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Abstract

The goal of this study is to understand how residents may benefit from living in a mixed income, HOPE VI development in the South. This analysis focuses on a former housing project and its immediate neighborhood in the aftermath of HOPE VI revitalization. I conducted a case study by utilizing original data collected from in-depth, semi-structured interviews and unstructured interviews, along with administrative records, evaluation data, media accounts, observation, and casual encounters. A unique contribution of this study of a HOPE VI development is that it also addresses the surrounding neighborhood. Furthermore, this case study offers a unique lens for examining contemporary black gentrification in a publicly constructed space.

A major finding of this study is that complex intra-racial social dynamics among African American community members may stem from HOPE VI intervention. Specifically, there may be limited positive interaction among residents in the development, and between them and residents of the proximate exterior neighborhood. Further, the nature of constrained interaction manufactures divisive processes for claiming space and community identity that may potentially have negative consequences for renters.

These consequences stem from a reproduction of space and community, which shapes social control, policing, and exclusion contests, among other tensions. Overall, this study brings to bear some unimagined consequences of HOPE VI that potentially neutralize anticipated benefits of mixed income living for the poor, based on real and
perceived alterations of class, mobility, and shared identity in and around the development site.
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Long they stood together peering over the gray unresting water.
“John,” she said, "does it make every one unhappy when they study and learn lots of things?"
He paused and smiled. “I am afraid it does,” he said.

"And, John, are you glad you studied?"
"Yes," came the answer, slowly but positively.

She watched the flickering lights upon the sea, and said thoughtfully,
“I wish I was unhappy,—and—and,” putting both arms about his neck, “I think I am, a little, John.”

1. Introduction

Southern City, similar to many recipients of Housing Opportunity for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) funds, has a colorful, historical narrative of how its first public housing project, Short Hills, was targeted for revitalization to advance broader visions for poverty deconcentration. Southern City eventually considered Short Hills, like many American housing projects, to be a critical social problem. Crime, decay, and concentrated disadvantage were reported to plague the community, its residents, and the city as a whole. As it approached its 50th anniversary in 2000, Southern City decided it was time to demolish its first public housing site.

Public housing—both the maiden successes and failures of subsequent decline—stands as a branding feature of American social policy. By the late 20th century, public housing was under attack. Waning political support along with deteriorating financial functionality (see Goetz 2011 for excellent summary) left much of the nation’s public housing in crisis. To address those conditions, the 1989 National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH) declared a “clear need” for a national program. In response to those recommendations, 1992 federal HOPE VI program legislation aimed to transform public housing communities by replacing projects with mixed income developments (HUD 1999; Goetz 2000; Smith 2002; Popkin et al. 2004; Joseph 2006; Vale 2006).

HOPE VI emerged as a response to the public housing crisis. It aims to deconcentrate poverty and to provide “greater opportunities for the upward mobility of
[public housing] families” (HUD 1996, 19710). Accumulated perceptions of persistent deprivation in public housing—negligible SES diversity, concentrated poverty, social isolation, disinvestment, aberrant pathologies, and culture of poverty—have fostered HOPE VI. “Deconcentration strategies assume that a better neighborhood-level income mix will lead to improved economic opportunities for poor residents….the creation of mixed-income neighborhoods is assumed to yield a more positive reproduction of social space” (Oakley et al. 2011, 825). In addition to altering the physical landscape, HOPE VI seeks to purposefully construct demographic shifts in targeted housing projects.

In Southern City, Short Hills was chosen as a site of such transformation. To accomplish both person- and place-based goals, HOPE VI entails federal grant making to public housing authorities (PHAs). Nationally, HOPE VI projects have been deployed extensively, having substantial physical and fiscal impact on locales with severely distressed public housing. By June 2010, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) reported that it had awarded more than $6.1 billion for 254 grants to 134 public housing authorities (PHAs) between 1992 and 2010. The Short Hills HOPE VI revitalization grant announcement from HUD restated the objectives of the program (Table 1 below).

Table 1: HUD HOPE VI Objectives

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Improve public housing by demolishing severely distressed public housing projects, such as high-rises and barracks-style apartments, and replace them with townhouses or garden-style apartments that blend aesthetically into the surrounding community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Reduce concentrations of poverty by encouraging a mix of incomes among public housing residents and by encouraging working families to move into housing that is part of revitalized communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Provide support services, such as education and training programs, childcare services, transportation and counseling to help public housing residents get and keep jobs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Establish and enforce high standards of personal and community responsibility through explicit lease requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Forge partnerships that involve public housing residents, state and local government officials, the private sector, non-profit groups and the community-at-large in planning and implementing new communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2000, Southern City’s proposal for Short Hills was one of the selected grantees from a pool of 74 applicants seeking a total of approximately $1.8 billion to address distressed public housing (HUD 2009). HUD awarded the Southern City Housing Authority $35 million to revitalize Short Hills into a mixed income HOPE VI development. Built into the stated objectives in Table 1 are strong assumptions about low-income communities, their residents, and circumstances: (1) public housing residents are not part of the surrounding community, (2) a more diverse income mix bringing working families into contact with nonworking families is meaningful, (3) low-income residents are unable to get and keep jobs without intervention and guidance, (4) existing levels of personal and collective responsibility among public housing residents are

---

relatively inadequate, and, (5) improvement in public housing centered neighborhoods
necessitates an externally driven mobilization process. The overall goal of my study is to
explain the reproduction of the neighborhood from a low income housing project into a
mixed income community after HOPE VI, and to answer whether mixed income
substantiates improvement, stability and, further, justified intervention and displacement
in the lives of those who previously inhabited the space.

Although the implementation of each HOPE VI project varies somewhat in
content, intent, and design, the guiding vision for life inside revitalized developments
consistently maintains helping the poor by having a select group of them live in
proximity to moderate- to middle-income households (Epp 1996; Smith 2002; HUD
2003). Many of the anticipated potential outcomes of HOPE VI, especially the benefits to
the poor, are primarily rooted in hopes for amended social-economic-political dynamics
(Wilson 1987; Kleit 2001; Arthurson 2002; Joseph 2006; Joseph et al., 2007; Kearns and
Mason 2007) that will improve their situational context as newly arrived, higher income
residents propagate mainstream values and norms. Expectations for mixed income
communities include improved social networks, more desirable forms of social control
and behavioral/cultural norms, and better political economy of place through improved
range of attention, resources, and infrastructure (Epp 1996; HUD 2003; Kleit 2005;
Joseph 2006; Joseph et al. 2007; Manzo 2008).

Contrary to conventional assumptions underlying HOPE VI initiatives, existing
research documents that in general neighbors are increasingly distant and those lacking
homophily are unlikely to connect (Galster and Booza 2007; Putnam 2007; Lees 2008).
An emerging literature on the lives of HOPE VI residents has begun to document the everyday realities experienced in these settings (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Graves 2010; Tach 2009; Kleit 2005; and Owens 2012). Notably, Kleit (2005) suggested that lack of interaction among mixed income residents might preclude benefits of positive neighborhood effects. Tach (2009) and Owens (2012) have produced two studies that assess the importance of residents’ perceptions when examining connections made (or the lack of them) in a mixed income HOPE VI site.

This study focuses on the revitalized Short Hills housing development, Murphy Manor, and adjacent homeownership, New Village. I collected original resident narratives to ascertain the nature and quality of contact among neighbors. While conducting this study, the significance of perceptions, compounded by artificial processes of knowing the community, became clear to me, especially sharp recognition of the fact that residents did not interact across status lines nor build close relationships among renters. Specially, inimical cleavages between bordering low-income, subsidized homeowners and HOPE VI renters were a principal original finding of this study.

Although interaction is the proposed mechanism for disseminating certain benefits of mixing income, after a HOPE VI initiative is underway, less is understood about the creation of community and opportunity. I argue that examining HOPE VI within the broader context of the neighborhood makes complex dimensions of difference apparent, particularly between low-income and more affluent residents. My research takes particular interest in how HOPE VI residents in Murphy Manor are perceived by others in the neighborhood in which the development is imbedded, New Village. I
explore whether or not HOPE VI efforts translate into distinct alterations in residents’ perceptions of closeness, neighboring, personal safety, and satisfaction with social interaction. My examination focused on how status hierarchies are manufactured and maintained among external homeowners and HOPE VI renters.

The neighborhood in this study is an African American community that remained racially homogenous after HOPE VI. At the time of demolition, the Short Hills area was nearly 100% black. Even with mixed income redevelopment, Southern City, like many other southern sites, experienced little racial demographic change after revitalization (see Goetz 2011 for excellent discussion of racial segregation in HOPE VI sites and for an explanation of black gentrification after HOPE VI). Therefore, this study also examines intra-racial class dynamics among community members and asks whether HOPE VI constructs new dimensions of class difference or whether it produces homophily, connections based on perceptions of similarities, along racial lines. I argue that a key dimension of difference is whether a resident owns or rents. I attempt to better understand processes of inclusion and exclusion, barriers and functions of interaction within and beyond the immediate HOPE VI site. I identify barriers to interaction across status group, buttressed by negative stereotypes of the poor that characterize the production of difference and fractured community.

Overall, this study brings to bear some unimagined consequences of HOPE VI that potentially negate anticipated benefits of mixed income living for the poor. Indeed, residents themselves describe benefits from HOPE VI narrowly along the lines of physical change; for example, improved housing units, architectural and design features,
and more desirable space. However, corroborating existing research, I find resistance to forming social ties is a key theme within and around Murphy Manor. An important original finding from this particular case study is that there is systematic distancing between Murphy Manor and other residents of New Village.

These dynamics may be a significant determinant in the redevelopment of Short Hills, and the ways ineffectual relations manifest to obstruct positive neighborhood effects for the poor after HOPE VI. Further, the nature of constrained interaction manufactures divisive processes for claiming space and community identity that may potentially have negative consequences for poorer renters in the HOPE VI development. These consequences stem from a restrictive, elite reproduction of space and community, which shapes social control, policing, and exclusion contests, among other tensions.

This dissertation is organized into eight chapters. Chapter 2 provides an overview and historical outline of low income housing in the US and briefly discusses preceding mobility programs predicated on neighborhood effects, Gautreaux and MTO. Both were employed in the design and introduction of HOPE VI. Chapter 3 explains the rationale and justification for HOPE VI. I discuss the poverty deconcentration narrative behind constructing mixed income communities and pertinent theories backing the mixed income design features that define HOPE VI. This chapter also provides a brief overview of the literature on the lived experience in HOPE VI developments. In the next chapter I explain my research methods. For this study, I utilize participant observation, fieldwork, unstructured interviews, in depth semi-structured interviews (50 original and 25 secondary), administrative records and data, casual encounters, and media accounts.
Chapter 5 provides background information about the Short Hills HOPE VI program in Southern City. Chapter 6 and 7 report the central analytical findings from this research. Chapter 6 examines residents’ social dynamics that stem from HOPE VI intervention. It illuminates patterns of interaction among neighbors. I discuss shifts in neighboring, relationships, and community and highlight patterns of contact in and around the HOPE VI site. Chapter 7 focuses on construction and production of difference in the community and the subsequent negative perceptions and expectations of those residents in HOPE VI. Throughout both of these chapters, I rely heavily on the voices and narratives of the residents. In my conclusion, I offer a synopsis of my research findings and initial examination of additional narratives that explain the consequential functions of barriers to social relations after HOPE VI. I end with a discussion of policy implications and recommendations for further research.
2. Evolution of Housing Policy

This chapter provides a brief overview of the provision of public housing in the U.S and the introduction of the HOPE VI program. Historically, federal housing policy has been reactive, offering solutions to concerns of “overpopulation, deindustrialization, racial segregation, central city disinvestment, inadequate design, and concentrated inner city poverty” (Owens 2012, 18).

Federal rental assistance provides housing to many poor households-- 4.4 million units in the year 2012-- but does so in the face of shortages and long wait lists across the country, serving just a fraction in need.¹ The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (2012) reported that the number of assisted rental units is only sufficient to serve one in four eligible families. HUD (2011) reported to Congress that 7.1 million unassisted households were very poor renters who paid more than half of their income for rent (severe rent burden), lived in severely inadequate conditions, or both. Further, the Worst Case Housing Needs 2009: Report to Congress projected a continued upward trend; severe rent burdens had increased by almost 42% since 2001.² Further, the HUD (2010)

¹ “HUD Rental Assistance in Urban and Rural Areas.” The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities reported that the three largest rental assistance program, Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, Public Housing and Multifamily Assistance units provide over 4.4 million units of assisted housing as of February 2012. “Public housing: Provides affordable housing to 1.1 million families through units owned and managed by local public housing agencies (PHAs). Families are required to pay 30 percent of their income for rent. Project-based assisted housing: Provides assistance to 1.3 million families living in privately owned rental housing. The assistance is attached to the units, which are reserved for low-income families that are required to pay 30 percent of their income for rent. Tenant-based rental assistance: The Section 8 voucher program supplements rent payments of more than 2.0 million families in the private rental market. The program is administered through state and local housing agencies. Although 30 percent of income is the rent baseline, families often pay more and use these portable subsidies to locate housing of their choice.” Available at: http://www.cbpp.org/files/RentalAssistance-RuralFactsheetandMethodology.pdf
Annual Homeless Assessment Report estimated that 643,067 people were homeless at a single point in time. Given this current landscape, policymakers continue to develop solutions to serve more households and to maximize returns from the investments made in housing assistance programs.

2.1 Public Housing

Before a national policy was introduced, housing for the needy was provided through orphanages, low-income farms, and veterans’ homes, locally and at the county level (Aiken and Alford 1970; Katz 1986; Lusignan 2002). By the onset of the Great Depression, urban migration sparked by industrialization, squalor, and housing shortages raised concern for the need for more affordable units, at the federal level (Lusignan 2002; Vale 2011; Owens 2012). The 1933 National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) appropriated the Public Works Administration (PWA). The Housing Division of the PWA had authority to finance and construct, or pioneer the U.S’s public housing; it supported the first 21,640 units in 49 projects across 36 metropolitan areas between 1933 and 1937 (Coulibaly et al. 1998; Lusignan 2002).

Later, the Housing Act of 1937 (P.L. 93-383, Sec. 2) was introduced. Radford (2000) outlined this legislation, known as the Wagner Act, which established local public housing authorities (PHAs), funding, and a national administrative apparatus. Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin (2011) noted “the 1937 Act was as much about economic
development and job creation in the context of the Depression as it was about housing the poor” (4). They contend that this act emerged partly, “out of a conjuncture of unemployment, labor organizing, homelessness, the harsh conditions of tenement housing…and compromises made with the building, real estate, and banking industries” (Fraser, Oakley, and Bazuin 2011, 3). Approximately 370 projects, which housed nearly 120,000 families from the “submerged middle class”, were constructed by 1940 (Friedman 1968, United States 1937; Bauman 1987; Atlas and Dreier 1992; Marcuse 1995; Lusignan 2002). Until the 1940s and 1950s, this early public housing was viewed as a stepping stone or a reward for working Americans, not as a safety net for the extremely destitute (Vale 2000; Friedman 1968). Further,

“Rather than develop a more aggressive right-to-housing approach…which…ensures that all people have access to housing that meets their basic human needs and allows them the financial conditions to pursue an upward mobility strategy, the public policy…provided adequate housing for workers that kept them alive and available to work. People who did not or could not work were excluded” (Fraser, Oakley and Bazuin 2011, 5).

Such policies required that unwed pregnant women be evicted, promoted two parent households, mandated head of household employment, required records of good housekeeping, and enforced strict tenancy rules (Bauer 1957; Spain 1996; Marcuse 1995; Bratt 1986).

When the Housing Act of 1949 (P.L. 87-71, Sec. 2) relaxed the interpretation of the deserving poor, the tenor of rental housing assistance shifted permanently. The Act
implemented the first upward mobility penalties by capping household incomes in public housing (Bratt 1986; United States 1949). Resident selection policies increasingly clustered the neediest families in housing projects while the working class exited. This Act also provided for the acquisition of slums and blighted land as attractive sights for new construction (Owens 2012; Bauman, Biles, and Szylvian 2000), which continued to concentrate even more assisted households in already compromised spaces.

From its origin, public housing had been designed to support prevailing patterns of racial segregation (Connerly 2005; Value 2000; Bauman 1987; Williams 2004; Sugure 1998; Hirsch 1998; Bratt 1986; Marcuse 1986; Massey and Denton 1993; Popkin 2008; Sugrue 2005). Eventually, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 led to the legalized desegregation of housing projects. Title VI of this Act formally prohibited discrimination in public housing; yet, ultimately, patterns of white flight resulted in minority populations increasingly dominating a larger proportion of housing projects (Julian and Daniel 1989; Pritchett 2003). Popkin (2008) asserts that entrenched, de facto, patterns of racial segregation in US urban centers generally mitigated movement toward racial integration in the projects.

In addition, the majority of supplementary public housing was constructed in very poor, highly segregated black neighborhoods (Freeman 2004; Goering et al. 1997; Newman and Schnare 1997). Further, much public housing also was built in undesirable areas, near railroad tracks, highways, and industrial zones (McCarthy 2005). While rental assistance policy successfully increased the number of units available to vulnerable families, over time, it also institutionalized public housing as an exceedingly segregated
space for poor minorities (Feins, Merrill et al. 1994; McCarthy 2005; Quercia and Galster 1999).

During the 1980s and 1990s, housing projects increasingly commanded public attention. Public housing gradually had become housing of last resort (Vale 2011). Operations and maintenance were inadequate (McCarthy 2005). Since the rent receipts were very low (rent is capped at 30% of resident income) from the impoverished population housed, PHA budgets did not sustain adequate management (McCarthy 2005). Severely distressed conditions in public housing had crystallized.

During the late 20th century, public housing areas, generally, reflected patterns of hypersegregation and concentrated poverty (Bickford and Massey 1991; Massey and Denton 1993). Coulibaly et al. (1998) noted that two-thirds of the public housing in the US had 80% or more of its units inhabited by members of a single racial-ethnic group. Goering and Kamely (1997) also found that in the 1990s the average African-American public housing tenant lived in a development that was 85% black.

In addition to racial segregation, concentrated poverty also characterized public housing neighborhoods. Over time, segregation patterns, urban renewal, and convention have intersected, sifting many minority recipients of housing assistance into poor neighborhoods. Popkin (2008) reports that nearly 80% of public housing residents lived in poverty by the 1990s, many deeply below the poverty threshold.

The conditions of hypersegregation and concentrated poverty in public housing left many residents situated in isolated economic disadvantage and disregarded politically. Families living in severely distressed public housing remained tied to an
intricate system of obstacles. For example, these neighborhoods typically were characterized as having unstable institutions, low levels of business development, poorly performing schools, limited opportunities for employment, inadequate public goods, and structures in physical disrepair. Such constraints directly and indirectly shape the geography of opportunity.

The media was rife with reports of the physical, managerial, and social problems plaguing housing developments, in cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, and NYC (for examples see Schill 1993). Accounts of appalling conditions, corrupt administrators, and innocent bystanders killed by gang warfare were commonplace (Schill 1993; see Vale 2011 for review). Negative images of public housing even found way into popular culture. Bestsellers, like Kotlowitz’s (1991) There are No Children Here, recounted the hardships of life in public housing, while films, like New Jack City (1991) and Candyman (1992), depicted life in housing projects as a horror story (see also Schill 1993). By the 1990s, HUD affirmed that many public housing communities were

---

destructive environments for residents and the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing was commissioned to respond to its problems (NCSDPH 1992).

Yet, despite all of its problems and failures, public housing policy during the 20th century attempted to and had observable success in providing many low- and moderate-income Americans with decent, affordable housing. Since its inception, in light of shifting priorities, HUD consistently has justified public efforts to provide housing to those the private market is unwilling or unable to serve.

However, the original public housing program led to a concentration of destitute families in resource-scarce environments. Today, policy reform is eliminating housing projects in a retreat from severely distressed conditions that may have crystallized because of what is now viewed as “bad” housing policy for the poor (NCSDPH 1992). Reflecting a sentiment that “projects are bad and people need to get out,” the former model of operating mass physical units to contain the low-income has gone out of fashion:

HUD believes that the intentional mixing of incomes and working status of residents, if done with care, can enhance the quality of life for residents while

family living in Chicago's Robert Taylor Homes). Candyman (TriStar Pictures, 1992). For less grisly, but no less disturbing, depictions, see Menace II Society (1993); New Jack City, 1991); Straight Out of Brooklyn (Samuel Goldwyn Co., 1991
improving the economic viability of…former public housing, and strengthen neighborhoods (1).4

The Gautreaux program, Moving To Opportunity (MTO), and Housing Opportunity for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) all reflect concern about whether households are able to navigate pathways out of rental assistance dependency and chronic poverty successfully in the absence of more affluent neighbors. In The Truly Disadvantaged, Williams Julius Wilson (1987) described what he perceived as the grave condition of the black ghetto after the exit of the middle class. Wilson’s has been an influential voice, relevant to the theoretical foundations for HOPE VI and its antecedent mobility programs.

In contrast to the contemporary ills of the ghetto, Wilson offered a historical narrative of flourishing, “vertically integrated” black communities that underwent decline due to deindustrialization and the flight of a middle class relocated after desegregation. According to Wilson, these factors left remaining residents worse off: trapped without jobs, facing weakened neighborhood stability, and experiencing a shift toward negative social norms as ghettoization ensued. O’Connor (2001) succinctly noted that the interconnected concepts of social isolation, disorganization, and the effects of concentrated poverty have been used to further rationalize how exit of the middle-class left the worse off behind (272). This is relevant to contemporary attempts to privilege higher income residents in reclaiming these spaces and communities.

While Wilson’s work was not exclusive to examination of public housing, he situated his study in Chicago-area ghetto neighborhoods. Wilson described an isolated population bearing routine low employment rates, lack of opportunity, family instability, and deepening social isolation exacerbated by the exit of the middle class. Wilson defines social isolation as “the lack of contact or of sustained interaction with individuals and institutions that represent mainstream society.” As conditions worsened, this produced poor job networks, erratic behavior patterns, and adaptive responses to persistent disadvantage that were dysfunctional (Wilson 1987, 61). A domino effect ensued according to Wilson, manifested in the rise of a permanent underclass. This left social behaviors unchecked, institutions weakened, social norms maladjusted, and hopelessness routine.

Wilson claimed that middle-class outmigration was detrimental to black communities because those residents once served as social buffers, gatekeepers of neighborhood stability, and role models for children and adults in the community; they represented economic opportunity, authority, and hope. For example, Wilson asserted that middle class residents played a major role in maintaining social and economic institutions, churches, schools, and businesses. Their exit ruined the social organization and structure of black neighborhoods as institutions once serving to absorb and offset shocks crumbled (Wilson 1987). Thus, the outmigration of the middle class is indispensable to Wilson’s theory of what results in and perpetuates a “tangle of pathology” (see Moynihan 1965).
The companion narrative, about the ghettoization of housing projects, anticipates a reversal by mixed income poverty deconcentration. Again, as the narrative has it, outmigration of the middle-class prompted further neighborhood deterioration; the resulting class segregation caused the increased magnitude of poverty and led to severely distressed conditions. These claims are essential, as a fundamental premise of HOPE VI stipulates that more middle or upper class persons reclaim ghettoized spaces to reverse neighborhood decline. Public housing agencies, pressured to meet operating costs, and real estate developers, motivated by profit, seized bringing higher income residents into revitalized public housing neighborhoods.

These interpretations fed the contemporary agenda to reclaim public housing spaces for a new population (former middle class exiters) in order to force vertical integration, the neighborhood effects described in Wilson’s narrative. A major expectation of HOPE VI is that higher income residents will resume the type of influence, especially as role models and agents of social control that Wilson ascribed to the black middle class before their exit (Epp 1996; Smith 2002; HUD 2003). These are the underpinnings for the view that poverty deconcentration, class integration, and neighborhood effects should be beneficial and positive for communities transformed by HOPE VI. Built upon such ideals, particularly, that of the benefits of higher income neighbors, Gautreaux, MTO, and especially, HOPE VI were borne.

2.2 Gautreaux program

A prelude to HOPE VI ideals, this voluntary anti-poverty, mobility program permitted families to “circumvent the ordinary barriers to living in suburbs, not by their
jobs, personal finances, or values, but by getting into the program, receiving a subsidy, and being assigned to white suburbs” (Rosenbaum, Reynolds, and Deluca 2001, 73). The Chicago-based Gautreaux program resulted from a 1976 Supreme Court order that charged resolution of racialized, concentrated poverty in housing projects. Gautreaux was one of the first programs to utilize tenant-based relocation vouchers to disperse poor families from public housing projects (for detail, see Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000) and give them access to lower poverty, majority neighborhoods. Gautreaux set as a special goal moving households to census tracts no greater than 30% black. Through Gautreaux, families moved across a broader geographical space when encouraged to relocate to middle-income white suburbs (Rosenbaum, Reynolds, and Deluca 2001; Keels 2005; Mendenhall et al. 2006).

Between 1976 and 1998, nearly 7,000 low income, black families participated. However, only about one-third of families were considered for the housing voucher treatment (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000). Nineteen percent of those eligible families relocated successfully (Rosenbaum 1993, 1995; Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000). According to Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum (2000), Gautreaux selection criteria “cream-skimmed” by excluding families with more than four children or criminal records and by privileging those with a satisfactory history of rent payment and housekeeping assessments.

Two-thirds of the first wave of Gautreaux families placed in the suburbs continued to live there 22 years later; this persistence is considered evidence of success in a federally sanctioned residential mobility program (Keels et al. 2006). Most benefits
accrued to children who relocated to the suburbs (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000); as adults, children who moved to the suburbs with their mothers lived in neighborhoods with higher educational attainment levels, less poverty, and more racial integration than their pre-Gautreaux neighborhoods (Keels 2005). While there were initial improvements in maternal employment, Mendenhall et al. (2006) found no employment advantages from relocation to the suburbs, in the long run. Despite the fact that there was high selectivity, or “cream-skimming,” of participants at the outset of the program, it remains unclear whether Gautreaux findings demonstrate improved personal outcomes for families. Gautreaux did not address the structural issues that constrain many low income households; its findings, however, often were, “cited as definitive rather than suggestive of the benefits of poverty deconcentration and mixed income strategies” for new programs like MTO and HOPE VI (Popkin 2008; Popkin et al. 2000).

2.3 MTO

The activities of Gautreaux solidified interest in effective strategies for addressing mobility and poverty in public housing through federal programming. A subsequent initiative, the MTO program, was a randomized experiment targeting low-income families to volunteer for the opportunity to move from public housing or private assisted projects to low-poverty neighborhoods in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York between 1994 and 1998 (Orr et al. 2003). While Gautreaux’s aim was to promote racial integration, MTO focused on improving neighborhood economic status (Duncan 2008). A primary goal was to relocate families to census tracts with poverty rates below 10% (Mendenhall et al. 2006).
Approximately 4,600 families were recruited, 3,169 families were offered vouchers, and 1,676 were able to find a unit and successfully move (Orr et al. 2003). Different from Gautreaux, whose major findings are grounded primarily in lasting improvement of neighborhood environment (suburbs), a striking success of MTO was improvements in mental health for movers (Duncan 2008). This outcome, decreases in the depression of mothers, was linked to gains in neighborhood safety (Orr et al. 2003; Kling et al. 2004). This finding has been linked to the potential benefits of moving to neighborhoods with relatively less crime and violence (Kling et al. 2004).

Some unanticipated results, essential to the goal of improving poverty outcomes for poor families, were that the relocating families were no more likely to be employed, earned no more and received welfare no less often than families assigned to the control group (Zuberi 2006; for more evidence, see Orr et al. 2003; Kling et al. 2004; Kling and Liebman 2004). In addition, MTO findings also suggest moving did not boost school achievement for children (Sanbonmatsu et al. 2007). Duncan (2008) concluded in his meta-analysis of Gautreaux and MTO: “what policymakers were hoping for- more work and higher earnings, greater independence from welfare, second generation success- the programs produced a mixed to null pattern of success” (8). Although expected gains were not realized, the frameworks from Gautreaux and MTO, especially the anticipated potential for gains from poverty deconcentration and mixed income contexts, served as background for HOPE VI.
2.4 Introducing HOPE VI

From Gautreaux and MTO came goals to formally deconcentrate poverty in public housing developments and to promote mixed income integration in severely distressed neighborhoods. Although in action during the beginning of the HOPE VI program, MTO did not see the scale or geographic reach of HOPE VI. Essentially, HOPE VI may be characterized as the physical and social dissolution of public housing communities tied to revitalization efforts to institute mixed income rental and residential owner-occupied developments (Buron et al. 2002; Holin et al. 2002; National Housing Law Project 2002).

The National Commission for Severely Distressed Public Housing (1992) urged that, “social distress is a very real phenomenon among the public housing resident population” (2-6). It reported that, “conditions in severely distressed public housing relate not only to… physical [environment]…but also to the households” (NCSDPH 1992, 1-5). Essentially, the commission expressed public housing’s ailments as a social problem (Fuller and Myers 1941); “the conditions of the severely distressed are characterized by: poverty brought on by high unemployment, unstable family structure, high incidence of crime, lack of education, and a lack of support services” (NCSDPH 1992, 1-5). Accordingly, HOPE VI initiatives intended to not only “fix” severely distressed public housing physically, but also to “fix” their inhabitants.
In 1992, the original goal of this program was to replace severely distressed public housing, about 86,000 of 1.2 million units.\textsuperscript{5} Goetz (2012) estimates that there were 394 public housing projects demolished in the 139 largest US central cities between 1995 and 2007, the majority of cases were HOPE VI revitalization projects. These demolitions involved approximately 163,393 units (Goetz 2012). By 2006, nearly $6 billion had been appropriated to HOPE VI, primarily in the form of revitalization grants.\textsuperscript{6} HOPE VI was intended to improve both the political economy of place (provision of goods/services, political and economic improvement, services) and the status of poor residents in these spaces by dispersal of the poor, creation of mixed income integration, and revitalization of public housing.

HOPE VI’s aims, to reform the “severely distressed” poor community-- through dispersal, heightened regulation and monitoring, and deliberate reconfiguration of the composition of inhabitants-- are built upon the conceptualization of whom needs “fixing.” Long before HOPE VI, discourse labeled the poor as a “jobless, welfare-dependent, uneducated, drug addicted, criminal, sexually promiscuous, inner-city, and overwhelmingly black” (O’Connor 2001 citing Auletta 1982 and Leman 1986, 267), many of whom were deemed to be trapped in public housing.

\textsuperscript{5} According to the major report, \textit{A Decade of HOPE VI Research Findings and Policy Challenges} (2004), “severely distressed” is defined loosely: “public housing was everything the label implies—dilapidated, often largely vacant buildings that showed the effects of poor construction, managerial neglect, inadequate maintenance, the wear and tear of generations of families with young children, and rampant vandalism …(9)”

\textsuperscript{6} Between FY 1996-2003, 287 of the HOPE VI grants in the amount of $395 million were exclusively for the demolition of more than 57,000 units of public housing; U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, “HOPE VI Funding and Appropriations History”
A key assumption behind “fixing” is the notion that the target populations and spaces of HOPE VI are abnormal and outside of mainstream society. The challenge of how to improve public housing without stigmatizing the black poor represents an unresolved tension between an assumption that pathology causes and maintains this “subcultural” group and alternative evidence that attributes this condition to political economy and structural factors (O’Connor 2001). Out of this, HOPE VI represents an unstable accommodation between cultural and structural explanations for the disadvantaged status of those neighborhoods and their residents.

Formally, the NCSDPH (1992) identified severely distressed public housing using a rubric based upon whether a site had one or more of the following conditions: physical deterioration of buildings, high crime rates in the development itself or the surrounding neighborhood, families living in distress, and severe management deficiencies or manageability problems (2-6). Potential HOPE VI grantees were established from a point system where physical deterioration could be rated up to 80 points, severe management deficiencies up to 45 points, rates of serious crime up to 45 points, and families living in distress up to 45 points (NCSDPH 1992). Developments could be categorized as severely distressed when scoring 80 total points or if a maximum number of points were tallied in any one category, even if not totaling 80 points overall (NCSDPH 1992, 2-7).

HOPE VI’s objectives were to use the information establishing that a site was severely distressed and remedy the negative conditions and the behavior of those “severely distressed.” As Popkin at al. (2004) explained, contenders for HOPE VI funds
were public housing developments with “residents living in despair and generally needing high levels of social and supportive services,” often living near a surrounding area also “economically and socially distressed” (8). Further, residents and their communities were understood to face, “isolation, inadequate services, crime, chronic unemployment, welfare dependency, and high concentrations of minorities, extremely poor residents, and single parent families” (Curley 2005, 107 from HUD 2001).

Beyond physical revitalization, broader HOPE VI goals rely heavily on cultural and social based change, like positive role modeling, reliance on racial homophily, attacking a culture of poverty, and community rehabilitation. Many programs attempt behavioral interventions and individual remediation. Although there is some acknowledgement that environment and structural constraints need to be addressed, noted by beautification schemes and architectural revision, efforts to address the behaviors of the poor are elaborate (income restrictions, screening, inspections, policing, mandatory case management, etc.).

In particular, the NCSDPH (1992) asserted, “There is an extreme lack of diversity among public housing residents, both economically and racially so that generations of families grow up thinking of public housing as permanent” (2-2). The report further states, “public housing residents have…little exposure to people who might serve as constructive role models of economic success” (NCSDPH 2-2). Such diagnoses of the problem, especially the assessment of homogeneity and isolation, led to the presumption that mixed income integration would produce positive, beneficial outcomes for the poor.
Two interrelated fundamental criticisms of revitalization initiatives in low-income, often predominantly African American, communities in the US are negative displacement and gentrification outcomes (Goetz 2011). The benefits of demographic and aesthetic “improvement” of former public housing communities intersect with the costs of displacing the original residents. For example, between 1994 and 2004, HOPE VI relocated/displaced 56,221 households nationwide (Manzo 2008). By 2004, a decade later, few revitalization sites were complete. Most were still under construction or in progress. After lengthy displacement, demolition, and construction time frames, only 19 percent of original residents returned to redeveloped sites (McCarty, 2005). Further, HOPE VI is designed to have more rigorous entry requirements and to limit the incoming number of public housing residents. And so, by design, a major outcome of HOPE VI redevelopment is that different, mixed income homebuyers and renters replace former poor residents.

For these reasons, there may be dissimilarities between families who originally inhabit the area and those who later occupy it after revitalization. In addition, HOPE VI initiatives’ leveraging of funds includes hopes for transformation of areas adjacent to public housing. McCarthy (2005) explained, the designs should, “generally connect the public housing development with their surrounding community, both functionally and aesthetically” (12). Policymakers have asserted, “The HOPE VI program rests on community building. It involves the participation of both public housing residents living at HOPE VI sites…and the surrounding community” (Naparstek et al. 2000).
Owens (2012) asserts that HOPE VI’s premise is that replacing public housing with mixed income developments may produce positive neighborhood effects for its residents. These policies exhibit a political and ideological shift both in concern for and understanding of the needs of impoverished families. The general desire, for HOPE VI implementers, was that the impact of positive social interaction and community building as neighborhood effects would produce a public good—better subsidized neighborhoods, positive relations among differing classes of residents, and socio-economic mobility resources for the poor. Yet, when HOPE VI was designed, another key finding from both the Gautreaux and MTO programs may have been overlooked. Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum (200) found that Gautreaux residents had negative experiences with new neighbors and Katz et al. (2001) found that social interaction was modest, at best, for residents participating in MTO.
3. From Segregation to Integrating Public Housing

3.1 Mixing Incomes in Public Housing and Neighborhood Effects

One of the fundamental assumptions undergirding HOPE VI was that producing mixed income communities at former public housing sites could produce positive neighborhood effects. This came from the expectation that middle income residents could and would be able to project mainstream values and models of success for the community (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Joseph 2006; Vale 2006). Interactions between neighbors across income strata were expected to facilitate improvement in the condition of those who were poor. The rhetoric of mixed income public housing revitalization represents the expectation that, if poverty concentration is bad and the poorest share behavioral defects, then deconcentrating poverty is good and mixing up the population, from a socio-economic standpoint, will be beneficial at both the individual and neighborhood levels.

In fact, policymakers generally agreed that social problems of severely distressed public housing may be rooted in the lack of middle class stakeholders. This perspective advances complementary solutions of “fixing” collective efficacy, socialization, contagion effects of poverty, and social capital in disadvantaged communities. HOPE VI initiatives built directly upon such ideas in efforts to reincorporate higher income residents into selected neighborhoods.

The benefits thought to stem from mixed income community originate in particular theories of the relationship between urban poverty and social capital (see Curley 2004 for an excellent summary) and concepts of social isolation and concentration effects of disadvantage (see Wilson 1987, 1996). However, many of these assumptions
that underlie HOPE VI initiatives are problematic. A flawed theoretical foundation might explain the failure of mixed income housing to yield expected improvements for poor residents. Curley (2004) asks whether, “policymakers and scholars must rethink the theoretical basis for such programs” given “the state of current outcomes [minimal improvements]” (116). In her criticism of outcomes, Owens (2012) questions whether “the HOPE VI promise of increased social capital among public housing tenants is plausible or if its language about social benefits is meant to mitigate criticisms about urban renewal and gentrification” (34).

Many of the expected benefits for the poor were thought to stem from socialization, interaction and networks. Hopes for the positive impact of neighborhood effects were contingent upon positive contact among community members (see Allport 1979). Interactions among the mixed income residents were thought to promote improved social networks among the poor, through enriched access to information and resources. The incorporation of higher income residents also was expected to encourage more desirable social control from new leadership, including heightened accountability, norms, rules, and order. Further, this also was expected to produce more desirable behavioral and cultural norms via role modeling, efficacy, and lifestyle changes prompted by incoming higher income residents. But Curley (2004) concludes, “research continues to find negative effects on residents’ social networks and little positive effects on self-sufficiency and upward mobility” (Curley 2004).

HOPE VI efforts embody a tacit expectation for personal and community transformation that is grounded in the premise that former and low-income inhabitants
are both quantitatively and qualitatively different from others (especially incoming higher income residents). Hoving (2010) succinctly explained using evidence from Manzo (2008) “that support for the value of mixing incomes is based on the presumption that middle class beliefs and values are different from, and superior to, those of lower income people” (14). However, Manzo cites studies documenting that people living below the poverty line feel that the “only difference between them and the rest of society is that they don’t have as much money. Therefore, low-income people themselves - whom mixed income housing is meant to serve - may not subscribe to the primary rationale for mixing incomes” (Hoving 2010, 15).

Even if poor residents see themselves as no different from other residents, others may not share this perception. Freeman (2005) established that collective efficacy and socialization are better undertaken the more homogenous a community is. More recently Putnam (2007) continues to assert that there are benefits from homogeneity, arguing that diversity tends to reduce social solidarity and social capital.

Perhaps, however, there may have been inadequate understanding of the ways in which mixed black neighborhoods function. For example, Patillo’s (1999) research (not on HOPE VI) on a mixed-income black community, illuminates the complexity of social division and heterogeneity along class lines among residents. Her findings suggest that any role middle class families might have once played as social buffers, role models, and stabilizers may have been particularly nuanced and complex. Similarly, Venkatesh’s (2006) ethnography of Maquis Park raises questions about interactions- relationships, networks, and norms sharing- between middle class and poor blacks. Venkatesh (2006)
acknowledges that when the middle class left “the area lost whatever mitigating effect on poverty the better of households once contributed,” (17) but refers primarily to physical effects on street cleaning, park maintenance, and conditions of schools—without reference to any social or cultural effects (14-20).

It is unclear how neighborhood effects currently function in and around HOPE VI, nor the magnitude of middle class stability, role models, and social buffering effects. Without more evidence, it is inconclusive whether in the absence of middle class residents to “serve as role models or provide social controls over unruly and delinquent behavior,” the social problems associated with severely distressed areas will persist, or whether the reincorporation of middle income residents will reduce adverse social-behavioral outcomes (Venkatesh 2006, 19, Wilson 1987). Thus, understanding the role of middle class neighbors in the lives of the poor may further illuminate why the HOPE VI program often fails to effectively transform the lives of the poor in a positive manner via positive contact across income.

3.2 Findings on Community after HOPE VI

Some of the main benefits of living in HOPE VI areas are assumed to arise from neighborhood effects evident between different “classes” of residents, as well as through the political economic pull that newcomers may hold over the public and private sectors (see Quercia and Galston 1997; Naparstek et al. 1997; Briggs 1997, 1998; Naparstek, Freis, and Kingsley 2000; Joseph 2006; Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007; Kleit 2008). Moving higher income residents into these communities is assumed to produce a mix of benefits such as improved social networks, positive role modeling, and more desirable
forms of social control and organization, and reduced social isolation (See Wilson 1987, 1996; Campbell and Lee 1992; Elliott et al. 1996; Briggs 1998; Tigges, Browne, and Green 1998; Rankin and Quane 2000; Joseph et al. 2007, Kleit 2001; Arthurson 2002; Joseph 2006; Kearns and Mason 2007; for review, see Tach 2009). Many of these rationalizations are based on somewhat simplistic and, arguably, unfounded conceptualizations of how residents would benefit from income mix (Galster and Booza 2007).

Since the inception of the HOPE VI program, scholars have documented the ways in which expectations of improved quality of life and outcomes may have been overstated (Brophy and Smith 1997; Kleinhans 2004; Popkin et al. 2000; Smith 2002; Wilkins 2002). Only recently have scholars examined, in-depth, social interaction and community building in HOPE VI communities (for examples, see Kleit 2005, 2011; Joseph 2008; Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Fraser et al. 2009; Graves 2010; Tach 2009). Evidence suggests the amount of social mixing and interaction between income groups tends to be fairly diffident in these communities, leading scholars to further question the rhetoric of “the social” in mixed income living (Rosenbaum et al. 1991; Pader and Breitbart 1993; Breitbart and Pader 1995; Hogan 1996; Brophy and Smith 1997; Rosenbaum, Stroh, and Flynn 1998; Buron et al. 2002; Kleit 2005) and positive neighborhood effects.

An emerging literature on the lives of HOPE VI residents has begun to document the everyday realities experienced in these settings. Chaskin and Joseph (2010), Graves (2010), Tach (2009), Kleit (2005), and Owens (2012) examined social processes and interaction in HOPE VI communities. This research suggests that there may be
challenges in building community, especially across socioeconomic status groups (Kleit 2005; Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Joseph 2008; Tach 2009; Owens 2012). Tach (2009), who examines both HOPE VI and non-HOPE VI mixed income neighborhoods, finds resistance in forming social ties. Notably, Kleit (2005) suggested that lack of interaction across mixed income residents might preclude benefits of positive neighborhood effects. In a critical review of the literature, Kleit (2011) concludes that social interaction in HOPE VI developments continue to be, “fairly distant, cursory, and infrequent.” Instead, there is a complicated [and potentially negative] relationship among mixed income residents (Fraser et al. 2009; Joseph 2008; Tach 2009; Kleit 2011, 2005; Owens 2012; Fraser, Burns, Oakley and Bazuin, forthcoming).

3.3 New Community in Old Spaces

Although interaction is the proposed mechanism for disseminating certain benefits of mixing income, less is understood about the production of community and opportunity after HOPE VI. Indeed, how are families affected, if at all, from alleged mechanisms of social interaction and community building? Specifically, does the “mix” attained in the neighborhood support the prevailing assumptions about the benefits and advantages of incorporating higher income residents into former public housing communities?

This study extends emerging research on residents’ perceptions and interactions by focusing on a smaller development in a broader, neighborhood context. It also provides another unique account of a southern city since much of the research on HOPE VI has focused on other locales. Little evidence exists to suggest that income mixing has
benefitted low-income residents (For example, see GAO 1998; National Housing Law Project et al. 2002; Popkin et al. 2004). Further, there is little evidence to help us understand the relationship between the revitalized development and the larger community in which it is embedded.

I argue that examining HOPE VI within the broader context of neighborhood and community, complex dimensions of difference become apparent, particularly between low-income and more affluent residents. The findings from this research explain the ways in which different residents understand status and come to know their place, how power lines are overtly and covertly drawn, and how people reconcile varying levels of dependence, independence, and interdependence on their mixed income neighbors after HOPE VI. I explore whether HOPE VI efforts translate into distinct alterations in residents’ perceptions of closeness, friendship, personal safety, and satisfaction with social interaction. My study also examines intra-racial class dynamics among community members and asks whether HOPE VI constructs new dimensions of perceived difference or whether it produces homophily along racial lines. I focus on better understanding processes of inclusion and exclusion, barriers and functions of interaction within and beyond the HOPE VI.
4. Method

The goal of this study of the Short Hills HOPE VI initiative is to understand how residents might benefit from living in a mixed income HOPE VI development in a southern city. I specifically asked, how do residents participate in and perceive the reproduction of space and place after HOPE VI? I sought to understand how the re-incorporation of middle class residents shaped outcomes in the HOPE VI and the overall neighborhood. This analysis focuses on the former housing project, now Murphy Manor, and its immediate neighborhood (specifically, homeowners) in New Village. I conducted a case study by utilizing original data collected from 75 in-depth semi-structured and unstructured interviews, along with administrative records, evaluation data, media accounts, observation, and casual encounters. A major contribution of this HOPE VI research is, in addition to providing unique, rich perspectives from residents, is it also addresses the neighborhood in which the HOPE VI initiative is imbedded. Further, this case study offers a unique lens for examining contemporary black gentrification in publicly produced and constructed space.

The analytical chapters are divided into two chapters. Chapter 7, “Stranger in my ‘Hood: Good Neighbors, Not Good Friends,” asks: How do changes in neighborhood structural characteristics express interaction in mixed income community? What are social dynamics of mixed income living explained through resident narratives? How are these dynamics relevant to or produced by HOPE VI policy implementation? The next chapter, “Pursuing a False Hope: Constructing “Mix” in Mixed Income Housing?” examines the questions: Considering the reproduction of space and place in Short Hills,
what is the process for the construction of class and social difference? What are the implications of the absence of “interaction”? Do we need interaction to get benefits from mixed income housing?

4.1 Approach

A qualitative approach is fitting for this study, because it allows for flexibility in uncovering meaning and may be illuminating for an in-depth understanding of the transformation of the former Short Hills community (Creswell 1994). Specifically, a grounded theory approach allows me to view the participants as a primary, iterative source of knowledge (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003, Glaser and Strauss 1967, Strauss and Corbin 1994). The participants offer perspectives that may be left out of the mainstream discourse, and present narratives that challenge prevailing assumptions about the use of public assistance, living in segregated black neighborhoods, and HOPE VI community revitalization efforts. The case study approach is a design that effectively can capture distinct circumstances unique to Short Hills and New Village, while providing context for interpreting the findings.

I utilize participant observation, fieldwork, unstructured interviews, in depth semi-structured interviews, administrative records and data, casual encounters, and media accounts for this study. The interview data come from a homeowners, condo owners, renters, and stakeholders who reflect on their perceptions of community change under HOPE VI. I conducted resident interviews mostly in their homes or at a designated location in close proximity to Short Hills. These conversations addressed a predetermined, but flexible, set of topics (pros and cons of buying near a HOPE VI,
residence experience, and community characteristics) as well as any additional topics raised by respondents. Interviews were collected over a period of several months, each interview lasting approximately 45 mins-2hrs. Fifty interviews were conducted in 2011, while approximately 25 were collected from 2000 until about 2004 in association with a larger commissioned HOPE VI project evaluation. Most of these interviews were recorded and transcribed. They were then coded and analyzed using the qualitative data analysis software Dedoose.

4.2 Site

![Murphy Manor HOPE VI Development, photo courtesy of housing authority](image)

The Short Hills HOPE VI, pictured in Figure 1 above, is comprised of 83 units: 55% Section 9/ACC units (public housing), 34% Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), and 11% market rate. This means that 89 percent of the redeveloped units at Murphy Manor are subsidized, although the LIHTC units have a smaller rent subsidy.
than the Section 9 units. Phase I and II of New Village includes 36 homes and condominiums.

![Figure 2: New Village Single Family Homes and Condominiums, photo courtesy of housing authority](image)

The single-family homes at New Village, seen in Figure 2 above, range from 1,100 to 1,400 square feet and consist of three bedrooms and two or two-and-a-half baths. The homes feature front porches facing a tree-lined street. The condominiums range from 1,000 to 1,200 square feet and consist of two-and-three-bedroom units with two-and-a-half baths. Sales prices for the single-family homes range from $103,900 to $127,900, while the condominiums were priced from $91,000 to $108,000.1

---

1 While eligibility for both Murphy Manor renters and New Village homeowners require credit history and criminal background checks, there are additional requirements for homeownership. Specifically, to be eligible to purchase a subsidized home, an New Village applicant has to produce a minimum $500 down payment and were expected to gain certification of homeownership counseling completion (Southern City Department of Housing and Community Development 2007).
4.3 Design

Before this research began, a primary goal was to complete interviews with approximately 40 community members and respondents. I knew that two sites of interest in the neighborhood, Murphy Manor and New Village, were somewhat contained, consisting of approximately 119 dwellings. I hoped to gain a variety of perspectives that went beyond simply mirroring the overall demographic profile of the community from an exploratory qualitative inquiry. For example, I knew that I wanted to seek diversity deliberately when sampling (i.e., different household composition types, neighborhood tenure backgrounds, relationship with assistance, and dwelling types). To accomplish this, I employed a combination of sampling techniques. I used convenience and snowball sampling, in addition to purposeful sampling to achieve theoretical saturation in the narratives regarding community development, social dynamics, processes, and relationships. The sampling and subject recruitment process was flexible and iterative which allowed for in-depth, emergent learning. Specifically, building the sample in this manner permitted direct investigation of subjective experience, meaningful contextual inference, opportunity for observation and description of condition, and also reduced unwarranted attention to universality and reflexivity in the researcher subject relationship (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003).

4.4 Access

4.4.1 New Village

To initiate this study, I sought key informants. For additional background on the Short Hills HOPE VI, I made contact with researchers identified on formal evaluation
documents associated with the revitalization plans. I was able to connect with each of them. In addition, before going to the community or beginning fieldwork, I spent time at the Southern City Housing Authority through a series of meetings. I was allowed to interview and solicit information from representatives of the current leadership involved with the revitalization of Short Hills. I also interviewed service providers who directly interacted with residents. During this time, the Housing Authority also permitted me to examine a range of administrative records on the planning and execution of the HOPE VI grant. I also met with the property management staff to better understand residency requirements and conditions in Murphy Manor.

Apart from these activities, I had an opportunity to make acquaintance with a key informant at a neighborhood fitness facility. I often (almost daily) learned about the current and historical dynamics of race and place in Southern City and particularly in the Northeast Central area near Short Hills. At this facility, I continued to hear from and learn more from other members. Without already having been on the ground in the neighborhood, this knowledge was helpful in better understanding the deeply contextual social, racial, economic, and political landscape of the city and the county.

These insights from the key informant and local contacts, and their sense of native connections to the community, were helpful in supplementing records, evaluations, and administrative notes on low-income housing and redevelopment in Southern City. With background rooted in these connections made with the HOPE VI evaluator, the housing authority, local practitioners, and local contacts, in addition to programmatic
understanding of HOPE VI from my time working at a large metropolitan PHA, I began on the ground fieldwork in New Village.

The next critical stage of this research began when my key informant invited me to attend a community barbeque. When I arrived at his home, I first recognized that it was on the homeowners’ side of the neighborhood, in New Village. These first homeowners at the community barbeque were open to the idea of my studying their community and extending my network there.

I secured IRB approval and began pilot interviews and observation. The first round of inquiry was in the form of open-ended interviews with homeowners. This interview approach allowed me to gather a number of opinions from a variety of sources. The first homeowner and spouse were the most tenured community members; they had lived in New Village for over two decades, returning to a newly constructed home there in 2008. They were active on the HOA board and were known and respected by the community.

I first learned about this couple early in the afternoon at the community barbeque. Later that evening, the wife actually attended the event, and I secured her telephone number. After a few phone conversations, I connected with this couple for my first interview in May 2010. The interview took place in their home. They provided a semi-complete catalog of all homeowners in New Village HOA, listing resident, address, and telephone number. I was allowed to copy this information into my notes for reference. They also provided some background on each household’s composition. New Village respondents were not paid to participate in this phase of interviews.
4.4.2 Murphy Manor

In Murphy Manor, a different approach was utilized, after “snowballing” among New Village homeowners failed to supply any contacts in the rental units. It was a challenge to find homeowners who could reference renters by name or acquaintance; in fact, none were able. As an alternative, I positioned flyers on every door of the external main streets and on every other door of the internal streets of Murphy Manor (see map of rental complex in Appendix). The flyer contained a generated telephone number for the study and a request to discuss housing in Southern City with respondents (provided in the Appendix).

Potential participants then contacted me. I used the initial phone call for screening to confirm their address or residency and tenure in the community. When needed, there was a second follow up call. Subsequently, I scheduled each in-person interview. During this stage, snowball sampling was utilized when possible. In this initial round, I was able to make contact with and complete interviews with several current residents (none declined in-person interviews) as well as a few participants who previously had lived in Short Hills. The majority of respondents were unable to provide additional references of neighbors in Murphy Manor.

A second round of flyer distribution occurred several weeks later. Since each unit has street front entry doors as well as a second door more proximate to parking, I put flyers in this alternative location during round two. These flyers were placed on the back doors of every dwelling on the exterior and interior streets. Again, participants contacted me directly, and a phone screening took place to schedule the in-person interview.
Finally, I also spent several weeks walking around the community, during different times of day (primarily 10am, 12pm, and 4pm) and on different days of the week (including weekday and weekends), openly soliciting participation by knocking on doors and by asking for references. Each connection made resulted in a completed interview. Therefore, one introduction of potential bias from this approach would stem from consistent absence from the dwelling or decided refusal to respond to the flyer. A final attempt to connect with new residents was made by leaving flyers at the front desk of the property management office.

4.5 Notes on Access

As a young African-American woman, access to the site and the participants was primarily based on transparency about my interests in housing and their experiences. Therefore, trust was often established as a precursor for interaction. Most of my respondents were African American women. Even when men were present, it was typically in partnership with a female respondent (with the exception of two homeowner interviews which took place in public settings). There seemed to be openness in their willingness to interact with me and in allowing me into their homes.

I typically wore generic clothing (white t-shirt and jeans) to interact with residents. Usually, my natural hair was pulled back and I minimized wearing any jewelry. I also tried to park my car out of sight of most units and opted to appear on foot. Also, I entered each home with as few materials as possible. Therefore, I carried only a black folder containing copies of the demographic survey, interview instrument, the consent form, and information sheet, along with a receipt book and no more than $30 in cash. The
recording device was a digital ink pen. Each Murphy Manor participant from the rental units was paid in cash ($10 or $20 if they had been displaced from the Short Hills public housing) for their interviews. Homeowners did not receive compensation.

This Appendix contains itemized copies of the consent and solicitation forms. This study is deemed to be one of minimal risk to participants and the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research was not expected to be greater than any ordinarily encountered in daily life, or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. I took care both in writing and verbally to ensure that participants fully understood the study, and that their participation was voluntary and confidential when planning, conducting and evaluating this research.

4.6 Data

The primary source of data is 75 open-ended and semi-structured interviews collected during the formal HOPE VI evaluation required by HUD from 2003-2006 and original interviews collected between May 2010 and August 2011. This data collection method was employed because it fosters interactivity with participants while eliciting in-depth, context-rich personal accounts, perceptions, and perspectives. This method attempts to capture authentic perspectives on Murphy Manor and New Village from the subjects as they experienced, perceived, and remember it. This technique also gave me an opportunity to clarify and probe for more information. I allowed respondents to digress and pursue tangential topics and anecdotes when relevant. Creswell (1994), Marshall and Rossman (2006) and Denzin and Lincoln (2003) observe that in-depth interviews allow the researcher the opportunity to capture deeply the informant’s perspective about his or
her experiences. An assumption guiding this approach is my belief that the perspective of the subject is “meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit” (Patton 1990, 278).

Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes to two hours. Most homeowner interviews took place inside the residents’ homes. All of the renter interviews were conducted in their homes. The key informant interviews were all held in the offices or on the premises (i.e., a boardroom). The respondents represent a broad range of occupation, tenure in the city and state, as well as spatial distribution within the community and proximity in and around the HOPE VI development. This method can produce a range of data appropriate for this descriptive and exploratory research (Marshall and Rossman 1989). While ethnographic observations may allow for even more intensive probing of issues, the lengthy field periods and need for sustained rapport with households and sites made this method infeasible for this particular study but holds great potential for future research.

4.7 Interviews

4.7.1 Homeowners

The first phase of the study involved interviews with an initial set of homeowners in New Village, conducted from May 2010 until August 2010. These interviews represent much of the homeowner interview data. These interviews were topical, but relatively open-ended. In addition to snowball sampling, I also randomly dialed down the Homeowner’s Association list, at three different points of the day over the course of several weeks. Only one voicemail was left soliciting participation. These recorded face-
to-face interviews were loosely structured, lasting from 45mins -1.5 hours. The topics covered included their selection of the community, social interactions, attitudes about revitalization, etc. (these topics are detailed in the Appendix). There were also phone conversations that were not recorded.

After the completion of this phase of the study, I reviewed interview audio, handwritten transcriptions, memos, and fieldnotes, and revised the interview protocol to develop a more directed semi-structured interview framework that was used from October 2010 until the completion of data collection in August 2011. I completed 9 recorded interviews and 3 non-recorded interviews from the 36 homeowners (approximately 1/3 of the dwellings). Table 4 notes the gender and dwelling type of each New Village respondent.

Table 2: New Village Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Dwelling type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Condo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Condo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.2 Renters

I papered Murphy Manor with flyers. I also left flyers at the desk of the property management office, off-site. I also walked the neighborhood, knocking on doors, several
times a week and on weekend midmornings and afternoons. I completed interviews with approximately 25 renter households of the 83 units (approximately 1/3 of the units). I also collected interviews from three residents living in subsidized housing in conventional public housing. Respondents also completed a demographic profile sheet (see Appendix). Self-reported demographic information, a sample of which is provided in Table 5 below, consisted of personal history, education, age, gender, ethnicity, and source of public assistance.
Table 3: Murphy Manor Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Income Sources</th>
<th>Income (monthly)</th>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>Years of Assistance</th>
<th>Assistance Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>$784</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>job at Walmart</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>unemployment</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>child support</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>babysitting,</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>workfirst and</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>$784</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32 (11 PH and 20.5 S8)</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>$644</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30 (10PH and 20 S8)</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>SSI/disability</td>
<td>$694</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>approximately 30</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>3 yrs. college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>tech</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>job at call</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>some college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>center and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disabled child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>school mom,</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>SSI and husband</td>
<td>$1,237</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>finished college</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>employment and</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boyfriend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>retirement/SSI</td>
<td>$694</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>husband widow</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pay (military)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>SSI check</td>
<td>$667</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>family members</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>pension and</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>finished college</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>social security</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>finished college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The renter interviews took place from November 2010 until May 2011. A set interview guide that covered contextual, perceptual, and demographic topics was utilized for each renter respondents. These interview materials, including observation, recordings, fieldnotes, memos and transcripts, are the primary source of original perceptual data. Specifically, participants’ descriptions and explanations of their experiences, influences, decision-making, and attitudes are utilized critically for this inquiry.

4.7.3 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview No.</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>HOPE VI HA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>HA Client Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Murphy Manor Office Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Murphy Manor Property Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mayor of Southern City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Former Executive Director of HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Southern City Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Community Activist/organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>City Council Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Displaced HOPE VI renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Displaced HOPE VI renter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Displaced HOPE VI renter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 provides a description of the key informants. Unstructured interviews with key informants were transcribed by hand, including the property manager, management office assistant, a developer, the mayor, former Executive Director of the Housing Authority, the senior Housing Authority real estate project developer, the head of client services, community members and residents living in Section 8 and other off site HOPE VI housing. These interviews covered background on social-economic
environment, specific HOPE VI award parameters, organizational history, neighborhood history, and the context of demolition/revitalization.

There were additional interviews with former residents of the Short Hills public housing community who relocated due to demolition or HOPE VI. Therefore, overall, primary data collection and fieldwork yielded interviews with approximately 50 (12 homeowners, 28 HOPE VI/renters, 10 key informants) 45-120 minute interviews.

The interview data I collected (including observation, audio, transcripts, fieldnotes, and memos), especially the audio and written transcripts, were integrated with extensive analyses of neighborhood change in the Northeast Central corridor, with focus on the Short Hills boundaries. Administrative records from the housing authority, HOPE VI project data (especially 25 recorded transcribed interviews that occurred between 2000 and 2004 for the commissioned Short Hills evaluation), publicly available city data, Census data, mapping and parcel visuals, and crime data were used for contextual and demographic information. The HOPE VI evaluation interview data was collected by a team led by Dr. J. C. Fraser. These interviews include respondents from the housing authority, police department, community officials, and Short Hills residents. These interviews openly discussed attitudes, outcomes, and events surrounding the demolition of Short Hills and construction of Murphy Manor. These respondents do not overlap with those collected in my more recent sample of renters, homeowners, and key informants.

Independent from the interviews, participant observation of the community took place during different times of day for six months to better understand the neighborhood’s patterns of entry and exit, casual encounters, police presence, and
interactions outside of the home. Finally, reports from local media coverage and historical documents, including newspaper articles, and photographs were also collected.

**4.8 Analysis**

The 50 new and 25 existing interview transcripts were downloaded into Dedoose for storage and analysis. Each interview audio, formal typed transcription, handwritten transcription taken during the interview process in addition to pre- and post-interview memos and fieldnotes were saved as independent documents linked to a respondent.

In Dedoose, open coding was employed during the initial stages of analyses. Primary themes were categorized broadly as coding for references to home conditions, public assistance, access to resources, family composition, residential mobility, and the physical and social reference to the neighborhood or community. This process involved describing the overall features of the data across respondents.

During the next phase, I emphasized relationships across the data and emerging themes, adding additional codes and sub-codes for the nature of social interaction, neighboring, well-being, neighborhood satisfaction, and conflict. This involved making connections between primary themes and their subthemes. In addition to Dedoose, hard copies of these data were analyzed iteratively by broad hand coding for patterns. Fieldnotes were recorded about the exchanges, emerging themes, methodological notes and other contextual details stemming for the interview process and analyses. Memos recorded before and after each interview that specifically address details on the respondent, residence, environment and other theoretical and methodological notes directly related to the interview environment. These memos and fieldnotes also were
utilized during this analysis. A listing of these major themes and subthemes is provided in the Appendix

4.9 Limitations and Delimitations

The use of the initial data collection period with homeowners, with repeated, deliberate refinement of the interview guide, was an internal validity check on the clarity of the interview technique. Efforts were made to maintain rigor in the interview environment and technique (Creswell 1994).

I triangulated a range of sources and information gathered when developing the analyses. The recording and transcription process was standard. Trustworthiness of the data was maintained through multiple storage files as well as the handwritten and formally transcribed narratives. Manuscripts of interviews were checked against audio, with additional checks against written transcripts taken during the interview. In addition, ten of interviews were transcribed also by an independent professional service to check for accuracy against my transcription.

For the ethical integrity of this work, and protection of the wishes and concerns of the research subjects in Murphy Manor and New Village, this dissertation manuscript has made the respondents anonymous. All names of locations and persons presented here are pseudonyms that represent actual data used in this study.

One main condition that placed restrictions on interview data collection relates to the compactness of the small community. My recognition for the privacy of the interview participants made it difficult to go beyond saturation I believe reached in the dataset; however, I successfully accessed approximately one third of the dwellings. I
hope to extend this research agenda to additional sites in the future for a broader extension of this exploratory data and findings.

Although I do not claim these findings are generalizable to all HOPE VI neighborhoods, the conclusions I reach may illuminate important concepts of same-race social “classing” and interaction. It also speaks to contemporary issues related to “upgrading” poor black neighborhoods via government intervention. Finally, it has direct implications for understanding the outcomes of the lived experiences in HOPE VI sites produced by re-introducing middle class residents to formerly distressed public housing neighborhoods.
5. Background on the Southern City Short Hills HOPE VI

This chapter focuses on the context of HOPE VI revitalization efforts in Southern City. The 1950s era photo above in Figure 1 captures vacant land on the Northeast Central side of the city, near the former Sunrise Mountain mill village. The area of land--its history and community--is the primary space and place of this inquiry. This area shown above was first developed as whites-only public housing before becoming eventually seen as a severely distressed, minority-segregated neighborhood over time. The recent transition from a disadvantaged housing project into a newly inhabited mixed income neighborhood made it a ripe case to examine.

After the Great Depression, efforts to stimulate housing construction and the “federal government’s aim to marshal both public and private resources to improve
housing conditions for low-and moderate-income families” continued.¹ Nationally, the issue of housing was considered urgent and was increasingly given high priority (Onque 2007). In 1949, Southern City Housing Authority (SCHA) was authorized by the state and chartered in October of that year (Lyons 2010). According to the Southern City Housing Authority² (SCHA), the main task at hand was to, “review the matter of substandard housing.” In Southern City, white factory workers were the primary population of interest. With its first request to federal officials, HUD granted approval for SCHA to develop 487 units of housing. These units would be split into two separate developments, one for whites and one for blacks, located in distinct communities. Short Hills is the first of those two housing projects built.

The photo below displays Short Hills in 1954. Note the open space shown in Figure 1 was filled with the Short Hills public housing units, linking nearby factories and mills to the other areas of the city and county.

² Southern City Housing Authority, About Us, History http://www.southerncityhousingauthority.org/history.asp
Short Hills has a racial history similar to other original public housing sites across the country. Short Hills was constructed and inhabited for a submerged lower middle class of whites, especially factory workers.
This general area in which Short Hills was embedded, Northeast Central City (NEC), just north of the downtown district, was a segregated, white area. US Census data for 1950 estimated that the proportion of whites in this census tract was approximately 99.6% (Lyons 2010). An African-American community development worker affirmed this. Bruce recalls, “During that time it was ah, a rather prosperous area. It started off being a predominantly Caucasian area. And then there were older, established families in the neighborhood.” In his biography, a Hall of Fame country musician called Short Hills [in the 1950s] “the first nice place he ever lived in.” On the other side of town, near the all-black university, the other complex, Booker T. Homes, housed non-whites (Morton Hoffman & Co 1968). US Census data recorded this area as 79.4% black in 1950; by 1960, it was estimated to be 96.3% Black (Lyons 2010).

Economic changes in the area directly shaped the demographic landscape of Short Hills residents over time. An older city worker, Tony, explained:

a lot of change came when some of the organizations, the factories, the companies in the area decided to close…they paid very well…And so, those, could work and live right there. And things changed… When the jobs went away, then the people went away too.”

In Southern City, this demographic shift also was augmented by urban renewal interruptions in predominantly black areas, which prompted displaced residents to relocate to Short Hills (Lyons 2010). The city’s Neighborhood Improvement Services

department collected a brief history of these demographic shifts from urban renewal projects in Northeast Central City area. They observe:

The urban renewal movements of the 1960s marked the beginning of a decline for NEC. Though these developments were intended to eliminate slum housing and maintain downtown viability, they tore apart the nearby black neighborhood. Many poor blacks were displaced during this process and moved into NEC, further sparking whites and middle-class blacks to flee to the suburbs…. By 1970, three of NEC’s four neighborhoods had become predominantly black, and a number of welfare recipients had risen astronomically.  

The Short Hills neighborhood became less white, and contained higher proportions of African Americans, as well as increasing levels of concentrated poverty and disadvantage. Segregation patterns persisted, accompanied by urban renewal, patterns of white flight, and suburbanization. Further, expansion of a highway into the black economic and cultural stronghold caused subsequent displacement of those living there. This was exacerbated as housing assistance goals preferred needier households over time. Short Hills’ reputation as a desirable place to live sank as the area became more associated with narratives of crime, prostitution, and disadvantage.

For example, in Urban Institute HOPE VI Panel Study Baseline Report evaluation of Short Hills before its demolition, 85% of surveyed Short Hills residents reported

---

4 “History: Northeast Central Southern City”
severe drug trafficking problems in the neighborhood (Popkin et al. 2002). In this report, a resident was quoted:

They (drug sellers) come out more at night. You have them during the day, but they know what time the [rental management] office closes and opens. They know what time the [police] officer is gonna come around and sometimes they don’t care. It can be the first of the month and they know people getting their check and they gonna sell drugs. They’d [drug sellers] rather run from ‘em [police] and if they catch ‘em, they catch ‘em, and if they don’t, then you know they gonna make their money. [Short Hills 025A, HOPE VI Panel Study: Baseline Report, Popkin et al. 2002]

By the time HOPE VI was proposed, both residents and community officials considered Short Hills to be a dangerous, troubled area in need of some form of revitalization.

Figure 6: Short Hills

The Short Hills HOPE VI application painted a picture of the severely distressed context of the neighborhood pictured in Figure 9. Further, this UI report documents that
80% of ShortHills residents identified major problems with violence and shooting (Popkin et al. 2002). “Surprisingly, respondents from Short Hills reported the highest levels of problems [among sites surveyed], higher even than respondents from Wells, which is one of the Chicago Housing Authority’s notoriously dangerous developments” (Popkin et al. 2002, 4—7). Indeed, although the Ida B. Wells project was expansive and in a much larger urban setting, Southern City residents reported higher risks associated with living in Short Hills.

The housing authority also was quoted, stating “on a per capita basis, police calls were twenty-five percent more likely to come from Short Hills than from the city as a whole” (Southern City Housing Authority, 2000:22). In particular, a major catalyst for public awareness of the problems in the Short Hills area was violent crimes with child and elderly victims. For example, one 1998 news article reported:

Short Hills is no stranger to violence. Four years ago, two-year-old Tinika Jones was accidentally shot and killed in the complex. … The latest shooting victim, [5 year old] Tykel Brown, is hanging on to life. …Neighbors say they’re tired of crime, …the children of Short Hills were outside playing one day after Tykel was shot in the back by a stray bullet.5

A police officer that worked in the Short Hills area for several decades further explained the nature of crime and disadvantage. He described scenarios of trouble in the housing development and outsiders as key perpetrators of the social problems and crimes that

prevailed: “most of the calls were drug calls or either disturbance calls. You would have fights…and you would have gang activity…the Few Crew, the Bloods, the Crips…It was just a lot of all of it.”

A later news story, in 2000, reported the continued presence of violent crime, “At Short Hills, residents cannot understand why anyone would murder 90-year-old Charles David and 76-year-old Betty Holmes. They were both well-known and well-loved in the neighborhood…”

One police officer, Green, described the area at its worst in the late 1990s: “they were shooting at us every time we went in.” Green explained during this time that a lone officer could not and would not be permitted to enter Short Hills. This rule acknowledged past events:

We came to work one night, and they had run every single police officer out of Short Hills that worked day shift. Every window in every police car had been broken; they had stole the shotguns out of the police cars…I mean, they were literally running you out…

The former executive director of the Southern City Housing Authority, Samuel, explained that plans for HOPE VI revitalization echoed a public awareness of the distressed condition of Short Hills. It also stemmed from concern for its effects on the surrounding community and broader city. According to Samuel and other officials, the $35 million HOPE VI award was to build up a broader hope for deconcentration of poverty and improved safety in a larger, 96 square block revitalization of NEC. The

---

revitalization plan image in Figure 8 below illustrates the expansive goals for revitalization in which the Short Hills HOPE VI project was embedded:

![Revitalization Plan]

Figure 7: HOPE VI/ NEC plans, image courtesy of James C. Fraser, 2012

The US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) 2000’s formal release of national HOPE VI award plans also affirmed broad transformation goals.

Police officer Green described blended partnerships among the community members, the police force, the housing department, and federal programs. An important community development leader, Melissa, said, “We are working… and its my understanding that the…target area is…a big initiative between the city and the county and of course, the public schools and university.” Figure 12 below is an alternative visual of the broader footprint to illustrate citywide hopes for the Short Hills investment.
Prior to its demolition in 2003, Short Hills was made up of 31 apartment-style buildings with a total of 240 inhabited units (Fraser 2006). According to Fraser (2006), the Short Hills project was 100 percent black, although blacks only made up about 40% percent of Southern City’s total population. Fraser et al. (2006) reported household median income at $3,564 per year (relative to the citywide median household income of $62,300) with a 90 percent poverty rate, a 70 percent unemployment rate (the citywide unemployment rate was 2.3%), and a 25 percent high school graduation rate among adults.
Table 5: Revitalization area vs. Southern City, selected figures for 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Homeownership Rate</th>
<th>Median Home value</th>
<th>Rental Rate</th>
<th>Median contract rent*</th>
<th>%HH on assistance</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
<th>% of subsidized units **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revitalization Area</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$68,429</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>11.59%</td>
<td>37.98%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.49%</td>
<td>$126,100</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$561</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, Southern City/County Planning Department, adapted from Fraser et al. 2004.

Table 2, above, uses 2000 Census data to compare and contrast the condition of the revitalization area to the city before demolition. The block group containing Short Hills was relatively distressed along several indicators. There were lower levels of homeownership. Median home value was 54 percent of the prevailing values in the city. Most households were not owner occupied; rental rates were 71 percent, much higher than elsewhere in the city. Also, the proportion of households using public assistance as well as the poverty rate exceeded city levels. Finally, a large number of subsidized units existed in this area of town relative to the city at large.

In March 2001, the housing authority commissioned a Survey of Households, conducted by a local university in preparation for HOPE VI activities. This report contained data from the 229 heads of household, who represented 603 Short Hills residents.
Table 3 describes residents in Short Hills prior to demolition. Marriage rates were low, barely reaching 5 percent. Single parent households were prevalent; approximately 218 of the 229 households were headed by a single parent. About 11 percent of the households were headed by an elderly adult. Half of the residents were children. The vast majority of residents had not completed a high school diploma; only 23 of the 229 respondents reported completing high school. A small percentage (5 percent) of residents had been or were pursuing post-secondary education. Approximately 59 percent of households were receiving food stamps, and TANF was the primary source of income in 21 percent of the households. Employment rates among working age adults were low and
income levels were severely below both the city and national average in 2000. Only 27 percent of household heads held a drivers license.

The people- and place- based goals of HOPE VI intersect. This area was considered by many as one of the worst—if not the worst—areas in the city; physical disrepair, the social condition of disadvantage, and the economic decline of the community were all foundations for the people- and place- based revitalization plan. It is important to understand the conditions of the community prior to demolition to better contextualize community change and policy effectiveness.

One news outlet reported briefly and simply, “One of Southern City's eyesores soon will be history. Demolition of Short Hills, the city's oldest housing project, is underway. People came out Thursday to watch. They even had a little cake to celebrate. The families who used to live in Short Hills have been relocated.” Particularly, bringing a critical lens on the community after its re-inhabitation is key for gauging the benefits and outcomes of HOPE VI efforts in changing both the alleged person based dysfunctions or social problems and an alternative place- based, disadvantaged opportunity structure.

Along with Short Hills, Southern City considers New Village to be an anchor for the sustainability of the HOPE VI redevelopment, as well as the larger Northeast Central area. This message is made clear to those who occupy the New Village units, promoting a
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sense of entitlement to the area. One city official, Marcus, explained the need for a reclaiming of space and place near Short Hills:

So, if you’ve got all of these gang bangers, between the ages of 16-25, for the most part, and these young folks who don't have jobs, don't have skills, don't have training, you’ve got all of them committing these crimes and everything and now…they’re going back into the community where they’re familiar with, you’re going to end up having the same problem.

He goes on to say that partnerships with institutions are needed to work to address and improve the feeling of safety and comfort among the project’s residents. This insight, the fear that the HOPE VI site could potentially regress back to the negative conditions which plagued Short Hills, proved telling for understanding the lived experience new residents face in in Murphy Manor.
6. Stranger in my ‘Hood: Good Neighbors, Not Good Friends

6.1 The HOPE for Integration:

“They’re just putting a tuxedo on a pig. It’s still a pig.” (Husock 2003, 39)

With a nod to loosely intertwined theories of the social effects of housing projects, the federal government in conjunction with private and public stakeholders has advanced an agenda to reproduce space and place in neighborhoods like Short Hills. The objective is to correct social, economic, and moral ills deemed pervasive and destructive for its inhabitants and the broader fabric of Southern City. The hope was to improve the aesthetic, socio-demographic (poverty levels, access to supportive services), and political economic resources available to housing assistance recipients. Such expectations for benefits from vertical integration in revitalized public housing neighborhoods are promising. However, the pathways that may link HOPE VI’s potential for positive neighborhood effects in the lives of the poor—particularly social contact and interaction—were unclear.

6.2 Studying the Creation of a Mixed, Black Neighborhood

Wireman (1984) keenly observed that much of the discussion of the lived experience of class integration is, “frequently a subterfuge for discussion of race” (105). While HOPE VI developments often achieve some form of socio-economic diversity—by design—often gains in racial diversity are marginal. Murphy Manor illuminates the failure to achieve real racial demographic shifts after HOPE VI (see Goetz 2011 for excellent discussion of racial segregation in HOPE VI sites).
Patillo (2003) highlighted the lack of attention to interclass dynamics among blacks:

existing research on neighborhood change and the development of mixed-income communities is disappointingly silent on intra-racial processes of distinction-making and collective ideology, and micro-studies of black communities (mostly on poor black communities) overlook their socio-economic diversity, a crucial issue (11).

Further, Owens and Wright (1998) assert a need to better understand mixed income black neighborhoods:

The stereotype of majority-black neighborhoods as distressed, deviant and dangerous urban underclass communities is misleading. Majority-black neighborhoods are neither monolithic nor static. They are diverse and changing. And far too little about them is known, particularly about those neighborhoods that are working- and middle-class. (1)

In many cases, HOPE VI may produce black gentrification. Paying attention to black gentrification facilitates examination of intra-racial processes of constructing and maintaining community and class (Goetz 2011). What are the dynamics of mixed income living in an all-black community explained through resident narratives? How are these dynamics relevant to or produced by HOPE VI? In this chapter, I discuss shifts in neighboring, relationships, and community and highlight patterns of contact in and around the HOPE VI. This analysis offers insight into the new forms of social meaning and progress that warrant partnerships.
6.4 From Short Hills to Murphy Manor

The gap between haves and have-nots widened strikingly; and the most rapid widening was among Negroes—between those outside the slums who were rising, beginning to finally cash in on the American dream, and those still in the hard-core ghetto, on limited rations of income and hope…Not only distance is building up between the two poles, but tension as well- with electrodes approaching sparking point. (Hothschild 1996, 47; citing Walter Williams, 1967)

Williams (1967) argues that tension is apparent among blacks due to broadening class inequality. His comments above, reflecting on conditions in Cleveland, suggested the occurrence of clashes between two groups of blacks, where one group located on the periphery of slums and the other residing in the midst of slums. This broader idea of intra-racial class conflict among blacks is observed today in the subtly interconnected nexus of race, class, and place.

One goal of HOPE VI is the return of two groups, haves and have-nots, to a shared geographic space. The ideologies used to support HOPE VI are deeply tied to notions of the culture of poverty and social disorganization. Short Hills was deemed the place of the “have-nots” or the hard-core ghetto. In contrast, the anticipated benefits of HOPE VI integration rely on a conceptualization of the political economy, identity, and supportive institutions thought to characterize middle class and working class neighborhoods-- the place of the “haves”.

Higher status residents “returning” to Short Hills are the presumed agents of the reversal of Wilson’s (1987) narrative about the exit of the middle class and subsequent
neighborhood decline. HOPE VI also promoted deeper integration, in lifestyle, attitudes, and improved condition, from mixing the groups. Murphy Manor and New Village were designed in an attempt to reduce the physical and social distance between those lower-income and better off individuals who would come to populate the old Short Hills area.

Both of these competing accounts of place, of the haves and of the have-nots, have been linked to black communities. Historically for blacks, demarcations of class, race, and place for the “haves” and “have-nots” are often superficially clear, at best. For many blacks in this country, even when achieving upward mobility, they, “remain physically and psychically close to the poorer neighborhoods they leave behind” (Patillo, 1999, 23). Further, Black communities have rich, intra-racial diversity, based upon class, status, and lifestyle (Patillo 1999).

HOPE VI created a newly blended community of black neighbors in and around the footprint of the former Short Hills. But it is unclear what the outcomes are for deliberately locating “haves” and “have-nots” in closer proximity to one another. This may have some effect on the reproduction of space and place; it is the goal of this study to examine the dynamics of life in a deliberately designed class stratified but racially homogenous community.
Although ten years have elapsed, Southern City’s HOPE VI plan remains a work in progress. The broader city plan also entailed the demolition of older adjacent homes to make way for construction of new single-family homes and condominiums around the public housing site. First, the two hundred plus public housing units were demolished at Short Hills, seen in Figure 1 above. Next, the city initiated the demolition of the row of dilapidated homes running adjacent to and across from that site, along the Oak Avenue corridor. This was set to catalyze the broader plan to revitalize the targeted multi-block area. Next, new single-family homes and condominiums, New Village, were constructed along Oak Avenue and immediately across from the vacant former Short Hills site.
After the New Village homes were built and partially occupied, the HOPE VI rental units, Murphy Manor, also were built and occupied. Today, the landscape is an assortment of the newly redeveloped single-family homes and condos, as well as the apartment complex (little density) organized along streets. Murphy Manor has broad manicured green spaces yet to be mounted with new homeowner construction, and older single-family homes remain in walking distance of this transformed, broader mix residential landscape.

Figure 10: Condominiums and Single Family Homes at New Village, photo credit to SCHA

Figure 11: Murphy Manor rentals, photo credit to SCHA
6.5 To Build a Mixed-income, Predominantly Black Neighborhood

“‘From looking at it, some of you all might think this is a predominantly white neighborhood, but actually this neighborhood is all black.’” (Patillo 1999, 201)

Patillo (1999) noted significant dimensions of diversity in class, status, and lifestyle in a predominantly African American community. She argued that, perhaps, spatial proximity and interactional networks that exist across class may exacerbate these distinctions. She further asserted that the distinct ecology (extreme segregation and disproportionate poverty) of a mixed black neighborhood may “have a particular impact on processes of neighborhood maintenance, raising children, and organization of social and cultural life” (209).

A unique aspect of this study is its focus on those individuals not necessarily targeted to benefit from dispersal and revitalization strategies of HOPE VI (higher income residents).1 These new residents’ experiences contribute to a critical, dual understanding. The transformations of Short Hills translated into new patterns of politics, charged with constructing a predominantly African American mixed income neighborhood and regenerating a community once characterized by concentrated poverty.

---

1 Popkin et al. (2004) argue the central premise of HOPE VI is improvement in the lives of residents living in distressed housing through the opportunity to relocate to better communities or through the creation of healthier, improved housing at their original public housing site.
6.6 Findings

6.6.1 Buying into an integrated, Black neighborhood

As we now understand, HOPE VI is a unique case for the examination of relationships, especially among its newly mixed-income, racially segregated residents. “…there are relatively few stably integrated neighborhoods in the United States, the integrationist ideal is elusive for all Americans” (Cashin 2001, 734). While it may be difficult to attract higher income, non-minority residents to former public housing sites, there are some relatively advantaged minority households attracted to opportunities for homeownership and mixed income living. “They [middle income blacks], like their white counterparts, are lured by the spacious homes, pastoral settings, and attractive prices” (Cashin 2001, 744). Curtis, a homeowner, described the appeal and his attraction to his dwelling, excitedly:

…it [the house] had all the upgrades in it. It had everything…the master with the walk in closets…it had the bathroom with the garden tub…and it was 3 bedroom, [a lot] of bathroom. So, I was real lucky to get what I got. And for the price for what I paid for it. ..I still had room you know [in my mortgage budget]….I was...way below what they appraised me at, approved me at. I got a really excellent deal.

Most of the home and condo buyers were lured to the community for reasons expressed by James. Limitations in the housing market that are shaped by patterns of racial segregation and, even, discriminatory real estate practices, can lead black residents, like James, to HOPE VI developments (Goetz 2011). One condo owner, Gary, recalled,
So, ah, we looked at a ton of different places. Some, in better neighborhoods. Um, but, the prices were, were high. And, um, again, it [some of the condos viewed] was almost like an apartment; it was one on top of the other on top of the other. Um, We had seen a picture of this place online. Obviously, didn't have really a reference in terms of where the location was. So when we were traveling over, I was like, holy cow! It was a little Sketchy…Depending on which way you come from….

But once we hit the neighborhood, I was like, this is really... oh, I like this. For me, this isn’t a place I’m gonna stay forever. I know it is very transitional for me. … Um, but this was such a good fit, Especially with the condo fees. I didn't have to take care of the yard. Everything looked very nice. In addition, ah, I know there was a lot of work going into downtown Southern.

Um, So for me it was a little bit of a gamble as well… I saw the place, ah the… biggest selling point for me was price. I mean, it’s just its so below market value um, that for brand new construction, to pay what I paid, it’s, it’s, like silly. It’s like, it's a done deal! Let’s go ahead and put in the offer. Let’s do it. So, you know, in a matter of weeks, that was done.

According to New Village homeowners, value and affordability was a key motivation. But Juan, also a homeowner, recalls:

I got like $45,000 in down payment assistance…is a pretty good steal, but I wanted to help stabilize the neighborhood. I wanted to help turn the neighborhood around. I grew up poor, you know, so I understood how it is to be in those
transition neighborhoods….

As Juan’s observation suggests, for some black gentrifiers, more is at stake than features of price and economic push-pull factors. In a study of middle class blacks in Atlanta, Fullwood (1996) noted another motivation for opting to live in an all-black suburban setting. While “an affordable and attractive house in a safe neighborhood with low taxes, good public schools and close-to-home retail services…” was important to dwellers and newcomers, there was also an expressed desire to have a community where a feeling of “we” is present among community members (188). Patillo (2003) suggested the significance of race in the arena of space “compels African Americans toward some basic recognition of shared historical and contemporary oppression, as well as some core of valued practices and beliefs, however changing and internally contested” (302).

One homeowner, Kris, who lives across the street from Murphy Manor explains, “[The revitalization effort] is a mechanism for homeownership for those willing to live here, right. It’s wonderful. Absolutely.” Her visiting son then noted, “people perceive ‘black neighborhood’, but, you keep it nice and looking like this and it’s no different from another neighborhood. It’s how you maintain, then it’s only perception.” Kris adds:

I can’t understand why this house was so reasonable. It was more than reasonable. I was delighted about that… and you know what, the good thing about it was that, it was low and moderate-income people. You know, …and that’s it, low and moderate. And that's why we were able to afford it, and a lot of these people, we able to afford to live here because it’s priced moderate, you know.
Kris’s son added that he believed strongly that the predominantly black, mixed income neighborhood can be maintained and even improved, over time, based on, “how much you attend to it; if [you] take care, if you keep the property and keep it looking like this, you eventually force the value up.” While the motivation for living in the HOPE VI setting does not necessarily include good public schools and proximity to amenities, value and affordability along with concern for the opportunity to participate in community development are factors highlighted by homeowners in their decision to move to New Village.

Jonathon offers a deeper explication of the ways in which the opportunity for community development has reconfigured the overall perception and neighborhood dynamics, particularly for blacks. He recognizes that the limitations of the housing market can lead to black gentrification within HOPE VI (see Goetz 2011 for discussion of this phenomenon). Jonathon explains how more upwardly mobile blacks replace former residents who were displaced by revitalization efforts:

… a lot of people wouldn’t have been home owners if it weren’t for New Village and this program, so, I give a lot of credit to that. I don’t know if we still believe that homeownership is the key to building wealth given, you know, the economy now, but at the time that was the mantra… I mean, I wouldn’t have been able to buy um, something as nice or something as good if it weren’t for the program, so that’s one positive thing.
The second is uh, just de-centralizing poverty um, spreading it out uh, no one wants to live in concentrated dens of anything, whether it’s concentrated dens of affluence….

I think people forget about areas when it’s brown people-- to be quite candid--- um, so I think New Village has brought in um, more... It’s brought in more diversity in the type of people who live there so it’s not just… um, you know, it’s still a low income area, but it’s not just low income people who may be dealing with public assistance, who may be dealing with other issues.

You got a lot of young professionals who are moving in the area, got a lot of people investing in the area. So, beyond our neighborhood … I think it’s upgrading in the whole community in general … it spurred that commercial development that I don’t think would have happened if public funds had not redeveloped Short Hills…it was definitely a catalyst and I think if it weren’t for uh, New Village and the whole HOPE VI, I mean nothing would have changed in that area. So, I definitely give the mayor and Southern City credit for making some big strides and I think everybody I talked to who knows the area says,’ wow, this seems really different than what it was.’

While many casually reference how ‘different’ communities are after HOPE VI, it is important to ascertain these changes and differences, not only in a quantitative sense, but also from the deeper perspective of lived experience. In Southern City, most renters and homeowners note, like renter Tisha does, “I see black. Mostly just black.” The owners, existing renters, and newcomers tend to maintain the prevailing racial
homogeneity of the mostly black NEC corridor. If this is the case, perhaps difference and change is perceived along dimensions of class or other attributes. One renter, Cheryl, describes the socio-demographics of the neighborhood: “Most are African-American. Most are low-income. Most people are not working. They are mostly younger over here. It’s mixed, it’s like half and half, grown up and kids.” However, Cheryl’s description diverges, somewhat, from a retired homeowner Kris’s characterization:

I would say they are African-American. It's an integrated neighborhood…I may say $30k to $50k [per year in household income]…most of them are working…I am like the only left on the block this way [not working]…me and Tom across the street. We the only ones at home. Everybody else works...Most of us are uh, over 40.

6.6.2 We are NOT all Family

This inconsistency in narratives of the neighborhood between renters and owners persists in many aspects of lived experience at New Village and Murphy Manor. Patillo (2003) clarified some the ways perceptions of homogeneity among neighbors in an all-Black community must be challenged. She highlighted critical dimensions of class. Class designation may be measured among members internally, utilizing income, occupation, and education as criteria; but it is more plausible that people actually identify class on the basis of, “signs of language, dress, demeanor, and other objects and behaviors that have social meaning” (2).

For residents at New Village and Murphy Manor, the designation as owner or renter has social meaning. Dominique explains:
And they [owners] also looking at the fact that its [many apartments] income based. So, [it’s thought] that a lot of these people are lower income, or have less education; they think that's gonna lead to more negative factors that aren’t necessarily there. You know, I think actually a lot of the incomes are probably not a big difference. I don't think that the income levels are, it kind of depends...

There is a diversity in the households; it just kind of depends on each individual household. But, I think, for the majority of the neighborhood, I don’t think there is a big income difference between New Village and Murphy Manor. Well, I have heard plenty of neighbors comment, you know, that, ‘oh that is Section 8 over there.’ I’ve been in Section 8 before. It’s for mothers with children... It’s like they forget that as soon as they sign the papers and this is they house.

These perceptions and constructions of difference rest at the core of complex class conflicts produced and experienced along the New Village/Murphy Manor corridor.

Other intangible signals, like behavior and demeanor, are often expressed laboriously and in complex fashion among residents. These processes of distinction making are peculiar, again when homeowners, like Dominique, note that:

The demographics [between the New Village and Murphy residents] would be similar….actually a lot of the incomes are probably not a big difference. When buying, they had so many different programs available [for purchasing]...you know, just how some people, once they have something, they tend to try and forget about when they didn't, and then look down on people who don't have what they have, even though 3 or 4 years ago, they were in the same position. And I
think that has a lot to do with it. They want to get as far away as they came from as they can.

Difference is often rooted in the tangible appearance of being an owner or renter, which is then identified but also further performed as a critical dimension of class. For example, when asked to describe the difference she sees between her fellow homeowners and the renters, Sheila responds:

Um, [it’s not just that they are renting] actually some people over here who are renting. I just think the difference is probably… um, …I don't wanna make it seem like it's a difference in the, in people. But I guess the um...the education may have a part to do with it. The parent. Different parenting…um, skills, you know, from…just the rearing of, you know, the people. It just, it’s just a difference. …um, I mean you can actually see the difference in the kids…um, you know, in like my son,…cause I, I wanted different in life. I mean, we all come from the same background. But just, it’s just, self. I wanted different in life. So I strived to do. To break the cycle…

Thus, class and status are interconnected, tangibly and intangibly coded and performed classifications, “distinction-making,” and “class schisms.” (Patillo 1999, 2003). When considering the new cohort of mixed income residents, and the somewhat superficial nature of co-habitation dictated by the contextual progress of the neighborhood, what is the nature of contact? This natural experiment, taking place in former public housing communities, lends itself to study of intra-racial interactions and encounters among mixed income residents.
6.6.3 Personal Relationships in the Mixed, Black community

Table 3, above, is adapted from, Together Alone: Personal Relationships in Public Places (Morrill et al., 2005). This text focuses on discerning meaning from the patterns of social interaction and personal relationships. The table displays the dominant categories of research traditions along two dimensions, time and space, in existing studies of relationships. For example, the lower right quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Ethnographic and historical studies on long-term relationships among urban dwellers in places that have broad social access and visibility (e.g. sidewalks, parks, bars, retail stores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitory</td>
<td>Ethnographic and biographical studies on short term relationships involving subordinated persons in mainstream and normatively marginal places with restricted access (e.g. domiciles, sex workplaces, mental institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>Experimental and survey studies on long-term intimate relationships involving Anglo, middle-class persons that are explicitly or implicitly contextualized in mainstream places with restricted access (e.g. domiciles, dorms, workplaces, Internet chat rooms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Dominant tendencies in research on personal relationships by time and place, (adapted form Morrill et al. 2005)

Wellman and Wortley (1990) note that community ties and relationships “make up much of the social capital people use to deal with daily life, seize opportunities, and reduce uncertainty” (559).
represents a large proportion of the existing research, including topics like marriage, close friendships, and family ties. However, Morrill et al. (2005) observe:

to study these topics, relationship researchers most often plumb the experiences of Anglo-American, middle class, heterosexual, 18-25 year old college students. As a result…little about less durable relationships among people who do not fit that profile, such as the poor, ethnic minorities, [and] people who are not college educated,…(4)
is known.

Also, beyond its atypical population of interest, HOPE VI neighborhoods muddle the distinction of public and private space due to the government’s and private sector’s joint intervention and ongoing role in the development of the community and its construction. The durability and form of relationships also may be fashioned around externally specified and internally regulated rules on entry, exit, and tenure into the community. The remainder of this chapter will analyze contact through a focus on relationships, neighboring, and community. Contact among residents in a HOPE VI site may be better understood through the lens of Peggy Wireman’s (1984, 2008) concept of the functions of relationships in neighborhoods.

6.6.4 Functions of Relationships and Intra-racial Contexts

Wireman’s (1984, 2008) explanation of the functions of relationships in neighborhoods provides a broad framework for looking at this intra-racial context of HOPE VI. Wireman notes a continuum of relationship types in neighborhoods. She defines them as: stranger, friendly recognition, casual acquaintance, casual friends,
friends, and kin (Wireman 2008, 55-61). These interactions and encounters are then categorized as: primary relationships, secondary relationships, and intimate secondary relationships.

Prior to HOPE VI, public housing developments like Short Hills may have fit within the frame of a close-knit, isolated, disadvantaged minority neighborhood rich in primary relationships. Real and fictive kinship ties among blacks (see Stack 1970, for example, or Chatters et al. 1994, Liebow 1967) and notions of black homophily have been used to explain and characterize relationships in public housing or communities similar to those in Wilson’s Truly Disadvantaged and Stack’s All Our Kin. Sheena, a renter who once lived in Short Hills prior to its demolition, wistfully nostalgic for her time living there:

Short Hills was all right to live in. Everybody got along with each other and all that, you know, like neighbors. You know, looking out for one another like that. I hate they tore that down. Mhm. Mhm…I ain’t even want to move from over there to tell you the truth. Cause it was me, and then my sister took and moved over there. And then, my niece. I mean all, it was family like, know what I’m saying? We go to one apartment to the other apartment visiting, you know?

While Sheena’ narrative may support depictions of contact in poor black neighborhoods, class heterogeneous black communities may not be characterized --as frequently-- through narratives of kinship and reciprocity in the same way.
6.6.5 Good or Bad: Primary relationships and the HOPE VI community

It was all tight knit, a tight knit community environment. It was just very close.

...was a very family oriented neighborhood. Like, the fully family and then around the corner was another family, another family member and so, I’ve seen some of that change over the years [with the HOPE VI]...

These were the words of an older community development leader, Willie, reflecting on the area in the 1960-70s.

Wireman (2008) noted, “Neighborhoods with close-knit relationships continue to exist in some small towns, ethnic enclaves, and in many public housing complexes” (62). Typically, ethnic urban neighborhoods were associated with primary relationships centered on care (Cooley 1962). Many connections were thought to be built upon relationship types involving kin, friends, and casual friends. Wireman (1984) noted that groups forming primary relationships generally, “are homogenous, rather small, relatively permanent, and offer continued face to face relationships” (2). When considering texts like All Our Kin, Tally’s Corner, or Drylongso, primary relationships fostered through such connections were the center of the black community. Brenda, who rents in a traditional public housing community in Southern City describes this type of context:

Oh, well I give them [neighbors] food; if they don’t have anything to eat, they will feed you. Um, they give you clothing if you need it… Yeah, yeah, we have noticed that they do really watch out for children… We stand out and talk and have our little street parties, whatever you want, invite each other to each one apartment just here and there. … Yeah I give them ride, I um, do for two
[elderly] men that stays over here, our neighbor too, um, if I go to the store; and take them to the clinic, whatever… the girl up there, she’ll watch people babies. [the elderly residents] They old…well, one of them is a veteran. He’s um, he has to go back and forth, he don’t have transportation. One of them is kind of [sick] so, so I go pay his bills for him and do his grocery shopping … … we sit outside and then, ah, we sit outside and talk you know and mingle together like that, and then when I get tired, you know, they go back in the apartment. Mhmm. I’m not that kind of person where you can’t come in my apartment, you know. And I can go in theirs. If you let me in theirs, I let them in mines…. yea, you know, like, if I need something from her[ points left], or need something from her [points right], or need something from him. Or them ladies upstairs, yea they help me out. They help me out… I mean, like if I need something to drink, you know, they help me out or something like, you know, like eggs something that, or sugar something like that, yea they help me out mhmm… These relationships are emotionally invested and interdependent (Morrill et al. 2005). In Brenda’s description, primary relationships are characterized by, “intense involvement, warmth, intimacy, a sense of belonging, knowledge of each other’s characters, and rapport” (Wireman 1984, 2008).

The nature of primary relationships among residents, like Brenda, can function with respect to kin, care, familial links, and reciprocity (Wireman 1984). This form of tie, however, may be desired or unwanted, imposed on neighbors, “because people lack alternatives due to limited income, limited knowledge of English, or discrimination”
(Wireman 2008: 62). Wanda, for example, also lives in a traditional public housing complex in Southern City. She says she must set limits on connections and encounters to protect her own resources. She explains that:

If you ain’t got nothing, they ain’t socializing with you. Cause I found that out, long as you got something, Ashley, there they go. So I don't fool with them. I say, ‘I see how y’all is,’ you know what I’m saying? I say, ‘that's a shame how y’all is.’ We should stick together. Just because you got. You ain’t got no more than me. We all live in the projects. Trying to make it. And then you get a little piece of money, you think you all that. And then you don't got nothing, and then you go to me expecting me to do something for you; but, uh uh. Non. Uh uh….I mean, you know, like, okay, this is an example... Okay, like my neighbor right here, okay, she get, she see that I got something, she all up on me [food, money, what?] food, money, whatever… And then when I ain’t got nothing, she gone bout her business. Mhmm. Yep. I say I see what kind of person you is.

The link to reciprocity and care as well as reference to close-knit relationships to kin, friends, and casual friends is noted among many of the narratives from renters living in traditional public housing. It is plausible, when considering a public housing development, then, these forms of closeness, described in primary relationships, good or bad, may be present and potentially expected in similar neighborhoods. This form of contact is central to the ideals of neighborhood effects from mixing incomes.

However, many of the connections and encounters described by renters living in Murphy Manor are in stark contrast to those described by Wanda and Brenda who live in
traditional housing projects. Instead, relationships based in kin, friendship, and casual friendships are not common. Rather, most residents only refer to others as strangers, and, more sparingly, as casual acquaintances. These relationship types are not considered to be the foundation for primary relationships (Wireman 1984). This finding suggests that beneficial social interaction in mixed income neighborhood remained limited if it all present (Fraser et al. 2009, Joseph 2008, Tach 2009, Kleit 2011, 2005, Owens 2012)

An older renting resident, Lenore, put it simply, “Mhmm, people mostly go they own way honey. … I haven’t had any differences [conflicts]. No, people do not help each other out; no, not in this neighborhood, sweetie.” Even homeowner, Kris says, “I don't have any friend down here yet,” even though she had been in the neighborhood two years. Another renter, Belinda, feels she has few connections or interactions that could characterize the types of kin, friend, or casual friend relationships or reciprocity and care based forms of primary relationships thought to persist in public housing community described by Brenda or Wanda. Belinda says:

They go they own way, they don't stick together … I don't be bothered with them. Like I said, I mind my business and I stay in mine. But some people don't mind they business, they like to gossip and things like that…I say hi to them but not socialize.

She goes on to explain her perception of underlying tension and distrust. The closest reference to care she recalls regards her relationship with the children in the complex:

The teenagers, they respect me more, cause I, they call me grandma; they call me mom, you know, and I let them do that and I talk to them to not get in trouble
cause you get arrested and thing like that, that's the way I..., but I don't talk to the parents.

Belinda is one of the few adult residents who expresses having rapport with the youth in the neighborhood. For example, an older renter, Janet, says, “mhm-mhm! You would want to strangle some of these children that's out here girl. ..They are little mini adults. Disrespectful. Ugh! I came from a different kind.” She then explains how Murphy Manor is different from other communities she has been a member of:

… where I came from, yea, I spent more time with my neighbors. On Dumont. It was just like a regular lil neighborhood. People enjoyed each other. And people didn't feel nothing about going to each other houses or sitting out in the yard with each other. Or like they have holidays and they have cookouts. You were always welcomed.

Thus, many residents, while not expressing primary relationships in the current HOPE VI context, can recall having such contact with neighbors in previous communities or in public housing. When I inquired about what prompts distance among neighbors, Belinda said:

It's the people. [what do you mean?] Because they act like they so nice. And they act, and they act, shitty. Pardon me … And they be watching, they be nosy and everything. And they be talking of how many people is coming to the house. You know, That's not they business. I don't go over there, I’m not going to go and tell them what people they should have.
The reference to surveillance, distrust, and tension is a persistent topic among all residents in and around Murphy Manor. This reference is not exclusive to renters; Kris’s daughter, who cohabitates with her, echoes a similar sentiment:

They [neighbors] are very pleasant. Very friendly. Nosy … I mean, constantly watching, you know … yea [what gives you that feeling?] cause you see them. … You see them peeping out the window and you’re like, what the hell is going on with these people? … I mean, my goodness, they watching all the time.

Nevertheless, this form of collective efficacy does not always benefit community members. Dominique describes her disappointment when her home was burglarized. She explains:

Like my house was broken into in February. Some one kicked my door down. Completely down. The entire frame. My front door down, at about 7:30am. I had just left to go to work. And they broke in and stole a television. And you know, any other time there is a million people outside in the neighborhood. How come nobody saw anything? But, they didn't. People saw, you know, two guys walking down the street carrying a television. Some of my neighbors were like, ‘oh it was probably someone across the street.’ And I’m like, but they didn't take the television across the street.

Resident and community narratives about the current context are distinct from their memories of Short Hills. A current renter in traditional public housing, Shondra, references a still present, network of primary relationships. She says there is help and support:
Um, like if you need to borrow money. Need to borrow some food or stuff like that. … And we watch out for each other neighbor, .. apartments and stuff when they be gone. Mhmm. And then, like this girl right here, I help the elderly, cause we got two elderly people upstairs, two elderly neighbors I help them out real good. You know, we have food trucks round here, I’ll say you want something off the food truck and bring the food up there.

In contrast, in Murphy Manor, there was just one narrative about the ability to secure help in distress. Tina explains that her father helps out people because of his work as a handyman and her ability to get help when she needed it:

…My dad knows a lot of people, but I try not to be messing with nobody. Like um like say if your car need a charge. Somebody will give you a jump or whatever. Most people come to us if they need a jump or something wrong with they car. My dad works on cars. … Um, I have asked my neighbor right there for help because one day I came home on my lunch break, and my dad had left a pot on the stove and I came in and there was lots of smoke so I had to use his phone and all this other stuff and he helped me get the smoke out because we thought the apartment would burn.

So, Tina was able to reach out and receive help in this isolated, emergency situation. She noted that the relationship did not extend beyond this incident. Other residents were less able to pinpoint a specific event where they helped or were assisted by a neighbor during a time of distress. Belinda notes, “I don’t know too many neighbors and I don't wanna know. I don't want nobody to know my business and I don't want to
know they business.” When I asked a younger resident, Kiana, about her relationship with other younger residents around reciprocity and care she said:

I don't have friends... Sometimes. They might, I don't know, they [neighbors] might make sure people alright or ask, like if something going on with my grandma, they’ll ask if she alright; but, as far as anything else, NO. I’ll help them, but I don't turn to them. Probably not them, the kids. Like, if I go to the store, I get the kids something. Something like that. I might give ‘em a ride, but as far as babysitting people kids, [no because] ain’t nobody gone babysit mine.

Some residents suggest that such distance among neighbors feeds real conflict and tension. Kiana, who considers herself to be somewhat transient, cohabitating with a grandmother in Short Hills part time and other acquaintances in conventional public housing, explains that much conflict stems from issues among the youth, “Fighting, shooting, they shooting each other back and forth almost like every week. Over gangs….they got mixed gangs out here. Or either fighting. Everything. Everything is drama.” Another teenager, Keith, says older residents misunderstand their energy and activities:

...It’s like us young people we just chilling and hanging pretty much all day everyday. We always clowning around...always everyday. And sometimes our good times can go bad...because we always find something to get into…that’ll be the wrong thing…I wouldn't say that anything over here is crime, it’s just mostly fights…and arguments. I feel safe but I always watch my back.
6.6.6 Should Secondary Relationships Replace Primary Ones?

Secondary relationships are formed in specific goals or purpose: “the overall personalities and lives of the individuals involved are irrelevant to the encounter” (Wireman 2). It is difficult to identify primary relationships in the HOPE VI neighborhood among both renters and owners. In some communities, like growing suburban areas, the primary relationship as the central focus or characteristic of community is thought to be diminished or even reversed (consider Putnam’s notion of community decline in Bowling Alone 2000). Jonathon agrees with this view. He explains:

Well I think, you know my observation in society, is that we’ve become more private. You know, people want their own business. I’m going to tell you, I don’t know the lady who lives next door to me. I have no clue what her name is. She came over and yelled at me cause our music was too loud one time and that’s the only real [contact], I think I introduced myself…

Further, secondary relationships, rather, are perhaps thought to exist more in suburban neighborhoods (Wireman 1984). Study of suburban and middle- to upper- income neighborhoods often focus on Whites (Cashin 2001). This may stem from the lack of integrated or all-black affluent neighborhoods.

It is difficult to quantify the precise extent to which affluent or middle-class African Americans have formed their own all-black suburban enclaves. Clear examples of these communities, however, exist in Prince George's County, Maryland; DeKalb County, Georgia; Dade County, Florida; and suburbs to the
south of Chicago and to the northeast of St. Louis. Notably, the number of affluent black suburbs is quite small. One researcher contends, however, that most metropolitan regions with a large black population have a "Black Belt," created by the black middle class's attempt to escape from poor neighborhoods, that stretches from core, impoverished areas in the central city to periphery areas in the first rung of older suburbs. Consequently, sociologist Mary Pattillo-McCoy argues that the typical middle-class black enclave sits as a buffer between core black poverty areas and suburban white areas (Cashin 2001).

How do all-black neighborhoods with class heterogeneity, correspond to Putnam’s notion of community decline? Is it true that primary relationships are in decline for black neighborhoods the way Juan suggests? Particularly, evidence on interactions suggests that the notion of the primary relationship-centered black neighborhood has disappeared after HOPE VI (consider Chaskin and Joseph’s work on Chicago, and Tach’s work on Boston). For example, Tach (2009) found that newcomers, “… actively resisted the formation of social ties with their neighbors and adopted daily routines that minimized their own and their children’s contact with neighbors and neighborhood spaces” (293).

If social networks are disrupted by HOPE VI demolition efforts, as well as the deliberate, regulated entry and exit of newcomers, then the subsequent interruption in kin, friendship, and casual friendship types could prompt diminishing primary relationships. Pat lived in the area before and after demolition; she says:

Well, I used to stay over here and the people from when I moved from over here,
they gone. Don't have nobody to talk to…I’d tell them, if somewhere better, find it. It’s not the same. I tell you, Short Hills, people got along with each other. Your yard was your yard. You ain’t had children running around walking up to other children. Like…I had my grandson a bike for Christmas and they stole his bike the same day here. Yea. Police did nothing about it. Yea. I know the lil boy [who took it] I seen the bike. I couldn't do nothing about it. Boy came down the street. Bragging about what he had done. …I can’t get no respect.

With limited, if any, kin, friend, and casual friend relationship types present, residents experience more encounters and relations in the neighborhood as strangers, casual recognition, and casual acquaintance. Therefore, instead, secondary relationships, if any at all, potentially could replace primary ones. These are characterized by, “involvement of the individual rather than family, commitment limited in both time and space with a relatively low cost of withdrawal, a focus on specific rather than diffuse purposes, a consideration of public rather than private matters, and the use of public meeting places rather than private homes” (Wireman 2008, 63).

6.6.7 Secondary Relationships: Intimate or Nonexistent

When considering contact, central to the imagined success of HOPE VI, little evidence of primary or secondary relationships is present in the renter narratives. Among homeowners, the patterns are more nuanced. Gary notes, for example:

Um, for me personally, I feel a connection with the neighbors on New Village along my street and those of us … basically, those within the homeowners association itself… I really don't know many of the other neighbors that live over
there. However, I am the type of person that, cause you’re in my neighborhood…the houses across the street on Teton St um, in front of Murphy Manor or on the other side, across from the school, If I see them, I wave. That's just what we do. Again, if we are walking our dog and you know, down Newton Park or any of those other streets and someone, kids ask, ‘what kind of dog is it?’, we absolutely have an interaction, but I don't interact with those folks...

Encounters with strangers, casual recognition, and casual acquaintance are most frequently described among homeowners in New Village. Dominique notes:

Um, like I said, you know, I don’t know many of my neighbors, you know, in New Village or Murphy Manor. I know people by sight or, you know, I see people walking their dogs when I walk my dog, but I don’t know really anything personal about anyone. So it’s kind of hard to tell just from watching it…

The homeowners, through the organization of the homeowners association (HOA) and other political interests, do describe relationship ties built upon concern for community development, crime alleviation, neighborhood maintenance, and youth. This capital translates into strong ties with external community leaders and serves as a foundation for residents' encounters and interactions. Gary explains some of the HOA organizing:

We engage with the Southern City Housing Authority. Mayor Jones actually gets involved and, you know, wants the Murphy Manor to be addressed. So we bring in the management company. They brought in a young lady that, ah actually, is a consultant. So, they bring her in and uh she is at this meeting. And again, ah, they
put together a program where they were trying to engage the children. They did all this research going door to door, knocking on doors, you know, a wonderful presentation on how many children we engaged in the summertime or after school activities. Ah, it [existing programs] didn't address the 51% of the children who had no summer activities or...anything but.

Then our community [New Village HOA] was allowed to kind of rant a little bit. And again, it was, they were trying to address the things they heard. (Interviewer: were people present from Murphy?) No, one; I don't think Murphy Manor was actually invited to the meeting. It was just us (Interviewer: the management of Murphy Manor and you guys?) Absolutely. So there were a lot of things. A lot of good things addressed. They are talking about putting more security in blah blah blah...

A relationship type functioning in New Village-- unique from the primary and secondary relationship notably absent among Short Hills renters-- is what Wireman (1984) refers to as intimate secondary relationships. These are often formed in support of community goal seeking (1984). This form of relationship is most prevalent among homeowners and is mostly facilitated through the HOA membership activities. One resident explains the development of the HOA:

[We were] trying to come in and, you know, make a difference and stuff. So we had that whole like organizing background um, from our work and experiences, so she [another neighbor] asked me to kind of work with organizing the neighborhood um, and I thought it would be great to harness that energy. But then
it became, I mean …it became like a New York City tenants association, like the ones you see on TV where everybody would get together and just complain for like hours on end about like who knows what in the neighborhood and who’s doing that and I think we have like a war going on with Murphy Manor and we don’t like what’s going on over there.

I don’t have any problems with those people. They’re trying to manage, you know, handle their own business themselves and so it became [too much] for me. And, I’m an introvert, so it just became a little overwhelming for me because, you know, I can’t walk my dog without having this like hour long conversation about like what’s going on.

Interactions that occur with frequency outside of formal HOA activities, like dogwalking and conversation on sidewalks, still originate in HOA concerns. Therefore, even these encounters and interactions are often rooted in concern for the community, property, and crime rather than other personal matters. Such relationships-- intimate secondary relationships-- are limited. In these relationship types, there are experiences of, “warmth, sense of intimacy, and rapport (or intense arguments and hostility)…however, [they] do not concern themselves with the details of each other’s personal lives” (Wireman 2008: 63).

Kris reported that that HOA is the primary mechanism for contact: “[the] HOA who they have been involved with … active in the neighborhood … know each other more intimately than we do down here [who don't participate].” Most references to interactions are connected to HOA relations. Curtis says:
We have functions in the neighborhood…meetings and stuff … among ourselves. And then, ah, with people, ah persons in the community they know. Cause I have even hosted meeting at my house. Some in the community host the meeting in their house. And sometimes now, we get together, ah, Invite each other to events they have in the community. We got good relations in our neighborhood. Ah, Cause we look out for one another, our neighbors. It’s like a little family.

Still, many homeowners are not able to refer to their neighbors by name or recall many details about them. This is typical of intimate secondary relationships (Wireman 1984). In light of the common perception and expression that community relations are good, often, they do not know other “members’ personal backgrounds, family relationships, or even their tastes” (Wireman 2008). In fact, even residents who are active in the HOA are unable to recall each other’s names.

When I tried to do snowball sampling with owners, usually they were unable to recall three neighbors by name, number, or address. For example, I asked Gary:

(Interviewer: are there other people you suggest I talk to? For snowballing, like 3-5 people?) Uh, yea, let’s see. See, I don't know people’s last names (Interviewer: You can put first names and I'll figure it out) Joe and uh, his wife….ah…*(has trouble recalling)* I can’t believe I forgot the names. They are, ah, that last bit of houses going towards liberty street. I can see their house, but I don't even know the number. But I can see their porch from my porch, Ah. … Um, Again, I know the people in the neighborhood that are most active. You know, cause I’m part of the HOA … and so, those are the people I get to see and talk to most often.
(Interviewer: So, Chris is in Phase III? I haven’t heard that name.) He is. Uh, and I cannot remember his wife’s name and I cannot believe I don't remember his wife’s name. I think they would have an interesting perspective. Um Let’s see, who else…um…there is a neighbor who lives in the condos and I never see her, she was very active in the very beginning and now she has gone quiet. She is a single female…

In and around the HOPE VI site, although there is little meaningful interaction via friend, casual friend or kin, there are formal connections and acquaintances made around issues of safety, child welfare, political awareness, and community development. Gary says the need for mobilizing against problems in Murphy Manor usually sets the agenda for HOA gatherings:

onz that Teton St side, cause they [owners] see it, they hear the partying that goes on at 2 am in the morning outside, they see the people of the roof of the building, they see the clothes hanging off the sides. They see the drug activity, the gang related activity. Those kinds of things… a lot of times I am not aware that some of these things that go on... But they make for great stories when we get together in HOA because everyone kinda raves.

This concern for the social problems of the rental complex sparks organizing and common interests among owners. Sheila explains their political and organizing sophistication:

We met with um, …the managers, the, the, whatcha call them (Interviewer: Property managers?) We’ve met with, yea, the property managers, the housing
authority, the mayor (Interviewer: Who initiated?) I initiated a couple of them, actually. The city manager. We met with everybody about…Murphy Manor.

(You said, the mayor, SCHA?) The city manager, the project manager for over here. Mhmm. (When you say project manager, do you mean the whole area?) For New Village… that’s been like over the past two years. (For 2 years?) Exactly. (You guys initiate these meetings?) Right. The New Village residents.

(When meeting with the mayor, what was the resolution?) Well, supposedly, implementing you know, programs. (When you met with him, what did you say was the problem?) Well, the concerns were the break-ins um, over here. Um, …(long pause) like I said, the disrespect from the kids, the um, (pause)…..gangs, the violence, you know, hearing the, I mean….um….actually having to call the police. Property damage, just a lot was going on. A lot of..theft, and you know….

(When meeting with SCHA, what was the concern?) Well, um, the, you know, being safe over here. Really, from the residents. At least actually, we not accusing, cause we don’t want to throw the blame. So we actually witness, we actually seen these kids doing things.

(With the city manager, what were the concerns?) The same concerns. We feel like chain of command first.

Gary also recalls attending a meeting with powerful outsiders and the HOA:

We just had a recent meeting with the housing authority, um (We? The HOA?) Yes. The homeowners actually, well it wasn't even homeowners,
it’s just kind of… again, people who live across the street absolutely were invited to the meeting. With the president, there’s a new gentleman who just took over. I don't have my notes to recall his name. But, In addition to himself and members of his staff, he also brought in… Ah, there is a separate management company that manages that property for the SCHA...

Residents almost exclusively refer to interactions and encounters with specific neighbors through organized meetings. When I inquired about other interactions in the community, most still referenced formal meetings and events. Kris explains that she is not as in touch with the neighbors since she stopped attending HOA events:

We have had a block party and I socialized with them and sometimes I go to the HOA meeting. Not much now. We had Halloween parties and we just had a, a regular, ah, just a, just a regular get together, we had that. Yea. And I’ve gotten to know them but I stopped going to the meetings stuff. So, that's where they mostly are. You know, at the meetings, you see most people at the meetings. So, I stopped going to the meetings. I didn't feel like going. You know, I’m sorry to say it. I could be a little bit more active.

Yea, at one time during the summertime, I used to be up there. We used to have a wonderful time. I used to go to the meetings with some frequency. But I stopped doing those things so I don't socialize with them as much.

Further, Juan asserts that many interactions remain formalized; he feels they are too formalized. For example, when some neighbors need to express a complaint, he said that notes are often drafted as HOA management correspondence, rather than personal
communication. “Yeah, so rather than, just like, you know, the local people on the
communw. ‘Yeah, so rather than, just like, you know, the local people on the
homeowners association group who like can write you a note on your door saying, ‘hey,
can you take care of XY and Z?’, you’ll get like this official letter saying neighbors have
complained.”

These examples of the very active homeowners association in proximity to the
new rental development are somewhat unsurprising. When studying middle income
Black neighborhoods, Cashin (2001: 751) asserts:

It is a quiet truth, spoken of in private conversations but not widely or publicly
admitted, that many middle-class black people are uncomfortable living in close
proximity to black persons of lower economic or social status. Unlike their white
suburban counterparts, they are attempting to escape the social distress,
particularly crime, associated with many urban neighborhoods. In many ways
they can be just as hostile to the urban poor as their white counterparts.

Thus, the relationships and ties are often built upon this desire to disassociate the
New Village development from the social problems perceived in HOPE VI. Intimate
secondary relationships form and thrive in this manner: “These relationships [often]
develop when people work together to perform specific public tasks” (Wireman 2008). A
main activity revolves around regulating the lower-income residents living in Murphy
Manor apartments and other charitable outreach efforts.

One homeowner offers:

Sure. We try to go out and, we try to establish relations with them. By having
Halloween party. Our annual back to school party. So, we have reached out to
them plenty of times in the past. Invite them over for our annual cookouts. It’s something we do. (Interviewer: How do you let them know about it?) We send out flyers. (Interviewer: And so, what is it like when you have these events and everyone is together?) It’s fun. We enjoy it. We invite the Mayor to come. He came. Some people from the Southern City housing, ah Southern officials. He was there at our last back to school party. (Interviewer: Were you able to get residents you gave flyers to to show?) Some. But mostly people send they kids. We would rather have the parents with the kids, instead of the kids being by themselves.

These secondary relationships are more prevalent in this community in a more formal way, like the HOA and community meetings, and remain exclusive gatherings for more advantaged, owner residents.

Some homeowners suggest that either the renters are not capable of organizing effectively, have no interest in doing so, or simply lack the resources. James says:

Well, a lot of times, they, they just don't know. It’s not, they don't have nothing established over there for them to group and meet anyway. Cause you really don't have activities for the kids over there. They was supposed to have a community center, they never did. I mean, it’s like people who live in the projects all they life or been around other people in the projects all they life. They have this mentality. It’s a bad mentality they have, and half the people, they don’t work, or half of the people on fixed income, or SSI, and welfare. They just got this mentality with they kids and that’s all they know.
Thus, specifically, these interactions and relationships are exercised predominantly among the upper income residents. Resident involvement has many formations and may effect residents, their feelings about the neighborhood, and their willingness to support it and its organizations (Wireman 1984: 69). Cashin (2001: 753) argues such exclusivity may be unpredicted, yet should be non-surprising:

…the rational way to create a haven of low taxes, low crime, stable property values, and comfortable suburban surroundings is to exclude or distance oneself from populations that bring increased social service demands and the type of anti-mainstream social behaviors that are frequently cultivated in isolated, poverty-ridden communities.

Dominique’s insight supports the view that community organization and division may be motivated by goals for community preservation:

I think that a lot of the people who live up here I believe are first time home buyers, and of course they are proud of their homes and they have made this investment and want to protect their investment. Which is of course understandable and in a lot of their minds, they feel like, to protect that investment, then the people who are not invested in the neighborhood are not gonna care as much. They may feel the people across the street won’t care as much about the neighborhood as those of us you know who own our houses. And I think that that is part of the problem and is part of the reason that their looking at them as though they could potentially be a problem.
Three dimensions of involvement, where these intimate secondary relationships and subsequent distancing occur, are noted and expressed by residents in the goals of self-help, community development, and citizen participation. The self-help goals include a play area being built, giving parties for neighborhood children, and holiday celebrations. Community development goals are recognized in the HOA’s initiative to effectively identify needs, set priorities, and use resources to create and carry out programs to develop community. Their organized efforts generate resources both internally and externally. Also, these intimate secondary relationships have expanded citizen participation and political economy in the neighborhood. Residents successfully cultivate and maintain working relations with officials.

However, the renters consistently are excluded from these dimensions of self-help, community development, and citizen participation. Without attention to these broader issues in policy formation circles, prescriptions like HOPE VI will continue to fall short of their goal of improving opportunity for people everywhere.

6.7 Implications: No Friends for the Poor?

HOPE VI was “initially conceived as a redevelopment and community-building program” (Popkin et al. 2004, 2). Recall that relationships “make up much of the social capital people use to deal with daily life, seize opportunities, and reduce uncertainty” (Morrill et al. 2005, 559). Further, HOPE VI specifically aimed to strengthen the status of the poor, and a major mechanism was considered to be interaction and contact with better off residents (Owens 2012). Thus, study of interactions, encounters, and relationships among these neighbors can shed light on neighborhood sustainability and
limited gains from beneficial neighborhood effects after HOPE VI.

Wireman (1984, 2008) discussed varying functions of relationships present in communities and neighborhoods. The concepts of primary, intimate secondary, and secondary relationship are key dimensions for loosely categorizing the expectations for and interactions that inevitably characterize life in Short Hills.

In Short Hills, there may be a lack of primary relationships once considered a notable attribute of ethnic urban neighborhoods. Primary relationships are characterized by intense personal involvement, mutual knowledge of character, knowledge of personal life, socializing, involvement with family, diffuse commitment, with little focus on specific purpose for association, public purpose for interactions, or public place for them to occur. These norms may have been reversed.

Instead, the Short Hills community is lacking many of the reported previous norms, especially among its low-income renters. Interactions, primary or secondary, seem permanently diminished among renting Short Hills residents. Among these residents, there seems to be little mending of the fabric thought to be important to lower income residents’ community and gains in access to opportunity.

Many of the attributes of the primary relationship, once deemed the norm for black neighborhoods, have given way to those more often associated among heterogeneous groups. Wireman argues that intimate secondary relationships, seen among New Village homeowners, “can have the intensity of involvement” noted in primary, but lack the personal connections of socializing and sharing of personal information in favor of limited commitment and consideration of public over private
matters, among other forms (1984, 3). Homeowners connect around goal seeking. These findings speak to the internal divisions present when living in the HOPE VI space; New Village residents have more intimate secondary relationships with one another, while Short Hills residents have few obvious relationships that fall within the primary, intimate secondary, or secondary categories, among themselves or with homeowners.

Further, integration of the homeowners and renters is fairly nonexistent. Wireman asserts that successful integration is marked by:

“1. Unafraid physical proximity; 2. Unhampered access by all to services and facilities; 3. Lack of tension among neighborhood residents around each other; 4. Opportunity to make friends with unlike neighbors; and 5. No more friction or conflict than occurs in nonintegrated communities (1984, 112).

Given the evidence presented in this chapter, successful integration is not expressed consistently or broadly between renters and homeowners. Wireman provides one explanation for the reluctance to commit to intimate secondary or primary relationships outside of the family unit as rooted in an apprehension for “unwanted obligation” in order to protect physical privacy, often threatened in the setting of apartment style, built environments (1984:9).

Wireman argues the functions of primary and intimate secondary relationship networks, may be of significance for low-income or low-status individuals or groups because of the way in which links across boundaries are facilitated. Relationships can function to provide access to power, resources, and institutions of political, social, and or economic power as they do for homeowners in New Village (Wireman 1984, 13). But, in
Short Hills, such links are not apparent in the narratives and activities of lower income residents. Who or what may cultivate positive interaction or association? These questions are vital as interaction is one of the primary mechanisms through which beneficial gains from HOPE VI living are expected to flow to lower income residents over time.

If the mixed income HOPE VI neighborhood is accepted as a heterogeneous community, then Wireman’s functions of secondary intimate relationships would be an important basis for achieving improvements stated in the goals of HOPE VI revitalization plans. Wireman (1984) hypothesizes these relationships may serve the following key functions:

1. permit a degree of intimacy and knowledge of others without commitment to friendship
2. permit common action on joint projects or mutual problems
3. facilitate acceptance of person from different incomes, races, ages, lifestyles, and housing tenure as legitimate community members
4. encourage understanding of the differing needs of persons in these such categories
5. help define a community’s responsibility to meet the needs of various groups
6. create a community network of trust relationships available for community business

The lack of these relationships among renting HOPE VI residents, between themselves and with the homeowners, may be counterproductive. These functions may be key to the success of HOPE VI’s ability to successfully construct vertical integration as a higher opportunity all-black neighborhood. These findings shed light on the intra-racial, lived experience of a community after HOPE VI policy intervention and suggest there are major flaws in the premise that community building and sustainability would be effortless and naturally borne.
7. Pursuing a False Hope: Constructing “Mix” in Mixed Income Housing?

This chapter offers particular attention to the construction and production of difference in the community and the subsequent negative perceptions and expectations of those residents in HOPE VI. Chaskin and Joseph (2010) assert that the concept of community building is key, significantly relevant to the goals of redeveloping former public housing communities into mixed-income communities that are perceived as better functioning and more sustainable than their predecessors. This study and previous research suggests that there is a complicated relationship among mixed income residents (Fraser et al. 2009, Joseph 2008, Tach 2009, Kleit 2011, 2005). To date, little evidence has suggested that income mixing has benefitted low-income residents nor supported the idea that positive social interaction or dynamic community building directly facilitates positive outcomes (For example, see GAO 1998; National Housing Law Project et al. 2002; Popkin et al. 2004).

The previous chapter asserted that there may be major flaws in the assumption that community building and interaction would flow naturally from HOPE VI. In a critical review of the literature, Kleit (2011) concludes that social interaction in mixed income communities continues to be “fairly distant, cursory, and infrequent.” This seems to be in comparison to previous understanding of strong community ties among residents in public housing. Often, there is some evidence that residents go through great lengths to do the opposite of engaging with one another, even in the face of perceived homogeneity. Short Hills demonstrates that community building is not effortless or natural. In addition,
to a degree, these interactions and development patterns can also produce unanticipated costs, production of difference and processes of intra-racial tension.

7.1 Resident Perceptions: More Different than the Same?

Kleit (2011) notes the lack of evidence available for gathering a deeper understanding of the ways in which social distancing functions among those with similar racial and ethnic backgrounds within the mixed income setting. While a common belief was that proximity or homogeneity may breed positive social interaction and community among mixed income residents, there is little evidence of this occurring.

Particularly, in HOPE VI sites, homeownership schemes appeal to first time homebuyers and working class families. Also, the constraints of real estate markets around public housing may be slower to respond to HOPE VI revitalization efforts, keeping home prices in affordable ranges. HOPE VI sites often achieve varying levels of income mix, and even owner/renter status; yet, simultaneously, many gentrifying HOPE VI communities’ newer, non-public housing families may be similar on observable socio-demographic factors, especially race and, in some cases, income (Rerat et al. 2010).

This distinction of mix (same race, different subsidy, different status) may be essential to understanding the ways in which perceptions of heterogeneity, social interaction, and social distancing function in regard to identity formation and the spacial-social dynamics are observed in these communities.

In this case study, there are low income and moderately low-income African-American families who comprise the community. The site consists of rental apartments and townhouses as well as heavily subsidized and low-cost homeownership single-family
homes and condominium units. Therefore, this was one potential source of sorting (see Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Joseph 2008; Pader and Breidbardt 2003; Ruming et al. 2004; Silverman et al. 2005; Varady et al. 2005, Owens 2012). This area of inquiry is the main focus of this study. Kleit (2011) discussed status homophily and value homophily in the mixed income community. Although Gans (1967, 1968) and Michelson (1976) noted that homogeneity may be most significant in the development of relationships, in this particular community, it was unclear which aspects of shared status and values would predict positive social interaction or distancing. Kleit (2011) and McPherson (2001) acknowledged status homophily can be established along formal lines as well as through informal and ascribed conceptions of status not limited to social class, education, race and ethnicity, and employment.

Apparent racial homogeneity and typologies for value and or status homophily were countered with distinct patterns of identity formation, social interaction, and social distancing that demarcate division among and between renters and owners as well as power dynamics. As a result, in this case, status homophily is often ascribed via homeownership and access to political power. This chapter illuminates the social- spatial identity work homeowners employ in their process of distancing and differentiating themselves from renters in the community. This is an important issue because, in many HOPE VI sites, in the absence of observable racial or socio-economic difference, there is a clear demarcation between low- income homeowners and renters.

This chapter pays particular attention to examining the narratives about behavior reported by recent homeowners. This group tends to construct identity and community
along the lines of ascribed status via homeownership or spatial location that facilitates the creation and maintenance of perceived status and value heterogeneity in the community. Once established, even when there is actual socio-economic difference, something other than income functions to prompt lines of separation. What are the implications of this, more generally, for these sites’ social cohesion and the development of community?

7.2 Findings

The findings of this chapter pinpoint those perceptions and actions of homeowners adjacent to the renters of Murphy Manor who formally and informally manage the HOPE VI development. These data explicate a complex production of belonging and community among newcomers. Three major pathways through which social interaction and community are constructed and experienced explain what types of families live in the Short Hills area and how they construct community in the HOPE VI area. These three pathways are the social construction of the other, the policing and regulating of social space, and the maintenance of rules of engagement and interaction.

7.2.1 “The People across the Street”: The Social Construction of Other

I really think it’s a us vs. them. I can’t describe it any other way. --Jonathon

I don’t wanna separate myself from anybody. I’m thankful god gave me the brain to do better. --Sheila¹

¹ Because interviews and interaction were quite informal, many respondents used informal speech. While I have edited some false sentence starts and rhetorical fillers (e.g., um, you know), most false starts are expressed in the transcriptions. I have not translated conversations into Standard English.
New Village homeowners are a diverse group. The homes of the community are comprised of families with a range of educational backgrounds, attitudes, and life cycle stages. Unsolicited, most mention their occupations in conversations about their experiences living in the revitalized, transitioning area: a lawyer, bondswoman, a medical center employee, city worker, community activist, a sales manager, and retail worker. For varying reasons, each purchased a home and decided to live in the transitioning community. The single-family homes are spacious, each 1100 to 1450 square feet with large front porches facing the quiet, tree lined street. The porches are adorned with rocking chairs, swings, wind chimes, plants, and flowers and it is not uncommon to observe a neighbor quietly perched there enjoying the day. In addition, the Housing Authority plans to construct twenty for sale single-family homes on the Short Hills site. Even though both revitalization projects are located in close proximity to one another, the narratives of homeowners quickly illuminate social cleavages.

New Village homeowners construct their identities through a constant process of contrasting their traits with constructed images of “low-income” renter residents of Murphy Manor to establish who they are not. They juxtapose their attitudes and behaviors against familiar typecasts of public housing residents. Even though Short Hills has been restructured, respondents rarely refer to or acknowledge the mixed income design, more stringent eligibility requirements, or self-sufficiency programs in place there. Many explicitly describe the ways in which Murphy Manor people are ‘different’ from them.
Even though homeowners seem to rely on extremely limited personal experiences interacting with renters, they operationalize a reliable, corroborated foil—“people across the street”-- to explain the isolation and difference between those living in New Village and the “others” living in Murphy Manor. The social construction of “the other” is a communal process of repeating narratives and sharing deep-seated opinions, attitudes, and conceptualizations of public housing households. Specifically, many homeowners construct the “other” identity through stereotypical images and narrative of the social problems that ail public housing communities. The homeowners interviewed demonstrated a need to explain and confirm that while New Village is located in proximity to the HOPE VI site, it is distinct and unified against problems potentially associated with being near public housing or low-income renters. Tension exists at the intersection of protecting and elevating personal status and the degradation of the unfamiliar, or perhaps, too familiar group.

One respondent, Sheila, continuously grapples with this issue. Sheila currently works as a bondsman. She is an older, single mother of a 14-year-old boy. Her son’s father has been in jail most of his life. She proudly describes her son as a quiet, good kid currently enrolled in a special science and mathematics program at his public high school. She moved to New Village after being raised in the rural part of the county.

Sheila is a first time homeowner. She is very passionate and concerned about the children affected by the “conditions” in Murphy Manor. She asserts that the difference between the homeowners living in New Village and the renters in Murphy Manor stems from education, parenting skills, and the desire to mimic the bad life. While arguing that
the families across the street are stuck in a vicious cycle, she contradicts herself with her parallel argument that these differences are perceived and not real:

I’m really not satisfied with Murphy Manor…I’m afraid for him [my son] to [go outside]; he doesn’t even interact with the kids around here … [Trails off] We have actual statistics from meetings about these people’s education and situations. We have some people here [New Village ] that don’t have the education or the finances. There is no difference. If they took the statistics here [in New Village ], they may find the same.

Sheila is unable to articulate definitively whether difference exists or not. She also conveys her desires to intervene by reaching out to the Murphy Manor children. Sheila expresses:

People are just heartless and cruel, but really are just reaching out for help which is why I care about them. It makes you look bad when you speak that way. I tell them [Murphy Manor kids], but they talk back. We can’t even use the motto it takes a village to raise a kid. I feel like we divided, but technically, we are still neighbors.

Sheila defines her neighborhood as the larger multi-block city revitalization effort, but she only can name neighbors who live in New Village. She speaks of community and neighborhood with Murphy Manor, but eventually concludes that New Village and Murphy Manor are, nonetheless, distinct and that more comprehensive screening of the renters could mitigate “difference”:
You know, New Village didn’t have anything to do with HOPE VI. It’s not the same funding, so we actually had some issues when they started talking about Murphy Manor…it’s basically Short Hills all over again. It’s not even the same builders. This is Southern City; that was the Housing Authority. If they understood the importance of education; high school education is free…went to school it would broaden their mind from crime, violence and what they are used to. That’s why we fight so hard for them [rental management company] to screen the residents more…just do different.

Some homeowners, like Sheila, vacillate between conceptualizations of the renters across the street as being inherently different, in need, or being just like themselves. Sheila notes, “I don’t wanna consider ‘these’ people, cause I’m one of them.” When describing why she was unhappy with Murphy Manor, she expressed genuine concern, especially for the children who live across the street from her. Even though at least half of the homeowners living in the first two phases of the homeownership community are defined as low- to moderate- income by Southern City, Sheila points to characteristics other than income like parenting, education, and lifestyle as markers of distress. For example, she asserts, “It starts with the importance of education and staying in school. High school education is free. The importance of working. Being productive members of society. We shouldn’t want to feel different or better than anybody, but that’s unfortunately how it is.”

Unlike Sheila, Gary seems more decisive about his view that the difference between his neighbors in New Village and those at Murphy Manor is based on socioeconomic barriers. Gary is a white sales manager from the Eastern part of the state.
He is college educated and bought his second home, a condominium, in New Village. He vividly remembers stumbling across (accidentally) the Short Hills community while in college several years ago. He plans to live in New Village no longer than five years and describes it as transitional housing and an investment.

Gary is remarried and lives with his wife as a couple that can be categorized as young, married empty nesters. He purchased his home after a buyer gave him two weeks to move out of his then single family home, which had been on the market for six months. He was attracted to the price and quality of the condominium in New Village and made the “gamble.” He is one of only a handful of non-blacks living in New Village. Gary explains:

I was gambling on the hope of gentrification [here] because of downtown. They are doing a lot, to try to make it, uh, a friendlier place. They are doing a lot. Those units being income based doesn’t necessarily scare me. There is an impression those units are going to draw bad elements. I am certainly a minority, it’s the first time in my life. Oftentimes, I am the, uh, um, only Caucasian person. I love it. It’s such a different experience for me, it’s kinda fun. I do feel a connection with the neighbors along my street, those in the HOA. But, I don’t interact with those folks. I think it’s deeper: I really think it runs socio-economic barriers.

The ways in which New Village residents describe the othering of Murphy Manor residents shapes interaction and may instigate practices of exclusion. Gary notes:

Again there is a perception on our end, New Village, that there’s just a lot of bad things going on across the street. I am insulated located in the middle of the
property; it’s a different experience, because I don’t see the street. There is a lot of distrust between New Village and Murphy. People are more concerned with the guy across the street than the homeless shelter in the neighborhood.

While Sheila’s account of difference-making or othering alludes to a complex of social factors and Gary’s account points to socioeconomic disadvantage, Curtis makes a more behavioral, pathological argument about those living at Murphy Manor. Curtis is “older,” single, and childless. He works as the manager of a local supermarket and grew up within a mile from the Short Hills site. After looking for a home for a year, Curtis chose New Village to be closer to his aging grandfather and his mother. While on the market, he knew of New Village and the demolition of Short Hills, but avoided visiting the area for months because of his views on Short Hills. Eventually, he was attracted to his home and purchased it because of the high quality of the construction and the price.

Curtis discusses the Murphy Manor community. Initially, Curtis’s view seems oblivious to notions of difference: “We reach out to the neighbors all the time. We send out flyers [cookout event]. Most of them people sent they kids.”

He then, employs the standard typecast of public housing residents, failing to acknowledge the mixed income structure of the rental community. Curtis continues:

People in that type of environment in and out anyway. If people don’t have the power to buy [homes], they know the government is taking care of them.

Kids look for guidance. If your parents strung out on drugs, half the time, they being taken care of by someone else (grandparents, aunt, uncle). They don’t know they parents. They gon have this type of mentality. It’s funny, u just can’t
get that mentality outta some people. No matter what you do. How you try to restructure they lives. That’s what we having now.

Most homeowners’ construction of New Village residents’ identities is divorced from any specific engagement or interaction with the majority of renters living across the street. Similar to Sheila’s insinuation that education and intervention could somehow reform Murphy Manor residents and children, Curtis concludes that, perhaps, the government could provide training for HOPE VI families to be more desirable community members.

We are an oasis in the middle of the desert [laughs]. Our community [sustainability] depends on what happens across the street. Their minds are pretty much set living at the low price. They not gon change. I would just want them to be more caring. They [government] should train the people in what to do when they come back and how they should live and be more caring. Set guidelines in place, like us. We pay dues.

Dominique and Jonathon, younger homeowners, express more sympathetic perspectives than many older residents who constantly point to pathological, behavioral, or socio-demographic differences for constructing otherness across the street. The younger homeowners are fully aware of the ways in which older residents conceptualize the people across the street. But, they are able to recognize and explain this process of othering without directly espousing it.

Dominique is a young single mother of a seven-year-old girl and has her seven-year-old nephew living with her. She has lived in this state for most of her adult life. She
moved to Southern City for law school and bought her home in New Village. She decided to stay after graduating. She plans to live there temporarily, and then intends to rent out her home. Dominique discusses the bias held by her neighbors and explains the concerns:

My daughter and nephew, they do not go to the neighborhood school. My daughter and nephew are both seven. They’re small children; they don’t know any others in the area. I don’t think I would mind them getting to know kids in the neighborhood. When we are home, we are in the house. There are not any children their age on this side of the street in the neighborhood, maybe some older kids, but no kids their age. There are kids across the street. We can go to the playground over there and they can play with the kids from across the street, but we don’t bother to learn their names. I think about safety, neighborhood, environment, people who are around, it’s a big difference when you have a child in this neighborhood. There are like no kids on this side of the community.

Most of the people [New Village ] are outsiders like me, or people who bought houses while in school, or people working near the area, but not people who lived there[Short Hills] before, but I don’t know about across the street. I think that a lot of people came across the neighborhood looking for affordable housing. The diversity is a benefit.

Dominique explains the othering and distancing from Murphy Manor residents. She suggests it is a protective response:
When I moved here, there was nothing across the street but a field. Neighbors complained once they heard about construction of low-income housing across the street. They were really not happy. A lot of time, I think people feel that it brings their property values down, but mines has remained level even though the housing market crashed. They complain about Murphy Manor in the meetings.

Yet, beyond rational concerns for their financial investment in the neighborhood, she suggests bias and prejudice also fuel persistent cleavages. Dominique explains:

I notice some of my neighbors attitudes are kinda like, oh they are low income and they turn their nose up and expect the worse out of the people across the street. That’s how they see them, [whispers] “the people across the street.” My neighbors would be mad at me that I am sticking up for the people in Murphy Manor.

This process of constructing the identities of renter households as poor, threatening, inadequately educated, and badly behaved has implications for community sustainability, social efficacy, and regulation of the space. Among many homeowners, the lack of interaction with those renting is deliberate (Rosenbaum et al., 1991; Pader and Breitbart, 1993; Breitbart and Pader, 1995; Hogan, 1996; Brophy and Smith, 1997; Rosenbaum, Stroh, and Flynn, 1998; Buron et al., 2002; Kleit, 2005). There may be genuine concern for the condition of those living in Murphy Manor, however, homeowners work to disassociate their geographic position and community identity from any shared ties with renters who are perceived to be in need of housing assistance.
One homeowner, Jonathon, describes the main outcome as the “war with Murphy Manor.” Jonathon is a younger, single childless condominium owner. He bought his home when he was 23. He is college educated, works in politics, and has a background working on social justice issues. Because he says he grew up poor, he wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to buy and stabilize the targeted neighborhood. Like Dominique, he argues the differences are not tangible, but quasi-psychological, stemming from bias. He explains:

The neighborhood is diverse: Older family, the Section 8 buyer, young yuppies. There is a war going on with Murphy Manor. I don’t have any problems with those people…but it [HOA] became this us against them thing. It’s uncomfortable for me [the way they talk about Murphy Manor residents]. This fear of us vs. them fuels a lot. There’s someone to blame. There is [also] kind of a old school vs. new school attitude towards lifestyle with people scrutinizing your house. For me, it’s just I go to work and come home, I work long hours. I don’t know many people on either side. But, my neighbors, it’s the us vs. them. Murphy Manor is them. Call me a hippie, but they are not bad people or flawed people. They have been dealt a lot in life, honestly, that takes generations to get out of. It’s frustrating to me, 85% of us are Black. We know what it means to struggle. I would say 90% of these people who live in New Village are low income.

I think it’s all psychological. It’s not rational. It concerns me this thought that people in the projects are any different from us. People struggle. The people in Murphy Manor have a larger number of dependents compared to our
neighborhood, just from the sheer number of kids running around. Um, now one hilarious thing, we’re so concerned with Murphy Manor when the homeless shelter is right there, we don’t care about that. It’s interesting to me. You would think they [homeless] would be more of a threat.

Still, even Jonathon refers to Murphy Manor renters as “those people.” Murphy Manor and New Village function as two communities adjoined --a superior and inferior--without a union.

Although previous research suggests that potential common traits like race and family and social economic status may help facilitate interaction (Lee, Campbell, and Miller, 1991; Kleit, 2001a, 2001b, 2005; Briggs, 1997; Brophy and Smith, 1997), there are persistent cleavages among homeowners and renters that seem to trump potential interconnectedness based on other comparable socio-demographic factors.

As the quotes illustrate, homeowners in the HOPE VI area face tensions from a desire to protect their social status by distinguishing themselves from the Murphy Manor residents. This may explain the sustained cleavages they perceive and promote and that, ultimately, manifest through the lack of social interaction and negative feelings of camaraderie with the renters in proximity to their homes.

7.2.2 “Danger and Crime”: Policing and Regulating Social Space

We got neighborhood watch. People watching. They see you. Nothing would happen to you here. --Samantha

Whenever I hear gunshots, even if it’s just every other month, I just call in to 911. That’s how they plot, it’s a double-edged sword. It means we run up our
reports on the crime map. But, we get increased coverage. That’s the biggest crime deterrent… --Jonathon

Homeowners’ concerns about and awareness of the others across the street burgeon into a larger manifestation of enthusiastic policing and regulation of the social public HOPE VI space. A casual observer may notice there is a strong police presence and awareness of public activities in the community. Homeowners express concerns over violence, deviant behavior, idle youth, and crime. Some homeowners actively participate in local politics, directing resources to the HOPE VI area, such as more police and patrolling. Others encourage formal and informal crime deterrence though neighborhood watch schemes and hyper-awareness of ‘bad’ behaviors and activity. Although major concerns are about the surrounding area enclosing revitalized space or the nearby community homeless shelter, most concerns expressed actually regard Murphy Manor residents rather than the latter.

In fact, the most important stated priority of the New Village residents active in the HOA is ensuring a safer neighborhood. One Community Development report, using information gathered from community stakeholders and focus groups including New Village homeowner’s association members, highlights the current conditions and priorities of the broader Short Hills area. A key finding of this report was residents’ desire to have more police presence in the area. This idea of police presence seems both to feed into feelings of safety and to perpetuate perceptions of threat. For example, even
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though Dominique says she has never felt threatened while in her community she admits, “It’s really good. They are just out there. They are patrolling. They’re usually, you know, around. It makes it safer.”

Yet, residents seem to muddle reality and perceptions of crime in New Village as well as deviant behavior and activities occurring in Murphy Manor. For example, Samantha, a long-term resident of the Short Hills area, states, “it [Short Hills] wasn’t as bad as it is now as it was before.” The Southern City HOPE VI Evaluation Report does not support this claim. Rather, evidence suggests crime has improved in the area, relative to the pre-HOPE VI periods where Curtis described Short Hills as the “Drug Capital.” Confusion remains about how “bad” or how “good” crime is in the Short Hills area. But, there seems to be agreement among many that, to some degree, most of the crime threatening the community comes at the will of non-resident outsiders.

The Community Development report states, “Although the criminal activity is perceived to originate from outside the community…New Village residents believe that there is a small but expanding criminal element living within the Hope VI rental apartments.” Jonathon suggests that his neighbors construct Murphy Manor renters in a negative light. “Murphy Manor is ‘them’ they are the problem. They are the bad people. It’s flawed, but, that’s the image people have.” Further, Jonathon says he has no personal knowledge of criminal incidents or the crime epidemic some neighbors imply. He equates
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any potential crime in New Village and Murphy Manor to the crime any rental community would experience:

Because it’s like, those people are renting; any time you have renters, no matter what their income is, you could have a bunch of college students, a posh apartment community, there is gonna be the same issues of crime, loitering, children around. No matter where you live in Southern City, there may be crime two blocks from you-- your car may be broken into, there may be petty vandalism or theft. And, so what makes us think we are gonna be any different?! You can go to those University apartments and they have the same issues of break-ins, or loitering, etc. For some reason, New Village thinks we’re different.

If you look at the crime map, it’s just domestic violence, it’s people who know each other. It’s just that a lot of people in our neighborhood know each other and beef with each other and hurt each other. It’s confined to that. You don’t hear about random shooting, you don’t hear about innocent people getting hurt in our neighborhood. As soon as we get over that us vs. them mentality, I think we can go a long way.

Jonathon also grounds his view in personal experience with crime in New Village:

I’ve left my computer on the porch over night, left my door unlocked all day accidently and come back, no one’s been in my house. For nothing to happen in three years, it’s a sign there can’t be an epidemic. I mean someone’s car radio got stolen, but that happened to me in a posh apartment complex. Other than loitering, I’ve never seen anyone do anything bad over there. They are just trying to make it
like everybody else. At night, it gets a lil, I mean, you ask the normal question you ask in any low-income neighborhood, “Why are these kids out at 11 o’clock at night? ”I walk my dog at night; I don’t have fear living in my own neighborhood. You just have to be smart no matter where you live.

Many of the homeowners tend to muddle criminal and social activities and behaviors. Jonathon argues that the standards for addressing those activities can be impersonal:

There’s also this, kinda rush to use the establishment that I think is tied a lot to people being first time homeowners. Instead of talking to neighbors, they file complaints with the official management company, community developer, mayor, Housing Authority. I don’t agree with that. I’ve gotten like three letters.”

Simultaneously, however, there are personalized recruitment efforts to encourage community members to regulate the space. A homeowner notes:

There’s also people who do City politics within our neighborhood. They send us emails to join this board, join this pact. They make it their hobby to keep up with stuff. They try to recruit us in to what is happening in the district, pact, and neighborhood event.

Reality and perceptions collide. Several homeowners echoed the phrase, “There is drama across the street.” There are few examples presented of the “drama” that is occurring. For example, Sheila offered, “Some incidents are all the time. Two, three times a week” However, the personal narratives fail to strengthen or fully support this claim. Dominique’s statement best summarizes this, “They tend to spend more time
outside, we may sit on our porch, but there is a lot more activity in general in Murphy Manor. You may hear a big argument; there is really never drama here in New Village.”

Many of the homeowners do not see or witness incidents all the time and, most often, refer to how peaceful they feel the streets are in New Village streets. In fact, Sheila is one of the few residents who has had repeated personal experiences with crime at her New Village home. She mentions that the, “Gangs, drugs, the violence, larceny…” of Murphy Manor concern her. Sheila says she feels compassionate for ‘these people’ because she studied criminal justice, but still fears for her own safety. Police data, noted in Table 7 of Appendix, A5, corroborates that three events were reported and recorded at Samantha’s address since she moved into her home in January 2007.5

Sheila, like many residents active with the HOA, supports increased policing and regulation of the HOPE VI site. The crime section of the Community Development report concludes, “There is a strong sense of partnership with the Police Department and the New Village neighborhood.” Gary and Dominique both describe the initiative between the city and the homeowners. Gary notes:

We are well aware that the City, on the police side, dedicated resources to this area. New Village is dead set in the center. For a whole year, they offered overtime to the police officers, they allowed them more flexibility, such as dressing in plain clothes. It wasn’t just New, it was also some of the surrounding areas. Crime has decreased, absolutely, but, would I feel safe walking at 10pm at

5Southern City Crime Mapper; between Sheila’s move in date of Jan. 2007, until the present, shows three reported incidents: simple assault in June 2009 and Larceny/theft in August 2009 and theft from motor vehicle in April 2010.
night around the corner? Nope. We are still aware that there still is criminal activity occurring. Oftentimes, it’s very out in the open. Very in your face.

Dominique adds:

There’s a lot of police activity there, in that area. Wanted, definitely, I believe, wanted. Although, I’ve never felt threatened or that it was a dangerous neighborhood or area. For me, it makes me feel like they care what’s going on around here; they are trying to make sure our neighborhood safe, they are trying to deter crime.

The idea of using policing and regulation to deter crime is a common theme in the homeowner narratives. Dominique says, “My neighbors think people across the street are gonna run it down or write graffiti all over it and tear it up.” Therefore, it was unsurprising that Samantha brought up a community summer program that directly targets children in an attempt to curb deviant behavior. In the summer, the district police department holds a summer camp at the neighborhood elementary school. Samantha said it was good for the Murphy kids and mentioned she believed that it would even be a good idea to, “take the kids down to the jail to see it.”

Both the desire to protect their investment and the ways in which they construct and maintain the otherness of Murphy Manor and a consequent hyper-perception of crime ground the homeowner support for and implementation of policing and regulation in the HOPE VI space. In essence, many homeowners fear that Murphy Manor may revert back into the old Short Hills. Curtis expressed that the HOA tried to convince stakeholders to build a community center for Murphy Manor to help regulate the activities of the
children. “If they get a center there that would cut down a lot of the kids walking and being destructive because when kids don’t have a place to go, everything they see becomes a target for destruction.”

Samantha also uses these types of concerns to explain the urgent need for the HOA to stick up for their neighborhood. The homeowners boast that there is even a “fake police car” parked in the community to deter crime.

This stands in contrast to the persistent inability to recall actual criminal activity in the community that would warrant hyper-policing. There seems to be a persistent portrayal of Murphy as violent and criminal, with very little reference to actual events. Curtis says the only crime he has witnessed were fights among the children in Murphy Manor. Thus, respondents only refer to hypothetical crime or real incidents of loitering and children being outside. Gary says he cannot personally recall criminal activity because his interior location insulates him from being able to witness crime firsthand:

I think that [Long pause], There’s, well, I am just trying to think of a good example… We [HOA] just had a recent meeting with the Housing Authority, the president, his staff, Murphy Manor management co… there were issues. Let’s back up--several months ago, there were issues where a young man came from across the street and stole a bike from a child living on our street. I wasn’t there, I am recounting the story. It sparked a lot of hard feelings, animosity. But, because I live on the inside of the property, I don’t see a lot of the incidents. You will find the most distrust and animosity is on the street facing [Murphy Manor], And so, they are talking about putting more security in blah, blah.
Often, the lines between criminal activity and social activities are intertwined. While it is difficult for homeowners to recall actual criminal activity incidents, they do recall incidents of partying and youth being outside. Roslyn worries:

Basically, I see a lot of the same things happening over there, as in other public housing. I see a lot of sitting out. I see boyfriends moved in. Um, the Crime rate right now hasn’t, is not that bad yet, so, that’s ‘cause it’s relatively new. I see children, unsupervised children, all over the neighborhood. Um, I think you know, Right now, I think, basically, it’s too early to tell.

Dominique’s narrative further elaborates earlier references to deviant children in the neighborhood. She discusses her neighbors’ concerns for controlling the children who live across the street:

The neighborhood itself, on our side, it’s quiet. Of course, there’s drama across the street! Since they developed the apartments across the streets, there seems to be where the ‘drama’ is now, even though the surrounding areas were bad. The neighbors have a lot of meetings to complain.

But mostly, they complain about the children. I never see these kids doing anything wrong. I only see them playing outside. I mean, yes, there are a lot of children. I’ve never seen them outside fighting or doing anything outrageous. But, a lot of the time, my neighbors complain about the children-- in general. But, they are just kids. They think the kids are going to do something wrong. They are not bothering us. They are not gonna go away, so, why not try to get along? Why be antagonistic?
Curtis provides an example of Dominique’s observation of how some homeowners’ tend to criminalize the activities of children in the neighborhood:

They don’t respect the place. The kids have no respect for the neighborhood. I have seen them. Sometimes, I go in my yard and kids walk by and just drop they trash in the yard in the streets. And I just have to go out, sometimes day after, and just clean up the stuff out the yard up the street. They don’t have no respect; pull the tree limbs off the trees. We try to beautify the neighborhood, they pulling tree limbs off the trees.

This past summer, we have incidents, 12 and 1 o’clock, kids walking the streets by themselves, this just recently. All night, kid is up in that neighborhood across the street. To me, if they was under some type of curfew; be in at a certain time, that would cut that riff raff out. Demolishing of the neighborhood. Crime would be a lot lower. Also over there, the girlfriends let they boyfriends come over and they have incidents selling drugs.

This quotation provides an example of how respondents intertwine perceptions of criminal activity with judgments about socially acceptable behavior in the neighborhood. Sheila goes further by suggesting these deviant behaviors are intergenerational:

It’s about choices you make. My mother did herself. I’m sympathetic to kids that don’t have that. And it’s not the kids; it’s their mothers, and their mothers. You got grandmothers 30 something years old! These kids walk by cursing like I’m not even there. It’s difficult to just jump in and help each other. We need to help
people to realize its [education] important. Everyone doesn’t have to go to college, even if you want to be a street sweeper, be the best one.

Sheila carefully outlines the “chain of command” used to address unwanted incidents in Murphy Manor. When asked about attendance at these meetings, Sheila admitted the Murphy Manor residents were not present, nor invited to participate in most of them: “We’ve met with everybody about Murphy Manor—I’ve initiated some of them…in the past two years since Murphy Manor has been there. We feel like we have the authority, or the right, to contact them.”

A primary example of how residents want to improve regulation of the HOPE VI space is their argument for enhanced, more comprehensive screening of Murphy Manor tenants. Although, she made clear earlier that her New Village community was distinct from Murphy Manor, Sheila and some of her neighbors actively engage and initiate forums to set and enforce guidelines in and around the HOPE VI space. Her stance is somewhat paternalistic.

We knew the demographics, that’s why we tried to fight so hard for them to screen the residents more and just do different. Offer what they need to be good tenants. More seminars, more speeches. I’ll volunteer to go and help the young mothers to show them, you know, to even be a mentor. I’ll even do it!

In addition, formal interventions through political involvement, respondents refer to informal actions, similar to policing, performed by specific homeowners and neighbor watch. Curtis explains:
William, Samantha’s husband, still looks out for the neighborhood; William is up, sometimes through the night, walking the neighborhood, checking on people. Making sure everything is like it’s supposed to be. Him and Charles [another homeowner].

In light of the hypersensitivity to crime, elevated policing, and formal and informal community watch activities and behavior, Dominique did not benefit from such measures. She and Sheila are the only homeowners to recount in detail actual personal experience with crime. In Dominique’s home:

They broke in, only took the flat screen TV. Upstairs in my bedroom. They stepped on my laptop, my camera was there, my wallet was on the dresser. They only took the television. I was grateful. No, they never found who did it. They police got several phone calls, accounts of two men with a television on the street. They never recovered it. They never figured out who did it. This could of happened anywhere. Especially, because they carried it and the police got several calls throughout different blocks. The neighbors said,” It had to be those Murphy Manor people”…but we know the TV didn’t go across the street. I am not one to say those people had to have done this. We don’t know.

The quotes illuminate the complexity of revitalizing HOPE VI areas, particularly when developing measures to protect the community. Residents tend to believe that crime originates in Murphy Manor even though little evidence supports this. As a result, the people who live there face criticism, policing, and regulation that may not be justified. These narratives shed light on what it is like to live in the mixed-income, publicly
constructed space. Specifically, the lack of social connections among the homeowners and renters in the Short Hills HOPE VI area shapes the management of crime and social behavior.

To counter the claim that the renters are the only and most relevant perpetrators of disruption, Officer Green argues:

The one thing … that is unfortunate…is that HOPE VI is right in the middle of the one mile square radius that has the most shots fired, the most gangbanger residents, the most…calls for noise…this is right in the middle of it. Now, HOPE VI, this area, is not where the problems are coming from, but the areas right around it…

7.2.3 “Family, Neighbors, and Community”: Rules of Engagement and Interaction

Residents of New Village feel strongly that it is the establishment of long-term residents and owner-occupants’ eyes on the street that will lead to stability and security in the neighborhood and the creation of community.”

I wish there was a way to bring our specific street with the rest of the neighborhood. That was a missed opportunity. I think fundamentally everybody in there is good people. --Jonathon

---

*S Southern City New Village / Community X Neighborhood Plan, Department of Neighborhood Improvement Services, Spring 2009 Report*
I love my home. If I could pick it up and move, it I would. I am very not satisfied with Murphy Manor. --Sheila

Many homeowners assert that their community is like a ‘family.’ Their neighbors make up that family. Yet, they rarely refer to Murphy Manor residents as family or as their neighbors. In the HOPE VI area, the noted isolation of Murphy Manor residents counters the ways in which the homeowners construct community. Samantha suggests there were higher levels of social interaction and engagement across Oak St and Short Hills before the revitalization efforts:

We was lucky. They [Short hills residents] never bothered us (Interviewer: Even back then in the 80s?) Yeah, they didn’t bother us in the 80s. I mean, they, I mean, we never had anything broken into. I think they respected us. You know, they, They would come by, people would walk by from the projects and they come and speak to us, and talk to us, and tell us some of they concerns of what was going on.

Today, community and social interaction in the HOPE VI area seems to be characterized by patterns of exclusion and organized inclusion. Homeowners view diversity within New Village as a benefit, but the perceived difference between them and renters is damaging. Therefore, even though the common response is, “I don’t know anyone who lives in Murphy Manor right now,” the image of the engaged ‘family’ many homeowners construct presents a complex definition of limited inclusiveness of Murphy Manor residents. For example, Gary explains how his idea of neighborhood includes mostly the two New Village streets and how his community is primarily composed of the
people along it, mostly in the close-knit HOA. It becomes clear that while homeowners feel responsible for managing community building with outsiders, they also construct norms of social interaction and inclusion within New Village.

Gary appreciates that he is a part of a group of close-knit neighbors who would ‘never know each other outside of the targeted community revitalization opportunity.’ Jonathon concurs, “One of the things I like is the sheer diversity.” The homeowners often refer to the diverse New Village community as a “family.” For example, Samantha views her strong “family” community as a great benefit; she feels there is “relative equality” among New Village neighbors compared to her old collection of neighbors. She says, “We’ve got a good communication with neighbors here, we like a big family here versus in 85 when they had the projects over there.”

Samantha, a medical center employee, is the sole homeowner who lived in the community prior to revitalization. She was not a resident of the Short Hills rental community, but had a house on the street adjacent to the development, Oak Ave. The city demolished her street to make way for the New Village construction. She currently lives just one address down from her original home. Her kids, now 19 and 23, grew up in the home. Samantha is not a first time homeowner. She bought her first home there at 23 years old. She has been a member of the community longer than any other respondent, nearly 25 years.

---

7 Southern City plans to demolish the dilapidated homes along Avenue X included compensation for affected homeowners. Samantha, however, is the only one of those homeowners to return to the site.
While her definition of family generally refers to her New Village neighbors, she maintains a strong opinion about whom the Housing Authority should allow into Murphy Manor:

Make sure they screen the people that come in there. Make sure the people are qualified to come in there. Do some testing, do some background checks. So they won’t get bad people over there. Everybody over there is not bad people, but the girlfriends bring in they boyfriends and you get a lot of mess.

While most homeowners understand the role of New Village within the larger context of the larger scale Short Hills area revitalization, a potential cleavage among the homeowners and the larger community unfolds in the complex narratives homeowners present regarding community interaction and engagement.

According to Jonathon, many homeowners do not view the others across the street as members of the family. He finds this problematic:

[other neighbors feel] ‘We need to keep them out, they are gonna steal our stuff.’

I became less fearful of this community after canvassing for the Presidential election, these thugged out guys are like, “yea, we need to vote!” We have created this us against them mentality with our wrought iron gates, with our beautiful sign, with our fencing. There was an idea to request that we become a gated community with only key code access! It’s annoying to me. Because that’s not how you stabilize a community, by having an enclave of “special” people and we want the rest of you out. It just invites more crime…if they’re not “family” or our “community.” It’s kinda like telling them ‘you don’t belong here.’ It’s that you
wanna be different or you wanna be above, and I understand where my neighbors are coming from, you wanna rise up. But, It’s like we are Purple Valley, and y’all poor people get out our neighborhood and we don’t want you here. It sets us apart.

Jonathon continues by describing New Village’s staged social engagement with Murphy Manor:

Another thing that’s interesting: It’s like we don’t want, we don’t like the other people in the neighborhood, but we throw events for their children. So, like for Halloween, we put candy at the beginning of the street so they won’t come into our neighborhood [to trick or treat].”

But, Gary has a different interpretation of the same Halloween event:

We hold some community events in our neighborhood. Two years ago, we started a Halloween event. We actually do it out on the street, so that way we are not hiding behind our doors. If you don’t want to participate, if you don’t feel comfortable doing that, you can at least donate candy and we’ll stand there and give it out. We open it up to the entire community. We go over to Murphy Manor and hand out flyers. For me it’s important we did that, it shows people, 'you are welcome here.

These different interpretations of interaction with residents living in Murphy Manor represent two versions of harmony that homeowners present. Younger, more educated homeowners, like Dominique and Jonathon, are more willing to bluntly critique the actions and potentially biased attitudes of their neighbors. The other version is
represented among older, lower income or less educated homeowners who seem to recognize a risk in fraternizing with or being associated with the plight of the poor. Therefore these two, differing interpretations echo through explanations for the nature of interaction in New Village and with Murphy Manor.

There seems to be some willingness for community engagement and interaction with fellow homeowners and Murphy Manor residents. Other homeowners also point to social activities targeted for the benefit of the renter community. Curtis says community events are very successful. There is a genuine inclination to organize large, public events that include Murphy Manor. Sheila says it is intentional:

We and the Housing Authority have tried to develop programs for the kids and resource centers to show, you know, give them another outlook. It’s not working. They are not taking advantage of them. It’s more kids over there, God, I would say, there may be triple the amount over there. We don’t have many kids over here. I say this because the kids are our future. It starts-- they mimic what they see. If all the see is a life of crime and violence then…you know… [Trails off]. Nobody is ever too old to be saved. We need to target their environment in the homes.

Sheila’s description of engagement with Murphy Manor is reminiscent of outreach and, again, has a paternalistic intonation. Nonetheless, such public events may be the limit for what forms of social interaction and engagement many homeowners permit. Sheila describes her personal limitations on social interaction and engagement:
…because of the things I see and hear going on, I don’t want to be involved. I am afraid to be involved. I wouldn’t have any problem bringing the kids in and helping them with homework after school if I didn’t feel threatened. We have residents here [New Village] with things going on in their homes, but we are not labeled. …it would just blow off if the things that happened across the street happened here. The parents curse you, it’s a cycle. You can’t even talk sensibly. Not everybody, but the ones [parents] we’ve actually dealt with. This is all facts.

We want to do things to help, but it’s so unfortunate.

Therefore, beyond the public events, somewhat primarily targeted for community youth, some older residents, such as Curtis, describe a more inclusive performance of community as functions, meetings, and personal invitations among themselves. Younger homeowners, like Jonathon and Dominique express weaker feelings of community with either the other homeowners or the renters. At first, Jonathon says it is intentional: “Also, here people scrutinize the company you keep. It’s a generational concept. For that reason, I don’t really engage in the group anymore.” Later, Jonathon offers a more theoretical explanation by saying:

My observation of society is that we’ve become more private. I don’t know the lady that lives next door to me. It’s, “hey,” and you keep on moving. I don’t know any of my neighbors on my side of the condos by name. I don’t know any of the people down the street at all. So that disclaimer…
Dominique concurs with Jonathon when she notes, “I don’t know many of my neighbors in Murphy or New. I don’t know anything personal about anyone. Maybe some faces.”

Some homeowners keep to themselves, while others engage in the performance of organized inclusive community engagement and interaction through public outreach events. Thus, most of the limited number of narratives about direct contact that Murphy Manor residents offer comes from those contexts. Casual interactions may extend to occasionally waving but do not include remembering names or establishing relationships beyond public events.

It remains unclear what implications these rules have for sustainability or social efficacy. To be sure, there are varying conceptions of family, neighbors, and community in the Short Hills area, and whether a homeowner holds one or another of these conceptions may relate to his or her own history, particularly whether he or she perceives connection to or distance from those perceived to be living in Murphy Manor. One related and negative effect is strained social dynamic between New Village homeowners and Murphy Manor renters.

7.3 “HOPE VI and Community Revitalization: Residents and Community”

For me this isn’t a place I’m gonna stay forever. It’s very transitional for me. We are thinking anywhere from 2-5 years and I am two years in. -- Gary

It reduced that crime. It reduced, now a place where you can walk the streets. Just a better development. It gave people a chance to buy a very
nice house. In another neighborhood, the house would be so much higher [costly] just cause of the way they are built state of the art. --Curtis

This study set out to analyze and describe what types of households invest in and benefit from the opportunity to secure housing in HOPE VI areas, and how they construct community. To accomplish this, perceptions and experiences of homeowners living in the revitalized area were explored with respect to buying in New Village, residential experience, and sense of community. Using a small, non-representative sample of single-family home and condominium owners in a revitalized HOPE VI area, I identify main issues involved in the construction of identity and community in the HOPE VI area: the construction of otherness, regulation and policing, and fractured community ties. Furthermore, these findings have implications for determining who benefits from the demolition of public housing. For example, after recalling the stressful experience of relocation during the two years it took between when her home was demolished for the revitalization project and when she moved into her new home in New Village, Samantha feels, overall, conditions are better in the Short Hills community:

I live here prior to, they came in and redid it. I moved here in March 85. And as the years got farther down, Like in 1993, they came up with, the government was saying, you know, from the city--- came through and did a walk through. And they said, 'We gon redo this neighborhood.' And, they ask us how we feel about it and showed us some plans and it just kept going from 93 on up to 2004 until actually something happened. But this, to versus to what it used to be to now, it’s better for, I think, for us now. You know, new homes. Cause those homes then
were older. Our homes were older in 85 versus now. But I think it has helped and I think it’s gon help a whole lot if the government step in and do more housing. Tear em down and rebuild em. But, make sure they screen the people that comes in there.

While the local government had identified early on the need to direct more resources to the Short Hills area, HOPE VI facilitated actual implementation. The demolition of Short Hills may benefit the larger community by offering better quality, safer housing. One homeowner explains:

I have a beautiful home. I don’t have to worry about so much crime as with Short Hills over there. So, it’s better with this beautiful house. This is less expensive than my displaced location. I had more bills, gas, and a mold problem, high light bills. Here, it’s more comfortable. It’s much better. It’s beautiful. Better than what we had, cause we have more space. My interest rate is at 5%.

The effects and implication of the HOPE VI plans are considered a model for citywide community improvement. For example, Samantha notes, “Mayor Johnson said eventually all neighborhoods will be torn down and rebuilt. Eventually. It would be a good thing.”

If the outcomes noted in Short Hills are to be exported for use in other targeted high crime or high poverty communities, Roslyn’s concerns about the pros and cons of public efforts to restructure communities are quite provocative. Roslyn is a single grandmother who has her three teenage grandchildren living with her. She is the only former public housing resident living in New Village.
Roslyn lived in public housing with her grandchildren for eleven years before becoming a homeowner. She was formerly the president of the resident association of her public housing community and politically organized her community. Her public housing community was demolished around the same time as Short Hills.

She discusses the effects of the HOPE VI revitalization efforts through a complicated analysis of who should benefit from the demolition of public housing and efforts to revitalize the area. She has passionate concerns about the ethics of gentrification and the nature of displacement and replacement:

They have houses [mixed income owners and renters in the revitalized Short Hills areas], but did they need to benefit, in the beginning? You know, these are people that’s supposed to be working and somewhat educated. So did they need to be benefitted anyway? Who needed to be benefitted? The people that, the poor people! Those were the ones that needed the benefit. Not the people they moved in there. Not all of them anyway. Some of these people have good jobs! Some of them are low income and the others may be up to medium, you know, mid-. Some of those people never lived in public housing ever.

People need housing, I agree to that. But, the people who lived there before, how do they benefit? We have only one person who lived on Oak, that’s Samantha and her husband. Believe it or not, we have university students over here. A student who rents out his house while he is in Africa, to other people. This man has a three-bedroom house by himself. A family could be in that house! And the government subsidized that house! And he don’t even live in it! You got
different people! So where is the benefit? How can I say this is better? What people did it better? People who didn’t need! You can put it on the news and make it seem the city did a great job, but they cleaned up the neighborhood, But they cleaned it OUT [her emphasis]. And it was my understanding it would benefit everyone, the people [originally] involved. The people who live in the surrounding areas, at least they should sleep better at night without that violence of the Short Hills. But, at one time, there’s 2000 people on the waiting list for an apartment!8

Roslyn’s concerns give rise to the harsh reality of HOPE VI revitalization efforts: often, we ground the measurement of success in the demographic shift itself. The new construction in the new community stands in stark contrast to the surrounding real estate. According to the Southern City HOPE VI Evaluation Final report in 2006, the poverty in the former Short Hills Census tract is three times higher than in the county where Southern City is located. The public assistance rate is four times higher. Homeownership rates and median housing values were less than half of the county levels.

Gary says that the isolated nature of the new construction could generate disdain in the broader community adjacent to and surrounding the HOPE VI site:

One of the things I’ve always been concerned about is the level of distrust from the community around us. The people who have been there. These folks have lived there. Then the city comes in and tears it all down; puts up new houses and

8 She is referring to the Southern City Housing Authority’s current waiting list for public housing. Her statement is accurate based on figures from March 2009 available from the Housing Authority.
condos and landscapes and it’s pretty. But then, what do you do for me? That’s
great you built that over there, but what about where I live? If I had to surmise
what they were thinking, I have often been weary thinking there must be distrust
from those people living all around us.

Changes in this broader HOPE VI area may not be instantaneous. In addition to
attention to housing, HOPE VI aims also to encourage private investment and revitalize
the neighborhood as a whole. Jonathon views the benefits from this macro perspective of
economic community development:

I think it’s better. I mean, aesthetically, definitely. But I think it’s been an anchor
and the whole HOPE VI development has been anchor for that side of Southern
City in general. I think it was necessary for public funds to intervene. No one was
gonna pay attention to this area. It was clear there was not going to be investment
into this area.

[Lists development examples in Southern]. It’s anchoring the
neighborhood. We are getting rid of a lot of blight and a lot of issues. So, I give
that project credit changing the community in general and fixing some
infrastructure problems. It was a step in the right direction, but there’s just a lot of
issues.

Finally, the newcomer families in New Village, who are still low- to moderate-
income and predominantly African American, challenge the ability to ascertain
community turnover and the potential for gentrification. It is unclear what the most
appropriate income mix should be. A condo-owner reflects:
A lot of people wouldn’t have been homeowners if it weren’t for New Village and its programs. So, I give a lot of credit to that. I don’t know if we still believe homeownership is the key to building wealth given the economy now but it’s a mantra. I wouldn’t be able to buy something as nice or as good if it weren’t for the program so that’s one positive effect. It decentralized abject poverty. Spreading it out. No one wants to live in concentrated dens of anything, whether it’s concentrated dens of affluence. People don’t like being crammed together in dense housing. That helps. Planning, I think People forget about areas when it’s brown people, to be quite candid.

New Village has brought in more white people and more diversity in the type of people who live there. So it’s not just, you know it’s still a low-income area but it’s not just low-income people who may be dealing with the public system and issues. You got a lot of young professional who are moving into the area. You got a lot of people investing in the area. So, beyond our area, you got people flipping homes, you got people starting their own business renting homes because they can get them at a low level. So, I think it’s upgrading the whole community in general. It spurred commercial development that wouldn’t happened without public funds. If it weren’t for New and the HOPE VI, nothing would have changed in the area. I definitely give the City credit for making big strides. Everyone says it seems really different from what it was. Overall, I’m happy.
7.4 Implications

These findings suggest that families attracted to this particular HOPE VI site tend to be predominantly African-American. The HOPE VI site, however, is somewhat more diverse than the public housing area prior to revitalization efforts due to the introduction of three non-black households among the homeowners. Newcomer families tend to have few if any children and are divided between young, recent students and older couples. The families tend to have conflicting perceptions of community, simultaneously articulate both satisfaction with their home and immediate neighbors and dissatisfaction and concern with the overall community. This tension is described through a process of othering and social distancing between homeowners and renters in the area. Social interactions are formalized and controlled through public events and limited casual exchanges. Boundaries of behavior and activity are reinforced though forms of patrolling and external regulation of the community.

Newcomers construct community and identity via middle class aspirations and social-political power. Most homeowners are active in the homeowner association meetings as well as in local politics that they perceive as relevant to the sustainability of their community. Many identify with a disadvantaged heritage through racial or economic narratives but strive to differentiate their positions as homeowners from the renters through constructions of class boundaries based on behaviors and attitudes.

The benefits and costs of mixed income life are weighed and expressed in the narratives and experiences of the homeowners. The benefits of homeownership in the community are new homes with high quality features at low costs, special incentives for
purchasing these homes such as soft mortgages and other special financing features, proximity to downtown and major highways, forms of solidarity and shared experience among neighbors, and pride. The expressed costs are the risk of proximity to low-income residents and the potential for further degradation of community reputation, security, crime, and regression of neighborhood quality over time. Many homeowners expressed a desire to relocate in the future rather than remain in community long term.

Furthermore, there is mixed evidence regarding the effects and implications of introducing higher SES residents at the former public housing site. There is little evidence of improved social interaction between renters and homeowners. If there is potential for positive role modeling, many homeowners assert there is very little exchange between the two groups. Therefore, while homeowners may potentially introduce more desirable behaviors and cultural norms in the community, this may be weakened by intra-racial class tension and division.

These social cleavages increase the level of social separation within the community among renters and homeowners while increasing social isolation between general HOPE VI site and outsiders. Previous research highlights patterns of displacement and the failure of former public housing residents to return to these revitalized communities. Previous research also highlights concerns about gentrification. This study augments our understanding of what types of households and individuals move into transitioning HOPE VI area. I find that significant cleavages persist in the mixed income community. Particularly, issues of stereotyping in the social construction of the other, criminalization of renters in the policing and regulation of social space, and
paternalistic approaches to maintenance of rules of engagement and interaction frame community life and social interaction in the mixed income community.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent (Move in Date)</th>
<th>2007*</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon (June 2007)</td>
<td>Burglary/Breaking and Entering (June)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila (Jan. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Assault and All Other Larceny</td>
<td>Theft from Motor Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique (Aug. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/Breaking and Entering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha (Spring 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roslyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis (Jan. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Note Jonathon, Sheila and Dominique reference crime at their home address during the period. Only Jonathon and Dominique actually provide narratives. Other events—specifically for Roslyn and Curtis—were not referenced during the semi-structured interview and may be indistinguishable from domestic violence or other reporting issues. For example, Curtis says, “I haven’t had an incident like some people did. Some people doors got kicked in, but one of them, they said, was an inside job because a family member knew. A plant and a bicycle got stolen off a porch, but that could happen in any neighborhood.”

*Before Murphy Manor was re-populated.
8. Little Mix with a Lot of Benefits?

8.1 Implications for Interaction after HOPE VI

A major finding of this study is that complex intra-racial social dynamics among African American community members may stem from HOPE VI intervention. Branton, a SCHA HOPE VI case manager, explained:

My perspective is that when you go into public housing, you go into a culture of poverty. You don't see anything else. Don't see anyone make it. Don't see hope. You don't see the rest of the world. HOPE VI allows them to live in the outside world, meet people who are making it.

He then said, “You want to see people who are proud of where they live. Branton’s views are telling for the lived experience of HOPE VI residents. Residents are allowed to access public housing units in an environment intentionally designed to be distinct from conventional public housing. New homeowners around the HOPE VI want to be proud of where they live. The idea of the two groups “working together” is simply not borne out of my study. While the level of interaction in the community may be somewhat diminished from that remembered in Short Hills, this study sheds light on the implications of such a change.

Social interaction may not shape the lives of subsidized renters as hoped for by planners of the mixed income community. However, these social relations do not necessarily hinder political and economic transformation in the overall footprint of former Short Hills. What has positively shaped the experiences of poor residents has been the physical redevelopment of the neighborhood, in and of itself.
Other beneficial changes have stemmed from demographic shifts. Recall an expectation for the revitalization of Short Hills was an improved political economy of place as the neighborhood recovered from economic decline. Physical transformation of the space has been connected to business development in downtown Southern City and in the areas adjacent to Murphy Manor. Particularly, new commercial and residential spaces were reconstructed as Bright Belt and along Main St, as well as a new train station and bus depot. Residents note these changes and applaud better access to public transportation and downtown amenities.

More political and economic attention to the NEC corridor has continued to be prompted and supported by the HOPE VI initiative. For example, Habitat for Humanity took interest in the area to target its own homeownership campaign. One case manager, Katie, suggests that there should be more linkages between these economic opportunities and resident success. She asserts that attention to business development could provide opportunities for employment and community development:

I’ve noticed that the commercialism should have come ahead of some of the building… Job opportunities, you know, like maybe a strip mall…or retail. So you know, money could come back into the community. You know, you shop here, you know, some people work here, and it builds a community.

Indeed, one potential mechanism for interaction and engagement among residents could be patronage and casual encounters at local vendors, although this has not occurred yet.

For newcomers, the improved housing units, architectural and design features, and more desirable space is arguably the biggest success of redevelopment. Residents
noted that the new units had better floor plans, more autonomy, better entry and access, were in better shape, and more amenities, like dishwashers and bi-level design.

Derick, a police officer familiar with the design of former Short Hills units described them as “cinderblock.” He argued they were the “worst possible scenario” for public housing because they seemed so institutionalized. He went on to assert that the physical design improvements in Murphy Manor were extremely important to residents: “…you can live in public housing now and your house looks just like somebody else’s house that they go and buy…I think just that feeling has got to improve a community…” Outside of the units, residents enjoyed the greenspace and small private areas attached to their dwellings. The also enjoyed the visibility of the street.

In addition to enhancements to the quality of housing conditions, the dissolution of violent crime was a major beneficial outcome in the HOPE VI area. A high-ranking police officer, Cindy, affirmed, “Short Hills was a major place that we got police calls, and a lot of violent crimes, a lot of drug activity.” She argues that crime could diminish simply through displacement of the former residents. She notes:

The removal of Short Hills and, I guess, the criminal element, and the types of calls that we were getting in a condensed area there, that—you remove that from any neighborhood and you’re going to show an instant decrease in crimes in the neighborhood, so I think that was the primary thing.

Residents explain that this, along with their satisfaction with the housing unit itself, are the primary factors that contribute to their perception of gains from HOPE VI for low income residents.
Officer Derick suggested that the physical transformation of Short Hills into Murphy Manor was central, “…live in something that looks nicer, …something that is made the same way as the homeowner…you’re not in this little cinderblock box, and you’re not labeled like you live in a cinderblock box…I think it—there’s a serious difference…” His proposition about no more labeling of those living in the housing project, however, was in error.

Adjacent to the HOPE VI development, there is now access to high quality homeownership in the neighborhood for the first time in decades. Much of this opportunity has been afforded to African Americans. This change in housing tenure in the area, once characterized by widespread non-owner occupancy, has increased the perception of “stakeholding” in the transitioning community. There is more perceived stability from New Village.

The social organization of the New Village is important to increasing resources and political cachet, even if only in the form of secondary relationships. There is a perception that the political and social capital of the area has been augmented by the introduction of New Village homeowners. Homeowners assert leadership and pursue voice in the sustainability of the community overall. From a broader standpoint, external relations with government and services provide outlets for advocacy and attention. Arguably, there may be better quality of life in the living space along political-economic lines. There is also evidence that there will be continued progress in the goods and services available in NEC.

Michelle, a case manager explains:
I think it’s a wonderful concept. I think that spreading these people out among middle class and lower middle class citizens is the perfect concept for diminishing the [problems] and the inconsistencies of opportunity that fester in these type of pockets. They have a tendency to be cut off from the rest of the world. They don’t feel welcome up beyond their boundaries. I lived in an upper-middle class [area], and I have two Section Eights living in my little cul de sac. They are wonderful neighbors. They keep up their yards. And I can see them building their capacity, the kids are going to school on a regular basis, they play with my children, they’re over here for dinner, just a wonderful concept. If it’s implemented properly, it could really have a major return on investment.

One finding from this study is that physical layout may be key; the physical separation of the homeownership and for rent dwellings seems to obstruct such natural forms of acquaintance among neighbors of differing housing tenure.

One hope was that mixing incomes would produce positive neighborhood effects in the lives of the poor. This was thought to function through improved networks for the poor. For example, one assumption was that higher income residents could provide better information and employment opportunities for poor residents. In Murphy Manor and New Village, there is little evidence of information sharing across homeowners and renters. Moreover, resistance to forming social ties is a key theme not just within, but also, around Murphy Manor.

HOPE VI service provider Liz, explains that, for her, the poor really are different:
Residents haven’t had the fortune of an education or learned to negotiate systems…there is a psyche of poverty…if you never been poor it’s difficult to understand. You can’t take the norms of someone who hasn’t (had these experiences) and superpose them on those who have. To take them from poverty to this other world there are going to be issues along the road. That is in a nutshell. It is the complexity of the job.

Her insights suggest that more attention should be targeted to the needs of residents, not just simplistic ideals of “mixing as fixing.”

But, the benefits related to interaction thought to stem from neighborhood effects have not been realized. There was an expectation that incorporating middle income residents could produce role modeling, efficacy and lifestyle enhancements in the lives of the poor, more closely aligned with mainstream values and ideals. In addition, more desirable social control was another line of outcomes expected for the Short Hills area. This was thought to potentially promote productive forms of accountability, norms, rules and order in the community.

Remarkably, there are also negative externalities that come from ineffectual relationships among residents. One renter, Keisha, explained that the lack of rapport among neighbors prompts her diminishing regard for the physical upkeep of her community compared to when she first arrived. She explained how she once would go around picking up trash and tending to the common areas if she noted something was out of place. She even included her grandchildren in this practice. Over time, she felt her
efforts were not appreciated nor did they contribute to an overall culture of caring about the neighborhood.

Instead, she felt “the dumpster is not full, you know, but there would be bags of trash and stuff [outside of it on the ground] and we would go out there and pick it up…we just stopped doing it because I felt like, you know, just people didn’t care, you know.”

She goes on to explain how this process was similar to her interactions with youth in the development over time. At first, she said she was involved in correcting and confronting children on their attitudes and actions.

She describes how, initially, she would come out and “fuss” with the children if she observed them doing bad things like standing and playing on top of dumpsters, with BB guns or fighting. However, she eventually came to believe that the lack of rapport among the adults in the area offered little room to advise the children. She did not want to have a reputation for being a problem nor did she want to carry the burden forever if the other parents had a different lifestyle, so she settled with just dismissing the youth around her. “You try to go and talk to them, but, you know, it’s like a fight so I just leave that alone.”

Further, distrust may also reinforce a resistance to neighborhood engagement among lower income residents. A safety officer, Lucas, explains that a lot of the crime in the area comes from outsiders. “Most of the time it’s not the people that live in the neighborhood. It's the visitors…that cause the problems. It’s company that they [the residents keep…” Officer Lucas goes on to explain that in light of this, residents may
view one another as potential foes. From talking to residents, he learned about their lack of participation in community meetings throughout NEC:

A lot of people within the inner city, they don’t really want to get involved much because they’re afraid if they have a meeting in their home, then people will come to their home and see what they have. And, then come back later and try to break in their home….Or they feel that they will be classified as a snitch. Or [that] people come to the meeting just to find out what’s being said and go back and tell the people that work the street.

Because residents do not know each other, further distancing persists. An important original learning from this particular case study is that there is also established distancing between it and New Village.

A case manager, Mimi, explains that distrust and ineffectual relationships contribute to residents’ lack of engagement in the community:

There is a lack of participation, in part, due to new situations. It is like a turtle coming out of his shell. A whole new world. The old neighborhood is what folks want, not a new one. It is like keeping the old mustang even when a new one is offered. Don't want a new one. Sense of place issues.

Many renters feel they are just getting by and do not believe there are grounds for having a stake in the community.

In regard to norms, there was little evidence of patterns of positive role modeling and only indicators of fragmented gains in collective efficacy. Maintenance of order was enforced through organization and political capital of the higher income residents against
the poor. Residents note enhanced surveillance of the space and persons in and around the development. They also recall more strict tenancy claims and grounds for removal.

In fact, negative social dynamics may produce unanticipated consequences in the lives of the poor. There is a deep-seated process of intra-racial distinction making that occurs at the HOPE VI site. While much of this energy is focused on imagining the lives, needs, and deficiencies of their “neighbors” across the street, higher income residents have little motivation to engage with poor residents. Rather, frequently they concerted efforts to disassociate from poor blacks.

Although Owens (2012) does not focus on intra-racial dynamics in her study of the St. Thomas HOPE VI, she found preliminary evidence that characteristics and behaviors ascribed to low income blacks seemed to be deterrents to social interaction for middle income blacks. She argues the use of terms like “them” and “they” signaled desires to disassociate from poorer residents (174). Assuming that positive neighborhood effects really matter, it is important to understand barriers to contact as processes of upgrading. These dynamics may be a significant determinant in the production of “difference” and “change” and in the ways ineffectual relations obstruct positive neighborhood effects for the poor after HOPE VI.

Overall, this study identifies some unanticipated costs of HOPE VI that potentially neutralize anticipated benefits of mixed income living for the poor. One case manager, Stephanie explains, “The stigmas that are placed, be they real or unreal, the stigma that is placed on the fact that you are poor, the fact that you are coming from a
public housing area tends to carry its own- its own barriers. Because of where you live
and where you’re coming from.” Another service provider, Lisa, concurs:

The general public’s impression of what HOPE VI is, regardless of the purpose, is
that this strictly public assistance, and when you say public assistance, that is poor
people, and then the age old impression of public assistance is these are people
who are poor. They don't want to do, they will not do, and they enjoy being where
they are, you know? And that needs to be changed- their image.

This image of the poor, one that plays on such stereotypes, continually reverberates
among homeowners.

If in fact this is how to improve the condition of the poor, in the absence of
positive contact, it is unlikely HOPE VI may accomplish its goals of improvement by
mechanisms that disseminate change through cross-class interaction. Many city officials
and stakeholders recognize the potential that demolition of public housing simply can
lead to displacement of the social ills targeted by policies for revitalization, rather than
actual accomplishments related to improved mobility and well-being that results in less
dependency on assistance and services.

A senior police officer in the district reflects:

So let’s take for example, if you had, um, twenty gangbangers in Short Hills and
lets say that five of them got relocated…here and there…whatever they were
doing in Short Hills, when you displace a person, unless there are programs in
place to change a person’s behavior. Once you displace them, they just go to
another place and do the same thing, so this would indicate that the people who
were moved out of Short Hills continued the same type of behavior once they moved somewhere else…without some programs or some real personal change on an individual’s part.

This fact, that residents still face disadvantage in and outside of HOPE VI, undercuts the belief that simply dispersing the poor and reintroducing higher income residents offers a clear solution to severely distressed public housing.

Further, the nature of constrained interaction manufactures divisive processes for claiming space and community identity that potentially may have negative consequences for poorer renters in the HOPE VI development. A theme that exemplifies this is the social constructions of the “other.” This is performed by distancing, application of stereotypes, class stigmatization, and distrust. Residents’ narratives suggest forms of hyper-policing, over-reporting of crime, and the conflation of crime with perceived social behavior of renters. Homeowners, few of whom have children in their own homes, have unfounded concern for “bad” parenting and employ such narratives to address concerns about neighborhood crime and quality.

Lack of connections among neighbors fails to contextualize criminality and victimhood in the neighborhood. Isolation also sheds light on the ways residents come to understand their space and the reconciliation of conflict. For instance, one off-site renter, Geraldine, was a victim of crime. As a resident of conventional public housing, she talked about having some contact with her immediate neighbors and knowledge about their conditions. When her car was broken into, footage from a security camera revealed it was a neighbor. She explained her non-punitive response, “I kind of know who did it,
but that family is having some problems right now and, maybe, I’m being too nice, I don’t know.” This acquaintance with those around the development, albeit somewhat superficial, provided her with the contextual signals to better understand the nature of crime and her status as a victim.

In addition to the importance of policing and regulating space, maintenance of rules of engagement and interaction is another key finding from this study. Higher income residents advance paternalistic critiques of the poor, endorse rigorous screening and exclusion practices, and reproduce a formalized community centered on the exceptionality of poor Murphy Manor residents. Some residents living in public housing elsewhere in Southern City may be deterred from trying to get access into living at Murphy Manor because of the more rigid eligibility requirements and standards. Some are intimidated or not willing to experience the more rigid screening and rules processes. One current resident described it as, “The screening. Oh, God, I thought they might want to know what color underwear I had on that day. It was so much stuff!” These practices can lead to suspicion, anxiety, even fear, and persistent discomfort in the community.

Resident perceptions, especially those involving trust, are established early on. Renters observe the strict maintenance of rules and order, but also realize that they are at the center of criticism, and usually not a priority. One resident, Julia, explained that the developer had to cut down her tree for some additional construction work and that she expressed concern over that loss. Management assured her that it would be replaced. “He promised me a tree…they cut down my tree and they promised me a tree…but they didn’t give me my tree. They kept saying, ‘I’m going to give you your tree back.’ Well,
it’s been three years and I still don’t have a tree.” She also explains similar situations related to the repair of paint in her home. In addition to these observations about management, she expressed concern that revolving evictions were resulting in the constant introduction of new tenants in her building.

When considering the maintenance of rules of engagement and interaction and the policing and regulating of social space, there may be consequential functions of barriers to social relations after HOPE VI. The “integration of higher income neighbors forces the exertion of extra controls on former residents behavior” (Owens 2012, 104). But, this strategy is problematic if “the exertion of social control and surveillance has the potential to produce social repression rather than facilitate social change” (Owens 2012, 104). This is a key critique in the actual manifestation of lived experiences after HOPE VI revitalization. Residents feel powerless, censured, and note that little attention is actually focused on their vision, perspectives, and needs.

HOPE VI is designed for change. The economic boosts occur via design, but changes in poverty trajectories, especially changes in upward mobility and independence housing assistance has not been realized. Gloria, a case manager, says “The biggest challenge has been to keep my families motivated on the narrow tract to be self sufficient and to become successful. It’s easy to become frustrated. The big picture…”

Brent, another case manager explained that outsiders fail to consider the real challenges faced by HOPE VI renters and the ways in which program goals may not pair with residents’ personal goals:
Self sufficiency, other goals are homeownership, work, and education. People go to school, work, and own their own…some people are difficult to work with. It's a long way down the road. It’s hard to get residents to see the big picture. The importance of having a job, home, and job benefits. A lot of people in the community just don't have those goals, so it’s hard.

This study of residents, however, finds that residents do have goals that are smaller and closely tied to every day survival, not just the big picture. A more experienced case manager, Lisa, was very in tune with residents’ perspectives. She explained:

It takes years, and people did not get where they are overnight or in one year or in two years. It took them years to get where they are. Before I can be able to possibly be part of that housing, you know, buy into a house, or move into one of these apartments, if you’re saying to me I’ve got to have a job, I got to have this kind of income, I got to have credit that is a this particular rate, you know. I got to have all these things in place, you’ve forgotten the fact that, first of all, I don't have a high school diploma. And so how long it’s going to take me to get that? You forgotten the fact that, you know, I don't have a job. So first I need a high school diploma so I can get the job. And, the fact that my credit is absolutely poor, so, before I can get my credit any better, I got to have the education. I got to have a job, and I got to work that job for a certain length of time in order to start to attend to those ills or get my credit in place. So chances of the average public
housing resident being able to truly take advantage of HOPE VI, from my perspective only, are slim. The reality of it is they’re slim.

Unsurprisingly, the Short Hills HOPE VI still has not accomplished improving the self-sufficiency of many public housing residents who came to live in Murphy Manor. Case manager Michelle criticizes weak program implementation and poor management. She revealed, there is “a lot of smoke and mirrors.” Her opinion on the progress of HOPE VI is, “Washington DC will realize that it has not been a successful program and those people that they’ve moved out of those projects are still in probably a pretty bad situation. I think you’re going to see that a lot of the folks have not built any fiscal capacity in these new communities they are in.” Rather fragmented interpersonal connections, isolation, and stigmatization mean that individuals and households are more reliant on non-HOPE VI mechanisms for improvement in their status. Michelle asserts, “… Isn’t enough to fix things. It really frustrates me. We have GED people who are testing at the 2nd grade.” She explains critically that HOPE VI “doesn't fix the problem,” if those in need don't have better employment and education.

Even the residents who have made strides toward self-sufficiency remain concerned about how fleeting their success might be. For example, residents who are employed and would like to leave assisted housing still feel they are in a precarious position. One woman, Clara, explains how, even though she utilizes case management to gain information about services and resources, her situation is only partially attainable through these forms of outreach.
Even though she was able to secure help from a non-profit to help pay to her light bill when she got behind, she has larger concerns that go beyond one-time assistance:

I’m 57 and they cut me off [Medicaid], when I was 50 and I don’t work full-time. I make good money at the retail store, but I’m not full time so I have no medical benefits. You know, I know I am kind of skating on thin ice but I can’t afford to go to the doctor, I can’t afford to get medication. I think there’s really nothing as far as social services to me at this time [to help build equity or money or wealth]

Case workers note that oftentimes low income residents in public housing have deep needs that may shape their potential for to exit from housing assistance. Wanda refers back to the formal needs assessment process before HOPE VI, which addressed residents’ goals and reasons for not working and needing assistance. She said that residents expressed identified, such as not having a driver’s license or car, and child care.

However, she explains that, with actual interaction with residents during casework, deeper issues and concerns related to drug use, mental health, financial limitations and criminal histories seemed to inhibit their ability to move up from assisted housing. She felt defeated, “You know, I can’t fix it for them…It’s not a given. It’s something that they have to do. You know, it takes dedication, education to work on…to just start with the simple stuff; paying your light bill on time, you know, those things, paying your rent on time.”

Many case managers suggested that a major goal for them is to instill pride in residents, to overcome stigma: “Others need to work on pride, for themselves and their family, this comes from meeting goals.” Yet, the nature of relations in their lived
experience may counter this, as homeowners in New Village direct stigmatization toward them.

This study reveals deep complexity in a neighborhood that simultaneously stems from and also transcends a policy intervention intended to promote transformation. The issues that are uncovered hint at the production of class and difference, the concerns of segregation and fragmented housing markets, dependency and mobility, stereotypes and facts of the everyday lives and needs of impoverished households, and social and political efficacy of black gentrification. Some of these issues, while important for understanding the transformation of public housing into mixed income communities are, to some degree, beyond the scope of this particular exploration.

8.2 Suggestions for Further Research

This study sheds light on the complexity of class difference among Blacks. This exploratory work raises further questions, especially those that may address the question, what are the conditions for a greater degree of solidarity among blacks? This work illuminates the potential that there could be boundaries to fictive kinship among Blacks and questions whether notions of linked fate should be contemporized by examining mixed black neighborhoods. Perhaps, there is diminishing commonality among blacks in the absence of the most intense forms of segregation? My research suggests there may be a deterioration of a sense of linked fate under today’s conditions. Further research may also better ascertain how groups perceive and construct what it means to be a middle class or integrated within a shared space.
Appendix A

A.1 IRB Form

Do not use this form if:

- you are an undergraduate; instead, go to: http://ors.duke.edu/undergraduate-research, or
- your research activities are limited to analysis of data collected by someone else; instead, go to http://ors.duke.edu/Research-with-Human-Subjects/forms for the “Secondary Analysis of Existing Data” form.

Exempt research is research with human subjects, but once approved, it is “exempt” from ongoing review, unless the research is amended in such a way that it no longer meets the eligibility requirements.

Restrictions on the Use of Exemptions:

Exemptions cannot be secured for research using the following populations:

1. Pregnant women when they are the targeted subject population
2. Students participating in the Duke Psychology Subject Pool (http://pn.aas.duke.edu/undergrad/subjectpool)
3. Students if the investigator is their instructor
4. Employees if the investigator is their supervisor
5. Most research with children
6. Prisoners

Exemptions cannot be secured for research that uses:

1. Deception
2. Experimental manipulations

Exemptions cannot be secured for studies that involve risk that must be managed, either through confidentiality procedures or services such as referral.

The FAQs for Exempt Research provide additional information. (http://www.ors.duke.edu/related-faqs-exempt-review).

Submit this form and required attachments:

- Mail Parts A and B with original signatures to: Office of Research Support, Suite 710, Erwin Square, 2200 West Main Street, Durham, NC 27705.
- Send Parts A, B, C, your project description prepared using the instructions in Part D, and any appendices as one Word file by e-mail to ors-info@duke.edu.
Contents:
A. Investigator and Project Information
B. Investigator Assurances
C. Category of Research Activity
D. Instructions for Preparing the Research Description

A. Investigator and Project Information

(Add more lines as needed for multiple investigators.)

**Project Title:** Understanding Residential Mobility of Low Income Families and Housing Assistance: Evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics and HOPE VI Revitalization

**Investigator:** Ashley Brown_Burns______________________________

Status: [ ] Faculty [X] Graduate Student [ ] Other:____________________

Department/School: Sanford School of Public Policy____________________

E-mail: akb17@duke.edu_____ Phone: (504) 610-2741____________

**Faculty Advisor for Graduate Students and Post-Doctoral Researchers:**

Dr. William Darity, Jr.______________________________

E-mail: william.darity@duke.edu__ Phone: (919) 660-7336_________

Source of Funding: departmental/ Aleane Webb Graduate School________
(If research is externally funded, submit a copy of the application or the award.)

Proposal/Grant Number for Federally-Funded Research: n/a____________

Research Site: _________Southern City______________________________
B. Assurances  
(Original signatures are required)

Investigator(s) Assurance:

I affirm the following:

1. The research will not be initiated until written approval is secured from the IRB.  
(Note: Approval will not be provided unless certification to conduct research with human subjects is current for the investigator(s), and if the investigator is a student, the advisor’s certification is also current.)

2. I will conduct this study as described in the approved protocol. If any changes are anticipated, I will contact the IRB staff prior to implementing the changes. I will contact the IRB staff immediately if any of the following events occur: unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, protocol deviations, or findings during the study that would affect the risks or benefits.

_Ashley Katrina Brown_________________________  
Investigator Date

Faculty Advisor Assurance (Required for Graduate Student or Post-Doctoral Research):

I affirm that I have reviewed and approved the research plan of the student(s). I assume responsibility for (1) ensuring that student researchers are aware of their responsibilities as investigators, and (2) that the IRB will be immediately informed in the event of unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, protocol deviations, or findings during the study that would affect the risks or benefits of participation.

_Dr. William Darity, Jr._________________________  
Advisor Date

=================================================================================================

For IRB use only

APPROVAL: _________________________________ Date ________

IRB Member or Human Subjects Program Director
C. Category of Research Activity

Categories of Eligible Research Activity:

Please select the exemption category that applies to your protocol. If the protocol includes any research activity with human subjects not specifically exempted under one or more of the exemption criteria, IRB review is required and the Request for Protocol Approval form must be used (http://www.ors.duke.edu/forms/request-protocol-approval).

The categories are listed in the order most often used by researchers in the social and behavioral sciences. Sponsors may want you to identify the federal number for the category used to exempt your research so the numbers are supplied at the end of each category.

___ (1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

___ (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, observation of public behavior, unless the information is obtained and recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and any disclosure of the human subjects’ responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects’ financial standing, employability, or reputation.

___ (3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under item (2) above; if the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or federal statute(s) require without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

___ (4) Research involving the study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens is exempt if these sources are publicly available, or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the subjects cannot be identified directly, or through identifiers linked to the subjects. The secondary analysis of pre-existing data requires the use of a separate form. Please go to http://ors.duke.edu/Research-with-Human-Subjects/forms.
(5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or Agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine methods and procedures of public benefit or service programs. (For example, a study of identifiable welfare data.)

(6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, if wholesome foods without additives are consumed, or a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or an agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the FDA or approved by the EPA or the USDA.
A.2 Murphy Manor Flyer

Want to Earn at least $10 for your story?
*PAID INTERVIEW OPPORTUNITY*

Do You Currently Live in the Murphy Manor apartments community?

Did you or your family live in Short Hills apartments before it was torn down in 2003?

I am a PhD student at Duke studying neighborhoods and community here in Durham, NC. I am looking to interview people who currently live in the Murphy Manor apartments and people who used to live in Short Hills apartments before July 2003.

If you choose to interview with me, I will pay you at least $10 for your time. For the interview, I am hoping you can tell me about living in your Murphy Manor home now or about what it was like to live in the Short Hills neighborhood before it was re-done. The conversation should last approximately one hour or less.

If you are interested in participating or need more information, Please Call me, Ashley Burns, at (919)697-8080 to set up a time and date for your interview. Your participation would be valuable and appreciated. All information that you provide will be kept confidential.

THANK YOU!
A.3 Interview Questions for Murphy Manor

*Let's start out talking about you coming here to Murphy Manor*

- Where do you currently live?
- How long have you lived here?
- How long do you plan to stay around here?
- Can you please tell me about how you came to live here?
- How many times have you moved in the past five years?
- How long have you lived in this area/overall part of town?
- If you left this home, where would like to go if you could? Why? How would you go about that? What do you think it would be like there?
- What did you know about Short Hills before the demolition?

*Point 2). I would also like to ask some questions about you and your family so I can get to know you better and understand what it is like to live here. Tell me about who you currently live with in your home.*

- How many children live in your home? Are all of the children your own or do the children in your home include relatives, friends of family, or foster children?
- How old are the children?
- Do other adults live in the house besides you? How many people other than the children and you live in your home? Are they related to you? How are they connected to you?

*Now I would like to get your opinions about your current home and neighborhood. First, I would like to understand more about how people think about neighborhoods. I mean, it seems we do not all think of neighborhoods the same way.*

- What exactly do you call your neighborhood? Like about how many blocks, streets, miles, or houses away from your home do you call your neighborhood?
- Does the neighborhood have a name?
- If I asked five people on the street, do you think they would agree?
- Are there places near by but you do not consider them a part of your neighborhood?
- Please tell me what it’s like living in this area compared to other places you have lived
- What do you like about here?

*How would you describe your neighborhood to someone who has never been here before or was thinking about moving here?*

*What do you like the most about living in this neighborhood right now? What do you like not like about living in this neighborhood right now? Can you tell about this house you live in?*
What’s the best aspect of this home?
What would you change?
What’s the worst aspect of this home?
What about this area? Street?

Let’s now talk about the people who live in your neighborhood. Describe your neighbors to someone who isn’t from the neighborhood.
- What race are most of your neighbors? How would you describe racial and ethnic relationships in the neighborhood?
- What income range would you put most of your neighbors in?
- Working, not working, retired
- Older or younger
- Has this changed at all in the last five years? If so, how?
- Do any of your friends live around here?
- Do any family members live nearby?

How well do people in this neighborhood know each other?
- Do people stick together or do they mostly go their own ways?
- Are there any differences between you and your neighbors? Have these differences affected your relationship with them?
- Do people help each other out? In what ways?
- Do people watch out for each other’s children?

Do you ever socialize with your neighbors?
- Do you have friends that live in the neighborhood?
- Do you ever turn to your neighbors for help or help them?
- If so, what types of help (babysitting, watching houses while away, keeping keys, shopping)?
- Has the amount of time you spend with neighbors changed at all in the last five years? If so, how?

Let’s talk about some of the things you do during a typical week:
Do you work?
Yes:
- What type of work do you do? How do you like your job?
- How did you find out about the job?
- Where is your job located? How do you get there? How long does it take?
- Has you employment changed from when you moved ______?
No:
- Why do you feel you are not working right now?
- Are you looking for a place to work? If yes, what kind of place or type of job?
- What do you rely on for the money you need?
- Do you go to school?
We talked a bit about your family at the beginning of the interview. Now I want to talk more about your children. How many children do you have living at home now?

- What are their first names?
- How old are they?
- Do they live with you?

Tell me about the schools your children attend.

- Where are the schools located?
- Are they located within the neighborhood?
- What are some of the features you like (and dislike) about the schools your children attend?
- How would you rate the quality of the schools?

What do you do for childcare? For your younger children? For your older children?

- What type of childcare provider (family, center, etc.) How did you find out about the childcare provider?
- Where is your childcare provider located?
- Are your childcare needs being met?
- Do you have any difficulties with childcare?

Point 4) Can you tell me what you know about getting public housing assistance?

- How do Housing vouchers or getting an apartment based on my income work like Section 8? What types of people get this?
- How does/did the HOPE VI program work? What types of people have to deal with this?
- Do you think these programs are helpful to the people who use them? How?

We’ve talked a lot about different things about your housing situation. Overall, do you think having ______ assistance has affected your family life? Why/Why not?

Are you interested in moving again?
Where do you see yourself five years from now?
Where do you see your children five years from now?
Do you have anything else you would like to add?

[STOP TAPE]
A.4 Consent

INTRODUCTION:
Hello. As you know, my name is Ashley Burns. I am a PhD graduate student at Duke University in Durham, NC. I study housing and communities. I am currently working on a major research project for school. I do not work for the Housing Authority.

For my dissertation research, which is the major independent assignment we create in order to graduate, I am studying the effect that housing assistance has on moving and the experiences of families who use it. The purpose of this interview is to understand more about how living in housing assistance shapes the ability to move or not for families. I want to know more about your housing situation and your family’s experience with the housing in Southern City.

During this interview, I want you to understand that I am interested in your experiences and opinions. You don’t have to be interviewed if you don’t want to and there is no right answer or wrong answer in this conversation. Your identity and your family’s identity will be kept strictly confidential; your name and information will not be connected or linked to anything you tell me during our conversations. I will not report any of your personal information in my research paper or to the housing authority and nothing you say to me will affect your housing assistance or any assistance or programs you receive or need. I will keep your name and phone number in case I need to contact you again with a follow-up question.

I hope you feel comfortable talking to me. If at any point in our conversation, I ask you a question that you do not feel comfortable talking about, let me know and we do not have to discuss that issue. This interview should last about an hour and I will pay you $10.00 in cash for your time and participation when the interview is over. Please feel free to ask me questions about my research at any time. I will also give you my business card and an information sheet so that you can contact me or my advisor later if you have questions or information that you want to add.

With your permission, I will use this recorder to tape this interview. I tape the interview to make sure that I record your opinions and experiences accurately. No one but me and my advisor will be allowed to listen to this tape. I will store the recording until I make a transcript.

Now, is it alright with you if I turn on the tape recorder?

(Turn on recorder.)

Do you have any questions before we get started?
Do you agree to interviewed by me for my research about public housing assistance, mobility, and HOPE IV in Southern City?
## A. 5 Crime Table of New Village

Table 7: Southern City Police Dept. Crime Mapper, 2007-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent (Move in Date)</th>
<th>2007*</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon (June 2007)</td>
<td>Burglary/Breaking and Entering (June)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila (Jan. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Assault and All Other Larceny</td>
<td>Theft from Motor Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique (Aug. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/Breaking and Entering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha (Spring 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roslyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis (Jan. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft of Motor Vehicle Parts or Accessories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Note Jonathon, Sheila and Dominique reference crime at their home address during the period. Only Jonathon and Dominique actually provide narratives. Other events-- specifically for Roslyn and Curtis-- were not referenced during the semi-structured interview and may be indistinguishable from domestic violence or other reporting issues. For example, Curtis says, “I haven’t had an incident like some people did. Some people doors got kicked in, but one of them, they said, was an inside job because a family member knew. A plant and a bicycle got stolen off a porch, but that could happen in any neighborhood.”

*Before Murphy Manor was re-populated.
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