraits of public housing communities including, Larry Bennett and Adolf Reed's (1999) depiction of Chicago's Cabrini Green housing development and Reichl's (1999) depiction of St. Thomas in New Orleans. See Prudence Carter (2005) for an explicit critique of "oppositional culture". See Geronimus (2003) for an alternative framework that positions early childbearing norms and the prevalence of extended kin networks (rather than nuclear families) among some low-income African Americans as adaptive responses to premature health decline and economic and social marginalization. See also Edin and

advocate demolishing public-housing that "concentrates poverty by design" (J. Smith et al., 2006b).

<u>1992: HOPE VI</u>

HOPE VI was initiated in 1992 with widespread support as a program that could potentially offer public housing residents an escape from distressed housing and areas of concentrated poverty, and also reduce the federal government's direct involvement in public-housing ownership through private-public partnerships (J. Smith, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006a). Building on the trends that had begun in the preceding decade, the program accelerated the loss of project-based housing, expanded the tenant-based voucher program and deepened partnerships with the private market. HOPE VI awards block grants to local housing authorities that are matched by funds from private sector partners who invest in its newly constructed mixed income communities. By July of 2007, HUD had awarded nearly six billion dollars in HOPE VI grants supplemented by an additional four billion from the private sector (Cabrera, 2007). By this date, HOPE VI had funded the demolition of 87,445 units and lead to the relocation of 68,657 families, with an additional 10,000 units slated for demolition in 2008, the program's final year of funding (Cabrera, 2007).

While HOPE VI was intended to demolish and revitalize the 6% of the nation's public-housing stock that the National Commission determined to be distressed, many analysts have argued that the program has resulted in a loss of units that were adequately serving large numbers of residents and that distress played a very minimal role in the allocation of HOPE VI demolition and revitalization grants (Bagert, 2002; Bennett,

Kefalas (2005) for ethnographic data that contradict Massey's argument regarding the devaluation of marriage in low-income African American communities.

34

Hudspeth, & Wright, 2006; National Housing Law Project, 2002). HUD considered

distress as only one of several factors when allocating HOPE VI grants and the definition

of distress itself was loosely defined (National Housing Law Project, 2002). In the

absence of objective criteria, HOPE VI eligibility was available to virtually any housing

authority for virtually any development[12]. Some analysts have argued that these loose

eligibility restrictions in regards to distress have allowed municipal authorities to use

HOPE VI funds to develop areas that are geographically ideal for real-estate

development, but considered blighted due to the presence of a public-housing project

(Bagert, 2002; Bennett et al., 2006; National Housing Law Project, 2002; Reichl, 1999).

For example, the Chicago Housing Authority applied for and received a 1993 HOPE VI

grant to demolish and revitalize the Cabrini Green development which was located in the

heart of the rapidly gentrifying Near North Side. According to Bennett and Reed (1999)

crime rates, neighborhood conditions and housing quality at Cabrini Green were superior

to many other CHA developments, but its prime location made it an early target for

demolition, leaving more distressed developments such as the Robert Taylor Homes on

the South Side of Chicago in place for several more years.

In addition to demolition, HOPE VI has produced substantial revitalization and new

construction on the site of many former public-housing projects. HOPE VI revitalization

plans are often carried out as a collaborative effort between local housing authorities,

private developers and the residents themselves. The degree of resident participation in

HOPE VI revitalization plans has varied from site to site. While in some cases residents

were able to play key roles in decision-making, in other cases residents were blindsided

---

[12] During the first 3 years of the program, HOPE VI grants were limited to 24 housing authorities included on HUD's eligibility list or to projects located in one of the country's most populous cities, but after the first 3 years, even these criteria were dropped (GAO, 1998).

by plans that directly contradicted their expressed needs (see GAO, 2003)[13]. While HOPE

VI grantees expect to construct more new units than were demolished, these new

developments will include market rate units in addition to traditional public-housing ones

(Cabrera, 2007). The public-housing units themselves are allocated to designated income

brackets, often with very few units reserved for the poorest residents , who in many cases

make up the majority of pre-revitalization tenants (J. Smith et al., 2006a). These income

mixing guidelines as well as an overall reduction in public-housing units have made

redeveloped HOPE VI projects inaccessible to the majority of their former tenants.

According to the National Center for Housing Law's analysis of HOPE VI, as of 2002

only 11.4% of relocated residents have been able to return to their original sites (National

Housing Law Project, 2002)[14]. While this number may increase as more reconstruction is

completed, it is clear that for a large number of public-housing residents, HOPE VI will

result in permanent relocation. Low rates of resident re-occupancy have been attributed to

several factors including: residents not wanting to move twice (moving may be especially

burdensome for low income families), not wanting children to have to switch schools

multiple times, and a preference for their new homes (L. Buron, Popkin, Levy, Harris, &

Khadduri, 2002). However, many residents also expressed a desire to return to their

former developments but were unable to because they did not qualify for the available

units (R. Smith, 2002; P. Wilen & Nayak, 2006) [15].

The late 1990s: Reinforcing HOPE

---

[13] See Bagert (2002) for a description of the conflict between the St. Thomas Residents Council, the Housing Authority of New Orleans and HRI developers over the HOPE VI funded renovation of the St. Thomas.

[14] Of the 39 sites that had completed re-occupancy at the time of a 2003 GAO evaluation HOPE VI, 17 had less than 25% re-occupancy by original residents and only 13 had rates of 50 or higher (GAO 2003).

[15] A study of those families from Chicago Public-housing in 2002 found that 89% expressed a desire to return to eventually their original developments (Venkatesh, Celimli, Miller, Murphy, & Turner, 2004).

Zhang and Weisman (2006) argue that it was not until several years after the legislation was introduced that the HOPE VI program became an agent of radical change in the restructuring of US public-housing. As a grant program, HOPE VI itself contained very few legislative guidelines, but the use of HOPE VI grants was very much constrained by existing public-housing legislation. In the mid 1990s, amendments to this legislation, as well as emerging ideologies about the role of the federal government in providing housing assistance to the poor, greatly expanded both the role and the reach of the HOPE VI program.

In its early years, the ability of HOPE VI to create mixed-income communities in the place of former public-housing developments was constrained by the "one for one replacement" rule set in place by the Public Housing Act of 1937. According to this rule, every public-housing unit that was demolished had to be replaced. For early HOPE VI grants, this often meant constructing off-site housing, or scattered site public-housing to replace units that were demolished. However, scattered-site public-housing plans were often difficult to carry out as a result of community resistance. Thus early HOPE VI developments were obligated to include large numbers of public-housing units. This changed in 1995 when President Clinton suspended the "one for one" rule with the passing of the 1995 Rescissions Act. The 1995 Rescissions Act was followed by a1996 Refinancing Act that offered an increased the role for private developers in both the ownership and construction of subsidized rental housing. These for-profit entities had a direct interest in reducing the number of public-housing units and maximizing the number of market rate units at HOPE VI developments.

Finally, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility act (QHWRA) of 1998

significantly amended the Public Housing Act of 1937 codifying many of HOPE VI's objectives. The QHWRA worked in tandem with the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) to reduce reliance on government assistance by encouraging and facilitating employment among public-housing tenants (Crump 2003). Like PRWORA, the QHWRA applied both a carrot and a stick approach towards its goal of increasing self-sufficiency among public-housing residents. In the case of the former, it allowed municipal housing authorities to set ceiling rents for subsidized units so that working families would not be penalized for increased income. In terms of the latter, the QHWRA allowed housing authorities to require community service or job training participation and to limit the availability of housing for the unemployed (Wilen and Nayek 2006). The QWHRA also expanded the ability of housing authorities to evict tenants for minor infractions.

In summary, by the late 1990's HOPE VI was part of a larger shift away from government ownership of public-housing that was guaranteed to low-income families toward a model where assisted housing was a contingent resource provided largely through public-private partnerships. While the following section specifically focuses on the effects of the HOPE VI program, to the extent that HOPE VI represents this larger fundamental shift, the evidence presented may have broader implications. While the HOPE VI program was not refunded in Fiscal Year 2009, it has been extremely influential in transforming American public housing and the public and policy discourse that surrounds rental assistance.

The Impact of HOPE VI on Relocated Public-housing Residents

Over the past decade and a half, HOPE VI grant money has funded the demolition

of distressed public housing and the creation of new mixed-income housing complexes that are lauded as beacons of a new and improved model of rental assistance. Site-based evaluations of HOPE VI redevelopment show marked improvements in safety, building conditions and neighborhood poverty rates at HOPE VI sites (GAO, 2003)[16]. However, it is clear that only a small portion of original tenants will benefit from these improvements (L. Buron et al., 2002; National Housing Law Project, 2002). For the majority of the original tenants, HOPE VI resulted in permanent relocation. One of the central arguments put forward by advocates of HOPE VI is the program's potential to "dramatically improve the life circumstances for families who endured terrible condition in distressed public-housing" (Popkin, 2007). However, it is unclear whether relocated tenants actually end up in better neighborhoods, or if these moves translate into improved economic and overall well-being. In this section, I critically examine the limited existing evidence on HOPE VI relocation focusing on neighborhood and housing quality, economic well-being among adults, educational outcomes among children and health.

Studies of HOPE VI relocation

Existing knowledge about the effects of HOPE VI on relocated residents is derived largely from two multi-site studies and a small number of single site studies (Clampet-Lundquist, 2003; Greenbaum, 2002; Popkin, Cunningham, & Woodley, 2003; Venkatesh et al., 2004). The two multi-site studies include the HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study (L. Buron et al., 2002) and the HOPE VI Panel Study (Harris & Kaye, 2004; D. Levy &

---

[16] It is unclear how much of this improvement can be directly attributed to HOPE VI. If, as hypothesized by Bennett et al (2006) housing authorities are using HOPE VI funds to take advantage of preexisting economic growth, these findings of improvement could be confounded by secular trends. Additionally, measurements of neighborhood poverty are clearly related to the massive relocation of a largely impoverished public-housing population.

Kaye, 2004; Popkin, 2006 and others; Popkin, Eisemann, & Cove, 2004a; Popkin et al., 2002b). Both of these studies are conducted by researchers at the Urban Institute and are funded by HUD. The HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study (L. Buron et al., 2002) examines post-relocation outcomes among a sample of 818 households from eight HOPE VI sites at which HOPE VI revitalization took place between the years 1993 and 1998. [17] The Tracking Study administered surveys to approximately 100 residents from each study site (66% response rate) two to seven years after the receipt of HOPE VI grants. The HOPE VI Panel Study is currently the only longitudinal multi-site study of HOPE VI residents. The study was commissioned by Congress in 1999 to address unanswered questions regarding the impact of HOPE VI on original residents (Popkin et al., 2002b). The Panel Study tracks the experience of individuals at five HOPE VI sites where redevelopment began in mid to late 2001. [18] Baseline data were collected in the spring of 2001. Follow-up data were collected 24 and 48 months later.[19]

In addition to these national studies, the Chicago Public-Housing Transformation Study (Venkatesh et al., 2004) examines the experience of all Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) families who relocated during 2002. The CHA is the largest recipient of HOPE VI grants and its public-housing stock has undergone the most dramatic transformation in the last few decades. The relocation experiences in Chicago can provide valuable insight into the consequences of HOPE VI revitalization when carried out on large scale.

Several analysts have studied HOPE VI relocation outcomes in other cities. Clampet-

---

[17] Quigg Newton, in Denver CO, Archbishop Walsh in Newark, NJ, John Hays Homes, in Springfield, IL, Hayes Valley, in San Francisco, Cottter and Lang in Louiville, KY, Connie Chambers, in Tucson, AZ, Christopher Columbus, in Paterson, NJ, Edwin Corning in Albany, NY
[18] Shore Park, Atlantic City, NJ; Ida B. Wells, Chicago, IL;Few Gardens, Durham, NC; Easter Hill, Richmond, CA; East Capitol Dwellings, Washington, DC.
[19] The results of the 24 month and 48 month follow-ups are available in a series of reports from the Urban Institute.

Lundquist has examined both qualitatively and quantitatively, the experiences of families

relocating from the Dubois public-housing development in Philadelphia (2004a, 2004b).

Greenbaum is currently conducting long-term ethnographic research with relocated

HOPE VI families in the Tampa, Florida neighborhood of Sulphur Springs (2002,2008).

Goetz (2003) describes the effects of the Hollman settlement, a large scale demolition

and deconcentration initiative in Minneapolis. While not funded by a HOPE VI grant, the

Hollman settlement resulted in the demolition of two public-housing developments in

Minneapolis and an involuntary displacement of 700 tenants in a manner similar to

HOPE VI relocation. Once these 700 tenants were accommodated either at newly

constructed scattered site units (built in low poverty neighborhoods) or with newly

available mobility vouchers, the Hollman settlement offered both of these options to

other public-housing families resulting in the relocation of 600 volunteers (Goetz, 2002).

Thus, evidence from the Hollman settlement provides a way to directly compare the

effects of voluntary and involuntary relocation on public-housing tenants, an important

distinction that separates HOPE VI from most other mobility and poverty

deconcentration initiatives[20].

Where do Residents End Up?

    Under the Urban Relocation Act (URA) of 1970, HOPE VI grantees are required to

provide three relocation options for displaced residents. These options are, 1) relocation

to another public-housing project, 2) relocation with a HCV or 3) leaving assisted

housing. Approximately 49 % of the residents displaced by HOPE VI as of June 2003

---

[20] This review of the HOPE VI literature is limited to studies that describe (quantitatively or qualitatively) post-relocation outcomes public-housing tenants. Several other studies not included here have documented the process of redevelopment at HOPE VI sites (Bennett et al., 2006; Bennett & Reed, 1999; Kleit & Manzo, 2006; Manzo et al., 2008)

were relocated to other public-housing projects (GAO, 2003) . Another 31% used HCVs

to rent housing in the private market (GAO 2003). Approximately 6% were evicted prior

to demolition and are not eligible for benefits under the URA. Finally, 14% vacate for

unknown reasons and do not receive assistance[21].

Relocating to Other Public-Housing Communities

Existing evidence indicates that the large number of HOPE VI tenants who

relocate to other public-housing developments experience some small improvements in

neighborhood poverty rates and housing conditions, but feel less safe in their new

neighborhoods. The Panel Study's three year follow-up finds that 59% of those who

relocate to other public-housing projects report that their housing conditions improved

since baseline (Comey, 2004). This finding is supported by the Tracking Study which

finds that 60% report improved housing conditions after relocation (Buron et al 2002).

However, many of those relocating to other public-housing reported worse conditions

after relocation. For example, 25% of Panel Study respondents reported worse conditions

in their new developments four years after relocation (Comey, 2007). Additionally,

Venkatesh et al (2004) study of relocation in Chicago found that many individuals

reported moving out of a unit that was serving them well to one that was in disrepair.

The fact that new public-housing developments are not always better than those

demolished by HOPE VI is not surprising given the aforementioned limited role that

'degree of distress' plays in the awarding of HOPE VI grants. Finally, it is important to

note that baseline reports of housing quality may not reflect pre-HOPE VI conditions if

buildings were neglected and allowed to deteriorate in the face of impending demolition.

---

[21] Buron et al, conducted a study of eight HOPE sites (The Resident Tracking Study) that produced similar results as the GAO report cited here. They found 49% were in public-housing, 33% were using vouchers, 13% were renting units without a subsidy and 5 percent had purchased homes.

For example, according to Bennett et al (2006), in an attempt to depopulate the ALBA project prior to application for a HOPE VI grant, the CHA ceased to maintain buildings in this development causing many tenants to leave prior to official evacuation.

One of the official goals of HOPE VI is to move tenants of distressed public-housing to lower poverty neighborhoods. The Tracking Study finds that HOPE VI tenants relocating to other public-housing projects experience a small decline in average neighborhood poverty rate (from 43% to 31%). However, despite this small improvement 19% of this group still resides in a neighborhood that is more than 40% poor (Buron et al 2002). The Panel Study also finds small statistically significant declines in neighborhood poverty rate, from 37% poor to 34% poor, for tenants living in other public-housing projects at the 48 month follow-up in 2005 (Comey, 2007).

Despite small improvements in neighborhood poverty rates, evidence suggests that feelings of safety did not improve with relocation. While 68% of the Panel Study families said that they felt safe in their old public-housing developments, only 57% continued to feel safe after relocation to new developments (Larry Buron, 2004)[22]. In Chicago, many relocated residents reported fears of gang tensions and harassment when entering new public-housing communities (Venkatesh et al., 2004). Research in Chicago suggests that the movement of public-housing residents from one project to another as a result of demolitions may have contributed to citywide increases in crime that occurred when relocation stirred up territorial disputes and disrupted the delicate balance of gang activity in Chicago's public-housing developments (Popkin, Gwiasda, Rosenbaum, & Buron, 2000b).

---

[22] The HOPE VI tracking study also reports extensively on collective efficacy and crime in new neighborhoods, but because this study is not longitudinal no comparison to pre-relocation is provided and this it is impossible to draw inference about the effects of relocation.

Relocating With Housing Choice Vouchers

Existing research indicates that those relocating from a HOPE VI project with a Housing Choice Voucher experience greater improvements in neighborhood conditions (in terms of poverty and safety) and housing quality than those who relocate to other public-housing developments. The Panel Study's 2005 follow-up finds that the vast majority (70%) of vouchers users report that their current living conditions are better than those that existed at baseline, a much higher rate of satisfaction than reported by those relocating to other public-housing developments. However, the Tracking Study finds that only 46% of those who relocate with vouchers report better housing conditions and 37% actually report worse conditions (L. Buron et al., 2002).

In terms of neighborhood poverty among HCV users, the Tracking Study finds that average neighborhood poverty rates decline from 43% in their original developments, to 26 % in their new neighborhoods (L. Buron et al., 2002). The Panel Study supports this large decline with a decrease from 39% to 23% poor (Comey, 2007). In terms of neighborhood safety, three years after relocation, 83% of HCV users said that they felt safe in their new neighborhood versus 68% at baseline, a statistically significant improvement.

In Chicago, more than half of those relocating with vouchers in 2002 reported that they were satisfied with their new units (Venkatesh et al., 2004). However, despite substantial and deliberate efforts by the CHA to relocate families to "opportunity areas" (areas that are less than 23.49% poor and less than 30% African American), 97% of those relocating in 2002 moved to areas that did not meet either the poverty or racial/ethnic

criteria specified by the CHA's relocation goals (Venkatesh et al., 2004).[23] The re-segregation of public-housing residents has been partially attributed to residents' strong desire to remain close to the area which they relocated from and the desire among the vast majority, to live in an African American neighborhood (R. Smith, 2002). However, Venkatesh et al (2004) find that this re-segregation is also related to an inability of public-housing residents to access opportunity neighborhoods on account of landlord discrimination and rents that are prohibitively expensive (Venkatesh et al., 2004).

Vouchers are commonly assumed to offer relocated HOPE VI families access to safer and more affluent neighborhoods (Austin Turner et al., 2004). However, voucher use itself is constrained by both individual and geographic factors. Many families who opted to stay in project based public-housing did so based on a real or perceived inability to successfully use a voucher to find an adequate and eligible unit (L. Buron et al., 2002; Clampet-Lundquist, 2003; R. Smith, 2002). Interviews conducted among HOPE VI relocatees in a variety of settings find that those who chose vouchers over public-housing tend to have higher levels of employment and education (Clampet-Lundquist, 2003), more experience in the private rental market (R. Smith, 2002) and to be more unsatisfied with their current public-housing unit. Some even report that they were already on the waiting list for a voucher before HOPE VI plans were announced (R. Smith, 2002). Those who choose public-housing tend to report fears of discrimination from landlords (Clampet-Lundquist, 2003) and fears of increased utility costs associated with private market units (R. Smith, 2002). According to Popkin (2000a), while vouchers may provide an opportunity for many former public-housing tenants to enter better

---

[23] In 2003, a group of housing and civil rights advocates launched a law-suit against the CHA contending that the voucher program was using public monies to re-segregate public-housing families (Venkatesh et al 2004)

neighborhoods, they are not an adequate solution for the "hard to house" population who include those individuals coping with mental health issues, disability, drug and alcohol problems as well as large households and non-traditional households such as "grand-families". Over 50% of the Panel Study population can be considered "hard to house" by this definition (Popkin et al., 2000a).

Among displaced HOPE VI residents who choose to relocate with a voucher, many are unable to find and maintain a rental unit. In Chicago for example, more than one quarter of those who choose to relocate to the private market end-up being consolidated (that is placed in public-housing) when they are unable to successfully utilize their vouchers (Venkatesh et al 2004). Smith (2002) found that in Baltimore, many HOPE VI relocatees reported a flooding of the affordable rental housing market that made it extremely difficult to find a unit. According to Fischer (2001), Section 8 works best as a mobility program when landlords have many vacancies. These conditions often do not exist in areas surrounding HOPE VI projects, especially in places like Chicago where HOPE VI has accompanied rapid gentrification (Bennett, 2006; Pfeiffer, 2006). As discussed above, discrimination against Section 8 holders may further limit the ability to use a voucher, particularly for minority voucher holders (Austin Turner, 1998; Massey et al., 1994).

While relocation studies have extensively documented where HOPE VI relocatees who continue to receive assisted housing end up, much less is known about those who either leave assisted housing or who never received assistance in the first place. According to Venkatesh et al (2004) HOPE VI relocation has had a profound effect on non-leaseholders (those who reside in the apartment of a lease-holder but are not on the

46

lease) and on squatters (those who reside in vacant public-housing units off lease).

Venkatesh et al (2004) found that one year after relocation in 2002, 13% of the squatter

population in CHA developments was homeless, but at least half of this population

experienced homelessness for some period of time after relocation. While the majority of

squatters relocate to other public-housing projects, it is unclear what will happen as this

stock continues to be depleted with the expanded shift towards voucher- based assistance.

Other Aspects of Neighborhood Quality

While the two large studies, the HOPE VI Tracking Study and the HOPE VI

Panel Study, have focused on housing quality, neighborhood poverty and safety, they

leave out other aspects of neighborhood quality which may be salient to the well-being of

relocated public-housing residents, for example, access to transportation, jobs and

services as well as the presence of social networks and social relationships within new

neighborhoods. The narrow scope of the location related outcomes described in the above

section may limit the ability of these studies to speak to the success of HOPE VI in

improving the well-being of public-housing residents.

It is assumed that if HOPE VI can indeed successfully move households to lower-

poverty neighborhoods and superior housing units, improved well-being will follow.

However, this assumption has not been empirically tested. Thus while the evidence

above indicates that a significant proportion of HOPE VI relocatees were able to make

"successful" moves to improved conditions, this evidence says little about the larger

consequences of these moves. Additionally, the above evidence indicates that a

substantial number of HOPE VI relocatees move to similar or worse neighborhood and

housing conditions. In many cases, relocated individuals are moving *away from*

neighborhoods that have experienced substantial improvements as a result of HOPE VI

funds (and in many cases pre-HOPE VI neighborhood revitalization that made these

neighborhoods ideal targets for investment) (Bennett et al., 2006). From this perspective,

the decline in neighborhood and housing quality experienced by some HOPE VI

relocatees is even greater than the evidence above suggests. Given the mixed locational

outcomes, what will be the effect of relocation on economic self-sufficiency for adults

and education and behavioral outcomes for children? Most importantly, how will HOPE

VI relocation affect the overall mental and physical health of all relocated residents? The

section below seeks to address these questions.

Are Relocated Residents Better Off?

Despite the fact that it is well known that few original tenants will benefit from

the improvements and investments at HOPE VI sites, advocates of the program posit that

just by leaving distressed public-housing, tenants will experience many improvements to

well-being and health. HOPE VI tenants are hypothesized to experience increased

employment as a result of greater access to human and social capital. Children of HOPE

VI tenants are expected to experience improved behavioral outcomes as they are exposed

to new peer groups and better schools. Improvements in both mental and physical health

for children and adults are expected to occur both as a result of improved economic well-

being and exposure to a healthier, safer and less stressful environment.

The HOPE VI Panel Study has collected two waves of data with the purpose of

testing these hypotheses. In addition, a few single site studies have examined various

outcomes among HOPE VI relocatees (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004a, b; Greenbaum, 2002;

Venkatesh et al., 2004). The section below discusses findings from these HOPE VI

specific studies. While the Panel Study's longitudinal design allows for a comparison of

pre and post-relocation outcomes at five HOPE VI sites, it does not contain a comparison

group of those who are not affected by HOPE VI and therefore is limited in the extent

that it can speak to the consequences of relocation[24]. In order to address the gaps left by

such methodological limitations, this section also reviews findings from another HUD

program, Moving to Opportunity (MTO). MTO, launched in 1994, offered residents of

public-housing developments in five US cities (Baltimore, Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles

and New York) an opportunity to move to low poverty neighborhoods. MTO is a housing

mobility program that provided housing assistance to 4608 families, but it is also an

experiment. MTO randomized families to three groups- control, Section 8 and

experimental group. The latter were required to move to census tracts with poverty rates

of less than 10% and were provided counseling and assistance in doing so, where as the

Section 8 group was given a voucher to relocate to unit of their choice. The experimental

design of MTO allows for more rigorous causal inference than the HOPE VI Panel Study.

Additionally, because many relocated HOPE VI residents did not end up in lower poverty

neighborhoods, MTO provides insight into what might have happened had HOPE VI

been better able to achieve its goal of residential upward mobility.

     While MTO can offer valuable insight into the potential consequences and

benefits of relocation for HOPE VI tenants, there are some important limitations to this

inference. First, there are flaws in MTO's experimental design that could lead to biased

estimates of relocation in favor of positive outcomes. In particular, lease up rates were

---

[24] While the Panel Study does compare individuals who remain in partially vacated developments (awaiting
relocation) to those who relocate, the former are also affected by HOPE VI and therefore do not constitute a
control group.

low (48%) across all MTO sites, introducing a significant degree of selection. Those

families who were able to lease up are likely to differ in important ways from those who

were not able to use their vouchers and were most likely better off to begin with. In order

to at least partially address this sources of bias, I only report findings that use and intent

to treat (ITT) analysis[25]. Additionally, MTO's eligibility criteria, which limited the

program to families who were up to date on their rent payments and who did not have a

criminal record, may select out the neediest public-housing families who are likely to be

the most reliant on social networks. Perhaps most importantly, MTO is a voluntary

program and HOPE VI is not. In fact only 50% of eligible household volunteered to

participate in MTO (Goetz, 2002). Based on this low participation rate, there is reason to

suspect that MTO participants were not a representative sample of residents from high

poverty neighborhoods. MTO's eligibility criteria, its voluntary nature, and its low rates

of participation suggest that MTO participants may have been better posed to benefit

from relocation than other public-housing residents. In this sense, MTO studies are likely

to overestimate the benefits of relocation as it occurs in the context of HOPE VI.

Additionally, to the extent that MTO mandates moves to low poverty neighborhoods that

are not experienced by a large portion of HOPE VI movers, it may present an ideal case

of HOPE VI relocation.[26]

The Findings: Adult Economic Well Being

One major goal of HOPE VI is to increase economic well-being and self-

---

[25] An intent to treat (ITT) analysis compares groups as they are assigned at randomization. This is essentially measuring the effect of being offered a voucher. For a discussion of the limitations of intent to treat in the context of the Moving to Opportunity Program, see (Kaufman, Kaufman, & Poole, 2003)

[26] Note that while it is assumed that low poverty neighborhoods are inherently better for health and well-being, some existing evidence contradicts this assumption. For example, Winkleby et al (2006) examined the relationship between neighborhood poverty and mortality rates and found that low SES individuals fare worse in low poverty neighborhoods.

sufficiency for residents of distressed public-housing (D. Levy & Kaye, 2004). At three year follow-up, the HOPE VI Panel Study finds that while the majority of employed residents were still earning below the poverty line, there was a small increase in the percentage of households with income greater than $15,000 (from 32%-42%). However, the Panel Study indicates that despite small increases in income, many voucher users are having difficulty making ends meet on account of increased housing costs (for example, having to pay utilities which were covered in public-housing projects) (Larry Buron, Levy, & Gallagher, 2007). Additionally, among the unemployed majority of HOPE VI relocatees, average income declined and the percent who were earning below $15,000 increased from 86% to 92% (D. Levy & Kaye, 2004).

HOPE VI relocation does not appear to affect employment. Neither those remaining in public-housing, or those relocating with vouchers experienced a significant change in employment rates at both the three year and five year follow-ups (Diane Levy & Woolley, 2007). While overall employment rates remain stable, the data indicated considerable cycling of employment and found that less than half of respondents still held the same job at baseline. People who moved more than a mile were less likely to report having the same job (D. Levy & Kaye, 2004). This suggests that while HOPE VI relocation does not seem to improve employment opportunity, relocation itself may be disruptive to job stability.

Supporting the Panel Study findings on employment, Clampet-Lundquist (2004b) found that two years after relocation, residents who moved from the Du Bois public-housing development in Philadelphia as a result of HOPE VI redevelopment experienced no gains in employment when compared to a control group of residents in a similar

housing project that was not affected by HOPE VI. This study also found that neighborhood poverty levels of new neighborhoods did not make a significant difference in determining employment or income after relocation. Goetz (2003a) found that residents who were relocated both voluntarily and involuntarily as a result of the Hollman settlement in Minneapolis experienced no net change in employment. While 15 % gained a job after moving, 15 % lost a job. Results from the more rigorously designed MTO experiment support the above findings. While the proportion of adults who were working doubled from baseline, there was no difference between control and treatment group despite the fact that members of the treatment group were living in significantly lower poverty neighborhoods at follow-up (Orr, Feins, Jacob, Beecroft, L., F. et al., 2003).

While neither HOPE VI nor MTO relocation appeared to affect employment in significant ways, the Panel Study did find small decreases in welfare receipt among relocated residents, which can be considered a marker of improved self-sufficiency, a central goal of HOPE VI (Popkin, Katz, & Cunningham, 2004b). However, this finding may be more of a reflection of welfare access than improved economic well-being. As mentioned above, HOPE VI was initiated at the same time as a nationwide push to decrease receipt of welfare through time limits and new restrictions (Ambramovitz, Withorn, & Reed, 1999). Because the Panel Study does not contain a control group, it is unclear whether this decrease is any greater than that which was occurring among residents of other public-housing projects. The more rigorous MTO study showed that there was no difference in welfare receipt between those who received a voucher designated for a low-poverty neighborhood and those who did not receive a voucher, lending support for the role of secular trends in the welfare decline observed among

HOPE VI relocatees (Orr et al., 2003). Additionally, it is important to note that studies of welfare-reform suggest that leaving welfare may not be equivalent to economic self-sufficiency and material well-being. As welfare rules are tightened, households increasingly rely on support from networks that are already over extended (Edin & Lein, 1997; K. S. Newman, 1999). In this context, families leaving welfare often experience increases in material hardship and struggle with tradeoffs between work requirements and obligations to their children (Danziger, Heflin, Corcoran, Oltmans, & Wang, 2002; Morgen & Maskovsky, 2003).

A central goal of HOPE VI is to help families attain economic self-sufficiency in part by reducing poverty concentration and thus exposing low-income families to increased social capital. Briggs (1998) argues that one of the ways that poverty is perpetuated is by the fact that poor people have social networks that are largely made up of poor people, in a system where people get ahead based on who they know. Poverty deconcentration can increase access to what Briggs refers to as "leveraging social capital", by increasing access to class heterogeneous social ties. However, the assumption that geographic mobility will increase social leverage may be naïve, even if HOPE VI relocatees were to end up in less poor neighborhoods. A large body of evidence suggests that deliberate income mixing of neighborhoods does not overcome class segregation of social relationships (Briggs, Darden, & Aidala, 1999; Clampet-Lundquist, 2004b; Greenbaum, 2002; Pattillo, 2007). For example, in an intensive investigation of mixed income rental developments, Brophy and Smith (1997) found low levels of neighboring between economically heterogeneous neighbors. Recent findings from the MTO three cities study (which consists of a 2004-2005 mixed methods evaluation of MTO in Los

Angeles, Boston and New York) indicates that few movers converted new housing to the kind of leveraging social capital that Briggs refers to (Cove, Austin-Turner, Briggs, & Duarte, 2008). Most movers reported forming only casual, if any, relationships with their new neighbors. In contrast, they reported strong social ties to other members of their churches, which often were located outside of their neighborhood. Evidence from these studies suggests that the ideological prejudices which produced homogenous networks in the first place cannot easily be overcome by spatial proximity.

While evidence above suggests that moving does not increase access to social leverage, moving may decrease access to social ties that are important facilitators of employment, in particular child care. According to Briggs (1998) while gaining little in leveraging social capital, families who moved as a result of the Yonkers' scattered site mobility program, reported a loss of what Briggs calls "support social capital" or the social relationships that help one get by within their class position. Public-housing residents in particular, report relying on neighbors and often family members who live in their building or a nearby building, in order to provide child-care for children (Mullings & Wali, 1999; Vale, 1997; Venkatesh, 2000). The loss of this affordable and convenient child-care may impose severe barriers to employment that did not previously exist.

"Spatial mismatch theory" (Fernandez, 1994) suggests that moving out of poor neighborhoods may grant movers better access to jobs. However, this may not be true for HOPE VI relocatees given that many HOPE VI sites are centrally located in places with very good access to transportation and near sources of employment (National Housing Law Project, 2002). According to Bennett (2006), these characteristics are what made many HOPE VI sites ripe for development in the first place. The MTO Three Cities

Evaluation (Cove et al., 2008) explored the validity of "spatial mismatch theory" for MTO movers in order to explain why moving to significantly safer and more well off neighborhoods did not produce the anticipated benefits in employment. Using spatial mapping techniques in Los Angeles, the authors found that movers were located in areas with significantly less access to low-wage jobs. The authors also found that one in seven respondents reported worse access to transportation at their new sites. Likewise, residents relocated as a result of the Hollman settlement in Minneapolis reported that their new neighborhoods had worse access to transportation than their former ones, a change that made it difficult for some to get to work (Goetz 2003).

Finally, neighborhood poverty simply may not be a good predictor of income and employment opportunity in that it may not address other significant barriers to employment including discrimination on the job market, lack of training and skills, caretaking obligations and poor health. It is well known that health and disability contribute to poor economic outcomes. For example, Bound et al (2003) found, using 1990 Census Data, that individuals reporting poor health and disability were significantly less likely to be working than their similarly educated healthy counterparts and that among the employed, those with health limitations earned 20 to 40 % less than their healthy counterparts. Likewise, Corcoran (2004) found that among women leaving welfare in Michigan, those who reported a physical, mental or child health problem worked fewer months. The overall poor health of HOPE VI residents both before and after relocation may serve as an important barrier to economic well-being. According to Popkin and Manjarez (2007) reports of severe mobility limitations, depression and anxiety had a larger negative effect on employment than lack of a high-school diploma.

The Findings: Educational and Behavioral Outcomes for Children

An important aim of evaluating the success of HOPE VI is to better understand the program's impact on children. While improved neighborhood and housing conditions may lead to improved educational outcomes and reduce behavioral problems and delinquency, a large body existing evidence suggests that relocation can be difficult for children (Astone & McLanahan, 1994; Hartman, 2002; Scanlon & Devine, 2001). Relocation can disrupt relationships with both peers and educators, and can put older youth at risk for conflicts with gangs in new neighborhoods (Popkin, 2007).

While the assumption of HOPE VI is that the benefits of leaving distressed conditions will outweigh the disruptive nature of relocation that is observed in other populations of children, it is important to note here that the assumption that "public-housing projects are bad for kids" has not been empirically supported (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000). The few studies that have examined the effect of public-housing residence on children find that while residence in public-housing is often associated with poor educational outcomes there is convincing evidence that this association may be due to factors that affect selection into public-housing. For example, Currie and Lebowitz (2000) and Newman and Harkness (2000) examine the effects of public-housing residence on educational attainment in two nationally representative samples. Both studies find that the statistically significant association between public-housing residence and grade repetition vanishes when controls for demographics and family background are included in the analysis. The results from these studies suggest that it is the more disadvantaged family background of children who live in public-housing, which leads to worse educational outcomes, not public-housing itself (S. Newman & Harkness, 2000).

The HOPE VI Panel Study examines a variety of educational factors including school quality and behavior problems. The Panel Study finds that 39% of children who relocate due to HOPE VI, change schools as a result (Popkin et al., 2004a) and that these changes, on average, result in attending a school that is less poor (operationalized by the percentage of students who receive free or reduced lunch). Additionally, on average, parents report that their new schools are of higher quality in terms of resources and teachers (Popkin et al., 2004a). While these findings are encouraging, it is unclear whether improvements in school quality translate to improvements in educational outcomes for relocated children. In the MTO evaluation, Sanbonmatsu et al (2006) find a modest improvement in school quality among MTO movers but no significant differences in reading and math scores for 5000 children ages 6 to 20 who were assessed four to seven years after randomization.

While the HOPE VI panel study does not collect data on academic achievement, Jacobs (2004) examines school drop-out among children who were relocated from Chicago public-housing as a result of demolition in the 1990s. Using Chicago Housing Authority Data and Chicago Public Schools Data, Jacobs evaluates the demolition policy by comparing outcomes for students living in CHA units that were slated for demolition with those who were in the same project but whose units were not slated for demolition. In this analysis, Jacobs finds that relocation as a result of demolition led to a small increase in dropout rate among older children and had no effect on younger ones contradicting the expectation that leaving distressed public housing would lead to educational improvements.

The HOPE VI Panel Study does collect data on a variety of school-related

behaviors including, problems getting along with teachers, being disobedient at school, school engagement and expulsion from school (Gallagher & Bajaj, 2007). In all published reports of HOPE VI data, these school related behaviors are aggregated into larger categories of problem behaviors (which includes both home and school behavior) and delinquent behaviors (which in addition to school expulsion, includes problems with the police, visits to juvenile court and drug use). While these categories cannot speak specifically to academic achievement, they can speak to broader issues of adjustment for relocated HOPE VI children. Overall, the Panel Study finds no significant changes in child problem behavior and delinquency at both the 3 year and 5 year follow-up, but these averages mask differences in subgroups of children. For example, at both the 2003 and 2005 follow-up, children who relocated to other public-housing projects or remained in their existing project experienced a significant increase in problem behavior, which was offset by a decrease experienced by those who relocated with vouchers (Popkin et al., 2004a). In terms of delinquent behavior, while children who relocated with vouchers, experienced no change in delinquent behavior, those who remained in their developments or relocated to other public-housing experienced significant increases of 12 and 10 % respectively (Gallagher & Bajaj, 2007). On the one hand, these data support the benefits of voucher-based relocation for children. On the other hand, they may reflect well-documented differences between those who are able (or choose) to use vouchers and those who relocate to public-housing. Additionally, the particularly negative findings for those who remain in their old developments which were nearly vacant at the five year follow up (Gallagher & Bajaj, 2007) may indicate that vacant public-housing projects are

particularly deleterious environments for children[27].

Other studies of relocated children may provide insight into some of the difficulties of adjustment for relocated HOPE VI children. Clampet-Lundquist (2007), for example, conducted in-depth interviews with relocated children and adolescents. In these interviews children described difficulties with integration into peer networks. These difficulties may marginalize children and put them at risk for association with more delinquent peers. Goetz (2002) found that parents who relocated voluntarily (as in MTO) as a result of the Hollman settlement reported no significant difference in their children's social relationships, in comparison to a control group. However, parents who relocated involuntarily (as with HOPE VI) reported that their children were significantly more socially isolated than both the control group and the voluntarily relocated group.

Children may also be affected by changes in the social relationships of their parents. Clampet Lundquist (2004) finds, that while many relocated children are eventually able to make friends, their parents' loss of social networks has led to a dramatic decrease in intergenerational closure (where parents know their children's friends parents). According to Coleman's (1998) theory of social capital, children who experience more intergenerational closure are likely to perform better academically and to be less likely to drop out of school.

Children may not only face difficulties integrating with neighborhood peers and adults, but they may also face discrimination and stigmatization from teachers that can

---

[27] It is important to note that age related trends may also complicate interpretation of the HOPE VI Panel Study's findings given that there is no control group present. For example, delinquent behavior, as measured in the study may increase as children age and behavior problems (which are reported by adults who may be less in touch with older children) may decrease.

negatively affect academic performance or cancel out any benefit of improved school conditions. For example, children who moved to the suburbs from Chicago public-housing as a result of the Gatreaux program reported high levels of discrimination from both teachers and peers in their new schools (Rubinowitz & Rosenbaum, 2000). Likewise, Goetz (2002) found that children whose parents relocated involuntarily reported significantly lower levels of attention from teachers than children of parents who did not relocate.

While there are not enough data to make conclusive statements, the evidence discussed above indicates that the impacts of HOPE VI (and public-housing exit in general) on educational attainment and child behavior may be small and positive at best, and perhaps even detrimental for some children. While children are assumed to benefit overwhelmingly and universally from a program that removes them from distressed public-housing conditions, evidence suggests that this may not be the case. Perhaps, escape from distressed conditions does not undo or cancel out the challenges of relocation that have been well documented in other populations of children. Or perhaps this evidence confirms prior studies (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000; S. Newman & Harkness, 2000) that have failed to find support for the hypothesis that public-housing residence is harmful to children.

HOPE VI and Health

The economic and educational outcomes described above are important benchmarks of HOPE VI's ability to improve economic self-sufficiency for relocated public-housing residents and future economic success of their children. While these outcomes may be central to the goal of increased economic self-sufficiency among low-

income families, it is important to also consider the affects of HOPE VI relocation on mental and physical health. From an economic perspective, health is an important precursor to employment and economic self-sufficency (Bound et al., 2003; Corcoran, 2004). Also, moving beyond an economistic perspective, health data can provide insight into how HOPE VI affects the overall well-being of relocated residents.

Findings from the HOPE VI Panel Study point to health as major concern for relocated residents. According to the authors of this study, their findings "present a picture of a population in shockingly poor health, a situation that seems to be worsening rapidly over time as residents grow older." (Manjarrez, Popkin, & Guernsey, 2007pg 2). In 2003 one quarter of respondents aged 18-44 and 57% of those aged 45-64 reported poor or fair self rated health. In 2005, 76 % of respondents reported no change or a negative change in their self-rated health, despite improvements in living conditions. Additionally, the number of respondents reporting need for ongoing medical care increased between 2001 and 2005, from 36% to 45%.

While these data provide a strong indication that relocation from distressed public-housing did not produce health benefits, it is unclear whether the observed deterioration in health is due to aging or to relocation from public-housing. The HOPE VI Panel Study includes no control group and therefore the counterfactual health trajectories (had residents remained in public-housing) are unknown.[28] Thus, while the panel study results suggest negative health consequences of relocation from public-housing, further study is warranted to elucidate this relationship.

---

[28] The authors do compare the health profiles of HOPE VI panel respondents to a nationally sample of black women of equivalent ages, and find that the health of the former to be significantly worse. However, while over 80% of the panel respondents were black women, these groups are not comparable given that the HOPE VI panel respondents represent a sample of particularly poor women.

Findings from the MTO study, which indicate mixed results in terms of health, may provide insight into the potential health consequences of HOPE VI[29]. In terms of adult health, MTO's cross site interim evaluation (conducted 4 to 7 years after randomization) examined overall health, asthma, obesity, hypertension, depression, psychological distress and feelings of tranquility (J. R. Kling, Liebman, Katz, & Sanbonmatsu, 2004; Orr et al., 2003)[30]. Using an ITT analysis cross-site studies have found statistically significant (p<.05) lower rates of obesity at 5 years (J. R. Kling et al., 2004). Kling et al (2004) also find a non-significant reduction in reported asthma in the experimental group at 5 year follow-up. Studies have also found significant improvements across a wide array of mental health measures. At 5 year cross site follow-up the experimental group reported more feelings of tranquility and less psychological distress (which were statistically significant at p <.05) (J. R. Kling et al., 2004). Similar improvements in adult mental health were observed in an earlier single site evaluations of the New York MTO (Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2003b) and also in an evaluation of the scattered-site housing mobility program in Yonkers (Briggs 1997).

However, the findings for adult health were not universally positive. While an early single site evaluation of the Boston MTO site (Katz, Kling, & Liebman, 2001) finds significant improvements in adult self reported overall health, at the 5 year follow-up Kling et al (2004) find that adults in both the experimental and the Section 8 groups report worse overall health (although not statistically significant). They also find a non-significant increase in hypertension. Both of these findings point to potential health costs

---

[29] In this literature review, I only discuss findings from studies that included a comparable control group of non movers. See Acevedo Garcia et al (2004) for a review of mobility programs and their health consequences that includes a wider range of studies.

[30] King et al (2004)'s 2002 study analyzed a subsample of the entire cross site sample that had been randomly assigned in 1997.

of relocation.

In terms of children, the results are even more mixed. Early single-site evaluations point to some positive impacts on health and health related outcomes for children. In Boston, Katz, Liebman and Kling (2001) find significant decreases in injuries and fewer behavior problems for both boys and girls. In New York, Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn (2003a) find that teen boys in the experimental group (although not the Section 8 group) report statistically significant decreases in cigarette smoking compared to control boys. The authors also find lower levels of unhappiness in the Section 8 group, fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression in the experimental group and reduced reports of behavior problems in both the experimental and Section 8 groups.

However, later cross-site interim evaluations yield mixed results and show important gender differences. Kling and Liebman (2004) find significantly fewer symptoms of anxiety and distress (in both the experimental and Section 8 groups) and lower levels of marijuana use among teen girls. However, the authors also find significantly higher levels of alcohol and tobacco use and higher rates of serious non-sports related injuries in among boys (in both Section 8 and experimental groups). Likewise, Kling, Ludwig and Katz (2005) find lower rates of property and violent arrests among girl in the experimental and Section 8 groups (aged 15-20) and higher rates of property rates among boys (when comparing the experimental and the control groups).

While these mixed findings from MTO may indicate some benefit of relocation, they also point to some concerns about the potential health costs of relocation for HOPE VI tenants. First, the small health benefits of MTO (in terms of obesity, adult mental health, and child mental health among females) may not translate to a group of

involuntary movers. As discussed above, the voluntary participants in MTO may have been especially well positioned to benefit from moving. Second, the largest benefit for MTO participants was experienced in the treatment group that was required to move to low poverty neighborhoods. The Section 8 group, which most closely resembles HOPE VI voucher users, did not experience as large improvements in wellbeing. While much discussion of MTO in the literature has focused largely on the positive findings, the few findings that suggest a potential detriment of relocation, even for this group of volunteers, needs to be considered more carefully.

In order to better understand the negative outcomes experienced by MTO boys, Clampet-Lundquist et al (2006) conducted in in-depth interviews with 15-19 year-olds at MTO sites in Chicago and Baltimore. Their analysis suggests that gendered patterns of socializing may make it more difficult for boys to adjust to new neighborhoods. While girls in both low and high poverty neighborhood discuss spending the majority of their time inside, boys describe congregating outside and thus may find themselves scrutinized, both by new neighbors and the police. It is possible that the increased policing that respondents describe may be responsible for increased arrest rates among boys who move to low-poverty neighborhoods, and may also lead to increased delinquency by making young men feel marginalized and disconnected from their new communities.

Kling, Liebman and Katz (2005) suggest that part of the negative outcomes for MTO boys may be due to the way that relocation disrupts relationships between boys and 'father figures' such as uncles and family friends. Clampet Lundquist et al (2006) find that while there were no differences, between control and experimental groups'

discussions of relationships with their biological fathers, boys in the control group were nearly twice as likely to describe meaningful, close and sometimes financially supportive relationships with a male who was not their biological father. This suggests that relocation may create distance between boys and father figures, perhaps placing them at greater risk for depression, anxiety and involvement in unhealthy behaviors.

For adults, the observed increases in hypertension and poor over-all health ratings for the MTO movers points to concerns for HOPE VI relocatees who may stand to gain less from relocation. Increases in hypertension suggest that moving, even to better neighborhoods, may be stressful. It is possible that MTO movers are exposed to stress that is particularly related to proximity to higher income neighbors. For example, Mary Pattillo's (2007) ethnographic work in a mixed-income African American neighborhood of Chicago describes a "tyranny of the middle class" where the needs of poorer tenants are subjugated to those of their higher income neighbors and where the social norms of the poor are degraded and 'policed' in order to appease middle class notions of appropriate behavior. Social stress associated with these cross-class interactions, or as a result of increased interaction with whites (for movers who end up in less racially segregated neighborhoods), may contribute to higher blood pressure and poor overall health (Geronimus & Thompson, 2004; Jackson & Stewart, 2003). HOPE VI movers are less likely to end up in close proximity to high income or white neighbors, but may be more likely to experience stress associated with involuntary relocation, with crime in their new neighborhoods and as will be discussed in more detail below, as a result of the breakdown of social support networks.

For both MTO and HOPE VI movers, the relocation process itself may be a

source of stress and a strain on health. Relocation requires readjustment and the forming

of new social ties, a process that is inherently stress inducing (Acevedo-Garcia, Osypuk,

Werbel, Meara, Cutler, & Berkman, 2004). The stress associated with this process may

be particularly pronounced for low- income households who have less material resources

to cope with readjustment. While some of the stresses of relocation are likely common to

both MTO and HOPE VI relocatees, others are likely unique to the latter. MTO

relocation occurred as the result of individual decisions among relatively few members of

participating communities. Thus while individual families moved away, their former

communities remained largely unchanged and they could and do return to them often,

sometimes daily (Popkin, Harris, & Cunningham, 2002a)[31]. In contrast, HOPE VI

resulted in the predominantly involuntary relocation and fragmenting of entire

communities.

In this sense, HOPE VI resembles other large scale displacements such as urban

renewal, more than it does MTO. Studies of such large-scale relocations point to

potentially devastating health consequences. For example, Wallace & Wallace (1998)

illustrates through ecological modeling, that policies of "planned shrinkage" during the

1970s (a process that resulted in the loss of nearly 80% of the population and housing

units in the central Bronx) were associated with the spread of intravenous drug use and

HIV. Wallace (1988) also describes how forced migration has complicated attempts to

contain HIV infection by dismantling the social networks that are natural vehicles of

prevention.

While Wallace primarily focuses on how displacement affects health through a

---

[31] Although this is not the case for MTO participants who were relocated from public-housing
developments that were subsequently demolished as a result of the HOPE VI program.

changing built environment, others have examined the health costs of displacement from

a psychological perspective. For example Fullilove (2004) describes the psychological

trauma that resulted from urban renewal and 'slum clearance' in the 1950s. Her in-depth

interviews with African Americans who were displaced as a result of urban renewal find

expressions of grief and loss that relate, not only to the razing of homes and communities,

but also to the loss of identity, that she argues is closely related to place (Fullilove, 1996).

Fullilove describes this large-scale displacement not only as a trauma experienced by

individuals who are severed from their homes and their communities, but a trauma that

was experienced collectively by Black America through the fragmenting of black

communities across the country and ultimately through a dissolution and disruption of

collective agency and political power.

The above discussion suggests that for HOPE VI residents, not only may access to

better neighborhoods and the benefits associated with these neighborhoods be overstated,

but relocation may be associated with great costs that are often overlooked. According to

Fullilove (2004), "We can't understand the losses unless we first appreciate what was

there" (p. 20). This appreciation is largely absent from HUD's official literature on

HOPE VI. While several independent analysts have begun to raise questions about the

possibility that HOPE VI may disrupt important social resources that exist within public-

housing communities (Greenbaum, 2008; Manzo et al., 2008), this perspective is largely

underrepresented in the academic literature as well.

What Might be Lost: Social Resources in Public-housing Communities

Despite the conventional image of public-housing developments as undesirable,

there is ample evidence suggesting that public-housing residents value aspects of their

communities (Kleit & Manzo, 2006; Vale, 1997; Venkatesh, 2000). For example, Manzo and Kleit's (2008) mixed-methods study of HOPE VI redevelopment in Seattle found that the majority (64%) of residents reported that the housing development was a "good place to live". In in-depth interviews, participants in this study described positive lived experiences of place that counter the external view of public-housing projects as "islands of despair" (Manzo et al., 2008). Positive place attachments are also evidenced by the fact that in the face of relocation and demolition, research indicates that many residents wish to stay in their current developments. For example, Varaday and Walker (2000) find that in a sample of 201 households who were vouchered out of distressed developments in 4 US cities, one third said they would have preferred to stay in their current development. Likewise, in a study that was comprised of 267 in depth interviews with residents of five Boston public-housing developments, Vale (1997) found that two thirds of the residents would prefer to stay in their current location. The in-depth interviews revealed that the reason behind this preference was partially based on a fear that there were no alternative housing options, but also on a real appreciation of social connections within these public-housing developments that for some residents, seemed to trump concerns about safety or the physical condition of buildings (Vale, 1997).

As mentioned above, in many cases, residents have actively resisted HOPE VI revitalization on the grounds that they wanted to remain in their communities (Bagert, 2002; Bennett & Reed, 1999; Goetz, 2003a; Pfeiffer, 2006; Ranney & Wright, 2000; Vale, 1997; Venkatesh, 2000; Wright et al., 2006). For example, tenant organizations at Cabrini Green and Henry Horner homes have waged lawsuits against the CHA seeking to minimize displacement (Wright et al., 2006). Likewise, tenant organizations in New

Orleans have brought issues of displacement to the attention of international human rights organization in ongoing protests against public-housing demolition (Reichl, 1999). According to Ranney and Wright (2000), the goal of many public-housing activists is not to maintain the "raggedy buildings" in their current condition, but to protect the right to housing for low-income families and also to maintain valuable social structures that exist in public-housing developments.

Qualitative studies at HOPE VI sites and in other public-housing communities reveal that social networks and social organizations serve many important purposes for residents of these communities. First, social ties provide crucial economic support for many public-housing residents. For example, in their study of Chicago's Cabrini Green development (which was demolished with HOPE VI funds in 1995), Bennett and Reed (1999) found that churches and community organizations provided many services such as child care, tutoring, counseling, and legal services for residents of Cabrini Green. Venkatesh's (2000) ethnographic study of the Robert Taylor homes in Chicago found that peer and kin networks provided invaluable resources such as child-care and temporary shelter. In her study of the DuBois public-housing development in the years prior to HOPE VI demolition, Clampet-Lundquist (2004a) found that despite economically devastated conditions, social networks provided residents with substantial benefits in terms of material goods. According to Briggs (1998), social resources such as the ones described above are especially vital to the chronically poor because they routinely substitute for those things that money could otherwise buy. As discussed above, for working residents of public-housing, access to child-care and the presence of "collective monitoring" from neighbors and community members may be an important facilitator of

their employment (Edin & Lein, 1997; C. Stack, 1974; Carol Stack, 1996).

In addition to providing material benefits, social networks may be important sources of psychological and emotional support. Descriptions of HOPE VI relocation in Tampa reveal that, "in addition to the practical losses of mutual aid have come loneliness and longing" (Greenbaum, 2008). Many public-housing residents describe their communities as 'families', which are not without problems but valued nonetheless. For example, a resident of Cabrini Green reports,

> It was a family…If somebody died, family would come and see you; if you're hungry, they feed your kids; if the kids are outside and they're getting their kid a popsicle, they'll get all of them a popsicle; if you come upstairs with your hands full of groceries, everybody'll help. That's in Cabrini.. period." (Bennett and Reed, p. 197)

Moving even a few miles away from family and friends may be particularly traumatic in the absence of adequate transportation. Loss of these social relationships may represent a loss of essential coping resources that help to mitigate the stresses associated with poverty (Mullings & Wali, 1999).   This may be especially true for African American public-housing residents who must contend with both poverty and racism on a daily basis. For African Americans, in a society where racial oppression is not only economic, but also cultural, social networks may serve as sources of affirmation that are vitally important to psychological well being (Geronimus and Thompson 2004). According to Geronimus and Thompson (2004), "By feeling part of a collective that stands in opposition to the dominant culture and through social ties that reinforce this feeling, members of the collective are able to contest the dominant culture's images of themselves as morally marred or culturally deficient" (p. 253). James (1993) posits that the manner in which minority women respond to race related environmental stress may depend on

70

the size and the strength of their social networks and on their access to such alternative cultural frameworks.

Analysts have also pointed to the political power and collective agency that exists in geographically situated social networks of the poor (Fullilove, 2001; Geronimus & Thompson, 2004; Greenbaum, 2008; Lopez & Stack, 2001). According to Greenbaum (2008) programs such as HOPE VI not only diffuse black voting power, but they also reduce the capacity of tenants to come together to protest and to advocate for their collective rights. Fullilove (2001) posits that the disruption of such collective capacity that occurred as a result of urban renewal caused a profound shift in the political and social engagement of the African American community. She says that,

> Prior to urban renewal, African American communities were improving steadily in the number and effectiveness of their social and political institutions. After the displacement, the style of engagement became angrier and more individualistic. Instead of becoming stronger and more competent in politics, the communities became weaker and more heavily affected by negative forces such as substance abuse and crime (p.78).

Evidence from a small number of HOPE VI relocation studies consistently finds that relocation leads to a loss of ties and may reduce residents' access to the material, emotional and collective support described above (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004b; Greenbaum, 2002; Venkatesh et al., 2004). Additionally, research indicates that displaced residents face many challenges in forming social ties in their new neighborhoods. For example, Clampet-Lundquist (2004a) finds that the majority of relocated residents from the Du Bois development in Philadelphia had not created local social networks two years after HOPE VI relocation and described a social isolation that is in stark contrast to their descriptions of dense social ties at Du Bois. Residents of

71

stigmatized public housing project may face barriers to building ties in new communities.

For example, An ethnographic study of HOPE VI relocation in Tampa, finds that HOPE

VI relocatees encountered widespread stigmatization from new neighbors and were often

blamed for bringing "problems" to their new communities (Feldman & Hathway, 2002).

The disruption of social support networks may be one reason that even those

individuals who have relocated to better neighborhoods (for example, MTO participants)

have not experienced the universally positive benefits in terms of health and well-being

that would be expected to accompany exits from distressed public-housing[32]. To the

extent that MTO's inclusion criteria selects residents who are likely to be the least reliant

on social support networks (see above), the mediating affect of social-network dissolution

on well-being may be even more pronounced (and negative) for HOPE VI relocatees.

The challenges that residents face in forming new social ties suggest that the

consequences of social isolation will not be short term.

According to Geronimus and Thompson (2004) it is critical that public policies

acknowledge the important role that social networks, alternative cultural frameworks and

local institutions play in mitigating the health effects of marginalization for low-income

African American families[33] . African American residents of public-housing projects,

like other African American residents of high poverty areas, experience an

extraordinarily high burden of chronic disease, early mortality and disability (Geronimus

et al., 2001; Manjarrez et al., 2007). Policies that are "likely to fragment or impose new

---

[32] Of course, as discussed above, social networks may not be the only mediating factor here. Stress associated with interacting with higher income neighbors for example, may reduce the benefits of relocating to a lower-poverty neighborhood (Pattillo, 2007). Additionally, relocation itself may be stressful. Greenbaum (2008) for example, found that frequent rejection from landlords was an emotionally trying aspect of relocation for many HOPE VI relocatees.

[33] The authors also discuss that higher income African Americans also rely on kin networks and alternative frameworks.

obligations on already overburdened networks" are likely to increase stress and "further imperil their health" (Geronimus & Thompson, 2004 p. 259). Through demolition of public-housing projects and the dispersal of their tenants, HOPE VI may have negative health implications that have not yet been documented by the few studies that have examined health outcomes among relocated HOPE VI tenants.

The lack of attention to social networks by the HOPE VI program (and more generally in the broader academic and policy discourse surrounding poverty deconcentration) may not only undermine the programs ability to benefit relocated families, but may also reflect and reinforce harmful stereotypes of low-income African American communities. HOPE VI's lack of attention to social networks may stem from conventional wisdom that views the social relationships of the poor as impediments to, rather than protectors of their well being. If according to Bennett and Reed (1999), "we assume that poor people suffer most from bad individual behaviors stemming from moribound social networks…improving people's social condition requires altering their patterns of behavior and interaction by dispersing them through neighborhoods in which the very poor do not predominate" (pg. 190)

According to Wacquant (1997) the view of 'ghettos' (areas of concentrated poverty) as culturally pathological places is so authoritative that it presents an obstacle to a theoretically informed understanding of the causes of concentrated poverty which lie, not in the cultural and behavioral practices of ghetto residents but in the activities of "dominant institutions" and social structures. For example, in its emphasis on poverty deconcentration, HOPE VI fails to acknowledge the forces of racial exclusion (such as institutionalized and interpersonal housing discrimination) that produced concentrated

73

poverty in the first place. According to Thompson (1998) without addressing the racism

that produced black urban ghettos such as those targeted by HOPE VI, these ghettos will

only be reproduced in the areas that HOPE VI households relocate to. The official

discourse surrounding HOPE VI makes no mention of race or the racialized nature of

concentrated poverty, despite the fact that almost everyone who is asked to move as a

result of the program is black (Greenbaum, 2002). As a policy approach that obscures this

structural and historical context, it is at best, limited in its failure to acknowledge and

address fundamental causes of racial inequality. At worst, in its emphasis on the

pathology of social networks among the urban poor, it naturalizes this inequality and

morally absolves us from seeking solutions to it.

      According to Bennett and Reed (1999) the construction of public housing

communities as pathological places with few social resources, also reinforces the

imperative for development and displacement. They say,

> If we can manage to convince the public at large that Cabrini-Green is a chaotic
> jungle whose residents do not deserve to be involved in discussions about the
> future of their neighborhood, than we can proceed with wholesale demolition and
> new, upscale residential redevelopment (p.209).

In the context of rapid urban redevelopment and gentrification that is occurring in many

US cities, this imperative for dispersal may limit the claims of low-income communities

to valuable and contested urban space (Logan & Molotch, 1987). This relocation

imperative also forecloses alternative forms of public-housing redevelopment that leave

social ties intact. Moving beyond current understandings of concentrated poverty,

towards models that recognize the agency and social resources that public-housing

communities possess opens the door for programs that move opportunity to public-

housing residents, rather than the other way around. Such initiatives, while largely unexplored, may grant residents of distressed public housing quality living conditions and economic opportunities while maintaining the social structures that exist within these communities. By offering opportunity without the trade-offs associated with displacement, such strategies may eventually produce the mixed-income communities that HOPE VI aspires to as low-income residents themselves are able to improve their economic positions.

Conclusion

This literature review has described the HOPE VI program and the limited evidence that exists to date on the effects that this program has had on relocated public-housing residents. The evidence presented in this paper suggests that the benefits of HOPE VI relocation are at best small, and for some families, this program may have resulted in an affront to health and well-being. The costs associated with the breakdown of social networks may provide one explanation as to why this program has not successfully improved the well-being of low-income families. Existing evidence is only suggestive and more research is needed to examine the long-term health consequences of HOPE VI for relocated families. Research is also needed to explore the ways that social-network ties may mediate the effects of relocation on health. Additionally, more qualitative and ethnographic research is essential in order to examine the lived experiences of HOPE VI relocation and its effect on social-support networks. Such qualitative studies can play an important role in informing public policy by revealing the ways that HOPE VI families are negotiating challenges of relocation. Additionally, by illuminating the agency of public-housing residents and the social resources that exist in

their communities, such studies can counteract harmful stereotypes of the urban poor (Hyatt & Shenk, 1995).

Despite lack of evidence supporting its benefit for low-income families, HOPE VI continues to receive widespread political and public support. Perhaps, HOPE VI has not been held to a high empirical standard because of its congruence with a socially constructed 'common sense' that surrounds urban poverty and urban redevelopment. According to Imbroscio (2008) this 'common sense' holds the shining new town houses constructed at the sites of decrepit high-rise public-housing developments as beacons of progress. As for the former residents of these areas, their claims to space are virtually erased by a 'common sense' that constructs them as barriers to urban revitalization (Bennett & Reed, 1999) or as beneficiaries of a benevolent system that allows them to 'move to opportunity'(Crump, 2002).

The obscuring nature of this 'common sense' has serious implications in supporting a policy agenda that may channel limited public resources to programs that are at best limited in their ineffectiveness, and at worst detrimental. For the African American communities that are displaced by HOPE VI, the stakes may be high. Such displacement may undermine the integrity of collective social resources that play a pivotal role in mitigating the health consequences of structural disadvantage (Geronimus, 2000; Geronimus & Thompson, 2004). Without broad changes to structures that produce race and class based inequality, individuals may experience a reduced capacity to cope with material hardship and psychosocial stress, ultimately resulting in severe health costs. Additionally, by disregarding the importance of social resources and the agency of low-income public-housing tenants, HOPE VI and other such programs perpetuate stereotypes

of low-income communities that pave the way for their destruction.

In addition to its affect on social networks, HOPE VI may contribute to already existing shortages of affordable housing. In many urban areas, HOPE VI has occurred in the context of rapid gentrification and rising rents, making it difficult for many voucher holders to find an apartment (Bennett, 2006; K. Newman & Ashton, 2004). According to Ranney and Wright (2000) public-housing may replace an old system of racial exclusion with a more insidious one. "In the old-system, African Americans were kept out of some areas and concentrated in other. Public-housing was the vehicle." In the new system, "very poor African Americans are removed from their homes and given vouchers to find housing that for the most part, does not exist". As more public-housing is demolished and rental markets become tighter, the challenges of finding affordable rental housing are likely to increase. Additionally, the current housing crisis is likely to have a profound effect on low-income renters. Forty percent of properties in foreclosure are rental properties and only two states offer legal protection to renters of foreclosed properties (Crowley, Pelletiere, & Foscarinis, 2009). The National Low Income Housing Coalition predicts that an additional 1.5 million families will become homeless in the next five years. As a result of HOPE VI and the broader shift toward tenant-based assistance, the safety net of federally owned public-housing that once existed for these families has largely disappeared (Crowley et al., 2009).

References

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Osypuk, T., Werbel, R., Meara, E., Cutler, D., & Berkman, L. (2004). Does Housing Mobility Improve Health? *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(1), 49-98.

Ambramovitz, M., Withorn, A., & Reed, A. (1999). Playing By the Rules: Welfare Reform and the New Authoritarian State. In A. Reed (Ed.), Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality pp. 151-386). Boulder: Westview Press.

Anderson, E. (2000). The Code of the Street: Decency, Violence and the Moral Life of the Inner City.

Astone, N., & McLanahan, S. (1994). Family Structure, Residential Mobility, and School Drop-Out: A Research Note. *Demography,* 31(4), 575-584.

Austin Turner, M. (1998). Moving Out of Poverty Expanding Mobility and Choice through Tenant Based Housing Assistance. *Housing Policy Debate,* 9(2), 373-394.

Austin Turner, M., Popkin, S., Kingsley, G., & Kaye, D. (2004). Distressed Public Housing-What it Costs to Do Nothing. Urban Institute.

Bagert, B. (2002). HOPE VI and St. Thomas: Smoke, Mirrors and Urban Mercantilism. London: London School of Economics.

Beck, P. (1996). Fighting Section 8 Discrimination: The Fair Housing Act's new Fronteir. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review,* 31.

Bennett, L. (2006). Downtown Restructuring and Public Housing in Contemporary Chicago: Fashioning a Better World Class-City. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities pp. 282-301). New York: ME Sharpe.

Bennett, L., Hudspeth, N., Wright, P., & . (2006). A Critical Analysis of the ABLA Redevelopment Plan. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing (pp. 185-215). New York: ME Sharpe.

Bennett, L., & Reed, A. (1999). The New Face of Urban Renewal: the Near North Redevelopment Initiative and the Cabrini-Green. In A. Reed (Ed.), Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality pp. 176-

192). Boulder: Westview Press.

Bound, J., Waidmann, T., Schoenbaum, M., & Bingenheimer, J. B. (2003). The Labor Market Consequences of Race Differences in Health. *Milbank Quarterly,* 81(3), 441-473.

Bratt, R. G. (1987). Private Owners of Subsidized Housing Vs Public Goals - Conflicting Interests in Resyndication. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 53(3), 328-336.

Briggs, X. (1998). Brown Kids in White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate,* 9(1), 177-214.

Briggs, X., Darden, J., & Aidala, A. (1999). In the Wake of Desegregation: Early Impacts of Scattered Site Public Housing on Neighborhoods in Yonkers, NY. *APA Journal,* Winter, 27-48.

Brophy, P., & Smith, R. (1997). Mixed Income Housing: Factors for Success. *Cityscape,* 3(2), 3-31.

Buron, L. (2004). An Improved Living Environment? Neighborhood Outcomes for HOPE VI Relocatees. Urban Institute.

Buron, L., Levy, D., & Gallagher, M. (2007). Housing Choice Vouchers: How HOPE VI Families Fared in the Private Market. Urban Institute.

Buron, L., Popkin, S., Levy, D., Harris, L., & Khadduri, J. (2002). The HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study: A Snapshot of the Current Living Situation of Original Residents from EIght Sites. Abt Associates and Urban Institute Press.

Cabrera, O. (2007). Hearing Before the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation: HOPE VI.

Carter, P. (2005). Keepin It Real: School Success Beyond Black and White. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2003). Hope or Harm? Deconcentration and the Welfare of Families in Public Housing. *UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations*.

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2004a). HOPE VI Relocation: Moving to New Neighborhoods and Building New Ties. *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(2), 415-447.

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2004b). Moving Over or Moving Up? Short Term Gains and Losses for Relocated HOPE VI Families. *Cityscape: Journal of Policy*

Development and Research, 7(1), 57-80.

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2007). No More 'Bois Ball: The Effect of Relocation From Public Housing on Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 22(3), 298-323.

Clampet-Lundquist, S., Edin, K., Kling, J., & Duncan, G. (2006). Moving at-Risk Teenagers out of High-Risk Neighborhoods: Why Girls Fare Better then Boys. Princeton Industrial Relations Working Paper. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Comey, J. (2004). An Improved Living Environment? Housing Quality Outcomes for HOPE VI Relocatees. Metropolitan Housing and Communities. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

Comey, J. (2007). HOPE VI'd and 0n the Move. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Corcoran, M. (2004). Long Term Employment of African-American and White Welfare Recipients and the Role of Persistent Health and Mental Health Problems. *Women and Health,* 39(4), 21.

Cove, E., Austin-Turner, M., Briggs, X. d. S., & Duarte, C. (2008). Can Escaping Poor Neighborhoods Increase Employment and Earnings? Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center Policy Briefs. Washington, DC.: Urban Institute.

Crowley, S., Pelletiere, D., & Foscarinis, M. (2009). Renters in Crisis. National Low Income Housing Coaltion

Crump, J. (2002). Deconcentration by Demolition: Public Housing Policy, Poverty and Urban Policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 20, 581-596.

Crump, J. (2003). The End of Public Housing as We Know It: Public Housing Policy, Labor Regulation and US City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 27(1), 179-187.

Currie, J., & Yelowitz, A. (2000). Are Public Housing Projects Good for Kids? *Journal of Public Economics,* 75(1), 99-124.

Danziger, S., Heflin, C. M., Corcoran, M. E., Oltmans, E., & Wang, H. C. (2002). Does it pay to move from welfare to work? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management,* 21(4), 671-692.

Edin, K., & Kefalas, M. (2005). Promises I can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood Before Marriage. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work. New York: Russell Sage.

Feldman, S., & Hathway, W. (2002). Research Report: HOPE VI. *North American Dialogue,* 5(1), 13-16.

Fernandez, R. M. (1994). Race, Space, and Job Accessibility - Evidence from a Plant Relocation. *Economic Geography,* 70(4), 390-416.

Fischer, P. (2001). Section 8 and the Public Housing Revolution: Where will the Families Go? Woods Fund. Chicago.

Fullilove, M. (1996). Psychiatric implications of displacement: Contributions from the psychology of place. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 153(12), 1516-1523.

Fullilove, M. (2001). Root Shock: The Consequences of African American Dispossession. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine,* 78(1).

Fullilove, M. (2004). Root Shock: How Tearing up City Neighborhoods Hurts America and What We Can Do About It. New York: Balantine Books.

Fullilove, M., Green, L., & Fullilove, R. E. (1999). Building momentum: an Ethnographic Study of Inner-City Redevelopment. *Am J Public Health,* 89(6), 840-844.

Gallagher, M., & Bajaj, B. (2007). Moving On: Benefits and Challenges of HOPE VI for Children. Urban Institute.

Gans, H. (1962). The Urban Villagers:Group and Class in the Life of Italian Americans. New York: Free Press.

Gans, H. (1965). The Failure of Urban Renewal: A Critique and Some Proposals. *Commentary,* 39(4), 29-37.

GAO (1998). HOPE VI Progress and Problems in Revitalizing Distressed Public Housing. GAO/RCED-98-187.

GAO. (2003). HOPE VI Resident Issues and Changes in Neighborhoods Surrounding Grant Sites.

Geronimus, A. T. (2000). To Mitigate, Resist, or Undo: Addressing Structural Influences on the Health of Urban Populations. *Am J Public Health,* 90(6), 867.

Geronimus, A. T. (2003). Damned if You Do: Culture, Identity, Privilege, and Teenage Childbearing in the United States. *Social Science and Medicine,* 57(5), 881-893.

Geronimus, A. T., Bound, J., Waidmann, T. A., Colen, C. G., & Steffick, D. (2001). Inequality in Life Expectancy, Functional Status, and Active Life Expectancy across Selected Black and White Populations in the United States. *Demography,* 38(2), 227-251.

Geronimus, A. T., & Thompson, J. P. (2004). To Denigrate, Ignore or Disrupt: Racial Inequality in Health and the Impact of a Policy Induced Breakdown of African American Communities. *Du Bois Review,* 1(2), 247-279.

Goetz, E. (2002). Forced Relocation vs. Voluntary Mobility: The Effects of Dispersal Programmes on Households. *Housing Studies,* 17(1), 107-123.

Goetz, E. (2003a). Clearing the Way. Washington DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Goetz, E. (2003b). Housing Dispersal Programs. *Journal of Planning Literature,* 18(1), 3-16.

Greenbaum, S. (2002). Social Capital and Deconcentration: Theoretical and Policy Paradoxes of the HOPE VI Program. *North American Dialogue,* 5(1), 9-13.

Greenbaum, S. (2008). Poverty and the Willful Destruction of Social Capital: Displacement and Dispossession in African American Communities. *Rethinking Marxism,* 20(1), 42-54.

Harris, L., & Kaye, D. (2004). How are HOPE VI Families Faring? Health. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

Hartman, C. (2002). High Classroom Turnover: How Children Get Left Behind. In D. Piche, W. Taylor & R. Reed (Eds.), Rights at Risk: Equality in a Age of Terrorism. Washington, DC: Citizens Commission on Civil Rights.

Hyatt, S., & Shenk, D. (1995). Poverty and Difference: Ethnographic Representations of "Race" and the Crisis of "the social". In Anonymous (Ed.), Gender and Race Through Education and Political Activism: The Legacy of Sylvia Helen Forman (p. 185). United States: American Anthropological Association/Association for Feminist Anthropology.

Imbroscio, D. (2008). "United and Actuated By Some Common Impulse of Passion": Challenging the Dispersal Consensus in American Policy Research. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 30(2), 111-130.

Jackson, P. B., & Stewart, Q. T. (2003). A Research Agenda for the Black Middle Class: Work Stress, Survival Strategies, and Mental Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* 44(3), 442-455.

Jacobs, B. A. (2004). Public Housing, Housing Vouchers and Student Achievement: Evidence from Public Housing Demolitions in Chicago. *American Economic Review,* March, 233.

James, S. A. (1993). Racial and Ethnic Differences in Infant Mortality and Low Birth Weight: A Psychosocial Critique. *Annals of Epidemiology,* 3(2), 130-136.

Katz, L. F., Kling, J. R., & Liebman, J. B. (2001). Moving to opportunity in Boston: Early results of a randomized mobility experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 116(2), 607-654.

Kaufman, J., Kaufman, S., & Poole, C. (2003). Causal Inference from Randomized Trials in Social Epidemiology. *Social Science and Medicie,* 57, 2397-2409.

Keating, L. (2000). Redeveloping Public Housing: Relearning Urban Renewal's Immutable Lessons. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 66(4).

Kleit, R., & Manzo, L. (2006). To Move or Not to Move: Relationships to Place and Relocation in HOPE VI. *Housing Policy Debate*.

Kling, J., & Liebman, J. (2004). Experimental Analysis of Neighborhood Effects on Youth. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper. Boston: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Kling, J., Ludwig, J., & Katz, B. (2005). Neighborhood Effects on Crime for Female and Male Youth: Evidence From a Randomized Housing Voucher Experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* February, 87.

Kling, J. R., Liebman, J. B., Katz, L. F., & Sanbonmatsu, L. (2004). Moving to Opportunity and Tranquility: Neighborhood Effects on Adult Economic Self-Sufficiency and Health from a Randomized Housing Voucher Experiment. KSG Working Paper No. RWP04-035. Available at SSRN:.

Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003a). The Early Impacts of Moving to Opportunity on Children and Youth in New York. In J. Goering & J. Feins (Eds.), Choosing a Better Life: Evaluation the Moving to Opportunity Social Experiment. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003b). Moving to opportunity: an experimental study

of neighborhood effects on mental health. *Am J Public Health,* 93(9), 1576-1582.

Levy, D., & Kaye, D. (2004). How Are HOPE VI Families Faring? Income and Employment. *Urban Institute: Metropolitan Housing and Community Center,* 4.

Levy, D., & Woolley, M. (2007). Relocation is not Enough. Policy Brief: Urban Institute.

Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place. London: University of California Press.

Lopez, L., & Stack, C. (2001). Social Capital and the Culture of Power: Lessons from the Field. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Manjarrez, C., Popkin, S., & Guernsey, E. (2007). Poor Health: Adding Insult to Injury for HOPE VI Families. The Urban Institute Press.

Manzo, L., Kleit, R., & Couch, D. (2008). "Moving Three Times Is Like Having Your House on Fire Once": The Experience of Place and Impending Displacement among Public Housing Residents. *Urban Studies,* 45(9), 1855-1878.

Marcuse, P., Varaday, D., Preiser, W., & Russell, F. (1998). Mainstreaming Public Housing: A Proposal for a Comprehensive Approach to Housing Policy. In Anonymous (Ed.), New Directions in Urban Public Housing pp. 23-47). New Brunswick: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Massey, D., Gross, A., & Shibuya, K. (1994). Migration, Segregation and the Geographic Concentration of Poverty. *American Sociological Review,* 59(3), 425-445.

Morgen, S., & Maskovsky, J. (2003). The Anthropology of Welfare "Reform": New Perspectives on US Urban Poverty in the Post-Welfare Era. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 32, 315-338.

Mullings, L., & Wali, A. (1999). Stress and Resilience: The Social Context of Reproduction in Central Harlem. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

National Housing Law Project. (2002). False HOPE: A Critical Assessment of the HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program.

Newman, K., & Ashton, P. (2004). Neoliberal Urban Policy and New Paths of Neighborhood Change in the American Inner City. *Environment and Planning,* 36, 1151-1172.

Newman, K. S. (1999). No Shame in My Game. New York: Russell Sage.

Newman, S., & Harkness, J. (2000). Assisted Housing and the Educational Attainment of Children. *Journal of Housing Economics,* 9, 40-63.

Ogbu, J. (1981). Origins of Human Competence: A Cultural-Ecological Perspective. *Child-Development,* 52(2), 413-429.

Orr, L., Feins, et al. (2003). Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program: Interim Impacts Evaluation.

Pattillo, M. (2007). Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Pfeiffer, D. (2006). Displacement through Discourse: Implementing and Contesting Public Housing Redevelopment in Cabrini Green. *Urban Anthropology,* 35(1), 39-67.

Popkin, S. (2006). Hope VI Program: What About the Residents? *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(2).

Popkin, S. (2007). Testimony of Susan Popkin, Urban Institute, prepared for the hearing on S.829 HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act, June 20, 2007.

Popkin, S., Cunningham, M., & Burt, M. (2000a). Public Housing Transformation and the Hard to House. *Housing Policy Debate,* 16(1), 1.

Popkin, S., Cunningham, M., & Woodley, W. (2003). Residents at Risk: A Profile of Ida B. Wells and Madden Park. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

Popkin, S., Eisemann, M., & Cove, E. (2004a). How Are HOPE VI Families Faring? Children. *Metropolitat Housing and Communities Center (Urban Institute),* 6.

Popkin, S., Gwiasda, V., Rosenbaum, D., & Buron, L. (2000b). The Hidden War: Crime and the Tragedy of Public Housing in Chicago. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Popkin, S., Harris, L., & Cunningham, M. (2002a). Families in Transition: A Qualitative Analysis of MTO Experience. US Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development Research.

Popkin, S., Katz, B., & Cunningham, M. (2004b). A Decade of Hope VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges. *Urban Institute*.

Popkin, S., Levy, D., Harris, L., Comey, J., & Cunningham, M. (2002b). HOPE VI Panel Study: Baselione Report. *Urban Institute*.

Ranney, D., & Wright, P. (2000). Race, Class and the Abuse of State Power: the Case of Public Housing in Chicago. *SAGE Race Relations Abstracts,* 25(2), 3.

Reichl, A. (1999). Learning from St. Thomas: Community, Capital and the Redevelopment of Public Housing in New Orleans. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 21(2), 169-187.

Rubinowitz, S., & Rosenbaum, J. (2000). Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbs: The University of Chicago Press.

Sanbonmatsu, L., Kling, J., Duncan, G., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Neighborhood and Academic Achievement: Results from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment. *Journal of Human Resources,* 41(4), 649-691.

Scanlon, E., & Devine, K. (2001). Adolescent Mobility and Youth Well-Being: Research, Policy and Practice Issues. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare,* 28(1), 119-138.

Smith, J. (2006). The Chicago Housing Authority's Plan for Transformation. In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities.

Smith, J., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006a). Mixed Income Communities: Designing Out Poverty or Pushing Out the Poor? In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Smith, J., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006b). Public Housing Transformation: Evolving National Policy. In L. Bennett, Smith, J, Wright, P. (Ed.), Where Are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Smith, R. (2002). Housing Choice for HOPE VI Relocatees: Final Report. Urban Institute.

South, S. J., & Crowder, K. D. (1998). Leaving the 'hood: Residential Mobility Between Black, White, and Integrated Neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review,*

63(1), 17-26.

Stack, C. (1974). All Our Kin. New York: Basic Books.

Stack, C. (1996). Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South. New York: Basic Books.

Sugrue, T. J. (1996). The Origins of Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Post-War Detroit. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thompson, J. P. (1998). Universalism and Deconcentration: Why Race Still Matters in Poverty and Economic Development. *Politics and Society,* 26(2), 181-219.

Vale, L. (1997). Empathological Places: Residents' Ambivalence toward Remaining in Public Housing. *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 16, 159-175.

Venkatesh, S. (2000). American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Venkatesh, S., Celimli, I., Miller, D., Murphy, A., & Turner, B. (2004). Chicago Public Housing Transformation: A Research Report. New York: Center for Urban Research and Policy Columbia University in the City of New York.

Wallace, D., & Wallace, R. (1998). A Plague on Your Houses: How New York was Burned Down and National Public Health Crumbled. New York: Verso.

Wilen, P., & Nayak, R. (2006). Relocated Public Housing Residents Have Little Hope of Returning: Work Requirements for Mixed Income Developments. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities pp. 216-239). New York: ME Sharpe.

Wilen, W., & Stasell, W. (2006). Gatreaux and Chicago's Public Housing Crisis: The Conflict between Achieving Integration and Providing Decent Housing for Very Low Income African Americans. In L. Bennet, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live?: Transforming Public Housing Communities. (p. 239). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Winkelby, M., Cubbin, C., & Ahn, D. (2006). Low Individual Socioeconomic Status, Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Adult Mortality. *Am J Public Health,* 96(12), 2145-2153.

Wright, P., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Community Resistance to CHA

Transformation: the History, Evolution, Struggles, and Accomplishments of the Coalition to Protect Public Housing. In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Zhang, Y., & Weismann, G. (2006). Public Housing's Cinderella: Policy Dynamics of HOPE VI in the Mid-1990s. In L. Bennettt, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities.

Chapter 3

Community-Based Social Support in Public-Housing Projects: Interrogating the Social Costs of Demolition and Dispersal

Over the last 15 years the nature of federal housing assistance has undergone dramatic changes. As a result of public and political dissatisfaction with public-housing projects, an increasing reliance on partnerships between housing authorities and other non-governmental entities and an increasing emphasis on poverty deconcentration, public-housing projects are rapidly being replaced by other forms of rental assistance such as privately owned reduced-rent units and housing vouchers. Some have argued that this shift has occurred without evidence supporting its benefit for public-housing residents (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000; Newman & Harkness, 2000, 2002).

While many public-housing developments in this country are in great need of repair, particularly after decades of disinvestment[34], many projects are in fact superior to what is available to low-income residents in the private market (National Housing Law Project, 2002). Additionally, a significant body of ethnographic and qualitative literature has documented the important role that social networks and community-based social support resources play in public-housing communities (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Clampet-Lundquist, 2007; Greenbaum, 2008; Mullings & Wali, 1999; Vale, 1997; S. Venkatesh,

---

[34] Maintenance budgets were cut sharply in the 1980s and virtually no new public-housing projects have been constructed since then (Ranney and Wright 2001)

2000). Public-housing residents in these studies describe not only networks of mutual

assistance and material exchange, but also a sense of community that is rooted in trust,

common goals and shared challenges (Greenbaum, 2008; Manzo, Kleit, & Couch, 2008;

S. Venkatesh, 2000). This community situated social support may be more accessible to

residents of public-housing projects than to other low-income families as a result of the

greater residential stability that exists in federally owned projects[35] and on account of

tenant organizations that provide unique opportunities for collective organizing and

social interaction (Bennett & Reed, 1999). The widespread demolition of public housing

that has occurred in American cities over the past decade may threaten these important

resources and pose a threat to the health and well-being of an already vulnerable

population.

This paper adds to our understanding of how recent shifts in federal housing

policy may affect public-housing residents by examining perceived access to community-

based social support among rent-assisted households. Using a nationally representative

sample of rent-assisted households from the Census Bureau's Survey of Income and

Program Participation (SIPP), I estimate the relationship between type of housing

assistance and reports that neighbors count on each other, watch each other's children,

help each other out and can trust each other to intervene in the face of danger or harm[36]. I

also estimate the relationship between type of housing assistance and reports of having

access to help from family nearby or friends. While the latter are not direct measures of

[35] According to HUD data, in 2000, residents of public-housing projects had been at their current location for an average of 107 months, compared to 52 months for Section 8 voucher holders (Portrait of Subsidized Housing, 2000).
[36] The items correspond with those used to measure the construct of social capital and its components (social cohesion and informal social control), however, this study does not assess social capital. Social capital is a collective or ecological measure that is assessed through aggregation of individual reports (Kawachi and Berkman 2000). In contrast, the measures used in this study are of individual perceptions of social support resources.

neighborhood support resources, they provide information about access to social support that may be associated with residence in a federally owned public-housing project. The central hypothesis of this paper is that among a sample of all rent assisted households, residence in a federally owned project will be positively associated with measures of social support described above. While several studies have documented the presence of social support resources in federally owned public-housing projects, this study is the first to provide quantitative measures of these resources in a nationwide sample.

In a second set of analyses, I examine relationship between these support measures and indicators of self-rated health among adults and educational outcomes among children. It is well established that access to social support, whether 'real' or perceived, is positively associated with numerous measures of child and adult well-being (Berkman, Glass, Brissette, & Seeman, 2000; Cohen, 1988; Shaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus, 1981). This second set of analyses seeks to determine the significance of the SIPP social support measures for the well-being of this rent-assisted sample.

This paper focuses specifically on a subsample of public-housing residents who self-identify as black. While I do not want to reinforce racialized assumptions about public-housing residents (31% of whom are non-Hispanic whites)[37], the unique experiences of black public-housing residents are worthy of specific investigation for several reasons. First, public-housing developments that contain large proportions of black residents have been particularly targeted for demolition (National Housing Law Project, 2002). In addition to this, research indicates that black public-housing residents may be particularly disadvantaged in the transition from project-based to voucher-based

---

[37] Calculated using HUD's Picture of Subsidized Housing, 2000 data set
http://www.huduser.org/picture2000 /

91

rental assistance as a result of racial discrimination in the housing market (Austin Turner, 1998; Beck, 1996). Finally, a significant body of literature indicates that for black Americans, social-networks may operate in unique ways to mitigate stress associated with racial, as well as socioeconomic marginalization (Geronimus, 2000; Hogan, Hao, & Parish, 1990; James, 1993).

Estimating the presence of health promoting social support resources in public-housing communities is an important addition to our understanding of how policies that demolish public-housing projects and disperse their residents may affect the health and well-being of this population. The few studies that have explored the health consequences of relocating from public housing with Section 8 vouchers have found that the effects are not universally positive, even among individuals who experience significant improvements in neighborhood and housing quality (Acevedo-Garcia, Osypuk, Werbel, Meara, Cutler, & Berkman, 2004; Liebman, Katz, & Kling, 2004; Manjarrez, Popkin, & Guernsey, 2007). It is possible that the loss of critical social support resources such as those described in this study, off-sets any benefit of relocation.

Background

Poverty Deconcentration and Public-Housing Policy

While public-housing was the primary mode of providing housing assistance to low-income families[38] in the 1950's and 60's, by the year 2000 it comprised only a quarter, or 1.2 million, of all federally assisted households[39]. In the 1970's, HUD shifted its focus from federally owned public-housing developments to subsidies that are awarded to

---

[38] Federal rent assistance is available to families who earn less than 80% of the Area Median Income.
[39] Calculated using HUD's Picture of Subsidized Housing (http://www.huduser.org/picture2000/)

private developers[40] or directly to tenants with the introduction of the Section 8 certificate

program (later renamed the Section 8 Voucher Program and then the Housing Choice

Voucher program). Over the next few decades, the voucher program grew in scope and

popularity and in 1995, HUD announced its ambitious goal of eventually replacing all

project-based assistance with tenant-based assistance in the form of vouchers (Currie &

Yelowitz, 2000).

    The reasons for this shift are multifaceted[41], but they rest heavily on HUD's broader

goal of reducing concentrations of urban poverty in predominantly African-American

neighborhoods. HUD's goals reflect growing concern over concentrated poverty in both

academic and policy circles, stemming largely from the influential work of sociologist

William J. Wilson. According to Wilson (1987) concentrated poverty that developed as a

result of economic restructuring and racially restrictive housing markets has come to

perpetuate itself through the social isolation of "ghetto communities" from middle-class

values and the social capital that exists within class heterogeneous social networks. This

view has contributed to the development of numerous programs that aim to

'deconcentrate' poverty through residential mobility programs (Goetz, 2003). It has also

led to a reconfiguration of federal housing assistance from a project-based system (which

concentrates housing by design) to a tenant-based system with the assumption that

vouchers will allow assisted households to move into neighborhoods where the poor do

not predominate (Crump, 2002).

    Much of this transition has been funded by HUD's HOPE VI program which was

established in 1992 to address the issue of distressed public-housing. After a federally

---

[40] Examples include the low-income housing tax credit and section 8 project based housing. See Chapter 1 for more details.

[41] For in-depth discussions, see (Crump, 2003) See also, (Smith, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006)

financed investigation identified a 6% (86,000 units) of the nation's public-housing stock as distressed, HOPE VI was designed to fund the demolition and revitalization of these units through block grants that are awarded to municipal housing authorities. However, HOPE VI quickly expanded its reach and has led to the demolition of many units that were not originally identified as distressed (National Housing Law Project, 2002). A central goal of HOPE VI is to deconcentrate poverty by providing former public-housing residents with vouchers that can be used in the private market, or by allowing some tenants to return to new mixed-income communities that are constructed on the sites of their former homes. However, the number of those eligible to return to redeveloped projects is small and in 2002, the return rate was only 11.4% nationwide (National Housing Law Project, 2002)

Deconcentration advocates assert that exposing poor people to more well-off neighborhoods will lead to positive cultural and behavioral changes (Austin Turner, Popkin, Kingsley, & Kaye, 2004; Massey, Gross, & Shibuya, 1994) and provide access to socioeconomically heterogeneous social ties that are precursors for upward mobility (Briggs, 1998). However, critics of the dominant discourse on poverty deconcentration have argued that the causes and consequences of poverty lie not within the confines of poor communities but within the larger structures that have initially given rise to inequality (Geronimus & Thompson, 2004; Harvey, 2000; Imbroscio, 2008). Poverty deconcentration initiatives, including the dispersal of public-housing residents through demolition and shifts toward tenant-based assistance, do little to address these underlying factors. Additionally, by threatening the integrity of social networks, which play a critical role in mitigating the effects of structural disadvantage, such initiatives may

94

undermine the health and well-being of low-income families.

The presence of these health promoting social networks is largely disregarded by the discourse surrounding HOPE VI and the broader shift to voucher based housing assistance. According to this discourse (which often omits residents own views of their communities) public-housing developments are commonly assumed to be "islands of despair" where social landscapes are just as desolate as the deteriorated physical conditions of many public housing buildings (Greenbaum, 2002; Manzo et al., 2008). While this paper cannot directly 'test' the effects of public-housing demolition or the broader policy shift towards tenant based assistance, it can speak to this central assumption by empirically examining the presence of support resources within public-housing projects.

Are Public-housing Projects Bad for Children and Adults?

Despite academic and policy concern over concentrated poverty and commonly held stereotypes of public-housing projects, there is little evidence suggesting that all else being equal, residence in a public-housing project is detrimental to the well-being of either children or adults. A few studies have used unique methodological designs to assess the effects of public-housing residence on child well-being. For example, Currie and Lebowitz (2000) and Newman and Harkness (2000) examine the effects of public-housing residence on educational attainment in two nationally representative samples. Both studies find that the statistically significant association between public-housing residence and grade repetition vanishes when controls for demographics and family background are included in the analysis. When both studies add an instrumental variable approach to further control for unobserved selection into public-housing projects, the

authors find that children in projects perform better than their peers. The results from these studies suggest that it is the more disadvantaged family background of children who live in public-housing that leads to worse educational outcomes, not public-housing itself (Newman & Harkness, 2000).

Following these nationwide studies, Jacobs (2004) combines data from the Chicago Housing Authority and Chicago Public School to assess the effect of residence in some of the nation's most notorious projects on student achievement. Jacobs takes advantage of the variation in public-housing residence that is generated by widespread demolitions in Chicago and uses demolition, which predicts public-housing participation, but is not directly correlated with the outcome of interest, student achievement, as an instrument to estimate the causal impact of living in public-housing. Jacobs finds no significant effect of public-housing residence (even in these nationally notorious projects) across measures of student achievement.

Based on the assumption that residence in high-poverty neighborhoods is detrimental to health and well-being, several studies have documented the ability of the Section 8 (or Housing Choice) voucher program to provide assisted households with access to better neighborhoods than those available to public-housing residents (Austin Turner, 1998; D. Varady & Walker, 2003; D. P. Varady & Walker, 2000b). In addition to HOPE VI, two well-known HUD programs, Moving to Opportunity and Gatreaux, provided public-housing residents with Section 8 vouchers to move to suburban and low-poverty areas. These programs, which provided extensive counseling resources and served relatively small samples of volunteers, were relatively successful in moving

families out of poverty [42] (Orr, Feins, Jacob, Beecroft, L., F. et al., 2003; Rubinowitz & Rosenbaum, 2000), however this experience has not been replicated by studies of the larger section 8 program (D. Varady & Walker, 2003). Studies of Section 8 use outside of these selective programs find that voucher users generally end up re-clustered in high-poverty and racially segregated neighborhoods (Goetz, 2002; S. Popkin, Buron, Levy, & Cunningham, ; D. Varady & Walker, 2000a, 2003; S. Venkatesh, Celimli, Miller, Murphy, & Turner, 2004). [43]Austin-Turner (1998) finds that black voucher holders, in comparison to whites are less likely to use vouchers to access low poverty neighborhoods. According to Beck (1996), given that landlords are under no obligation to accept vouchers, refusal to rent to voucher holders can act as a proxy for racial discrimination, making it difficult for African American voucher holders to find a rental unit in any neighborhood. Voucher holders in general face challenges in finding rental units and these challenges seem to be increasing with tightening rental markets and rising rents, particularly in gentrifying urban areas (Fischer, 2001). In 2001, 31% of those holding vouchers nationwide were unable to find an acceptable unit before their vouchers expired, an increase from 19% in 1993 (D. Varady & Walker, 2003). In a study of relocation from demolished Chicago public-housing in 2002, Venkatesh et al (2004) find that 24% of those who chose to relocate with a voucher were "consolidated" (moved to another public-housing development) when they could not find a unit to rent. Thus, despite its reputation, public-housing may be an important source of affordable housing in many urban areas (Daskal, 1998). The fact that waiting lists for public-housing in

---

[42] In the MTO program, one group was given vouchers that could be used only in low-poverty neighborhoods. A second experimental group was given Section 8 vouchers to use in any neighborhood. This latter group experienced only marginal improvements in neighborhood quality (cites).
[43] An exception, Varady and Walker (2003) describe a relatively successful experience of voucher users in Alameda County.

many cities are more than a decade long also suggests that this resource is already in short supply (Ranney & Wright, 2000).

Community Situated Social Support in Public-housing

A large body of literature has documented the important role that social networks play in providing material and psychosocial support (Edin & Lein, 1997; Stack, 1974), and mitigating the health effects of structural disadvantage (Berkman et al., 2000; Geronimus, 2000; James, 1993; Mullings & Wali, 1999). Social networks may be particularly significant for the health of African Americans, serving as important resources for coping with race related stressors and providing identity affirming "alternative cultural frameworks" (James, 1993). According to Geronimus and Thompson (2004), "By feeling part of a collective that stands in opposition to the dominant culture and through social ties that reinforce this feeling, members of the collective are able to contest the dominant culture's images of themselves as morally marred or culturally deficient" (p. 253). James (1993) posits that the manner in which individuals respond to race related environmental stress may depend on the size and the strength of their social networks and on their access to such alternative cultural frameworks.

Qualitative and ethnographic studies that focus specifically on urban and predominantly African American public-housing developments have also documented the importance of community-based social support in these communities. This support takes the shape of mutual assistance, exchange of resources, collective monitoring of children, and social organizations that serve as advocates for tenants' collective rights (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Greenbaum, 2008; Mullings & Wali, 1999; S. Venkatesh, 2000). These studies also reveal that many residents value these social resources and wish to maintain

them. For example, Vale's (1997) ethnographic study of public-housing residents in Boston, found that when faced with the opportunity to move, the majority expressed a strong desire to remain in their current public-housing development. While this decision was partly attributed to fear that residents would not be able to find adequate housing elsewhere, it was also based on a real appreciation for social connections within these public- housing developments that for some residents, seemed to trump concerns about safety or the physical condition of buildings. Studies of public-housing demolition have found that while some residents embrace the opportunity to leave their developments, others are devastated by a loss of home-place that represents, not only a physical building, but also geographically rooted social ties (Greenbaum, 2008; Kleit & Manzo, 2006; S. Venkatesh, 2005). In fact, in many cases public-housing tenants, and the organizations that they are a part of, have protested the demolition of their homes and in some cases, waged successful legal action against housing authorities (Bagert, 2002; Wright, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006). According to Ranney and Wright (2000) the goal of many public-housing activists is not to maintain the "raggedy buildings" in their current condition, but to protect the right to housing for low-income families and also to maintain the valuable social structures that exist in public-housing developments.

Methods

Data and Measures

This study uses data from the 1996 and 2001 panels of the Survey of Program Participation (SIPP). The SIPP is a stratified probability sample of US households whose main objective is to provide accurate and comprehensive information about the income and program participation of individuals and households in the United States (US Census

Bureau, 2002). Both the 1996 and the 2001 SIPP interview panel participants every four

months for 4 years, producing 12 waves of data for the 1996 panel and 9 waves of data

for the 2001 panel. A set of core questions (pertaining to income, expenditures, program

participation and residence) is repeated at each interview and a set of unique topical

questions are asked once (occasionally twice) during the four-year period. This cross-

sectional study relies primarily on a sample that combines data from wave 7 of the 2001

SIPP and wave 12 of the 1996 SIPP. These waves contain equivalent questions regarding

community- support resources and child well-being. An additional set of analyses are

conducted combining wave 8 of both the 1996 and 2001 SIPP which contain equivalent

questions about access to helping resources and adult well-being. In some analyses, I use

data on self-rated health which is found in wave 11 of 1996 and wave 8 of 2001[44].

The core files for all SIPP waves contain measures of public-housing residence

("Is this unit in a public housing project, that is, is it owned a local housing authority?")

and rent assistance, ("Is the federal, state or local government paying all or part of the

rent for this unit?"). The 2001 SIPP also asks all rent assisted households whether

assistance is "from Section 8 or some other program". While ideally, it would be useful

to compare voucher users to public-housing residents, sample size limits my ability to do

this given that this question is not available for the 1996 sample[45]. Additionally, the

wording of the question may exclude recipients of Housing Choice Vouchers (that the

Section 8 voucher program was renamed the Housing Choice Program in 1998). Given

---

[44] In each wave, the SIPP core questionnaire collects data for each of the 4 months in the reference period.
This study uses combined topical and core files which refer only to the 4th reference month. The dates of
the 4th reference month for each wave used as follows: 1996 wave 8 (07/98), 1996 wave 11 (11/99), 1996
wave 12 (3/00), 2001 wave 7 (3/03), 2001 wave 8 (1/04).
[45] The Section 8 question was actually included for wave 12 of 1996, but was not only asked of those
households who have changed residence after the addition of this item. Thus is only available for about
25% of the sample.

these limitations, I follow previous studies and compare public-housing to all other rent assisted households (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000). However, it is important to note that a large portion of this other assisted renter category are, in fact voucher users. Analyses of the 2001 sample find that 72% of non-public housing residents reporting rent assistance responded yes to the Section 8 question. The core files also contains control variables that are used in these analyses including, education (for these analyses, categorized as no high school degree, high-school diploma or equivalent, and at least some college)[46] and marital status (for these analyses, dichotomized as married versus not married).

The SIPP contains several measures that are useful for assessing access to community based support. In waves 7 (2001) and 12 (1996), a subsample of SIPP parents are asked questions about their neighborhood including, "Are there people in this neighborhood/community that you can count on?", "Do people in this neighborhood help each other out?", "Do people in this neighborhood watch each other's children?" and "If something happened to your child, would there be someone who you would trust to help out?". All of these items are measured on a 1 to 5 scale of 1=strongly agree, 4=strongly disagree and 5=no opinion. For the purpose of these analyses, the no opinion category (10-13% of the sample for each item) is dropped and the scale is reverse coded with 4 designated as strongly agree[47]. These same waves also contain measures of grade repetition and expulsion among children. In wave 8 of both the 1996 and 2001 panels, the reference person from each household is also asked about access to help from family and

---

[46] The original item contains more detail, but a more fine grained breakdown of educational attainment results in empty or too small cell sizes.
[47] I also ran analyses including the "no opinion" category as a neutral value (3 on a 5 point scale). These analyses produced virtually identical point estimates and confidence intervals. Ultimately, I decided to stick with the four point scale given that "no opinion" is not really equivalent to neutral, and it doesn't seem that it was intended to be used as such.

friends. These items include, "If you had a problem with which you needed help, how much help could you expect from family nearby?" and "If you had a problem with which you needed help, how much help could you expect from friends?". These items are measured on a 1 to 4 scale where 1= "all of the help I need" and 4= "no help". These items are also reversed coded for all analyses so that higher values refer to a greater expectation of help.

This study uses two SIPP measures of child and adult well-being: child educational outcomes and adult self-rated health. Educational outcomes for SIPP children include measures of whether or not a child has ever repeated a grade (for ages 5-17), or has ever been expelled or suspended from school (for children ages 12-17). Self rated health is a measure of how individuals assess their own overall state of health and in the SIPP is assessed[48] on a five point scale which I reverse coded so that 1=poor and 5=excellent. Self rated health is considered to be a reliable indicator of overall health that takes into account aspects of both psychosocial and physical well-being (McDonough & Berglund, 2003).

While the SIPP sample is quite large (approximately 80,000 households and 141,000 individuals in the combined 1996/2001 panel), this study analyzes data from a subsample of the SIPP that receives housing assistance and self-identifies as black. For analyses using community support measures, the sample is further restricted to primary guardians, the only SIPP respondents who are asked questions about their neighborhood and community. For analyses involving access to help questions (using wave 8 data), the sample is restricted to household reference persons who are asked these items. Tables

---

[48] Assessed 4 months before community support measures in 1996 and 4 months after community-support measures in 2001.

3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 contain sample sizes and distributions for each of the items that are used. As a result of non-response across waves, sample sizes were further reduced by approximately 10 % for analyses that used self-rated health.

<u>Analysis</u>

In the first set of analyses, I use a series of ordered logistic regression models to estimate the odds of agreement with community-based social support based on public-housing residence, among a sample of black rent assisted individuals. In all models, I include controls for age, gender, marital status and level of education attainment. I also include a control variable for panel (1996 or 2001) to take into account the fact that conditions in public-housing developments may have differed between these two time periods. Additionally, I use ordered logistic regression to estimate the relationship between community-support variables and self-rated health among the black rent assisted sample and in a larger sample of all black SIPP respondents including the same control variables described above. Finally, I use measures of community-based social- support items (as reported by primary guardians) to predict two educational outcomes (among their children) in a series of logistic regression models. These models contain controls for panel, age of child, age of parent, marital status of primary guardian and educational attainment of primary guardian.

In all models described above, I use balanced repeated replication with Fay's correction in order to account for the SIPP's complex sampling design (US Census Bureau, 2002). Fay's correction is ideal for analyses using small subpopulations because this method adjusts the balanced repeated replication estimation to include information from omitted primary sampling units (Rao & Shao, 1999). All analyses are also weighted

using a combined 1996/2001 weight (US Census Bureau, 2002).[49] Additionally, for each

analysis, I test to confirm that there was no violation of the proportional odds assumption

of ordered logistic regression (UCLA: Academic Technology Services).

Results

Table 3.4. includes the results of ordered logistic regression models predicting

community support variables for public-housing residents compared to other rent-assisted

individuals. The odds ratios indicate a positive effect of public-housing residence on all

measures of perceived access to social support. This effect was particularly strong for the

items "there are people I can count on in this neighborhood" and "we watch each other's

children". Both of these relationships were statistically significant at $p < .05$. These

findings suggest that contrary to public opinion, residents of public-housing perceive

valuable social resources in their developments, lending support for the central

hypothesis of this paper. Public housing residence was not a significant predictor of the

other two measures of community support (access to help and trusting people to

intervene). However, it is possible that this is due to inadequate power, rather than the

absence of a relationship. Appendix A contains sample size estimations for these analyses

and indicates that the current study is limited in its power to detect significant differences

between public-housing residents and other rent-assisted households. Table 3.4 also

contains findings from the same set of analyses reported as predicted probabilities for

each level of agreement.

Table 3.4 also includes the results of ordered logistic regression models predicting

access to help from family and friends among the wave 8 sample. The reported odds-

---

[49] This weight is constructed with the assumption that the 1996 and 2001 samples are drawn from the same population (http://www.census.gov/sipp/).

ratios indicate a statistically significant (p < .05) positive relationship between public-housing residence and access to help from family nearby. It is possible that desire for proximity to family was a predictor of public-housing residence in the first place. While in one sense, this may introduce selection bias into the analyses described above, on the other hand, public-housing developments may provide opportunities for families to remain together that are not available through other forms of housing assistance. There was also a positive relationship between residence in a public- housing project and reported access to help from friends, although this relationship was not statistically significant. However, this item is less theoretically relevant to the discussion in this paper given that it does not specify residential proximity and refers more broadly to help from friends in general.

Table 3.5 contains the results from logistic regression models that predict educational outcomes as a function of community-support variables. All measures of community-based social support were associated with greatly reduced odds of being expelled or suspended from school and repeating a grade. For example, each scale increase in perceptions (among parents) that people in their neighborhood counted on each other, reduced the odds of being suspended or expelled from school by nearly a half. Despite small sample sizes, 5 of these 8 relationships were statistically significant at p < .05.

Table 5 also includes the results of ordered logistic regressions that estimate self-rated health (measured on a 5 point scale) as a function of community-based support measures. Analyses using the black, rent-assisted sample found no statistically significant association between measures of reported community-based support and

improved self-rated health. While point estimates were in the direction of a positive association, odds were only slightly above one. It is possible that as a result of small sample size, this study did not have enough power to detect a significant relationship here. Table 3.5 also contains results from the same analyses conducted with a larger sample of all black SIPP respondents. Here the association between reports of community-situated social support and improved self-rated health are both positive and statistically significant. While the nature of the association between health and support may vary in these two distinct samples, these results suggest sample-size limitations may play a role in the first set of analyses.

Discussion

Using a sample of black rent-assisted households from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), this study finds that in comparison to other rent-assisted households, residents of federally owned public-housing developments are more likely to report access to several measures community-based social support. Despite small sample sizes many of these relationships are statistically significant. These findings are consistent with several ethnographic studies of public-housing developments that have documented the presence of health promoting community-based social resources in these settings (Greenbaum, 2002; Mullings & Wali, 1999; S. Venkatesh, 2000). This study also finds that some measures of community-based social support were associated with lower-rates of grade repetition and expulsion or suspension among children. While measures of community-based support were not associated with improved self-rated health among black rent-assisted adults, these measures significantly predicted better self-rated health among a larger sample of all black SIPP respondents.

The association between public-housing residence and social support, combined

with the finding that measures of social-support are correlated with positive outcomes for adults and children, may explain why other studies of public-housing developments have failed to identify any negative effect of public- housing residence despite the much maligned reputation of this form of housing assistance (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000; Newman & Harkness, 2000, 2002). The observed association between public-housing residence and social-support resources may also help to explain why programs that move residents out of distressed public housing have failed to produce universally positive effects (Acevedo-Garcia et al., 2004). If these programs are successful in helping public-housing residents access more advantaged neighborhoods, perhaps the loss of such social-support resources counterbalances any benefits of improved housing and neighborhood conditions.

Many questions remain with regards to the mechanisms underlying the associations between public-housing residence and community-based social support that are observed in this study. One possibility is that public-housing residence provides greater residential stability than other forms of housing assistance and thus allows for the development of social relationships and social organization. Existing research suggests that residential stability may be protective against the deleterious effects of neighborhood disadvantage through increased access to social capital and social support (Crowder & South, 2003). HUD data indicate nearly twice the length of residence for public-housing residents compared to voucher users[50]. However, more research is needed in order to better understand the sources of social support in public-housing communities and in other forms of assisted housing. In particular, ethnographic studies of voucher use and of newly developed mixed-income communities will be useful in better understanding

[50] See HUD's Picture of Subsidized Housing (http://www.huduser.org/picture2000/)

access and barriers to community-based support among other rent assisted households.

One limitation of the findings in this study is that they rely on individual perceptions of community-based social support, rather than aggregate measures used by a large literature on neighborhood social capital (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). These individual perceptions of social support may be endogenous to public-housing residence, thus we do not know whether the same individuals who resided in public-housing developments would report lower levels of community support in other forms of assisted housing. While these findings were robust to controls for observable characteristics such as income, gender, and marital status, other potentially relevant differences between public-housing residents and non-public-housing residents remain unobserved. In relation to the second set of analyses, these measures of community-support may be determined by, as well as predictors of self-rated health and educational outcomes. This is particularly true for self-rated health measures given that healthy people may be more likely to engage in their neighborhood and community and thus perceive greater access to support. However, despite this limitation, these latter findings are consistent with literature on the benefits of perceived access to social support for numerous indicators of child and adult well-being (Berkman et al., 2000; Shaefer et al., 1981).

Another limitation of this study is the fact that the extreme heterogeneity of public-housing in this country is unobservable in this national sample of public-housing residents. It is possible, that the findings are driven by subsamples of public-housing residents, for example large developments in urban areas, or that average effects mask the diversity of social conditions within public- housing projects. In this study, some heterogeneity is eliminated by the fact that the majority of analyses focus on primary

108

guardians of children who are likely to reside in family public-housing, rather than in senior public-housing which has different social and demographic characteristics. This study also masks heterogeneity in the alternatives to public-housing that comprise the "other assisted households" category. Given HUD's current shift toward voucher based assistance, it would have been useful to directly compare voucher users to public-housing tenants. While SIPP data do not allow for this comparison, the majority of the "other" category are likely to be voucher users (72% of the 2001 sample reported participation in the Section 8 program and similar proportions, though unobservable, are likely to be found in the 1996 sample). Additionally, given the particular emphasis that has been placed on the deleterious nature of federally owned public-housing developments (Austin Turner et al., 2004), the comparison between public-housing and all other forms of assisted housing is still a useful one (Currie & Yelowitz, 2000). Finally, this study may also be limited by the self reported nature of public-housing residence and rent-assistance variables. In a Michigan study, Corcoran and Heflin (2003) compare self-reports of these measures to HUD data and find a significant amount of misclassification on this variable[51].

In terms of policy implications, the current study lends support for public-housing revitalization that improves the physical conditions of federally owned projects, but also maintains the right of current residents to remain in them. Increasing voucher availability may also be an important strategy to offer more choices to low-income families and to off-set high rental cost. However, existing literature suggests that vouchers may not be able to adequately serve all households, particularly large extended kin households or

---

[51] Although the SIPP question on public-housing residence was more specific than in the Michigan study, perhaps eliminating some of this bias, the item that assesses rent-assistance is virtually identical.

families with health problems, and particularly in areas where housing markets are tight and landlords have little incentive to accept subsidized renters (Fischer, 2001; Susan Popkin, 2007; S. Popkin, Cunningham, & Burt, 2000). Thus replacing all public-housing with vouchers may leave many families without options.

Furthermore, while the shift toward tenant-based rent assistance and the demolition of public-housing has been justified, in part, by the presumed social pathologies of public-housing communities, the findings from this study suggest that these communities may contain resources that are protective for their residents. For some public-housing residents, the ability to maintain the integrity of social resources that they have amassed in public-housing developments and their surrounding communities may be vitally important to their health and well-being. Given the high rates of morbidity and mortality that are already experienced by public-housing residents and other rent-assisted households, it is critically important that future housing policy initiatives consider any possible affronts to the health of this already vulnerable population (Manjarrez et al., 2007; S. Popkin et al., 2000).

Table 3.1. Sample Characteristics from 1996 (wave 12) and 2001 (wave 7) Combined Rent-Assisted Sample of Black Primary Guardians

	Black Public-housing Residents (N=278)	Other Black Rent Assisted (N=179)
Percent female	97.8%	96.5%
Mean Age (Standard Deviation)	33.6 (11.1)	34.3 (9.9)
Percent without high-school degree or GED	32.7 %	34.9%
% Ever repeated a grade (ages 5-17)	16.0%	19.7%
% Ever expelled or suspended from school (ages 12-17)	19.4%	31%
Mean years at Current Residence (S.D.)	4.74 (8.5)	3.47 (6.0)
Mean Self-Rated Health (5=Excellent, 1=Poor)** (S.D)	3.46 (1.12)	3.38 (1.19)

Table 3.2. Distribution of Community-Support Measures among Black Parents and Guardians from Combined 1996 (wave 12) and 2001 (wave 7) Rent-Assisted Sample

	Black Public-housing Residents	Black Other Rent Assisted
There are people I can count on in this neighborhood/community?		
N	269	172
Strongly agree	15%	13%
Agree	54%	45%
Disagree	25%	33%
Strongly Disagree	6%	9%
We watch out for each other's children in this neighborhood?		
N	273	172
Strongly agree	14%	13%
Agree	56%	45%
Disagree	25%	32%
Strongly Disagree	4%	9%
There are adults I trust to help the children. If my child were outside playing and got hurt or scared there are adults nearby whom I trust to help?		
N	278	176
Strongly Agree	17 %	16%
Agree	61%	55%
Disagree	19 %	24%
Strongly Disagree	4 %	5%
People in this neighborhood help each other out?		
N	273	176
Strongly Agree	11 %	12 %
Agree	52 %	31 %
Disagree	29 %	44 %
Strongly Disagree	8 %	12 %

Table 3.3. Distribution of Access to Help Measures from 1996 (wave 8) and 2001 (wave 8) Black Rent Assisted Sample.

	Black Public-Housing Residents	Other Black Rent Assisted
If you had a problem with which you needed help, how much help could you expect from friends?		
N	592	313
All of the help that I need	*25%*	*20%*
Most of the help that I need	*30%*	*32%*
Very Little of the help that I need	*27%*	*27%*
No Help	*18%*	*19%*
If you had a problem with which you needed help, how much help could you expect from family nearby		
N	592	313
All of the help that I need	*41%*	*34%*
Most of the help that I need	*27%*	*33%*
Very Little of the help that I need	*15%*	*17%*
No Help	*17%*	*17%*

*Length of residence is measured using data from wave 2 of the SIPP.

**Self rated health data was assessed in wave 8 for 2001 and wave 11 for 1996, so in each case, there is a 4 month lag between the assessment of this variable and of the community-based support variables described above.

Table 3.4. Odds-Ratios and Predicted Probabilities of Perceived Community-Based Social Support as a Function of Housing Assistance Type (Public-Housing Versus other Rent Assistance)

	N	Odds-Ratios for Public-Housing Residence	Strongly Agree (public /other)	Agree (public /other)	Disagree (public /other)	Strongly Disagree (public /other)
There are people I can count on in this neighborhood/community,	441	1.64** (1.04-2.59)	.160 .104	.525 .465	.258 .339	.058 .092
We watch out for each other's children in this neighborhood.	445	1.59*** (1.14-2.21)	.155 .104	.535 .480	.252 .328	.057 .088
If my child were outside playing and got hurt or scared there are adults nearby who I trust to help	454	1.38 (.89-2.14)	.180 .137	.589 .567	.199 .249	.033 .045
People in this neighborhood help each other out	442	1.39* (.945-2.05)	.118 .088	.512 .463	.277 .324	.093 .125
			All Help	Most Help	Little Help	No Help
If you had a problem with which you needed help, how much help could you expect from friends?	905	1.22 (.94-1.58)	.242 .208	.319 .304	.270 .289	.169 .199
If you had a problem with which you needed help, how much help could you expect from family nearby?	905	1.38** (1.07-1.77)	.404 .330	.299 .302	.148 .173	.150 .196

** $p < .05$

 *$p < .10$

114

Table 3.5. Odds-Ratios for Measures of Well-Being Outcomes as a Function of Community Support

Predictor	Repeating a Grade (ages 5-17)	Ever Being Expelled (ages 12-17)	Better SR Health	Better SR Health, Entire Black Sample
There are people I can count on in this neighborhood	.647** (.456-.919) N=767	.510** (.310-.864) N=310	1.04 (.79-1.37) N=408	1.19*** (1.05-1.33) N=2528
We watch out for each other's children in this neighborhood	.786 (.547-1.13) N=773	.589** (.363-.954) N=311	1.02 (.83-1.26) N=413	1.17*** (1.05-1.30) N=2495
If my child were outside playing and got hurt or scared there are adults nearby who I trust to help	.601*** (.420-.859) N=789	.669 (.361-1.24) N=318	1.08 (.84-1.38) N=407	1.12* (.98-1.27) N=2549
People in this neighborhood help each other out	.743* (.537-1.02) N=764	.612* (.373-1.00) N=303	1.09 (.85-1.37) N=419	1.15*** (1.04-1.28) N=2476

***p < .01
** p < .05
 *p <.10

Sample Size Estimation

To my knowledge, it is not possible to estimate an accurate sample size prediction

for an ordered logistic regression model where the primary predictor, in this case public-

housing residence, is categorical. However, in order to obtain a conservative estimate of

the necessary sample size, I dichotomized each community support variable (into agree

and disagree) categories, and estimated the sample sized needed to detect (with statistical

significance of alpha < .05), a difference in the proportion of agreement that is observed

between public-housing residents and other rent assisted households with a power of .80.

Table A. reports the estimated sample size (per group) for each community support

variable, and my effective sample size used in each analysis. The estimated sample size

was adjusted for multivariate analysis by dividing the reported sample size by 1-r2 (r2 is

calculated by regressing the covariates on the main predictor, public-housing residence).

The effective sample size is adjusted for design effects associated with use of complex

survey data. Here N's are divided by the design effect. As table A indicates, effective

sample sizes in this study were much smaller than those required to detect statistically

significant findings with 80% power. While this table presents a conservative estimate of

sample size (given that this study uses ordered logistic regression, capturing more

variation than the bivariate relationships used for this power calculation), it is suggestive

of power limitations for the analyses in this study.

Variable	One Group Estimated Sample Size for Beta=.80	Black Public-housing Residents (effective Sample Size)	Other Black Rent Assisted (Effective Sample Size)
People I can count on	318	182	116
People help each other out	672	184	114
People watch each other's children	227	184	116
There are people who I trust to intervene	507	189	119

References

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Osypuk, T., Werbel, R., Meara, E., Cutler, D., & Berkman, L. (2004). Does Housing Mobility Improve Health? *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(1), 49-98.

Austin Turner, M. (1998). Moving Out of Poverty Expanding Mobility and Choice through Tenant Based Housing Assistance. *Housing Policy Debate,* 9(2), 373-394.

Austin Turner, M., Popkin, S., Kingsley, G., & Kaye, D. (2004). Distressed Public Housing-What it Costs to Do Nothing. Urban Institute.

Bagert, B. (2002). HOPE VI and St. Thomas: Smoke, Mirrors and Urban Mercantilism. London: London School of Economics.

Beck, P. (1996). Fighting Section 8 Discrimination: The Fair Housing Act's new Fronteir. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review,* 31.

Bennett, L., & Reed, A. (1999). The New Face of Urban Renewal: the Near North Redevelopment Initiative and the Cabrini-Green. In A. Reed (Ed.), Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality pp. 176-192). Boulder: Westview Press.

Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. E. (2000). From Social Integration to Health: Durkheim in the New Millennium. *Social Science and Medicine,* 51(6), 843-857.

Briggs, X. (1998). Brown Kids in White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate,* 9(1), 177-214.

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2007). No More 'Bois Ball: The Effect of Relocation From Public Housing on Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 22(3), 298-323.

Cohen, S. (1988). Psychosocial Models of the Role of Social Support in the Etiology of Physical Disease. *Health Psychology,* 7(3), 269-297.

Corcoran, M., & Heflin, C. M. (2003). Barriers to Work among Recipients of Housing Assistance. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy and Development Research,* 6(2), 73-87.

Crowder, K., & South, S. J. (2003). Neighborhood distress and school dropout: The variable significance of community context. *Social Science Research,* 32(4), 659-

698.

Crump, J. (2002). Deconcentration by Demolition: Public Housing Policy, Poverty and Urban Policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 20, 581-596.

Crump, J. (2003). The End of Public Housing as We Know It: Public Housing Policy, Labor Regulation and US City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 27(1), 179-187.

Currie, J., & Yelowitz, A. (2000). Are Public Housing Projects Good for Kids? *Journal of Public Economics,* 75(1), 99-124.

Daskal, J. (1998). In Search of Shelter: The Growing Shortage of Affordable Rental Housing. Washington DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work. New York: Russell Sage.

Fischer, P. (2001). Section 8 and the Public Housing Revolution: Where will the Families Go? Woods Fund. Chicago.

Geronimus, A. T. (2000). To Mitigate, Resist, or Undo: Addressing Structural Influences on the Health of Urban Populations. *Am J Public Health,* 90(6), 867.

Geronimus, A. T., & Thompson, J. P. (2004). To Denigrate, Ignore or Disrupt: Racial Inequality in Health and the Impact of a Policy Induced Breakdown of African American Communities. *Du Bois Review,* 1(2), 247-279.

Goetz, E. (2002). Forced Relocation vs. Voluntary Mobility: the Effects of Dispersal Programs on Households. *Housing Studies,* 17(1), 107-123.

Goetz, E. (2003). Housing Dispersal Programs. *Journal of Planning Literature,* 18(1), 3-16.

Greenbaum, S. (2002). Social Capital and Deconcentration: Theoretical and Policy Paradoxes of the HOPE VI Program. *North American Dialogue,* 5(1), 9-13.

Greenbaum, S. (2008). Poverty and the Willful Destruction of Social Capital: Displacement and Dispossession in African American Communities. *Rethinking Marxism,* 20(1), 42-54.

Harvey, D. (2000). Spaces of Hope. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hogan, D., Hao, L., & Parish, W. (1990). Race, Kin Networks, and Assistance to Mother Headed Families. *Social Forces,* 68(3), 797-812.

Imbroscio, D. (2008). "United and Actuated By Some Common Impulse of Passion": Challenging the Dispersal Consensus in American Policy Research. *Journal of*

Urban Affairs, 30(2), 111-130.

Jacobs, B. A. (2004). Public housing, housing vouchers, and student achievement: Evidence from public housing demolitions in Chicago. *American Economic Review,* 94(1), 233-258.

James, S. A. (1993). Racial and Ethnic Differences in Infant Mortality and Low Birth Weight: A Psychosocial Critique. *Annals of Epidemiology,* 3(2), 130-136.

Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. (2000). Social Cohesion, Social Capital and Health. In L. F. Berkman & I. Kawachi (Eds.), Social Epidemiology pp. 174-189). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kleit, R., & Manzo, L. (2006). To Move or Not to Move: Relationships to Place and Relocation in HOPE VI. *Housing Policy Debate*.

Liebman, J., Katz, L., & Kling, J. (2004). Beytond Treatment Effects: Estimating the Relationship Between Neighborhood Poverty and Individual Outcomes in the MTO experiment. *John F. Kennedy School of Government Faculty Research Working Paper Series*.

Manjarrez, C., Popkin, S., & Guernsey, E. (2007). Poor Health: Adding Insult to Injury for HOPE VI Families. The Urban Institute Press.

Manzo, L., Kleit, R., & Couch, D. (2008). "Moving Three Times Is Like Having Your House on Fire Once": The Experience of Place and Impending Displacement among Public Housing Residents. *Urban Studies,* 45(9), 1855-1878.

Massey, D., Gross, A., & Shibuya, K. (1994). Migration, Segregation and the Geographic Concentration of Poverty. *American Sociological Review,* 59(3), 425-445.

McDonough, P., & Berglund, P. (2003). Histories of poverty and self-rated health trajectories. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* 44(2), 198-214.

Mullings, L., & Wali, A. (1999). Stress and Resilience: The Social Context of Reproduction in Central Harlem. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

National Housing Law Project. (2002). False HOPE: A Critical Assessment of the HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program.

Newman, S., & Harkness, J. (2000). Assisted Housing and the Educational Attainment of Children. *Journal of Housing Economics,* 9, 40-63.

Newman, S., & Harkness, J. (2002). The Long-Term Effects of Public Housing on Self-Sufficiency. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management,* 21(1), 21.

Orr, L., Feins, J. et al. (2003). Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration

Program: Interim Impacts Evaluation.

Popkin, S. (2007). Testimony of Susan Popkin, Urban Institute, prepared for the hearing on S.829 HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act, June 20, 2007.

Popkin, S., Buron, L., Levy, D., & Cunningham, M. The Gatreaux Legacy: What Might Mixed Income and Dispersal Strategies Mean for the Poorest Public Housing Tenants? *Housing Policy Debate,* 11(4), 911.

Popkin, S., Cunningham, M., & Burt, M. (2000). Public Housing Transformation and the Hard to House. *Housing Policy Debate,* 16(1), 1.

Ranney, D., & Wright, P. (2000). Race, Class and the Abuse of State Power: the Case of Public Housing in Chicago. *SAGE Race Relations Abstracts,* 25(2), 3.

Rao, J. N. K., & Shao, J. (1999). Modified Balanced Repeated Replication for Complex Survey Data. *Biometrika,* 86(2), 403-415.

Rubinowitz, S., & Rosenbaum, J. (2000). Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbs: The University of Chicago Press.

Shaefer, C., Coyne, J., & Lazarus, R. (1981). The Health Related Functions of Social Support. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine,* 4(4), 381-406.

Smith, J., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Public Housing Transformation: Evolving National Policy. In L. Bennett, Smith, J, Wright, P. (Ed.), Where Are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Stack, C. (1974). All Our Kin. New York: Basic Books.

UCLA: Academic Technology Services, S. C. G. Statistical Computing.

US Census Bureau. (2002). Survey of Income and Program Participation.

Vale, L. (1997). Empathological Places: Residents' Ambivalence Toward Remaining in Public Housing. *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 16, 159-175.

Varady, D., & Walker, C. (2000a). Vouchering Out Distressed Subsidized Developments: Does Moving Lead to Improvements in Housing and Neighborhood Conditions? *Housing Policy Debate,* 11(1), 115-163.

Varady, D., & Walker, C. (2003). Using Housing Vouchers to Move to the Suburbs: The Alameda County, California, Experience. *Urban Affairs Review,* 39, 143-178.

Varady, D. P., & Walker, C. C. (2000b). Vouchering out distressed subsidized developments: Does moving lead to improvements in housing and neighborhood conditions? *Housing Policy Debate,* 11(1), 115-162.

Venkatesh, S. (2000). American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Venkatesh, S. (2005). Dislocation. (p. 70 minutes). USA: Alladi Group, LTD.

Venkatesh, S., Celimli, I., Miller, D., Murphy, A., & Turner, B. (2004). Chicago Public Housing Transformation: A Research Report. New York: Center for Urban Research and Policy Columbia University in the City of New York.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wright, P., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Community Resistance to CHA Transformation: the History, Evolution, Struggles, and Accomplishments of the Coalition to Protect Public Housing. In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Chapter 4

Leaving Chicago for Iowa's "Fields of Opportunity": Community Dispossession, Rootlessness and the Quest for Somewhere to "Be Ok"

"Many millions of Americans lack a place to go home to. Their families are no longer rooted in a particular piece of ground, or never did put down such roots. Generations of migration have taken their toll. Rootlessness is but one of the many costs of migration. Marriages are strained beyond endurance, children are torn repeatedly from their friends and their nest, generations are scattered, never to meet again. The community of trust supporting civil society is undermined; social capital is squandered. Efforts to maintain love and friendship and ordinary neighborliness must be started all over again from scratch. The toll is played in the old homeplace as well as in the new town up the road, and individuals and families and communities continue to pay the toll for many years- probably even after scores of years" (Stack , 1996, pg.197)

Carol Stack's ethnography, *Call to Home*, describes the return migration of

African Americans to the rural south, moves that were often driven, not only by

economic opportunities, but by a sense of "homeplace".   As Stack argues above, today

this concept of "homeplace" no longer exists for many Americans in a society that has

become increasingly mobile. The 'rootlessness' that Stack cites may have particular

meanings and consequences for low-income families, particularly low-income minorities,

whose claims to space have been marginalized, contested or denied. Historically, many

urban African American communities were 'uprooted' as a result of urban renewal

initiatives of the 1950s and 1960s (Fullilove, 2004 p. 161; Gans, 1965; Keating, 2000; R.

Wallace, Wallace, Ullmann, & Andrews, 1999). Today, the redevelopment of central city

areas has again displaced many low-income African-Americans. This current

displacement has occurred both through the widespread demolition of public-housing

developments nationwide and also through a neoliberal reimagining of urban spaces as

zones of investment and commerce (Bennett, 2006; Crump, 2002; Keating, 2000;

Reuben, 2001). This latter process has excluded poor and working class families from

neighborhoods that once provided ample supplies of affordable housing (Newman &

Wyly, 2006).

Through in-depth interviews and participant observation, this study examines the

experiences of low-income men and women who have relocated from Chicago to

Johnson County, Iowa in the context of widespread public-housing demolition and urban

redevelopment that have occurred over the last decade. Participants in this study describe

their move from Chicago to Iowa as an agentive quest for "something better". Many

describe leaving Chicago in search of jobs, education, safe neighborhoods, affordable

housing and rent subsidies, resources that have become increasingly scarce in the city.

While Iowa offers many of these opportunities, the move itself may disrupt critical ties

between both people and place.

This study documents a process of voluntary migration. However, this migration

has occurred in the context of both material and discursive community dispossession that

has threatened not only the ties between individuals and their social support networks, but

also connections and claims to the places in which these social ties reside. In Chicago, as

one participant stated, "Mayor Daley said he was taking back the city" and public

housing residents organized in collective protests against this claim. In contrast, Iowa

City, according to one participant is "someone else's city" where in the absence of

124

support from a larger community, and without connections to each other, newcomers often negotiate vulnerable and fragile positions in relative isolation. Many participants describe claims to space in Iowa as tenuous and Chicago as a city that is no longer theirs. In this context, some eventually find themselves searching elsewhere "for somewhere to just be ok".

While a great deal of academic literature has focused on the benefits of residential mobility for low income families (Acevedo-Garcia, Osypuk, Werbel, Meara, Cutler, & Berkman, 2004; M. Johnson, Ladd, & Ludwig, 2002; Rosenbaum, Reynolds, & Deluca), little is known about the consequences of the 'rootlessness' that participants in this study describe. As Stack states above, the costs to communities may be large and long lasting. The dislocation that occurs as ties to both people and place are fractured may also have important health implications. A large body of literature has recognized the important role that social networks play in providing material and psychosocial support (Edin & Lein, 1997; C. Stack, 1974), and mitigating the health effects of structural disadvantage (Berkman, Glass, Brissette, & Seeman, 2000; Geronimus, 2000; James, 1993; Mullings & Wali, 1999). The disruption of these informal, place-based networks may increase exposure to psychosocial stress and decrease coping capacity of individuals and communities, resulting in an affront to both mental and physical health. The loss of geographically rooted social ties may also undermine the prospect of collective challenges to these structural conditions themselves as collective agency and political power are dispersed (Greenbaum, 2008; Lopez & Stack, 2001).

Background

<u>Moving from Chicago to Iowa</u>

The outmigration of low-income African American families from Chicago and other central city areas is part of a national trend that has been observed but is not well understood (Frey, 2006). Census data suggest that many urban African Americans are moving from center cities to suburban fringes, perhaps in response to rising housing costs and lack of employment opportunities (Frey, 2006). Between 1990 and 2000, 17 of the 100 largest cities experienced at least a 2% reduction in their proportions of black residents (Berube, 2003). In Chicago, the proportion of African Americans living in the city declined from 2000-2006, but increased significantly in suburban areas as a result of migration patterns (K. Johnson, 2007). While interstate migration of African Americans is understudied[52], census data also indicate out-migration from urbanized, high immigration states in response to high housing costs and job availability (Frey & Liaw, 2005).

In Chicago's inner city, the persistent problem of under and unemployment is well documented and may have contributed to an outmigration of low-income residents (W. J. Wilson, 1996). In the 1980s and 1990s continued outmigration of manufacturing jobs to the suburbs and abroad have deepened joblessness in Chicago and increased the unemployment gap between blacks and whites (Peck & Theodore, 2001). Additionally, evidence suggests that employment related interstate and intrastate migration have increased in response to the 1996 enactment of Welfare Reform, which reduced the value of public assistance (in part by imposing stringent time limits) and increased pressures to find work (Kaestner, Kauhshal, & Van Ryzin, 2003).

Scarcity of both affordable housing and assisted housing benefits may have also

---

[52] An exception is a significant body of literature that has examined the 'return migration' of African Americans from northern cities to rural and urban areas in the south (Stack 1996; Cromartie and Stack 1989).

contributed to the out migration of low-income Chicago families in recent years. In Chicago, access to affordable housing has become increasingly scarce over the last decade, particularly for very-low income households (Fischer, 2001; W. Wilen & Stasell, 2006). In 2000, the city launched the 10 year Plan for Transformation (PFT) which represents the largest demolition and restructuring of public housing in the nation's history (Berg, 2004). The PFT has resulted in a demolition of 39,000 public housing units and a net loss of 13,000 units, one third of the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA)'s public-housing stock (Smith, 2006). Additionally, as a result of new income-mixing criteria laid out by the PFT, the vast majority of former Chicago public housing tenants are excluded from newly constructed mixed-income developments on the sites of their former homes (P. Wilen & Nayak, 2006). The PFT may contribute to an already large shortage of affordable and assisted housing in Chicago where waiting lists for rental subsidies are over a decade long (Ranney & Wright, 2000). This loss of affordable housing is occurring in the context of rapid gentrification that has further restricted housing options for low-income and working class renters (Bennett, 2006; Smith, 2006)[53].

In addition to its effect on affordable housing, the PFT may have contributed to increasing rates of crime and violence in the neighborhoods that remain affordable to low income families. Between 1999 and 2003, the murder rate in CHA developments doubled (Rogal & Turner, 2004). This increase may be related to the ways that relocation has stirred up territorial disputes and disrupted the delicate balance of gang activity in Chicago's public housing developments (Hagedorn & Rauch, 2007; Susan Popkin,

---

[53] See "Out of Reach 2007-2008" (http://www.nlihc.org/oor/oor2008/) for a comparison of wages to affordable housing by region. These data indicate that in the Chicago metropolitan area, an individual would need to work 75 hours/week at minimum wage in order to afford a one bedroom apartment.

Gwiasda, Rosenbaum, & Buron, 2000). Increases in crime in some neighborhoods may also result from the "uneven development" (Reuben, 2001) that has occurred as the city has invested in certain areas that are deemed profitable and ripe for growth, while allowing others to decay. Studies of urban decay in other cities have found that it is associated with increases in violence and substance abuse (Gomez & Muntaner, 2005; Newman & Ashton, 2004; R. Wallace et al., 1999).

Job shortages and lack of safe and affordable housing within the city of Chicago may have contributed to the outmigration of low-income families, particularly those who were displaced from demolished public housing developments (Bennett, 2006). While several studies have examined the relocation experience of public housing residents within Chicago (S. Popkin & Cunningham, 2001; S. Popkin, Cunningham, & Woodley, 2003; S. Venkatesh, 2002; S. Venkatesh, Celimli, Miller, Murphy, & Turner, 2004), little is known about those who leave the city. Venkatesh et al.,(2004), found that only 3% of those relocating from demolished CHA developments in 2002 left the Chicago area. However, their study only captures moves that occur in the year after relocation. Some households may eventually make moves outside of the Chicago area after they experience difficulties with the private rental market. Others may leave, not directly as a result of public housing demolition, but because they can't find a safe and affordable place to live or have been pushed further down on long waiting lists as a result of the CHA's need to prioritize those displaced by demolition.

Iowa City and the surrounding Johnson County, located 200 miles west of Chicago, have received small but significant numbers of low-income African American migrants from Chicago. Other eastern Iowa Cities (such as Burlington, Cedar Rapids,

Waterloo and Dubuque) have also experienced significant influxes of Chicago residents in recent years. The Iowa City Housing Authority (ICHA), which serves all of Johnson County and parts of Washington and Iowa counties, reported in 2007 that 14% (184) of the families that it assists through vouchers and public housing were from Illinois (Rackis, 2007). According to housing director Steven Rackis, virtually all of these 184 families are from the Chicago area, and the vast majority of them are African American. Additionally, Rackis estimates that about one third of the approximately 1,500 families on the Section 8 waiting list for Johnson County are Chicago area families[54]. As a proportion of the general population, this influx of low-income Chicago area families is extremely small, but has received a significant amount of media attention in Johnson County and is the subject of much public conversation and debate (C. Wilson, 2007). Chicago migrants are visible newcomers in Johnson County, where the proportion of black residents was only 3.9% in 2007 (an increase from 2.9% in 2000)[55]. Little is known about why families choose eastern Iowa as a destination, but speculation among Iowa City Housing Authority officials is that the moves are a combination of push and pull. Waiting lists for housing assistance in the Johnson County area are significantly shorter than those in Chicago (2 years versus more than 10 years in 2007). Additionally, Johnson County has a reputation for good schools, safe communities and job opportunities that may draw residents from Chicago.

<u>Poverty Deconcentration and Moves to Opportunity</u>

From the perspective of a growing emphasis on 'poverty deconcentration' in both

---

[54] In response to community concern over the possibility that Chicago area families would overwhelm the available housing resources, the ICHA issued a "residency preference" for residents of Johnson County. Thus, according to Rackis, many families move to Iowa City when they approach the top of the waiting list.
[55] Approximately three quarters of these 4093 African Americans were born outside of Iowa. The population estimates are based on the 2000 census and the 2007 American Community Survey.

academic and policy circles (Goetz, 2003), leaving Chicago's high poverty

neighborhoods for Iowa's white middle-class communities represents an idealized escape

from urban poverty. The widely held view that the spatial concentration of poverty is a

major cause of social problems such as joblessness and crime has provided a rationale for

several recent policies and programs seeking to move low -income families out of high

poverty urban neighborhoods (Goetz, 2003)[56]. Relocation from areas of high to low

concentrations of poverty is thought to improve employment, income, educational

prospects and health through exposure to class heterogeneous social ties and improved

neighborhood resources (Austin Turner, Popkin, Kingsley, & Kaye, 2004; Briggs, 1998;

W. J. Wilson, 1987). However, critics of poverty deconcentration programs have argued

that such spatial solutions fail to address the causes of concentrated poverty and may do

little to improve the well-being of relocated individuals. Additionally, critics have argued

that such initiatives may reinforce the assumption that the causes of poverty lie within the

social relationships of the poor, precluding attempts to address the larger social, political

and economic structures that give rise to inequality, reinforcing harmful stereotypes, and

disregarding the important role that social ties play in mitigating the consequences of

structural disadvantage (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Geronimus & Thompson, 2004;

Greenbaum, 2008). Finally, research on residential mobility suggests that many families

who do relocate to low-poverty neighborhoods eventually return to high-poverty areas

suggesting a need to understand the challenges to residential stability that they face

---

[56] The most well-known of these initiatives is HUD's Moving to Opportunity Program which has provided over 4000 volunteers residents of high poverty neighborhoods in 5 cities vouchers to be used in low-poverty neighborhoods (Goering, Fines, & Richardson, 2002; Orr, Feins, Jacob, Beecroft, L., F. et al., 2003). In the 1990's, the large-scale demolition of public housing funded by HUD's HOPE VI program and a national shift from project-based to voucher-based rent assistance also garnered widespread political support as solutions to concentrated poverty (Goetz, 2003).

(Crowder & South, 2003, 2005; S. Venkatesh et al., 2004).

In light of this literature, many questions remain about the costs and benefits of relocation from high-poverty neighborhoods. By capturing the lived experiences and decision making processes of individuals who have made such moves, the current study may inform the larger quantitative literature on residential mobility. Qualitative and ethnographic works offer the possibility to understand migration processes as "cultural events that are rich in meaning for individuals, families, social groups, communities and nations" (McHugh, 2000). Such an approach allows for an examination of migration decisions that extend beyond the range of economic factors that are most commonly considered. In particular, this study's emphasis on social-networks considers collective aspects of migration decisions and experiences. Ethnographic studies indicate the significance of extended kin networks (containing both biologically and non- biologically related members) for African Americans, particularly for those who are socioeconomically disadvantaged (Mullings & Wali, 1999; C. Stack, 1974; C. B. Stack & Burton, 1993). The desire to maintain these support systems may play a significant role in migration decisions, and the significance of social support networks may play an important role in migration experiences (Brettell, 2000).

The experiences of participants in this study can also speak to the challenges as well as benefits of such long distance moves to "opportunity". Experiences of both integration and isolation that occur as movers negotiate their status as outsiders in a new community can provide important insight into the barriers that participants in assisted mobility programs may face. Little is known about the experience of Chicago families in Iowa, but the preliminary findings of documentary film-maker Carla Wilson (2007)

suggest that Chicago migrants may face many barriers to acceptance. Despite their relatively small numbers, she says that the conventional wisdom in Iowa holds that in last few years, poor blacks from Chicago descended on the state, placing a tremendous burden on subsidized low-income housing and public schools at a time when Iowa is already taxed and struggling to care for its poor. As stated in one letter to City Council, "We're turning into a mecca for out-of state high maintenance, welfare recipients. These often dysfunctional families are causing serious problems for our schools and police." (Sanders, 2004). A large body of literature on transnational migration has explored the way immigrants are received in their destination communities (Brettell, 2000; Reitz, 2002), however this issue is largely absent from studies of inter-neighborhood or interstate residential mobility. To date, only a few studies of residential mobility have addressed the experiences of stigmatization that migrants may face as they relocate from stigmatized spaces such as public-housing complexes and urban neighborhoods to other communities (Feldman & Hathway, 2002; Greenbaum, 2002).

Neoliberal Urban Development, Community Dispossession and Health

In addition to filling an important gap in the residential mobility literature, this study also contributes to research on community dispossession and its potential consequences for health and well-being (Fried, 1963; Fullilove, 2004; Gans, 1965; D. Wallace & Wallace, 1998). While this study documents 'voluntary' migration, its participants experienced varying degrees of constraints on their ability to remain in Chicago. As discussed above, the demolition of public-housing and rising rents have made it challenging for many low-income individuals to find safe and affordable housing in the city. Housing shortages are exacerbated by limited employment opportunities.

These economic realities have occurred in the broader context of a neoliberal urban development that has reinvented center city areas that were once considered "islands of despair" as zones of commerce and investment (Crump, 2002; Newman & Ashton, 2004; Reuben, 2001). According to Logan and Molotch (1987) the commodification of urban space creates an inherent conflict between the "exchanges values" and use values of place. In cities such as Chicago, residents struggle to maintain place-based social networks, access to credit and emotional attachments to place (use values), while growth coalitions of government officials and private developers seek to maximize the exchange value of the city as a product that is marketed to higher income "urban pioneers" and suburban tourists (Perez, 2002). Studies of neoliberal urban growth coalitions have documented the displacement of public-housing residents and other low-income families who are often seen as barriers to growth (Bagert, 2002; Bennett & Reed, 1999; Reichl, 1999; Reuben, 2001). Urban ethnographers in Chicago and other cities have also documented the discursive dispossession of low-income communities that occurs as urban space is redefined to serve the needs of higher income "urban pioneers" (Maskovsky, 2006; Mumm, 2007; Pattillo, 2007; Perez, 2002; Pfeiffer, 2006). Finally, ethnography has explored the ways that low-income communities have resisted this process (Hyatt, 2003; Pfeiffer, 2006).

Some analysts have argued that the urban redevelopment that is currently occurring in Chicago and other cities bears much in common with the widespread displacement of African American communities that occurred as a result of urban renewal initiatives in the 1960s (Bennett, 2006; Keating, 2000). Studies of urban renewal point to long-term health consequences as displaced individuals experienced grief due to

133

a loss of home-place and isolation from social-networks of support (Fried, 1963; Fullilove, 1996, 2004; D. Wallace & Wallace, 1998).   Studies of urban renewal have also documented the community level consequences of dispossession as collective agency is dispersed and political power diffused (Fullilove, 2001). According to Fullilove's (1999) study of community dispossession and urban renewal, in the context of weakened claims to space, people maintained ties to close family and friends, but disengaged from the larger communities that surrounded their immediate social networks. In a similar vein, this study examines experiences 'rootlessness' and an isolation from geographically situated community ties, experiences that may have significant health implications.

Methods

Sampling and Recruitment

The goal of this project is to produce rich and diverse descriptions of this unique migration experience, and not to generalize these descriptions to a larger population. Given this goal, I used a sampling strategy that is purposive rather than probabilistic. While my original intention was to restrict my sample to former residents of CHA developments, I soon learned that many low-income families came to Iowa to find housing assistance that was not available in Chicago. Not wanting to exclude this important population, I expanded my sampling frame to include individuals who had applied for housing assistance in either Chicago or Johnson County, Iowa.

In order to explore a broad range of migration experiences and to understand how a range of factors shape these experiences, I systematically constructed my sample to capture diversity related to timing of arrival in Iowa City and experience with public housing demolition in Chicago. As indicated in table 4.1, approximately half of my

134

sample resided in Iowa for more than 2 years, and half had arrived within the past 2 years. In regards to public housing experience, I had difficulty locating and recruiting individuals who had been directly affected by public housing demolition (that is had relocated from a building that was slated for demolition) and was unable to achieve exact parity in this respect, despite adapting my recruitment materials at the half-way point of the study in order to specifically target those who were directly affected by demolition. This is perhaps due to the fact that residents of demolished projects are given housing vouchers, often pushing other low income families further down on the waiting lists for assisted housing, and thus may have been less likely to leave Chicago (Ranney & Wright, 2000). Another possibility is that former public-housing residents were more economically disadvantaged, and did not have the resources to make such long distance moves.

Table 4.1. Theoretical Sampling Distribution

	More than 2 years	**Less Than 2 years**	Total
Directly Affected	4	5	**9**
Indirectly Affected	8	8	**16**
Total	**12**	**13**	**25**

Sample participants were recruited through fliers posted at an Iowa City food-bank, local neighborhood centers, the Iowa City Housing Authority and bus stops. Some sample members were referred by local social workers or by other respondents. When contacted by a study participant, I asked a series of screening questions in order to determine eligibility and in order to attempt to reach parity with regards to the above mentioned theoretical sampling approach[57]. Appendix 4.A includes examples of a

---

[57] Initially, I did not interview participants who fell into over sampled categories (according to my theoretical sampling matrix) and instead let them know that I would contact them at a later date if 'spaces'

recruitment flyer and a table indicating specific details regarding response to recruitment

efforts. Demographic material was collected in a short survey following each interview.

Table 4.2 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the final sample.

Table 4.2. Demographic Characteristics, N=25

Average Age	33
Cumulative Average # of Months in the State of Iowa	26
% Female	84
% African American	100%
% With High School Diploma or GED	72%
% With Some College	44%
% With Housing Assistance in Iowa	84%
% Ever resided in a CHA Project	72%
% Married	4 %
% Partnered	28%

Data Collection

        This study relies primarily on data collected through in-depth semi-structured

interviews. These interviews followed a semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix

4.B) that covered key areas of inquiry, but also allowed participants to discuss the issues

that were salient to them. While I interviewed the majority of participants only once, I

conducted follow-up interviews with two participants. Total interview time for each

participant averaged 75 minutes in length (ranging from 40 minutes to 3 hours). Location

of the interview was determined by participants' preferences. Approximately half took

place at participant's homes and the remainder took place at a local neighborhood center.

Interviews at the neighborhood center took place in a private office in order to protect

participants' privacy. While the analyses in this paper focus primarily on data collected in

the semi-structured interviews described above, they are also informed by participant

opened up. Ultimately, due to time and budget constraints, I re-contacted and interviewed several
participants who were in over sampled cells.

observation conducted at local community organizations and events throughout the summer of 2008.

Analysis

I used a grounded theory approach to the analysis of the interview data (Corbin & Strauss, 1998). According to this approach, rather than collecting and using data to test a specific hypothesis, I started with a broad question and formulated theory according to themes that emerged from these data. To assist in the analysis and organization of the data, I conducted a series of coding procedures. First, while still in the field, I used a process of In Vivo coding, reading transcripts, identifying themes, and writing marginal notations, often using participants own words as labels for these themes. This early coding served to inform my data collection process, allowing me to refine interview questions or probes according to emerging themes. After completing this initial phase of coding, I constructed a codebook of key themes and sub themes (see Appendix 4-C) and used the qualitative data-analysis software, ATLAS-TI, to code all of the interview transcripts according to this codebook. Once the data were coded, I conducted a series of vertical (across interview) analyses. This process allowed me to construct broader categories and to examine the relationships between these categories.

The analysis presented in this paper is only one of many possible interpretations of the multifaceted migration narratives that were collected in this study. My decision to focus on these particular aspects of participants' stories is certainly influenced by my own broader theoretical interest in community dispossession and social networks. However, I was careful to test my interpretations against the data by comparing individual cases to each other, and by paying close attention to examples that

contradicted my initial interpretations. This combination of inductive and deductive

reasoning helped to ground my analysis in the lived experiences of the study's

participants.

Results

  The findings from this study are organized into three distinct sections, each

introduced by an individual migration narrative that thematically exemplifies the

discussion that follows. The first section focuses primarily on the experiences of former

public-housing residents who came to Iowa after relocating from a demolished public-

housing development. This section describes both a fracturing of social networks that

occurred as a result of demolition, and the contested nature of urban space in Chicago.

The second section explores the experience of living in '*someone else's city*,' that is

described by many participants. As stigmatized outsiders, the majority of participants

describe feeling this study felt marginalized from the larger communities of Johnson

County, Iowa and in order to avoid being labeled as "*just another one from Chicago*", (a

label that signifies deeply rooted stereotypes of an urban 'under-class') many participants

describe a desire to physically and rhetorically separate themselves from other

Chicagoans. While some participants have the support of family and friends who had

moved with them to Iowa, many others describe meeting day to day struggles in relative

isolation. Without rootedness in the larger community, many Chicagoans eventually

return to Chicago or look elsewhere for somewhere to "be ok". The third section of this

paper discusses this fragility and the stories of dislocation that emerge from it. All names

used in the discussion that follows have been changed in order to protect the anonymity

of study participants. In some cases, small details that could be used to identify a

participant have also been changed.

"Mayor Daley was taking back the City": Public Housing Demolition and Community Dispossession in Chicago

Carol

Carol is a 30 year old African American woman who lived most of her life in Chicago Public Housing. She grew up in one CHA development and when that project was demolished in the late 1980s, moved to another CHA development, Rockwell Homes, where she lived off-lease in an apartment that was rented to one of her nieces. When Rockwell was demolished in 2002, Carol moved from apartment to apartment on the Westside of Chicago. As a non-leaseholder, Carol received some moving assistance from the CHA, but struggled to pay the bills in a neighborhood that was becoming increasingly expensive. Finally, after living in her 4th apartment is 5 years and after the closely spaced deaths of her mother, fiancé and sister, in late 2007 Carol decided to leave Chicago. She chose Iowa with little knowledge of this new destination, but with a strong desire to "find something better" for herself and her children. Carol describes a desire to protect her children from increasing violence in her Westside neighborhood (violence that she partially attributes to the demolition of public housing and the dispersal of gangs that resided within them) and the desire for her children to have educational opportunities that she felt were unavailable to them in Chicago. She also describes with enthusiasm, her own motivation and efforts to find a job in Iowa, something she had difficulty doing in Chicago's tight labor market.

While Carol's decision to leave Chicago appears to be motivated by a series of material concerns related to employment, neighborhood safety and housing affordability,

the narratives that emerged from our conversations highlight the fact that this decision to leave was also intimately connected to the uprooting of social networks and the contestation of space that was occurring in her neighborhood. After Rockwell was demolished, Carol's nieces (who she describes as her closest family), moved with Section 8 vouchers to another part of Chicago in a neighborhood that Carol herself could not afford. According to Carol, many friends and family were separated when some were offered Section 8 and others were moved to other public housing projects in Chicago or left with no assistance. She says that,

> It's hard because when you live in the projects, you got neighbors, you be knocking on their doors, you kick it [hang-out] and you think, I have been with this girl for 25 years and now she got section 8 and I don't.

While Carol still went over to the empty lot where Rockwell once sat to attend barbeques and get-togethers, it seems that the Rockwell where "everyone knew me" no longer existed for Carol when she departed for Iowa.

Carol is also acutely aware of the contested nature of the space that the Rockwell building and the community it contained once stood on. She adamantly believes that the decision to tear down the buildings was motivated by the city's interest in "cleaning up" the neighborhood and is angered by what she feels is a lack of concern for the needs of residents in her mostly black, but slowly whitening neighborhood. She says,

> We feel like man, they trying to like take our neighborhood, that's how we feel. Y'all moving these white folks over here. We've been here for like 25 years and now you are going to tell us we have to leave because you're moving these white folks here. Uh, huh, this ain't happening.

Carol's story contains many themes that are echoed throughout the narratives of the other participants in this study. For many participants, like Carol, the decision to

move to Iowa appears to be motivated by a desire for better schools, safer neighborhoods, job opportunities, affordable housing and rent subsidies. However, many participants describe seeking out these opportunities in a context where their social networks have been fractured or strained as a result of displacement and material hardship, and at a time when claims to their homes and communities have been contested or denied.

Demolition and Fractured Ties

A common theme that emerged from the narratives of those who had resided in now demolished public housing buildings was a sense of loss associated with demolition. This sense of loss is expressed, even by those respondents who felt that the public housing buildings should have been demolished on account of their decrepit conditions, prevalence of violence and drug related activity. For example, Jonathan, a 21-year former resident of Robert Taylor Homes remarks that despite the violence that made Robert Taylor a hard place for anyone to grow up, it is,

> The people that you grow to love. It is like we like a family. I was heartbroken when they tore them down. Because you get to know people. And you become like a family. They not your family, but you grow to love them. And when they get taken away from you because of nonsense, it hurts you.

After Robert Taylor Homes were demolished, Jonathan relocated with his biological family and a small group of this Robert Taylor 'family' to another CHA project [58]. He describes this new project as a place with many of the same problems as Robert Taylor. Much like the majority of families who are relocated from demolished public housing in Chicago, Jonathan moved to an equally poor and equally segregated

---

[58] While the majority of relocated public housing residents preferred to move from their old developments to private market housing, many were either not eligible for section 8 or were unable to find a section 8 eligible rental unit and were 'consolidated', that is moved to other public housing developments (see Venkatesh et al 2004).

neighborhood (S. Venkatesh, 2002; S. Venkatesh et al., 2004). In his new home, Jonathan describes having to cope with the same challenges of neighborhood poverty, without the 'family' that had looked out for him at Robert Taylor.

Like Jonathan, Michael, a 30 year old former resident of Henry Horner Homes describes demolition as a tragedy that separated him from many of the people he was close to. He says,

> I watched a lot of people grow up and they had been there for years. And then for you to see the building tore down and they being separated. So I look at that as a tragedy in your own heart, in your own mind it's a tragedy, because you probably don't ever see these people again, because you being put here and here and you all was always like a family when you was there. But now, you guys can't be in a big building together, running house to house getting butter and milk. You know, it ain't gonna happen like that. You never know who might be your neighbor now.

In reminiscing about the projects, older participants described the important role that the project 'family' played in their own childhoods and in raising their own children. For example, 45 year old Ernestine, who left Robert Taylor a few years before it was demolished on account of increasing violence, says there was a lot of collective child rearing that occurred in the projects. Ernestine herself was involved in planning back to school days and other events for Robert Taylor children. She says,

> They help you a lot. You get to take kids, get together, and plan a trip. The parents, you know, all of us get together and plan a trip and try to take the kids somewhere. . You could rent a bus and pay for it in advance and somebody with a license or whoever would come and they'd drive us and take us around. It wasn't really nothing like everybody thinks. Just the name-the projects…I miss the good times in the projects, but not the bad stuff. Other than that, I could live there forever. If it had still been the way it was.

Forty-nine year old Shawna describes growing up under the supervision of many watchful adult eyes in the Le Claire Courts project. She says,

It was cool in a way, it was good in a way and then in another way it was bad because you couldn't get into nothing out there because everybody knew each other and then you know, the neighbors get on you and then they tell your mom and you come home and your mom'd get you too.

Shawna says that when she goes back to visit Le Claire courts, everyone still knows each other, but there isn't the same "togetherness" that there was when she was growing up. She admits that gang related violence has taken its toll, but misses the community that she experienced as a child.

The above expressions of both ambivalence and loss echo findings from other ethnographic studies of public housing demolition where residents express a desire for safer neighborhoods and better maintained buildings, but also mourn the loss of social ties that are both emotionally and materially important (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Feldman & Hathway, 2002; Manzo, Kleit, & Couch, 2008; Vale, 1997; S. Venkatesh, 2005). These ties not only represent friendship and social support, but also provide important resources such as the child care that Ernestine and Shawna describe.

The participant experiences described above emphasize 'family' that is the "projects" suggesting that their ties to these admittedly run-down buildings are rooted in ties to the community of people that inhabit them. However, the buildings themselves also seemed to bear an important significance to many participants in this study. Lakia, a 38 year old former resident of Robert Taylor, describes how project residents created T-Shirts with pictures of all the buildings on them in order to commemorate the place that was 'home' prior to demolition. Carol, Michael and Jonathan own similar T-shirts and refer to them as treasured possessions. Not only do residents immortalize these buildings on their clothing, but several participants describe holding frequent reunions and get-

143

togethers in the empty lots where the buildings once stood. For these individuals, the physical space of the projects was more than just a building, but a location for social ties. Without this place, relationships were maintained, but not in the same way, as Jonathan says, we still see each other, but it is "not like it used to be when we were all in the same building". Echoing studies of displacement in the wake of urban renewal, some residents describe demolition as a disruption of both ties to people and ties to place. It is in the context of this fracturing, that some respondents made the decision to move to Iowa (Fried, 1963; Fullilove, 2004).

The importance of a building as a location for social ties was also expressed by one non-public housing resident, Marlene, whose extended family lived in a rental building on the Westside of Chicago that was demolished in the context of neighborhood revitalization. Marlene describes her family as being relatively well-off in comparison to her neighbors, but says that this advantage came more from collective resources than it did from employment or income. She says,

> It wasn't so much as good jobs, as just good resources. We kind of like, grew up with all families together, making sure nobody went without. We lived in one building where I think my mom's sister lived in the basement. My father's brother lived on the top floor. It was like a 16-unit building. My 8 families lived in half of the building. So it kind of worked out. We lived there for almost 20 years. We'd babysit each other's kids. So that's how we lived. We all kept each other…. That's how the generations went.

Marlene describes how the building provided not only exchanges of mutual aid and material support, but also protection from a neighborhood that she saw deteriorating around it. When the owner of the building passed away, it was torn down and the members of Marlene's 8 families, "just moved. Some people moved out of the city, went to Minnesota mostly. Some people went down south to Mississippi and others went here,

144

to Iowa". When I asked Marlene if anyone stayed in Chicago, she says, "without those older women around, we didn't have protection anymore so it was up to our parents and the elders to leave the community."

For Marlene, like Carol and many others, social ties that were rooted in geographic spaces seem to have played a key role in getting by in Chicago. Not only did they provide material and psychological support, but they also served as a form of protection from urban neighborhoods that have become increasingly more dangerous over the last few decades. Without these ties and without the spaces in which they existed, it seems that some families and individuals felt that Chicago was, as one respondent stated, "no longer a place that I could call home".

Demolition and Dispossession

When asked why her family's building was torn down, Marlene cites a process of urban revitalization in the surrounding neighborhood as a primary motivation. She says,

> They were doing a lot of remodeling in the neighborhood. ..A lot of office jobs from downtown Chicago were moving further south so they kind of were flushing the whole city out. I used to watch them on the Chicago network channel 23, and Mayor Daley said he was taking the city back.

For Marlene and many other residents of demolished buildings, the city was being "taken back" and their own claims to a space within it were contested by the process of demolition and dispersal. Vanessa, a 27 year old who lived in private rental housing in Chicago explains that Chicago's city neighborhoods were now in high demand. She says,

> Now everyone that works in downtown Chicago wants to live in Chicago. They don't want to live in Jolliet. They don't want to live in the west-south suburbs. They don't want to live where they are because they have to commute an hour and a half, or two hours. So now, okay, if we demolish these buildings, where are they going to go? They're already on a fixed income. They already can't afford the lowest of the low. So what are we going to do? We're going to make it easier

145

for them to move to Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, places like this. So now the
people that work downtown ain't gotta commute and if they do, it's 20 minutes

Vanessa's analysis echoes that of many analysts who describe the increasing

value of downtown Chicago and the marginalization of low-income residents from space

that has become an increasingly valued commodity (Mumm, 2007; Perez, 2002; Pfeiffer,

2006). Carol's analysis below exemplifies what Logan and Molotch (1987) refer to as an

inherent conflict between residents 'use values' and the market based 'exchange values'

of the space where the CHA development, Rockwell Gardens, once stood. She says,

> They just think about money. Nothing but money. If we tear down Rockwell and
> build some condos right here, we gonna get some money. That is all they think
> about. They don't think about the people up in there. The kids, could they go to
> this school. They just think about the money.

According to Reuben (2001) in order to maximize the market value of formerly

unproductive urban spaces, landscapes must be "sanitized" and "aestheticized" a process

that often means the removal of marginalized populations. For Carol, this process has

reduced her own claim to space in the city of Chicago, and she sees the process of

gentrification as a constant threat. She says,

> They didn't do nothing but tear down the building just to make that part of
> Madison look real nice. Because these people here spending all this money to
> come to the United Center and they got to see all these people hanging out in the
> streets and they don't want that. So they had to tear down those buildings. So they
> just moved the people to another project on 43rd. That ain't nothing! Just like any
> minute they are going to tear down the building on 43rd and they are going move
> the people to another project. So you ain't doing nothing but just moving people
> around.

It is important to note that displacement and dispossession were contested by

residents of public-housing projects in Chicago and several studies document the

sometimes successful attempts of CHA tenant organizations to negotiate terms of

relocation and demolition that better meet the needs of project tenants (Bennett & Reed,

1999; Wright, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006). For example the Coalition to Protect

Public Housing in Chicago (CPPH) has waged and won lawsuits against the CHA

minimizing displacement at both Cabrini Green and Henry Horner Homes (Wright et al.,

2006). One participant in this study described participating in such protests. Dennis, a

27 year-old former tenant of Cabrini Green describes being part of a march on City Hall

that involved 5000 tenants. He says,

> In my head it wasn't ever going to happen. It was like I really felt that we
> controlled that area and they couldn't do it unless we allowed them to… It was a
> sense of "this is our neighborhood, not my neighborhood. And can't nobody touch
> our neighborhood." Everybody had that attitude.

Thus for Dennis, the demolition of Cabrini Green represented not only the loss of a space

that was home, but was also an affront to his own ability to advocate for collective claims

to this space.

"Doing a Beat" in "Someone Else's City": Social and Geographic Rootedness in Iowa

Danielle

Danielle is a 27 year old African -American woman who moved to Iowa in 2007.

Danielle has an associate's degree and held a steady job in Chicago. Despite her income

and despite the support of a family that she describes as both large and incredibly close,

Danielle felt she simply could not make ends meet in Chicago. She says, "It got to the

point where it was like, the phone bill or the paper bill, the day care or the gym shoes for

my son. And it really got to the point where things were not meeting".

While Danielle's entire family still lives in Chicago, she was not alone in making

decision to leave the city. A group of her close friends together decided that Chicago was

147

no longer a place where they could get by. She says,

> All of us came to the conclusion that here we are, each with at least 2 children. It's to a point where you can't do it anymore. You want to get out of the situation. So that's pretty much the thing we have all come to part with. It's either us or the city, so I mean, we pretty much all left the city.

Danielle describes how her friends dispersed, one to Atlanta another to Kansas and a few to Iowa. She says that the only one of her close friends who was able to stay in Chicago had Section 8 housing assistance. While Danielle herself says she had never considered applying for housing assistance in Chicago, she now believes that it is an important resource for helping her get on her feet financially and is currently on the year long Section 8 waiting list in Iowa. Danielle lives next-door to one of her close friends from Chicago and through this neighbor has met a small handful of other friends and associates in Iowa. This small support circle often exchanges child-care services, meals and rides to and from Chicago, which for Danielle are frequent given that her children's fathers and her family all still reside there.

Danielle, through her friends in Iowa and family in Chicago, has access to many sources of material and psychosocial support that social-networks are known to provide. The fact that she was able to some extent, 'transplant' social ties to Iowa and remain connected to a relatively intact social network in Chicago seems to give Danielle considerable advantage in getting by in Iowa when compared to other migrants who, like Carol, have experienced a fracturing of social ties in Chicago, and who have moved to Iowa alone.

While Danielle arguably has access to social support (or what some analysts would call social capital) in Iowa, she does not see herself as socially rooted in the larger community, or even in her immediate neighborhood, where she describes actively

avoiding associations with her neighbors. Nor does she have intentions of putting down

roots in Iowa through the establishment of social ties. She says,

> The people that I know, that I'm living with, that visit with me, that's enough for
> me. So, I don't have any intentions on, you know, exposing myself or trying to
> conjure up a new group of people or anything like that. There really isn't a reason,
> cause my purpose for coming here is solely to do what I need to do financially to
> take care of me and my children. If I want to be social, if that's the thing I want to
> do, I'll just go to Chicago for the weekend and come back.

Like Danielle, many other Chicago migrants describe "keeping to myself" as a strategy of

negotiating pervasive stigmatization, residential instability and economic vulnerability

that they encounter as outsiders in Iowa. In this context, many describe Iowa as place to

pursue individualized quests for economic self-sufficiency and upward mobility, but not

as a place to call home. As one respondent put it, *"Living in Iowa is like doing a beat"*.

She says, it is a place where you come to do what you have to do, whether that is

receiving a housing voucher (which after 18 months becomes 'portable' to another

county or state), finding a safe neighborhood and educational resources for your children,

or the opportunity to build your own human and financial capital through jobs an

education. While Iowa affords these opportunities, it is still, as Danielle says, "someone

else's city". Danielle, like many others, is aware that as an African American newcomer,

her claims to space in Iowa are marginalized. As a result, despite the social resources

that she has, her social and geographic ties in Iowa are fragile.

Relocation and the Disruption of Social Ties

    Participants in this study cite many reasons that people choose Iowa as a destination

including its reputation for being a place "where people are willing to help you get on

your feet", "a place where there is opportunity", a place that has a strong educational

system and where "they are all about the children", and a place where there is "peace and a quiet". However, perhaps the most commonly cited reason for moving to Iowa, was the presence of a friend or a family member who had already made this move. Like Danielle the majority of the men and women in this study, had someone in Iowa who was involved with their decision to relocate and who helped them get settled. While a few participants initially took up residence in homeless and domestic violence shelters, the majority describe living with friends and family while trying to find their own place to live, or while waiting for their name to come to the top of the housing authority's waiting list. They also describe the advice that they received about how to find jobs, negotiate the bus service (which in a city where most residents rely on cars for transportation, is described as sporadic and "hard to get used to") and where to find help from social service agencies. Echoing a large literature on network mediated migration (Brettell, 2000; Massey, Gross, & Shibuya, 1994), these experiences suggest that the presence of friends and relatives in a new destination often helps 'pave the way' both emotionally and materially.

Not only does the presence of a friend or family member seem to help ease the transition from Chicago to Iowa, but moves themselves are in some cases motivated by a desire to maintain social networks of reciprocal exchange. Echoing Stack's (1996) rich ethnographic descriptions of return migration of African Americans from the urban north to the rural South, the motivation to receive or provide what Stack and Burton (1993) refer to as 'kin-work' was a key factor in many migration decisions[59]. For example, 20 year-old Alicia left Chicago shortly after the birth of her daughter. While she describes a

---

[59] In contrast to this common theme, one participant described leaving Chicago in order to avoid excessive burdens associated with kin work. Stack (1996) also describes how certain family members may be enlisted to perform disproportionate shares or kin-work that become overly burdensome.

variety of push factors (lack of affordability and neighborhood safety, for example) that caused her to leave Chicago, she was also drawn to Iowa City because her mother (who had moved there a few years ago) could help her look after her daughter while she attended a local community college. Likewise Anita, whose story is elaborated in the section below, convinced her mother, a home owner in Chicago, to follow her to Iowa. She says, "I dragged her down here after 9 months. I'm like, 'you don't want strangers watching your grandkids and I've got to get a job, so what is going to be'? Sell your house and come down here!" Anita says that it took a lot of convincing, but the death of her cousin who was shot in a drive-by shooting was the final straw, and her mother and father decided to join their daughter in Iowa bringing with them a few of Anita's other relatives.

While some participants maintained systems of social support through the transplanting of social ties, others describe the challenge of making difficult trade-offs between economic resources in Iowa and access to social support in Chicago. For example, Tara describes making a difficult trade-off between adequate housing and social support from an extended kin network. Tara was living with her mother on a joint housing voucher in Chicago, but when her sister's family and her brother had to move into the house Tara says it just became "too crowded and too stressful". She knew that she would not be able to afford market rent in Chicago and that the waiting lists were so long that she would be "old and grey" before her number came up, so she applied for and received a housing voucher to move to Iowa. She now lives in a comfortable house in a rural part of Johnson County. However, Tara has no transportation and remains socially isolated. She says, "It is lonely out here with no family. Very very lonely. You can't go

visit your mama. You can't go visit your sister."

Twenty-nine year old Jocelyn, echoes Tara's expression of isolation and loneliness and reiterates the difficult trade-offs that have left her conflicted about whether or not to return to Chicago. She says that she likes the peacefulness of Iowa and appreciates the numerous social service providers who have helped her. However, she really misses her family, who she talks to on the phone, "5 or 6 times a day". She says, "I still feel alone. Just me and the kids. I am used to being around my family a lot. I really miss my daddy and my granny". Jocelyn says that the difficulty of being separated from her family is material as well as emotional. She says that while there are more job opportunities in Iowa, it is hard for her to hold a job without the childcare support that her grandmother provided in Chicago. Jocelyn recently quit her job as a home health aide because finding someone to watch her two young boys during the 10 pm to 6 am shift became too expensive. She is torn about whether to stay in Iowa stating, "I really like it here and I don't want to leave, but I just want to be close to my family so I can get a job".

Marlene describes the contrast between Iowa and Chicago in terms of the availability of social support. She says,

> I had a lot of good friends that helped me out where I went to school. So I kind of miss that. If those same people could be here, the good ones, then I think we'd do even better. But sometimes struggle can be good too, so I don't mind the struggle.

Other respondents describe the challenge of raising children in Iowa without the help of their children's fathers. In accordance with the ethnographic literature on non-custodial fatherhood in low-income African American communities (Edin, Tach, & Mincy, 2009; C. Stack, 1974), many respondents report that fathers play a significant role in the raising of children. Dennis, one of the few fathers in this study, describes his decision to move to

Iowa as very much motivated by his responsibility to his children and his need to find a

job. He says,

> My son's mother is a beautiful person. She doesn't hound me. But still, if my son
> needs something, she's going to call me, and it's like, okay, what can I do? My son
> gotta eat today. My son needs clothes today.

Vanessa says that her daughters' fathers' involvement extended beyond material

support and that one of the hardest aspects of leaving Chicago was,

> The fact that I knew they was leaving they fathers. And their fathers, they play such a
> big role in their lives. It was going to be hard for them and for me, because I am used
> to being able to say, 'come and get your daughter'. And being here, you have to have
> more patience, because you don't have your mom, you don't have their father, and
> you don't got your grandma and your auntie or your cousins. You're here by yourself

For many participants, separation from Chicago based social networks made it

difficult to get by in Iowa. According to one Iowa City social worker, some families do

"make it" in Iowa but without the support systems that they possessed in Chicago, their

stability is extremely fragile. She says that families simply do not have the same access to

"contingency plans" for snow days, for sick kids, for health problems, as they did in

Chicago and as a result the population of Chicago migrants is extremely transient.

 "Keeping to Myself" and Social Isolation in Iowa City

Proponents of the housing mobility and poverty deconcentration programs

described in the beginning of this chapter posit that relocated families may leave behind

the ties that were helping then 'get by', but in lower poverty areas will be able to form

new class heterogeneous ties that provide social leverage and opportunity for upward

mobility (Briggs, 1998). However, echoing the findings from studies of housing mobility

programs (Briggs, 1998; Brophy & Smith, 1997), participants in this study describe many

obstacles to forming new ties in Iowa. Not only are many Chicagoans geographically

and socially marginalized from the larger community, but many describe actively

avoiding social ties as a strategy to mitigate economic vulnerability and the

precariousness of this marginalized status.

For some participants, the decision to avoid building social ties in Iowa was

expressed as a desire to avoid relationships that may be burdensome. For example,

Marlene says,

> I get along with my co-workers. But outside, the job, I don't have any friends or
> anything like that because coming from where I come from, you didn't really
> want to make too many friends because they would all be in your house and then
> they'd be knocking on your door saying 'can I borrow this? Can I borrow that?'
> so you pretty much stay to yourself.

Marlene's statement echoes other ethnographic studies that find an avoidance of

potentially burdensome social ties as a strategy for economic survival (Dominguez &

Watkins, 2003; C. Stack, 1974). The demands associated with networks of exchange can

be particularly risky when in the context of material hardship and risk, balanced

reciprocation is not guaranteed (Dominguez & Watkins, 2003). Like Danielle, Marlene

came to Iowa to better her financial situation, a pursuit that for her, currently involves

long hours at multiple low-wage jobs. Just as Danielle has no intentions of "exposing

herself" through new social relationships, Marlene describes not wanting to put in

jeopardy the financial stability that she is relentlessly pursuing.

The riskiness of potentially burdensome social-ties seems to be exacerbated by

the unfamiliar social terrain in Iowa. For example, Michelle says that,

> It is not like at home, where I'll go to someone's house and visit them. I won't do
> that here. I don't know them that well. The new people that I have met, I won't go
> over to their house. I don't know you like that. I'd rather stay to myself.

> Iowa is not only a place where the social terrain is unfamiliar, but a place where

Chicago migrants experience a vulnerable status as stigmatized outsiders. As Danielle says, "it is someone else's city" a place where, according to Marlene, "we are only here because they are letting us be here". The vulnerability of this outsider status seems to play a profound role in shaping social relationships, both among fellow migrants and between Chicago migrants and Iowans.

The 'scandalizing' of Chicago is a common theme throughout the participants' narratives. Participants describe how Chicago is often blamed for everything that goes wrong in Iowa City, particularly in relation to drugs and crime. In the words of one former Chicago resident, "It's just, Chicago, Chicago, Chicago, Chicago. I mean, everywhere you go, they talk about us. There were drugs in Iowa City long before anyone came from Chicago". The association between drugs, crime and Chicago that participants describe is also evident in my own reviews of the comments posted on a local newspaper's website. One particular article about the police response to a fight in South east Iowa City drew numerous racially charged comments about the problems caused by Chicago migrants, despite the fact that 'Chicago' was not even referenced in the article. One blogger called for a need to "address the increase in violent crime, jail population, welfare costs and the burden placed upon the public school system by the influx of people from urban areas"[60].

According to Martin's (2008) study of a gentrifying neighborhood in Atlanta, higher income white residents often express concerns about the well-being of children as a socially acceptable way to object to class and race differences of their neighbors. This study revealed similar articulations of resistance to Chicagoans, couched in the language

---

[60] To be precise, the 33 comments to the original article were removed because they were offensive and "causing a disruption on the press-citizen web-site". This comment was posted in reference to the censorship of the original comments.

of child welfare. For example, at a parent meeting that I attended at one Iowa school, parents expressed concerns about the impact that the recent influx of children from Chicago would have on their own children's education. They were concerned that the needs of Chicago students who came from sub-par city schools would exhaust the school systems limited resources. Parents at this meeting also expressed concern that families did not "value education" in the same way they did. They were surprised to hear that Iowa's "excellent school system" was discussed at length by participants in this study as a primary reason for moving to and staying in Iowa.

While participants often spoke of the "kindness" and "helpfulness" of Iowans, they are acutely aware that *some* Iowans are opposed to their presence. Carol for example, describes being taken aback when she was told by a fellow passenger on the bus, "I am tired of all these black folks coming and messing up our small town. I don't know why the hell you all up in here, but y'all need to go back where you came from*"*. While Carol explains that encounters such as these are rare, Jonathan considers this attitude to be more pervasive. He says, "They don't want us black people down here. Even though it is some black people down here like me and my family that want something better for our life. They don't understand that. It is how you look. That is all they know".

The stigmatization that participants describe seems to goes beyond race and is particularly associated with Chicago. Anita says,

> Well, it's like when you say you're from Chicago around certain people and I ain't just going to say the police, I'm saying other people like, if you're trying to get housing or some kind of low income, for your family, it's like they discriminate on you because you say where you're from. Chicago.

In this context, several participants said that they had begun telling people that they were

from Indiana, Michigan or "somewhere else, not Chicago". It seems that to some

Iowans, 'Chicago' has become a code-word for deeply entrenched stereotypes of the

'urban underclass' that are associated not only with race and material disadvantage, but

also with a set of highly stigmatized behaviors and cultural patterns (Gans, 1990). Many

participants describe extensive efforts to resist these stereotypes which often take the

shape of physical and discursive disassociation from other Chicagoans.

Participants voice a desire to not be associated with the kinds of 'trouble' related

to drugs and crime that is often rhetorically connected to Chicago, the very 'trouble' that

many describe moving to Iowa in order to avoid. For several participants, it seems

important to differentiate their own desire to make a "better life" from those who

"brought Chicago to Iowa". Jonathan says, "They think we are coming here to do what

they are doing in Chicago, but really we are coming here to get away from that. So

people are judging us unfairly". There seems to be a consensus among the majority of

participants, that those people who do "bring Chicago to Iowa" by getting involved with

drugs or gangs, are making it harder for those who come to Iowa "do the right thing" to

avoid stigmatization. Likewise, a few participants describe how those who came to Iowa

just to get a Section 8 voucher that they can then take back to Chicago after 18 months

have "messed it up for a lot of people that want to stay in Iowa and get it together". The

discourse surrounding these two motivations seems to condemn the former as an attempt

to play the system or "get over on Iowa", in contrast to the more laudable goal of coming

to Iowa to escape discursively condemned Chicago neighborhoods.

In order to resist the associations described above and the label of, "just another

one from Chicago", many participants describe keeping to themselves and avoiding

social relationships with other Chicagoans. Michelle, says,

> They act like they really don't want us here. They try to make like we keep up so much trouble. I don't know what the rest of these people are doing. That's why I stay to myself. They could be gangbanging and selling drugs or whatever, I don't know. I don't care. I'm just trying to live.

Like Michelle, a handful of other participants describe avoiding, in particular people in their immediate neighborhood who were often fellow Chicagoans. In fact, several participants express dismay that in Iowa City, their neighbors are mostly other people from Chicago. While a few participants live in single-family homes scattered about Iowa City or in neighboring towns (the Iowa City Housing Authority has tried to scatter its public housing rather than concentrate it), the majority of participants live in two private apartment complexes in South East Iowa City that house a large number of families from Chicago[61]. A few participants explained that they do not want to live in these complexes, but that it is difficult to find landlords elsewhere who would rent to them. According to one young woman, "it's basically like you have to get in where you fit in". Other respondents experienced difficulty in finding places that would accept their section 8 vouchers. Michelle says: "A lot of places here don't accept Section 8. I figure it's because they don't want that type of thing in their neighborhood, or whatever, or those type of people-you know". These sentiments were echoed by 25 year-old Christine who says, "It sort of looks likes they section us off, they try to put us in certain places to do certain things or be with certain people you know".

In the context of both stigmatization and geographic separation, participants describe few experiences of forming ties with Iowans who were not also from Chicago. Two exceptions were the experiences of 19 year-olds Derek and Larissa who describe

---

[61] While this distribution may be an artifact of my recruitment strategy, these two complexes were discursively associated with Chicago, even among participants who lived elsewhere.

extensive and racially heterogeneous social circles that were formed on basketball courts, at work, in college classrooms and in local clubs. However, these ties are described as casual social interactions and are not representative of the relationships of trust and mutual exchange that older study participants describe relying on in Chicago. Only two other participants discussed forming close friendships with members of Iowa City's professional and middle class community. These two women describe feeling at home in Iowa City, in contrast to Danielle's description of "doing a beat". This relative social integration may be at least partially attributable to the fact that although they receive housing assistance, both of these participants reside in neighborhoods where very few Chicago families live. However, residential segregation is clearly not the only obstacle to social integration for Chicago migrants. Literature on housing mobility programs that aim to provide low-income households with access to more heterogeneous social networks finds that deeply entrenched social divisions of race and class are not easily overcome by residential proximity (Brophy & Smith, 1997; Smith, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006). Participants in this study echo other literature suggesting that stigma associated with high poverty neighborhoods, and in particular with public housing residence, often serves as a barrier to social integration (Feldman & Hathway, 2002; Greenbaum, 2002).

Many participants describe experiences of being "judged" and "stereotyped" and some describe actively avoiding interactions with white Iowans as a way to protect themselves from these judgments. For example, 25 year old Christine describes how when she first started working in a small town outside of Iowa, her coworkers, who were all white, left her out of their conversations and talked about her behind her back. She says that from this early experience, she learned to stay to herself at work. She says, "I

am still that way three years later, I still have my guards up, you know, it affected me when I got other jobs because I don't want to interact". Michelle talks about how she has adapted to frequent encounters with racism in Iowa. She says, "I'm basically a friendly person, but I can be not friendly very well. So, that's the way I cope with it. I just act like they don't exist. I just stay in my own little world."

Separation from social ties in Chicago and barriers to the formation of new ties in Iowa, leave many former Chicagoans socially isolated and reliant on highly individualized strategies of survival. The desire to be self-sufficient and to get by without help, was a common theme throughout the interviews, and in the context of social isolation, some participants may have been left with no alternative to relying on themselves. As Tara, who describes being alone without family or friends nearby says, "I don't count on these people in this neighborhood. I count on myself because myself would not let my own self down. I can't count on nobody". Without social rootedness, for many participants, Iowa is not a place to call home, just somewhere to be for a while, or as Lakia says, a place to "do a beat". Without social ties, and in the context of stigma and economic vulnerability, the nature of this "beat" is also extremely fragile. Individualized strategies for survival seem to prevent the establishment of collective sources of support and resistance (such as the resistance to public housing demolition that occurred in Chicago). With a few exceptions, it seems that many men and women are fighting the same battles as their neighbors, but doing so on their own. In this context, many participants have stories of friends and family who were unable to make it in Iowa and eventually returned to Chicago, or moved on in search of somewhere else to be ok. As discussed in the next section, some participants were themselves considering this

move.

"Just looking for Somewhere to be OK": Fragility and Dislocation

Anita

Anita is a 35 year- old mother of four and former resident of Robert Taylor Homes. When Robert Taylor was demolished in 2002, Anita received a voucher from the Chicago Housing Authority to subsidize her rent in Chicago's private housing market. However, she had great difficulty finding a rental unit that both met her standards and where her voucher would be accepted. She says,

> I couldn't find any place in Chicago that was to the standards for me raising my kids. They had bugs, they had rats, and I refuse to have my kids live like that. And then, everything was just so expensive. And you have some people in Illinois that were just like, 'ah you've got section 8. No, I don't want this…Within a year I talked to 18 or 19 landlords. Seriously. And application fees, I was out $1000 in application fees just to find a decent place for me and my kids to stay.

In 2003, after deciding that living in Chicago was not a possibility, Anita decided to take her voucher to Iowa. Despite the support she receives from the handful of family members who followed her westward, Anita says she has *"struggled a lot"* in Iowa. For example, Anita ended up losing her housing voucher after getting into a fight with her neighbors. Her son was involved in an incident of police harassment and she has not been able to find an affordable lawyer to take on his case. She describes feeling that Iowa is a place where her rights and those of her children are not protected. For Anita, life in Iowa is emotionally trying, but also risky. She has already lost her Section 8 housing assistance (something that she feels would not have happened had she stayed in Chicago) and feels that there are other things at stake. For example, Anita is afraid of losing her kids to "the system", because "in Iowa, they will take your kids away with a quickness". Additionally, in the context of "racial profiling" by the police, she feels that her

"background" is at risk of being marred in a way that may limit her future options. Finally, she is afraid of how exposure to racial injustice will affect her children. She explains that she wants them to hold on to what can be considered the essence of the 'American Dream', the mentality that if you stay in school and do the right thing, you will be successful. She is not sure whether it is possible to do this in Iowa.

When I interviewed Anita, she had decided that after 5 years of living in Iowa, it was time to leave. She says,

> After all I have been through, I just want to get out of Iowa point blank, period. Iowa is for some people, but it is not for everybody. I can honestly say, I tried to stay here and that I gave it a shot, and that I did get something out of it, but I can't do this one. I'm just tired of the racial profiling. I know it is racism everywhere, but I don't want my kids to experience what is going on here. If you are feeling uncomfortable and you just don't feel right in a place, leave. Just go. Pack up and go. Just move on and don't look back.

Anita did not want to return to Chicago, but to find somewhere where she could, "have a clean slate and start all over". When I met her for lunch at the end of the summer, she had finalized her plans to move to Minneapolis. Anita had never been to Minneapolis and had only one acquaintance there, but she had done a good deal of research about the state and was optimistic. While she was a little reluctant to be so far away from her now Iowa based family, she felt that this was a move that she needed to make in order to build a foundation for her own children that would be "less fragile". She says,

> You know, how can I try to build a solid foundation for them if I don't have a solid foundation? And that's what I am trying to get, a solid foundation. It's like here, it is not solid, you know. It's making it, but it's fragile. That's why I can honestly say, I've got to go.

Anita's experience of "fragility" in Iowa seems to stem, not from a lack of social support, but from her position as an 'outsider' whose claims to space in Iowa are marginalized. Her loss of home in Chicago and her struggles in Iowa have left her

162

searching for rootedness and stability. She says, *"I know there's some place out there for me and my kids to just be ok"*.

Risk and Vulnerability in Iowa

Several other participants echo Anita's expressions vulnerability and describe Iowa as a site of potential risks as well as gains. For example, like Anita, other participants discuss fears of losing their children to child protective services and had stories of acquaintances whose children had been "put into the system". Tanya says,

> I don't want to risk my little children being put in the system and being taken away from me because society or the people in the state of Iowa don't think I'm a good enough parent to take care of my children.

Several participants describe feeling that the state often reacts too quickly in removing children from their homes. Christine, who is currently engaged in a battle with the Department of Human Services (DHS) to regain custody of her children, discusses feeling that her own rights as a parent are marginalized on account of the fact that she is a "young black mother". She says,

> When I moved here, I started getting every black movie with black people in it, talking about slavery, talking about roots, and glory road and all that kind of stuff, I mean, I was so into it, because you know, I was experiencing it. And in the movies, you know, it says some do give up and some stick it out and fight and I am going to stick it out and fight. And if I got to do whatever I have got to do, I am going to get me some money, get me an attorney and get my kids.

Other participants describe feeling that their rights as citizens are not protected in Iowa. Several have stories of taking legal action in the face of discrimination or injustice. While in some cases these actions were successful, several participants describe feeling that in Iowa, it was hard to get support from the, "the big people". For example, Diane, a 50 year old woman who has lived in Iowa City for several years, describes being told that it was not worth filing a claim against a wealthy Iowa City resident whose car hit and

163

injured her, *"but let me had of hit him"*, she says. Other participants describe this marginalization of rights as a pronounced racial bias by the police who only listened to "one side of the story". In this context, Anita describes taking extra precautions not to fall on the wrong side of the law. She says,

> I keep my insurance paid. I don't speed. I drive the speed limit. You know, of course you're going to turn on a red if you can at a light. But sometimes I don't even do that, I just wait until the light turns green and the person behind me will just be mad. I don't care. I don't want no trouble from the police.

Like Anita, many Chicagoans eventually leave Iowa. Several participants had stories of friends or family members who had decided to move back to Chicago or elsewhere and some discussed their own plans to leave. While reasons for leaving were numerous including the pull of social networks back in Chicago, notions of risk and fragility clearly played a role in at least some of these moves. For example, Tanya, whose daughter was recently involved in a series of fights at her school, has begun to consider Iowa as too risky. She says that she would rather leave Iowa before something happens that would make it hard for her daughter to get into college or get a job in the future. She says,

> I'm not getting the support that I need from the police officers and people that's in charge down here in the state of Iowa. It's like me fighting and complaining about my rights and the well being of my children. So, I hate to leave Iowa because I love their schooling and I know that being down here, my kids will be able to have a better education. But it's just the other stuff that comes along with it. It's like I'm just to the point now that I'm tired of fighting when I know that I'm in a no-win situation. So that's what kind of led me to be looking into moving back to a part of Illinois which, that's my last resort, but I just don't see no other way out.

Tanya's expressions of exhaustion and resignation suggest that for some, this move has also presented a risk to health and well-being. While a few participants describe the health benefits of leaving Chicago neighborhoods where crime and

164

unemployment were a constant source of stress, other participants describe health

consequences of stress, struggle and uncertainty in Iowa. For example, a few participants

describe gaining weight "because of all the stress". Christine, who is only 25, says that

the stress associated with losing her children and fighting to get them back has affected

her physically. She says,

> My weight gain, I can't stand on my feet for long, my feet swell up….My eyes'll jump, my body will hurt, I will get pain everywhere, I will have to take Excedrin all the time.

Another participant, a long time drug user who had been clean for two years

before moving to Iowa, states that the threat of losing her children is a stressor that could

have health implications. She says,

> If I lose my kids and my Section 8, I believe I'd go back to getting high. Because I'd be having all these feelings, all these emotions going on, and I am so used to self-medicating my feelings that I wouldn't know how to even go about another day in a healthy way.

Participants in this study, like other African Americans residents of high poverty

urban areas (Geronimus, Bound, Waidmann, Colen, & Steffick, 2001; Geronimus,

Bound, Waidmann, Hillemeier, & Burns, 1996), experienced what appeared to be an

extremely high level of mental and physical health impairments for a sample whose

average age was 33, and the oldest member was 52. Twelve of the 25 participants

describe experiences with depression. Others report diabetes, high blood pressure,

chronic pain and child birth complications. While these health issues are likely due to a

lifetime of exposure to material and psychosocial stressors, and not the result of moving

to Iowa, they point to an underlying vulnerability that may be exacerbated by experiences

of 'rootlessness' and a dislocation from social support resources.

While participants in the study describe coming to Iowa in search of upward

165

mobility and opportunity for themselves and their children, as Tanya expresses above, there reaches a point when the costs outweigh the benefits and it is time to move on. In this situation, Tanya, Anita and perhaps many other low-income families who have left central cities in search of somewhere safe and affordable to raise their children, decide not to return 'home' (a place that may no longer exist) but to look elsewhere. Will these moves yield the solid foundation that Anita and other parents want for their children, or will they only bring more challenges, as movers find themselves further removed from geographically rooted social ties?

Discussion

The participants in this study describe some of the challenges of building ties to people and place in the context of stigmatization and marginalization that they face as urban African Americans in a predominantly white community. While some participants in this study are able to maintain or transplant their ties to family members and close friends in Chicago, and build small but significant networks of support in Iowa, the majority describe experiences of isolation from the larger communities of Johnson County, Iowa and a fracturing of community ties in Chicago. Without rootedness in community, some participants describe a persistent and courageous quest to find somewhere to "be ok" and to fulfill the deeply held goal of providing a better life for themselves and their families.

The 'rootlessness' that families and individuals experience may threaten health and well-being by disrupting the interpersonal ties that are important sources of psychological and material coping (Berkman et al., 2000; Geronimus, 2000; James, 1993; Mullings & Wali, 1999). While social networks are no substitute for the alleviation of

poverty itself, in their absence, socioeconomic upward mobility may be more challenging to achieve. Additionally, as families move from place to place, they cease to benefit from the collective assets and collective strategies of survival that are well documented to exist in poor communities (Bennett & Reed, 1999; Mullings & Wali, 1999; S. Venkatesh, 2000). From a perspective of health equity, this uprooting may serve to further entrench vast and persistent racial disparities in health. Geronimus (2000) argues that in order to reduce or eliminate racial and ethnic health disparities, in particular those experienced by urban African Americans, social policy must first "do no more harm" and avoid polices that, "affect the integrity of autonomous institutions…that members of oppressed groups work to develop and maintain in order to mitigate, resist or undo, the structural constraints that they face…" (p. 869). For participants in this study, policies of urban redevelopment in Chicago and the resultant quest for opportunity in another state, appear to have posed great challenges to the stability of social rootedness, and on a population level may serve to deepen health inequalities.

The findings from this study point to the importance of residential stability and a need for programs and policy that build, rather than break down ties to people and place. Existing literature on mobility suggests that while residence in a high poverty neighborhood is associated with poor outcomes across multiple measures of social well-being, long term residence, even in the poorest of neighborhoods is protective (Crowder & South, 2003). Long-term residence may allow people to build important ties, not only to close family and friends, but also to a larger community. While current policy has emphasized "mobility" out of high-poverty neighborhoods, an alternative approach would be to improve conditions in these neighborhoods using strategies that minimize

167

displacement (Manzo et al., 2008).

For those families who do move in search of opportunity, there is a need for programs that can help them remain in their new communities and establish as Anita says, a "solid foundation". One important aspect of this policy agenda is to recognize the importance of social-ties and the role that they play in mitigating poverty and its consequences. Programs that help families transplant social ties, for example relaxing regulations that prohibit non-leaseholders to occupy section 8 subsidized homes, may provide greater stability for relocating families.

This study also illustrates a need to address pervasive racialized stereotypes of an 'urban underclass' that for Chicago to Iowa migrants, presented barriers to social rootedness and residential stability. In the presence of these stereotypes, participants failed to develop the heterogeneous social ties that are often considered important for upward mobility. The presence of these stereotypes also created barriers to the establishment of class and race homogeneous ties that help people get by (Briggs, 1998). In this sense, this study illustrates some of the limitations of spatial solutions to urban poverty. For many participants, leaving stigmatized urban neighborhoods did little to address the systems of racial exclusion that gave rise to these neighborhoods in the first place.

Recruitment

Means of Recruitment	Number of Respondents
Flier at Neighborhood Center	6
Signs Posted at the Food Bank	2
Signs posted at the Housing Authority	1
Referred by Friend, Family or Acquaintance	10 (6 stemming from one network)
Met at the Neighborhood Center	2
Referred by Social Worker	4

Recruitment Flyer

Did you move to Iowa from Chicago?

- **Did you move to Iowa from Chicago?**

- **Have you ever lived in a unit that is owned by the Chicago Housing Authority?**

- **Would you like to share your story?**

I am a student at the University of Michigan. I am writing about the experience of families who move from Chicago to eastern Iowa. I want to hear your story. If you are interested in discussing your decision to move to Iowa and your experiences since you have been here, please call me to discuss setting up an interview time. All interviews will take place between May 15-and Aug 1 2008. We can arrange to meet at a time and place that is convenient for you and you will receive 20 dollars compensation for participation in this interview. I look forward to hearing from you. Thanks,

Appendix 4-B

Interview Schedule

Script of Oral Consent

Is it ok with you if I tape record our conversation today? If that is not ok with you, I will use a pen and paper to take notes. [Is ok for me to turn on the tape recorder, now?]

First, I want to give you some background on the project

Statement of Research:

I am a student at the University of Michigan's school of Public Health. I am currently studying how the demolition of public housing in cities across the country affects the health and well being of public housing residents. As part of this project, I am interested in how you came to Iowa. I want to know what factors affected your decision and I also want to know about your experiences here in Iowa City.

Statement of privacy protection:

I will use the material from our conversation today to write my dissertation project and to get my degree from the University of Michigan. I hope that I will also be able to publish this material in a journal or a book so that other people can learn about your experiences. In anything that I write, I will not use your real name. I will also leave out or change any details that would allow people to identify you in order to ensure that your responses are anonymous and that your privacy is protected.

Statement of research activities:

Today I am going to ask you some questions about your decisions and experiences. You are free to stop the interview at any time. You do not have to answer all of these questions. If you feel uncomfortable answering any question let me know. Also, if there is anything that you would like to talk about that is not included in my questions, please

let me know. The interview will last anywhere from 45 minutes to 2 hours, depending on what you want to talk about. You will be given 20 dollars for your participation.

<u>Statement of Consent</u>

Do you have any questions about the project or the interview process?

Now that you understand the research project and process, do you agree to participate?

Interview Questions

<u>Move to Iowa:</u>

I want to start the interview by talking about your decision to move to Iowa City

1) So first, can you tell me a little bit about your decision to leave Chicago?

- Why did you decide to leave? Were there other reasons?
- When did you start thinking about leaving?
- Who was involved in this decision?
- What made you finally decide to leave?
- What was making this decision like for you?

2) Was Iowa your first destination?

- Where else did you move?
- What was it like there?
- Why did you leave?

3) Tell me about why you chose to come to Iowa

- Did you know people here?
- What had you heard about Iowa?
- Where did you hear it from?
- Did you consider other locations?
- What would you say is your main reason for choosing Iowa City?

4) Can you tell me about what the moving process (to Iowa from Chicago) was like for you?

- Did you move with someone? Who?
- What was it like for you in the first few months after you got to Iowa City?

171

- How did you find a place to live?
- Emotionally, what was the moving process like?
- How did your actual move meet your expectations?
- What was the move like for your [name people who moved with]?
- What were some of the biggest challenges of the move?
- What were some of the best parts of the move?

Life in Iowa

This next set of questions is about what your life is like here in Iowa, now that you have lived here for __ years.

5) Can you tell me about where you live and where you have lived in Iowa City

- Who do you live with?
- What is your housing like?
- What is your neighborhood like?
- What are the people like there?
- How long have you lived there?
- Where did you live before that?
- Probe for reasons for moving

6) Can you tell me a little bit about what a typical day is like for you in Iowa City?

7) How would you describe your interactions with your neighbors here in Iowa?

- How well do people in this neighborhood know each other?
- Do you have friends and family who live nearby?
- Do people help each other out?
- [if multiple hoods] What were some of the differences between these neighborhoods?
- Since you arrived in Iowa City, have your relationships and interactions with your neighbors changed? In what ways.

8) How would you describe your interactions with people outside of your immediate neighborhood?

- How do you feel that you have been received by the larger community in Iowa City?
- Have you experienced racism here? Can you tell me a little bit about that? [What was that like for you?]
- Has your relationship with the community changed over the last years?
- Do you belong to a church here in Iowa City? Who goes there?

9) Can you tell me about friends and acquaintances that you have made in Iowa?

- Are there people that you rely on when you need someone to talk to or when you need a favor?
- Where did you meet them?

10) How would you say that your move to Iowa has affected connections with friends and family in Chicago?

- Who are the people you keep in touch with?
- How often do you visit?
- How often do you talk to them?
- When was the last time you saw them?
- For what reasons do you return to Chicago?
- Do people visit you here in Iowa?

11) [If moved with partner or living with partner or if they describe a partner back in Chicago] Do you think moving to Iowa has influenced this particular relationship in any ways?

Health and well being

These next questions are about your health and well-being since you moved to Iowa

12) Would you say that your lifestyle changed in any way since moving to Iowa? In what ways?

- Exercise habits
- Sleep
- Diet

13) Have you noticed any changes in your physical health since you moved to Iowa?

- When did these changes begin?
- Why do you think these changes occurred?
- What is your access to health care like? How is this different from Chicago?
-

14) Have you had much stress in your life since moving to Iowa?

- How do you cope with that stress?
- What are the things that you worry most about?

15) Can you tell me about what you like most about living in Iowa?

16) Can you tell me about what you like least about living here?

- Biggest challenges that you have faced

17) Tell me about your future plans to stay in Iowa

- Why are you planning to move/stay?
- How long?

18) Is there anything else that you would like to discuss about your move from Chicago to Iowa or about your experience living in Iowa City?

Chicago Life:

In this last section of the interview, I want to talk a little bit about what things were like before you moved to Iowa

19) Can you tell me about where you lived in Chicago?

- What was your housing like?
- What was/were your neighborhoods like?
- What were the people like there?
- Were there people you were close to? People you could count on?
- How long did you live there?
- Where did you live before that?
(repeat)

20) What was it like when you were in public housing in Chicago?

- What was your housing like?
- What was/were your neighborhoods like?
- What were the people like there?
- Were there people you were close to? People you could count on?
- How long did you live there?
- Where did you live before that?
(repeat)

21) If PFT ask, what was that like for you when you heard that they were going to demolish your building]

22) Can you tell me a little bit about what a typical day was like for you when you lived in Chicago?

23) Can you tell me about your friends and family in Chicago?

- Who were the people that you were close to?
- Who were the people you could count on if you needed something?
- In what ways did you help each other out?

24) Overall, what did you like most about living in Chicago?

Demographic Survey

1) What is your age?
2) Do you have children? How many? What are their ages?
3) Are you married, living with a partner, or single?
4) How do you define your race ethnicity
7) What is the highest grade or level of school that you have completed or the highest degree that you have received?

8) Do you receive any financial assistance from the federal or state government such housing assistance, welfare or food stamps?

10) Residential history a) Where do you currently live b) For how long c) PH/subsidized? (Repeat for complete residential history).

List of Focused Codes

<u>Main Code: Chicago Public Housing (CHA)</u>
1.Growing up in CHA (CHA-CH)
   a. Collective monitoring (CM)
   b. Violence and drugs (VIDR)
   c. Close Knit (CK)
   d. Social Org (ORG)
2.Living in CHA as an adult (CHA-ADLT)
   a. Social Support (CHA-ADLT-SS)
   b. Violence and drugs (CHA-ADLT-VIDR)
   c. Close Knit (CHA-ADLT-CK)
   d. Social Org (CHA-ADLT-ORG)
3. Outside opinions of CHA (CHA-OP)
4. Gangs (CHA-GNG)
   a. political power (CHA-GNG-PP)
   b. protection and safety (CHA-GNG-SAFE)
5. Demolition CHA-DEM
   a. Gentrification connected to demolition (CHA-DEM-GENT)
   b. Loss/Miss the projects (CHA-DEM-LOSS)
   c. Opportunity (CHA-DEM-OPP)
   d. Separating people (CHA-DEM-SEP)
   e. Effect on surrounding neigh. (CHA-DEM-NEIG)
   f. Effect on affordable housing stock (CHA-DEM-HOUSING)
   g. Analysis of why (CHA-DEM-WHY)
   h. Didn't change anything/same thing (CHA-DEM-SAME)
   i. Staying Connected after demolition (CHA-DEM-STCON)
   j. More violence as a result of demolition (CHA-DEM-VIO)
   k. Uprooted as a result of demolition/nowhere to go (CHA-DEM-UPRT)
   l. Making Ends Meet after demolition (CHA-DEM-MEM)
6. CHA has gotten worse (CHA-WRSE)

<u>Main Code: Chicago Life[62] (CHI)</u>
1.Growing up (CHI-CH)
   a. Collective monitoring (CM)
   b. Violence and Drugs (VIDR)
   c. Close Knit (CK)
   d. Social Org (ORG)
2. Adult (CHI-ADLT)

---

[62] Refers to life in Chicago outside of Chicago Public Housing

a. Social Support (SS)
b. Violence (VIDR)
c. Close Knit (CK)
d. Social Org (ORG)
3. Making Ends Meet (CHI-MEM)
a. formal employment (CHI-MEM-JOB)
b. informal employment (CHI-MEM-INJOB)
4. Housing (CHI-HS)
a. Doubling up (CHI-HS-DBL)
c. Moving around (CHI-HS-MV)
4. Chicago has gotten worse (CHI-WRSE)
5. Attitude toward Chicago (CHI-ATT)
a. Positive (CHI- ATT-POS)
b. Negative (CHI-ATT-NEG)
c. Ambivalent (CHI-ATT-AMB)

Main Code: Decision to Move (DEC)
1.Decision making process (DEC-PR)
2.Leaving Chicago (DEC-CHI)
a. 'Bad memories in Chicago' (DEC-CHI-MEM)
b. Nowhere safe (DEC-CHI-NOSAFE)
c. Too expensive (DEC-CHI-EXP)
d. Too hard to get subsidized housing (DEC-CHI-SUB)
e. Death of loved own (DEC-CHI-DEATH)
f. To make a change/live right (DEC-CHI-CHANGE)
g. No jobs in Chicago (DEC-CHI-jobs)
h. Demolition (DEC-CHI-demolition)
i. Getting away from a bad relationship (DEC-CHI-BDRELAT)
j. Leaving for 'something better for the kids' (DEC-CHI-BFORKIDS)
3. Choosing Iowa
a. Finger on a map DEC-IA-MAP
b. People help there DEC-IA-HLP
c. Getting a voucher DEC-IA-VCH
d. Family/Friends in Iowa DEC-IA-FF
e. Kids education DEC-AI-KED
f. Own education DEC-IA-OED
g. Jobs in Iowa DEC-IA-JOB
h. Close to Chicago DEC-IA-CLS

Main Code: Opinions about why people are moving to Iowa
1.Why others are moving (OPCI-OTH)
2. What people think about why "we" are moving (OCPI-THSPP)

Main Code: Moving to Iowa
1.The trip (MV-TR)
2. No Regrets (MV-NOREG)

3.Hard at first (MV-HRD)
4. Getting help at first (MV-HLP)
3. Finding a place (MV-HSING)
5.Getting easier (MV-SFADJ)
6. Back and forth at first (MV-BF)
7. Starting to feel like home (MV-HM)
8. Moving Back to Chicago (MV-BCK)
9. Breaking the Chicago Addiction (MV-BRCHAD)
10. The Bus is different here (MV-BUS)
11. Moving Regret (MV-REG)
12. Cool at first but problems began later (MV-COOLFST)

Main Code: Descriptions of Iowa
1.Peaceful (DI-PEACE)
2.Affordable (DI-AFF)
3.For the children (DI-FKDS)
4. No nonsense kind of place (DI-NNP)
5. Take care of your business place (DI-TCB)
6. Fields of Opportunity (DI-OPP)
7. Helpful Place (DI-HLP)

Main Code: Making Ends Meet in Iowa
1.Employment (IAMEM-JOB)
   a. Finding Work (IAMEM-JOB-FND)
   b. Descriptions of Work (IAMEM-JOB-DSC)
   c. Losing Work (IAMEM-JOB-LOSS)
2.ChildCare (IAMEM-CC)
  a. Market (IAMEM-CC-MKT)
  b. Non-Market (IAMEM-CC-NMKT)
  c. Challenge finding (IAMEM-CC-CHL)
3. Assistance (IAMEM-ASS)
  a. Strings attached (IAMEM-ASS-STR)
4. Cost of Living in Iowa (IAMEM-COL)
5. Transportation (MEM-TRANS)

Main Code: Housing in Iowa (HI)
1.Getting Assistance (HI-GET)
2. Descriptions of Housing (HI-DES)
3. Finding a Sec 8 Unit (HI-S8)
4. Losing Housing Assistance (HI-LOSS)
5. Residential Segregation (HI-RSEG)
6. Neighborhood Descriptions (HI-NEIGH)
   a. Violent (HI-NEIGH-VI)
   b. Nice (HI-NEIG-NC)
   c. Getting worse (HI-NEIGH-WRSE)
   d. Cleaning-Up (HI-NEIGH-CLUP)

7. Spending time downtown/References to down-town (HI-DNTN)

Main Code: Social Networks and Social Support (SSN)
1. Keeping to myself (SSN-ISO)
2. Church (SSN-CH)
3. Family (SSN-FAM)
   a. "Kick It" (SSN-FAM-KI)
   b. Receive Support (SSN-FAM-RCV)
   c. Give support (SSN-FAM-GIVE)
4. African American Friends (SSN-AA)
   a. "Kick It" (SSN-AA-KI)
   b. Receive Support (SSN-AA-RCV)
   c. Give support (SSN-AA-GIVE)
5. White friends
   a. "Kick It" (SSN-WHT-KI)
   b. Receive Support (SSN-WHT-GIVE)
   c. Give support (SSN-WHT-RCV)
6. Meeting 'Iowans' (SSN-MTIA)
7. Meeting Chicago folk (SSN-MTCF)
8. Connections in Chicago (SSN-CNCH)
   a. Visiting (SSN-CNCH-VS)
   b. Going back to help (SSN-CNCH-HLP)
   c. Others moving to join in Iowa (SSN-CNCH-MOVE)
9. Family in other parts of the country (SSN-FFAMELSE)

Main Code: Racism and Stigma
1. Bringing Chicago to Iowa (RS-CtoI)
   a. Blamed for messing up Iowa "scandalizing Chicago" (RS-CtoI-SCND)
   b. "We are messing up Iowa"(RS-CtoI-US)
   c. They are messing it up for the rest of us (RS-CtoI-THEM)
2. Discriminating against Chicago (RS-DAC)
3. Experiences of racism (RS-R)
   a. DHS (RS-R-DHS)
   b. Police (RS-R-POL)
   c. Officer Smitty (RS-R-SMIT)
   d. Schools (RS-R-SCH)
4. Internalized Racism (RS-INT)
5. Managing and Responding to Racism/Stigma (RS-MNG)
   a. Going to authorities (RS-MNG-AUTH)
   b. Speaking out (RS-MNG-SO)
   c. Leaving Iowa (RS-MNG-LV)
   d. Sucking it up (RS-MNG-SU)
   e. Disassociating w/ AA (RS-MNG-DISS)
   f. Faith (RS0MNG-Faith)
   g. Anger (RS-MNG-ANG)
6. Being labeled as what you are trying to escape (RS-LBL)

7. Iowans against racism (RS-IAGNST)

Main Code: Internalized Ideologies
1.Self-sufficiency (II-SS)
2. Personal responsibility (II-PR)
3. Being a good person (II-DESV)
4. Being a good parent (II-GDPRNT)
5. Valuing Education (II-ED)

Main Code: Rootlessness
1. "Doing a beat" (ROOT-BEAT)
2. Rootless (ROOT-LESS)
3. Rooted (ROOT-ED)

Main Code: Future Plans
1.Stay in Iowa (FTP-IA)
2.Move back to Chicago (FTP-CHI)
3.Move somewhere else (FTP-SE)
4. Never going back to Chicago (FTP-NOTCH)

Main Code: Health
1.Positive Effects of Move (HLTH-POS)
2. Negative effects of move (HLTH-NEG)
3. Coping with Stress in Iowa (HLTH-CP)
   a. Medicalization (HLTH-CP-MED)
   b.Social Support (HLTH-CP-SS)
   c. Eating (HLTH-CP-EAT)
   d. Faith (HLTH-CP-FTH)
4. Health Care (HLTH-CR)
5. Health and Work (HLTH-WK)
6. Less stress in Iowa (HLTH-LSTR)
7. More stress in Iowa (HLTH-MRSTR)
8. Life style changes (HLTH-LFSTL)
9. Experiences with depression (HLTH-DEPR)
10. Experiences with illness (HLTH-ILL)

Main Code: Kids in Iowa (IAKIDS)
1. Excelling in School (IAKIDS-EXSCH)
2. Problems in School (IAKIDS-PROB)
3. Social Isolation (IAKIDS-SOCINT)
4. Social Integration (IAKIDS-ISO)
5. Getting adjusted (IAKIDS-ADJ)
6. Missing Chicago (IAKIDS-HMSCK)
7. Going back to live in Chicago (IAKIDS-MVBCK)

References

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Osypuk, T., Werbel, R., Meara, E., Cutler, D., & Berkman, L. (2004). Does Housing Mobility Improve Health? *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(1), 49-98.

Austin Turner, M., Popkin, S., Kingsley, G., & Kaye, D. (2004). Distressed Public Housing-What it Costs to Do Nothing. Urban Institute.

Bagert, B. (2002). HOPE VI and St. Thomas: Smoke, Mirrors and Urban Mercantilism. London: London School of Economics.

Bennett, L. (2006). Downtown Restructuring and Public Housing in Contemporary Chicago: Fashioning a Better World Class-City. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.). Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities (pp. 282-301). New York: ME Sharpe.

Bennett, L., & Reed, A. (1999). The New Face of Urban Renewal: the Near North Redevelopment Initiative and the Cabrini-Green. In A. Reed (Ed.), Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality pp. 176-192). Boulder: Westview Press.

Berg, K. (2004). Implementing Chicago's Plan to Transform Public Housing. Conference on Chicago Research and Public Policy.

Berkman, L. F., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. E. (2000). From Social Integration to Health: Durkheim in the New Millennium. *Social Science and Medicine,* 51(6), 843-857.

Berube, A. (2003). Racial and Ethnic Changes in the Nation's Largest Cities: Evidence from the Census 2000. In R. L. Bruce Katz, and Alan Berube (Ed.), Redefining Urban and Suburban America. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Brettell, C. (2000). Theorizing Migration in Anthropology: The Social Construction of Networks, Identities, Communities and Globalscapes. In C. Brettell & J. Hollifield (Eds.), Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines pp. 91-139).

Briggs, X. (1998). Brown Kids in White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate,* 9(1), 177-214.

Brophy, P., & Smith, R. (1997). Mixed Income Housing: Factors for Success. *Cityscape,* 3(2), 3-31.

Corbin, A., & Strauss, J. (1998). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing a Grounded Theory. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Crowder, K., & South, S. J. (2003). Neighborhood distress and school dropout: The variable significance of community context. *Social Science Research,* 32(4), 659-698.

Crowder, K., & South, S. J. (2005). Race, Class, and Changing Patterns of Migration between poor and non-poor neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology,* 110(6), 1715-1763.

Crump, J. (2002). Deconcentration by Demolition: Public Housing Policy, Poverty and Urban Policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 20, 581-596.

Dominguez, S., & Watkins, C. (2003). Creating Networks for Survival and Mobility: Social Capital among African American and Latin American Low-Income Mothers. *Social Problems,* 50(1), 111-135.

Edin, K., & Lein, L. (1997). Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work. New York: Russell Sage.

Edin, K., Tach, L., & Mincy, R. (2009). Claiming Fatherhood: Race and the Dynamics of Paternal Involvement among Unmarried Men. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 621, 149-177.

Feldman, S., & Hathway, W. (2002). Research Report: HOPE VI. *North American Dialogue,* 5(1), 13-16.

Fischer, P. (2001). Section 8 and the Public Housing Revolution: Where will the Families Go? Woods Fund. Chicago.

Frey, W. (2006). Diversity Spreads Out: Metropolitan Shifts in Hispanic, Asian, and Black Populations. Living Cities Census Series: Brookings Institution.

Frey, W., & Liaw, K.-L. (2005). Interstate Migration of Hispanics, Asians and Blacks: Cultural Constraints and Middle Class Flight. Population Studies Center Research Report: University of Michigan.

Fried, M. (1963). Greiving for a Lost Home. The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis pp. 151-171).

Fullilove, M. (1996). Psychiatric implications of displacement: Contributions from the psychology of place. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 153(12), 1516-1523.

Fullilove, M. (2001). Root Shock: The Consequences of African American Dispossession. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine,* 78(1).

Fullilove, M. (2004). Root Shock: How Tearing up City Neighborhoods Hurts America and What We Can Do About It. New York: Balantine Books.

Gans, H. (1965). The Failure of Urban Renewal: A Critique and Some Proposals. *Commentary,* 39(4), 29-37.

Gans, H. (1990). Deconstructing the Underclass: The Term's Dangers as a Planning Concept. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 56(3), 271-277.

Geronimus, A. T. (2000). To Mitigate, Resist, or Undo: Addressing Structural Influences on the Health of Urban Populations. *Am J Public Health,* 90(6), 867.

Geronimus, A. T., Bound, J., Waidmann, T. A., Colen, C. G., & Steffick, D. (2001). Inequality in Life Expectancy, Functional Status, and Active Life Expectancy across Selected Black and White Populations in the United States. *Demography,* 38(2), 227-251.

Geronimus, A. T., Bound, J., Waidmann, T. A., Hillemeier, M. M., & Burns, P. B. (1996). Excess Mortality among Blacks and Whites in the United States. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 335(21), 1552-1558.

Geronimus, A. T., & Thompson, J. P. (2004). To Denigrate, Ignore or Disrupt: Racial Inequality in Health and the Impact of a Policy Induced Breakdown of African American Communities. *Du Bois Review,* 1(2), 247-279.

Goering, J., Fines, J., & Richardson, T. (2002). A Cross-Site Analysis of Initial Moving to Opportunity Demonstration Results. *Journal of Housing Research,* 13(1), 1-30.

Goetz, E. (2003). Housing Dispersal Programs. *Journal of Planning Literature,* 18(1), 3-16.

Gomez, M., & Muntaner, C. (2005). Urban Redevelopment and Neighborhood Health in East Baltimore, Maryland: The Role of Communitarian and Institutional Social Capital. *Critical Public Health,* 15(2), 83-102.

Greenbaum, S. (2002). Social Capital and Deconcentration: Theoretical and Policy Paradoxes of the HOPE VI Program. *North American Dialogue,* 5(1), 9-13.

Greenbaum, S. (2008). Poverty and the Willful Destruction of Social Capital: Displacement and Dispossession in African American Communities. *Rethinking Marxism,* 20(1), 42-54.

Hagedorn, J., & Rauch, B. (2007). Housing, Gangs, and Homicide: What We Can Learn from Chicago. *Urban Affairs Review,* 42(4), 435-456.

Hyatt, S. (2003). Report From the Field: The Death and Rebirth of North Central Philadelphia.

James, S. A. (1993). Racial and Ethnic Differences in Infant Mortality and Low Birth Weight: A Psychosocial Critique. *Annals of Epidemiology,* 3(2), 130-136.

Johnson, K. (2007). Demographic Trends in Metropolitan Chicago at Mid-Decade. Working Papers on Recreation, Amenities, Forests and Demographic Change. Chicago.

Johnson, M., Ladd, H., & Ludwig, J. (2002). The Benefits and Costs of Residential Mobility Programs for the Poor. *Housing Studies,* 17(1), 125.

Kaestner, R., Kauhshal, N., & Van Ryzin, G. (2003). Migration Consequences of Welfare Reform. *Journal of Urban Economics,* 53, 357-376.

Keating, L. (2000). Redeveloping Public Housing: Relearning Urban Renewal's Immutable Lessons. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 66(4).

Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place. London: University of California Press.

Lopez, L., & Stack, C. (2001). Social Capital and the Culture of Power: Lessons from the Field. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association.

Manzo, L., Kleit, R., & Couch, D. (2008). "Moving Three Times Is Like Having Your House on Fire Once": The Experience of Place and Impending Displacement among Public Housing Residents. *Urban Studies,* 45(9), 1855-1878.

Martin, L. (2008). Boredom, Drugs, and Schools: Protecting Children in Gentrifying Communities. *City & community,* 7(4), 331-346.

Maskovsky, J. (2006). Governing the "New Hometowns": Race, Power, and Neighborhood Participation in the New Inner City. *Identities-Global Studies in Culture and Power,* 13(1), 73-99.

Massey, D., Gross, A., & Shibuya, K. (1994). Migration, Segregation and the Geographic Concentration of Poverty. *American Sociological Review,* 59(3), 425-445.

McHugh, K. (2000). Inside, Outside, Upside Down, Backward, Forward, Round and Round: A Case of Ethnographic Studies in Migration. *Progress in Human Geography,* 24(1), 71-89.

Mullings, L., & Wali, A. (1999). Stress and Resilience: The Social Context of Reproduction in Central Harlem. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Mumm, J. (2007). Report from the Field- Redoing Chicago: Gentrification, Race and Intimate Segregation.

Newman, K., & Ashton, P. (2004). Neoliberal Urban Policy and New Paths of Neighborhood Change in the American Inner City. *Environment and Planning,* 36, 1151-1172.

Newman, K., & Wyly, E. (2006). The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies,* 43(1), 23-57.

Orr, L., Feins, J., J et al. (2003). Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program: Interim Impacts Evaluation.

Pattillo, M. (2007). Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2001). Contingent Chicago: Restructuring the Spaces of Temporary Labor. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 25(2), 472-496.

Perez, G. (2002). The Other Real World: Gentrification and the Social Construction of Place in Chicago. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems,* 31(1).

Pfeiffer, D. (2006). Displacement through Discourse: Implementing and Contesting Public Housing Redevelopment in Cabrini Green. *Urban Anthropology,* 35(1), 39-67.

Popkin, S., & Cunningham, M. (2001). CHA Relocation Counseling Assessment Interim Report. *Urban Institute*.

Popkin, S., Cunningham, M., & Woodley, W. (2003). Residents at Risk: A Profile of Ida B. Wells and Madden Park. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

Popkin, S., Gwiasda, V., Rosenbaum, D., & Buron, L. (2000). The Hidden War: Crime and the Tragedy of Public Housing in Chicago. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Rackis, S. (2007). Iowa City Housing Authority Annual Report.

Ranney, D., & Wright, P. (2000). Race, Class and the Abuse of State Power: the Case of Public Housing in Chicago. *SAGE Race Relations Abstracts,* 25(2), 3.

Reichl, A. (1999). Learning from St. Thomas: Community, Capital and the Redevelopment of Public Housing in New Orleans. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 21(2), 169-187.

Reitz, J. (2002). Host societies and the reception of immigrants: research themes, emerging theories and methodological issues. *International Migration Review,* 36(4), 1005-1019.

Reuben, M. (2001). Suburbanization and Urban Poverty under Neoliberalism. In J. G. a. J. Maskovsky (Ed.), The New Poverty Studies pp. 435-470). New York: NYU Press.

Rogal, B., & Turner, B. (2004). Moving at their Own Risk: the Redevelopment of Public

Housing Creates New Dangers. Chicago Reporter.

Rosenbaum, J., Reynolds, L., & Deluca, S. How do Places Matter? The Geography of Opportunity, Self-Efficacy and a Look Inside the Black Box of Residential Mobility. *Housing Studies,* 17(1).

Sanders, D. (2004). Don Sanders' Observations- Letter to City Council. Iowa City.

Smith, J. (2006). The Chicago Housing Authority's Plan for Transformation. In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities.

Smith, J., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Mixed Income Communities: Designing Out Poverty or Pushing Out the Poor? In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Stack, C. (1974). All Our Kin. New York: Basic Books.

Stack, C. (1996). Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South. New York: Basic Books.

Stack, C. B., & Burton, L. M. (1993). Kinscripts. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* 24(2), 157-170.

Vale, L. (1997). Empathological Places: Residents' Ambivalence Toward Remaining in Public Housing. *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 16, 159-175.

Venkatesh, S. (2000). American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Venkatesh, S. (2002). The Robert Taylor Homes Relocation Study. New York: Columbia Center of Urban Research and Policy.

Venkatesh, S. (2005). Dislocation. (p. 70 minutes). USA: Alladi Group, LTD.

Venkatesh, S., Celimli, I., Miller, D., Murphy, A., & Turner, B. (2004). Chicago Public Housing Transformation: A Research Report. New York: Center for Urban Research and Policy Columbia University in the City of New York.

Wallace, D., & Wallace, R. (1998). A Plague on Your Houses: How New York was Burned Down and National Public Health Crumbled. London ; New York :: Verso.

Wallace, R., Wallace, D., Ullmann, J. E., & Andrews, H. (1999). Deindustrialization, inner-city decay, and the hierarchical diffusion of AIDS in the USA: How neoliberal and cold war policies magnified the ecological niche for emerging infections and created a national security crisis. *Environment and Planning A,*

31(1), 113-139.

Wilen, P., & Nayak, R. (2006). Relocated Public Housing Residents Have Little Hope of Returning: Work Requirements for Mixed Income Developments. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities pp. 216-239). New York: ME Sharpe.

Wilen, W., & Stasell, W. (2006). Gatreaux and Chicago's Public Housing Crisis: The Conflict Between Achieving Integration and Providing Decent Housing for Very Low Income African Americans. In L. Bennet, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live: Transforming Public Housing Communities? (p. 239). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Wilson, C. (2007). New Iowans: An Exploration of the Implications of Reverse Migration- Cities to Small Towns- for Our Understanding of Whiteness and Otherness in America's Heartland.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1996). When Work Disappears: The New World of the Urban Poor. New York: Vintage Books.

Wright, P., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Community Resistance to CHA Transformation: the History, Evolution, Struggles, and Accomplishments of the Coalition to Protect Public Housing. In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This dissertation has explored the potential impacts of public-housing demolition and urban redevelopment on African American communities in three distinct inquiries, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. While public-housing demolition has been the subject of much scholarly and political debate, only a small handful of analysts have examined policies of demolition and dispersal from a perspective of health equity (Acevedo-Garcia, Osypuk, Werbel, Meara, Cutler, & Berkman, 2004; Fullilove, 2001, 2004; Geronimus & Thompson, 2004; D. Wallace & Wallace, 1998; R. Wallace, Wallace, Ullmann, & Andrews, 1999). This project seeks to contribute to this important conversation by exploring how public-housing demolition may affect social-support resources that are considered important inputs to health and well-being. Below, I summarize my findings from Chapters 2-4, discuss their broader implications and propose directions for future research.

In Chapter 2, I critically reviewed existing evidence on the effects of relocation as a result of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) HOPE VI program. HOPE VI has funded the demolition of public-housing developments in cities across the country and created in their place, mixed-income communities that often exclude the majority of former tenants. While the program has advocated increased "housing choice" and opportunity for families who are moved out of demolished HOPE

VI units and into other public-housing developments or subsidized private market rentals, existing evidence suggests that a large portion of HOPE VI families relocate to neighborhoods that are equally poor and equally segregated. Additionally, current evidence reviewed in this chapter suggests that relocated adults experience only marginal improvements in income, no changes in employment and that their children experience a mix of positive and negative educational outcomes. Methodological limitations leave many questions about the health consequences of HOPE VI relocation, however current evidence indicates that this experience is associated with a marked decline in self-rated health and increased experiences of chronic conditions. This chapter also reviews evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Study (MTO), which has a more rigorous quasi-experimental design, and finds that relocation from public-housing is associated with a mix of positive and negative health effects. Participants in MTO were volunteers and likely better positioned to benefit from relocation than HOPE VI relocatees. The fact that even this 'ideal case' of relocation did not produce universally positive benefits, suggests that there may be health costs to relocation for displaced HOPE VI tenants.

From the perspective of the "weathering framework", introduced in chapter 1 of this dissertation, relocation from demolished public-housing may have not only failed to reduce exposure to stressors associated with residence in dilapidated developments and high poverty urban neighborhoods, but it may have also decreased access to social resources that help to mitigate the effects of such structural disadvantage on health. The final section of this chapter considers the social resources that exist in public-housing communities and their significance for health, countering the assumption that there is very little of value that might be lost through processes of demolition and dispersal. Here

I review the extensive qualitative and ethnographic work that has documented the critical role that social networks play in providing material and psychosocial support for low-income African American families in general, and also particularly in public-housing developments. The loss of these social resources may off-set any benefits of relocation from public-housing, perhaps explaining the at best weak benefits of relocation for the health that is observed in studies of residential mobility (Acevedo-Garcia et al., 2004).

While conventional wisdom posits that HOPE VI, as a program that offers an escape from distressed public-housing, would be beneficial to low income families, findings from Chapter 2 suggest that this may not be the case. More research is clearly needed to better understand the health consequences of programs like HOPE VI. Current evidence suggests that there is a considerable amount of variation in how individuals experience and are affected by relocation. Future research should consider how factors such as age, gender, race and disability status affect the health trajectories of relocated families and individuals. As Chapter 2 suggests, research is also needed to understand how relocation affects the integrity of collective social resources and how their loss mediates the health consequences of dispersal. A first step in this process is to document more extensively the existence of such resources and their role in promoting health and well-being. Chapter 3 begins to address this goal by examining the relationship between public-housing residence and community-based social support in a national sample of African- American rent-assisted households.

Chapter 3 uses the Census Bureau's Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) to estimate the relationship between residence in a federally owned public-housing project and reported presence of community-based social support among African

Americans who receive rent assistance. This study finds that in comparison to other rent-assisted households, public-housing residents are significantly more likely to report that people in their neighborhood count on each other, watch each other's children and help each other out. This study also finds that measures of community-based support are associated with reduced odds of school expulsion and grade repetition among rent-assisted children and with better self-rated health among a larger sample of all black SIPP participants.

The conventional wisdom supporting programs such as HOPE VI has constructed public-housing communities as "islands of despair" where social landscapes are just as desolate as their poorly maintained physical structures (Greenbaum, 2002). The findings from Chapter 3 support an alternative view (also described by the qualitative literature that is reviewed in Chapter 2) of public-housing communities where social resources do exist and may play an important role in mitigating the challenges associated with individual and neighborhood poverty, racial exclusion and poorly maintained buildings (Mullings & Wali, 1999). The findings from Chapter 2 and 3 combined lend support for policies of public-housing redevelopment that minimize displacement and leave health promoting social ties intact. These findings also raise many questions for future investigation. Given that current policy projects the rapid decline of public housing as a form of rent assistance (Smith, Bennett, Smith, & Wright, 2006), it is important to understand why other rent-assisted individuals do not report the same levels of community–based social support as residents of federally owned developments. For example, voucher users may experience greater residential instability in general and their experiences are also likely to be sensitive to changes in the rental market. For example,

as housing markets tighten in gentrifying urban areas, voucher users may experience greater threats to residential stability and may become more and more disconnected from the social resources that this study attempts to measure.

In addition to residential instability, there may be other reasons that rent-assisted households who reside outside of public-housing projects report less access to community based support. For example, these households may encounter discrimination and stigmatization from neighbors who are more well-off or do not receive assistance. Ethnographic studies of mixed income neighborhoods have begun to explore the relationships and class tensions between low-income families and the population of professionals that have come to populate gentrifying urban areas (Jackson, 2003; Pattillo, 2007; Perez, 2002). More in-depth qualitative research is needed to better understand the relationships between voucher users and their neighbors and in general to understand the lived experiences of low-income families in the private rental market. Chapter 4 begins to do this by using qualitative interviews and ethnographic techniques to explore issues of social and geographic rootedness in a unique sample of low-income men and women.

This chapter uses in-depth interviews and participant observation to document the experience of low-income African American men and women who have relocated from Chicago to eastern Iowa in the context of widespread demolition and urban redevelopment. While this study examines a process of 'voluntary' migration, this migration occurred in the context of both material and discursive community dispossession that has threatened not only the ties between individuals and their social support networks, but also connections (and claims) to the places in which these social ties reside.

These findings support previous studies of urban renewal suggesting that there is an interrelationship between ties to people and ties to place (Fullilove, 2001). Participants in this study described the ways that both ties to people and ties to place were fractured in Chicago where "Mayor Daley was taking back the city". Widespread demolition of public-housing as part of Chicago's Plan for Transformation and rising rents in the context of gentrification, left many low-income families without safe and affordable housing options. Additionally, several participants described the discursive marginalization of their own claims to contested urban space in the context of urban revitalization.

In Iowa, participants described keeping to themselves as they struggled to negotiate their fragile and marginalized outsider status in "someone else's city". In contrast to the descriptions of collective social resources and community based support that is documented by the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 and the data that are analyzed in Chapter 3, participants in this study described negotiating the challenges of day to day life in relative isolation. While many participants maintained ties with close family and friends from Chicago and often transplanted these ties to Iowa, they remained disconnected from a larger community in either city. Without connections to people and place, their existence in Iowa was extremely fragile and several participants described plans to search elsewhere for "somewhere to be ok".

From the perspective of the "weathering framework" introduced in Chapter 1, the narratives presented here speak to a process of dislocation and uprooting that may threaten collective social support resources that help mitigate the health consequences of structural disadvantage (Geronimus, 2000). Building on findings from Chapter 3, these

experiences of social and geographic 'rootlessness' speak to the importance of residential stability for low-income families.

The findings from Chapters 2 through 4 emphasize the importance of collective social resources for the health and well-being of low income individuals, in particular African American public-housing residents. These chapters provide a counter portrait to traditionally held assumptions of public-housing communities and their residents by documenting both the presence and significance of social ties in public-housing and among those who have left public-housing. A growing body of policy discourse and academic scholarship has emphasized the dispersal of poor households with the goal of breaking up harmful patterns of behavior that have allegedly developed within the social networks of the poor. However, the findings from this dissertation suggest that these social-networks may provide vital support that low-income families rely on to contend with the structural inequalities that policies of demolition and dispersal are unlikely to ameliorate. As suggested by the findings from Chapter 4, the demolition of public-housing and the redevelopment of urban areas have had a profound impact on the stability of social networks, but have also displaced people from the places that serve as anchors of social rootedness. Both Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 raise important questions about claims to contested urban space in the context of urban redevelopment and public-housing demolition.

In the simplest terms, both HOPE VI and Chicago's Plan for Transformation have contributed to a growing shortage of affordable housing in urban areas, raising questions about where poor people will live (Bennett, 2006). The demolition of public-housing eliminates a source of guaranteed shelter that is reserved for very low-income households

and replaces it with tenant based assistance that is contingent on market availability. As discussed in Chapter 2, this availability is particularly limited in gentrifying urban areas and tight rental markets where landlords have no incentive to accept voucher holders. In fact, given pervasive stereotypes of public-housing residents, particularly those who are African American, many landlords actively discriminate against voucher holders (Beck, 1996). Even advocates of the HOPE VI program have acknowledged that tenant based assistance in the form of vouchers may leave some public-housing tenants without options, particularly those who have large families or who are coping with mental and physical disabilities (Cisneros & Katz, 2004; Popkin, 2007).

Participants in Chapter 4 described the lived reality of finding housing in Chicago's tight rental market, an experience that contained financial and psychological costs. They described spending hundreds of dollars on application fees, only to be rejected from apartment after apartment and being able to afford housing only in neighborhoods that were not up to their standards of safety. They also described the tradeoff between dilapidated housing conditions and the material hardship associated with spending a large portion of their income on rent. Finally, they described having to confront neighborhood poverty and poor housing without the support of the family, friends and community organizations that they relied on in public-housing. Even families who had never lived in public-housing described the effects of demolition on their access to an affordable home. For example, one Iowa mover explained that because the CHA had to prioritize displaced public-housing tenants, others like her were pushed farther down on already long waiting lists.

Despite their stated intentions, HOPE VI and the Plan for Transformation may

have done little to improve real "housing choice" for low-income families. However, these programs have dramatically contributed to a shifting urban landscape. In Chicago and other urban areas, the demolition of public-housing has made poverty less visible and moved it away from central city neighborhoods that have become areas of economic growth (Bennett, 2006; Bennett, Hudspeth, Wright, & . 2006; Crump, 2002; Harvey, 2000). The irony of HOPE VI is that in the name of deconcentrating poverty and creating mixed income communities, the program has often displaced low-income families from neighborhoods that were already on their way to becoming mixed-income as a result of gentrification (Bennett et al., 2006; Bennett & Reed, 1999; National Housing Law Project, 2002). Some analysts have suggested that it was the marketability of these up-and-coming neighborhoods that led to the removal of their more marginalized inhabitants, not the other way around (Bennett et al., 2006; Bennett & Reed, 1999; National Housing Law Project, 2002).

The removal of stigmatized public-housing projects and their residents has supported a neoliberal reimagining of urban space that seeks to stimulate investment and growth through the creation of 'safe' zones of commerce, and to market the city as a commodity in and of itself (Maskovsky, 2006; Reuben, 2001). Advocates of HOPE VI have proclaimed its success in "creating markets where markets did not formerly exist" (Cisneros & Katz, 2004). Through partnerships with private developers, formerly public spaces are commodified and marketed to higher income renters. In cities across the country, the commodification of urban space has, according to Logan and Molotch (1987) privileged the "market values" of urban space over the "use values" (place-based social networks of exchange and support, small businesses, neighborhood organizations

and emotional attachments) of its residents. Rather than investing in neighborhoods to improve conditions for their residents, the neoliberal development model constructs the city as a place of consumption, not only for its new population of higher income residents, but also for tourists and suburbanite visitors (Reuben, 2001). The city becomes a product in and of itself, a destination as well as a home (Perez, 2002). The participants in Chapter 4, like many other residents of gentrifying urban areas, are often absent from this product because they have been removed, through the demolition of their homes or rising rents, to areas on the outskirts of the city that are passed over by uneven-development, or perhaps as Chapter 4 suggests, outside of cities altogether (Bennett, 2006; Reuben, 2001). This process is evident not only in Chicago but in other gentrifying urban areas (Davis, 2006; Harvey, 2000; Maskovsky, 2006; Reichl, 1999).

The case of New Orleans is particularly interesting and important for future study. Before Hurricane Katrina struck in August of 2005, the project of reinventing New Orleans was well underway. In 2002, despite large-scale resident protests, the housing authority used HOPE VI funds to leverage a partnership with a private real estate firm that funded the demolition of public-housing that was located between two profitable tourist districts. After Katrina, this same real estate firm (the Urban land Institute) became a central player in a market based model of rebuilding the city (Davis, 2006). This model prioritized profitability in its redevelopment plan and excluded public-housing and other low-income units that had long been considered obstacles to the city's success (Reed & Steinberg, 2006). Low-income minority families are vastly over-represented among those who have not returned to New Orleans, perhaps because they live in areas that were the hardest hit by the hurricane, but perhaps also because they have

been excluded from the new vision of post -Katrina New Orleans (Logan, 2006). Many of these displaced individuals remain in other states, far from networks of family and friends. Preliminary data from qualitative interviews with displaced New Orleans residents suggests experiences of social and geographic rootlessness similar to those described by participants in Chapter 4 (Waters, 2009).

The reimagining of urban space that has occurred in Chicago, New Orleans and in other cities across the country is reinforced, not only by the displacement of poor people, but by discursive processes that necessitates their removal. One-dimensional constructions of public-housing communities as "islands of despair" that are plagued by crime, joblessness and material hardship and are devoid of social resources and collective agency, reinforce pervasive popular stereotypes of urban poverty and creates a moral imperative for relocation. The problems that affect these communities are no doubt real, however, according to Thompson (1998) the possibility that poor people may have amassed geographically rooted social resources that are critical to their survival is often considered unimportant or secondary to the facilitation of their escape from the "ghetto". From another perspective, the removal of poor people is required to serve the larger goals of development and growth. If the poor are considered 'responsible' for the conditions that exist in high poverty urban areas, than urban growth can only occur in their absence. There is no possibility for strategies of urban revitalization that occur without displacement, improving the conditions of low-income neighborhoods *for* and in collaboration *with* their residents.

Popular stereotypes of urban poverty may also create barriers to the creation of the 'mixed income' communities that HOPE VI seeks to engineer. In the presence of these

198

stereotypes, such new developments will likely only be marketable to higher income tenants if the proportion of low-income residents remains small. Indeed this is how HOPE VI has operated at most sites (National Housing Law Project, 2002). The number of low-income families is kept to a minimum according to naturalized ideas of race and class based "tipping points"(Wilen & Stasell, 2006), which themselves are at least partially determined by dominant popular stereotypes. For the former public-housing residents who remain in new mixed-income communities or relocate to other "opportunity" areas, as did the participants in Chapter 4, the persistence of these stereotypes may produce stigmatization that has health consequences. With a few exceptions (Briggs, 1998; Brophy & Smith, 1997; Greenbaum, 2002; Pattillo, 2007), issues of class and race-based stigma have largely been overlooked by the literature on housing mobility and poverty deconcentration. As mentioned above, this is an important area for future investigations of both redeveloped HOPE VI sites and of 'mixed-income' neighborhoods that are emerging in gentrifying urban areas.

It is critical that future academic studies of public-housing communities and low-income minority communities in general, work to combat one dimensional stereotypes of urban poverty by providing a deeper understanding of the collective agency and social resources that they contain. It will be particularly important to understand how low-income families negotiate and resist the processes of gentrification that are occurring in and around their neighborhoods. Recent ethnographic work has begun to do this by documenting not only resistance to displacement, but also the contestation of discursive constructions that have justified it (Greenbaum, 2008; Perez, 2002; Pfeiffer, 2006; Reichl, 1999; Wright et al., 2006). The ability of ethnography to explore the ways that

structural factors play out in everyday lives and are understood and acted on within local

settings offers a unique lens for understanding experiences of neighborhood change.

Ethnographic studies may also offer a valuable contribution to public health literature that

has considered the "effects" of place on low-income urban communities, but has largely

excluded the subjective experiences of place that may play important roles in the social

production of health and illness. In addition to ethnographic studies, epidemiologic

studies are also needed to better understand the health consequences of neighborhood

change, both for those who remain in gentrifying urban areas and for those who are

displaced from them.

    The intention of this critical evaluation of the HOPE VI program, Chicago's Plan for

Transformation, and the urban redevelopment that has occurred in many center city areas,

is not to suggest that the existing conditions of inadequately maintained public-housing,

residential segregation and concentrated poverty should not be addressed. Quality

housing, safe neighborhoods and access to resources are certainly necessary prerequisites

to health and well-being and persistent racial segregation and concentrated poverty are no

doubt fundamental causes of the excess morbidity and mortality that is experienced in

high poverty urban areas. However, as suggested by evidence presented in this

dissertation, programs such as HOPE VI have done little to change these conditions.

These programs do not address the underlying inequalities of race and class that produced

these conditions in the first place and in fact may reinforce them (Geronimus &

Thompson, 2004; Thompson, 1998). Additionally, as discussed above, programs that

aim to address race and class based segregation with mobility may conveniently serve the

interest of urban "growth regimes" by providing a moral imperative for the removal of

poor people from their homes.

As a remedy to the shortcomings of desegregation and deconcentration initiatives,
Calmore and Forman advocate for policies of "non segregation" which "implies both the
right of people to remain indefinitely where they are, even if in ghetto areas, and the
elimination of restrictions on moving into other area" (quoted in Wilen and Stassel, p.
247). A non-segregation approach recognizes the importance of quality housing,
neighborhood resources and freedom from racially restrictive housing practices.
However, in the context of persistent popular and institutionalized racism, such an
approach also recognizes and respects the decision to live in among co-ethnic neighbors
where rich and dense ties may buffer experiences of racial exclusion. Du Bois argued that
the struggle for integration should not undermine the recognition of strength and agency
that exists in the African American community stating that, "Never in the world should
our fight be against association with ourselves because by that very token, we give up the
whole argument that we are worth associating with" (quoted in Thompson, 1998, p.197).
This perspective, combined with policies that combat housing discrimination, and
provide resources for urban neighborhoods and their *current* residents, may be an
important strategy to protect real "housing choice" for low-income families.

References

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Osypuk, T., Werbel, R., Meara, E., Cutler, D., & Berkman, L. (2004). Does Housing Mobility Improve Health? *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(1), 49-98.

Beck, P. (1996). Fighting Section 8 Discrimination: The Fair Housing Act's new Frontier. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review,* 31.

Bennett, L. (2006). Downtown Restructuring and Public Housing in Contemporary Chicago: Fashioning a Better World Class-City. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities pp. 282-301). New York: ME Sharpe.

Bennett, L., Hudspeth, N., Wright, P., & . (2006). A Critical Analysis of the ABLA Redevelopment Plan. In L. Bennett, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing pp. 185-215). New York: ME Sharpe.

Bennett, L., & Reed, A. (1999). The New Face of Urban Renewal: the Near North Redevelopment Initiative and the Cabrini-Green. In A. Reed (Ed.), Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality pp. 176-192). Boulder: Westview Press.

Briggs, X. (1998). Brown Kids in White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate,* 9(1), 177-214.

Brophy, P., & Smith, R. (1997). Mixed Income Housing: Factors for Success. *Cityscape,* 3(2), 3-31.

Cisneros, H., & Katz, B. (2004). Keep HOPE (VI) Alive.

Crowley, S., Pelletiere, D., & Foscarinis, M. (2009). Renters in Crisis. National Low Income Housing Coalition.

Crump, J. (2002). Deconcentration by Demolition: Public Housing Policy, Poverty and Urban Policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 20, 581-596.

Davis, M. (2006). Who is Killing New Orleans. *The Nation,* April 10:, 11-20.

Fullilove, M. (2001). Root Shock: The Consequences of African American Dispossession. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine,* 78(1).

Fullilove, M. (2004). Root Shock: How Tearing up City Neighborhoods Hurts America and What We Can Do about It. New York: Balantine Books.

Geronimus, A. T. (2000). To Mitigate, Resist, or Undo: Addressing Structural Influences on the Health of Urban Populations. *Am J Public Health,* 90(6), 867.

Geronimus, A. T., & Thompson, J. P. (2004). To Denigrate, Ignore or Disrupt: Racial Inequality in Health and the Impact of a Policy Induced Breakdown of African American Communities. *Du Bois Review,* 1(2), 247-279.

Greenbaum, S. (2002). Social Capital and Deconcentration: Theoretical and Policy Paradoxes of the HOPE VI Program. *North American Dialogue,* 5(1), 9-13.

Greenbaum, S. (2008). Poverty and the Willful Destruction of Social Capital: Displacement and Dispossession in African American Communities. *Rethinking Marxism,* 20(1), 42-54.

Harvey, D. (2000). Spaces of Hope. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jackson, J. (2003). Harlem World: Doing Race and Class in Contemporary Black America.

Logan, J. (2006). The Impact of Katrina: Race and Class in Storm-Damaged Neighborhoods. Hurricane Katrina Project, Initiative on Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences. Brown University.

Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place. London: University of California Press.

Maskovsky, J. (2006). Governing the "new hometowns": Race, power, and neighborhood participation in the new inner city. *Identities-Global Studies in Culture and Power,* 13(1), 73-99.

Mullings, L., & Wali, A. (1999). Stress and Resilience: The Social Context of Reproduction in Central Harlem. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

National Housing Law Project. (2002). False HOPE: A Critical Assessment of the HOPE

VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program.

Pattillo, M. (2007). Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Perez, G. (2002). The Other Real World: Gentrification and the Social Construction of Place in Chicago. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems,* 31(1).

Pfeiffer, D. (2006). Displacement through Discourse: Implementing and Contesting Public Housing Redevelopment in Cabrini Green. *Urban Anthropology,* 35(1), 39-67.

Popkin, S. (2007). Testimony of Susan Popkin, Urban Institute, prepared for the hearing on S.829 HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act, June 20, 2007.

Reed, A., & Steinberg, S. (2006). Liberal Bad Faith in the Wake of Katrina. The Black Commentator.

Reichl, A. (1999). Learning from St. Thomas: Community, Capital and the Redevelopment of Public Housing in New Orleans. *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 21(2), 169-187.

Reuben, M. (2001). Suburbanization and Urban Poverty under Neoliberalism. In J. G. a. J. Maskovsky (Ed.), The New Poverty Studies pp. 435-470). New York: NYU Press.

Smith, J., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Public Housing Transformation: Evolving National Policy. In L. Bennett, Smith, J, Wright, P. (Ed.), Where Are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.

Thompson, J. P. (1998). Universalism and Deconcentration: Why Race Still Matters in Poverty and Economic Development. *Politics and Society,* 26(2), 181-219.

Wallace, D., & Wallace, R. (1998). A Plague on Your Houses: How New York was Burned Down and National Public Health Crumbled. London ; New York :: Verso.

Wallace, R., Wallace, D., Ullmann, J. E., & Andrews, H. (1999). Deindustrialization, inner-city decay, and the hierarchical diffusion of AIDS in the USA: How neoliberal and cold war policies magnified the ecological niche for emerging infections and created a national security crisis. *Environment and Planning A,* 31(1), 113-139.

Waters, M. (2009). Adversity and Resilience after Hurricane Katrina. University of Michigan Poverty Center Seminar Series. Ann Arbor, Michigian.

Wilen, W., & Stasell, W. (2006). Gatreaux and Chicago's Public Housing Crisis: The Conflict Between Achieving Integration and Providing Decent Housing for Very Low Income African Americans. In L. Bennet, J. Smith & P. Wright (Eds.), Where are Poor People to Live: Transforming Public Housing Communities? (p. 239). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Wright, P., Bennett, L., Smith, J., & Wright, P. (2006). Community Resistance to CHA Transformation: the History, Evolution, Struggles, and Accomplishments of the Coalition to Protect Public Housing. In Anonymous (Ed.), Where are Poor People to Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities. New York: ME Sharpe.