Chapter 1: Neighborhood Racial and Ethnic Diversity in U.S. Cities

Philip Nyden
Loyola University, Chicago

John Lukehart
Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities

Michael T. Maly
Roosevelt University

William Peterman
Chicago State University

The existence of racially and ethnically diverse urban neighborhoods is one of our Nation's best-kept secrets. Instead of telling about these places, the media regularly report on the continued legacy of racial and ethnic tensions in the United States. As the Nation is becoming more racially and ethnically diverse and the 21st century approaches, social scientists see possibilities of a patchwork of segregated urban neighborhoods or options for more diversity within our neighborhoods. Although *diversity* and *multiculturalism* are words in vogue, the current controversy about affirmative action suggests that there is hardly any consensus on the state or progress of race relations in the United States. In private conversations, out of public scrutiny, skepticism about the practicality of diversity—particularly diverse residential neighborhoods—is apparent. The politics of race is such a tinderbox that many dare not suggest a variation from business as usual, for fear of igniting caustic debates over this country's history of racism and ethnocentrism and over what our future could look like. To some, the civil rights movement has been relegated to the halls of history—it is viewed as a movement of days past to be recognized and celebrated once a year.

This study seeks to challenge the skeptics and policy pessimists. It documents several successful, stable, racially and ethnically diverse neighborhoods in our cities. We recognize that such neighborhoods are, by far, the exception rather than the rule. At the same time, we assert that within these neighborhoods there may be alternative models of living and interacting—models valuable to a Nation fast becoming more diverse. A recent analysis of U.S. demographic trends notes that "by the middle of the 21st century, today's minorities will comprise nearly one-half of all Americans" (O'Hare, 1992). This begs the question: Will we become a Nation of coexisting, cooperating groups sharing our resources, or will we become an even more segregated society, with each racial and ethnic group battling for its piece of the pie?

Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research • Volume 4, Number 2 • 1998
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development • Office of Policy Development and Research

Cityscape 1

The neighborhoods we describe in this study have maintained their racial and ethnic diversity for at least 10 years and as long as 30 years. The study was not created in the heads of academic researchers; rather, it has been a nontraditional project involving collaboration among university researchers and community-based leaders. The study thus has benefited both from academics' research skills and knowledge of the literature and from community leaders' experience and day-to-day practical wisdom. The findings of this research project, therefore, are anchored in the everyday reality of community life.

In the United States, diverse urban communities are unquestionably the exception to what sociologists Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton (1993) refer to as "American apartheid." Massey and Denton describe a present-day "hypersegregation" that has marginalized African-Americans and Latinos in the housing and job markets. They correctly identify these segregated communities "as an institutional tool for isolating the byproducts of racial oppression: crime, drugs, violence, illiteracy, poverty, despair and their growing social and economic costs." Their analyses, along with many others, clearly indicate a dominant pattern of housing discrimination and segregation.

This apartheid goes beyond race. Our Nation has also been marked by significant economic segregation, which has become much more of a problem for city residents during the past decade. Low-income, inner-city neighborhoods have suffered economically as a result of the out-migration of the middle class to the suburbs, the shift from a manufacturing-based to a service-based economy, the displacement of poor people caused by gentrification, and the economic downturn of the 1970s and 1980s. A dwindling tax base and a large percentage of predominantly minority residents without competitive skills and employment opportunities increase the marginalization of these neighborhoods and continue to undermine the viability of central cities.

Although polls have indicated a strong demand for a larger number of diverse neighborhoods than actually exist (Darden, 1987), such neighborhoods are commonly perceived as inherently unstable. Whether the perception is correct or not, for middle-income groups, racial or economic diversity is often a flag for neighborhood decline and decreasing housing values. For lower income groups, diversity is often a flag for gentrification, inevitably leading to displacement. Neighborhood character is thus determined not only by physical structures and amenities, but also by social, political, and cultural practices that create a perception of community (Goetze, 1979). These practices and resulting perceptions can be affected by institutions outside the neighborhood (for example, the media, the real estate industry, lending institutions, and local government) as well as inside the neighborhood (for example, community-based organizations, schools, religious congregations, business owners, and other neighborhood groups) (Taub et al., 1984).

There has been substantial documentation of forces outside the neighborhood that influence who lives in what neighborhood. In a *Wall Street Journal* column, writer Hugh Pearson (1996) observes:

> The pervasive practice of discrimination in the real estate industry … is the major reason there are predominantly black neighborhoods, Hispanic neighborhoods, Asian neighborhoods and white ones, which tend to contain the best housing stock of all. And it is a major reason racial misunderstanding continues, since it lessens opportunities for interaction across our artificial racial barriers.

The causes and ill effects of racial discrimination and segregation have been extensively documented. Massey and Denton's book *American Apartheid* is a recent comprehensive example. A 1989 national fair housing study found that a majority of African-American and Latino homeseekers in 25 metropolitan areas experienced discrimination. In the housing sales market, African-Americans and Latinos experienced discrimination 59 and 56 percent of the time, respectively; in the rental market, they experienced discrimination 56 and 50 percent of the time (Turner et al., 1991). Minorities were frequently steered to different neighborhoods, told units they wanted to see were not available, or given less information than Whites about sources of financing. These findings suggest that there had been very little progress in fair housing since a similar survey carried out more than a decade earlier (Wienk et al., 1979).

Historically, once minority homebuyers had identified homes for purchase, they were confronted with additional racial barriers. According to Stephen Dane, as late as the 1970s, "Public statements by lenders and even Federal regulatory agencies continued to express the view that lenders must take the race of a potential borrower or the racial composition of a neighborhood into account in order to assure the security of the lender's investment." (Dane, 1992.) More recently, commenting on the dual lending market, community lending expert Calvin Bradford (1991) has stated:

> Lenders have been allowed to continue to allocate their resources toward the building and maintenance of white communities while withholding their credit from minority communities and transitional communities. Lacking access to conventional lending, minority communities and transitional communities are left to be served by the federally insured and guaranteed markets of FHA and VA lending programs … [which] left unregulated and overprescribed … are extremely … lethal to entire communities.

Findings by William Peterman and Qi Sanshu (1991), which are presented in a companion paper to Bradford's (1991) historical review of lending in Chicago, document the continuing shift to federally assisted lending in Chicago-area neighborhoods as the percentage of minority residents increases.

Although there has been modest progress in recent years, data gathered by Federal financial regulatory agencies continue to show that mortgage-loan denial rates for African-Americans and Latinos are significantly higher than those for Whites. "Recent studies of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act [HMDA] data have revealed that the current mortgage finance system underserves low- and moderate-income and minority borrowers and communities" (Megbolugbe, 1993). HMDA data have also shown large disparities in rates of acceptance of mortgage applications between White and non-White applicants, as well as between minority and nonminority neighborhoods (Canner and Smith, 1992). The most powerful evidence to date of disparate treatment comes from a 1992 study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, which found that loan applications from minorities in the Boston area were rejected 56 percent more often than those from equally creditworthy Whites (Munnell et al., 1992).

And finally, in another real estate-related field essential to equal housing opportunity, a 1994 study of homeowners' insurance practices found pervasive patterns of redlining and discrimination against Latinos and African-Americans by major insurers. The study found that in Chicago 95 percent of all Latino insurance shoppers experienced discrimination. African-American testers[1] experienced discrimination 60 percent of the time in Atlanta

and Milwaukee and nearly 50 percent of the time in Louisville. Discrimination took the form of calls not being returned, lower quality coverage, and higher premiums quoted when compared with those of White testers (National Fair Housing Alliance, 1994).

As a whole, these discriminatory housing practices have had a profound negative impact on minority homeseekers. They have also undermined the development of minority communities as well as racially and ethnically diverse communities. As Harvard University political scientist Gary Orfield has stated, "Residential segregation is a key contemporary institution for creating and maintaining inequality, not only for individuals and racial groups, but also for neighborhoods and entire municipalities" (Orfield, 1985). Orfield has observed that the related historic problem of rapid racial change of neighborhoods "has shattered entire neighborhoods, uprooted thousands of black and white families, dramatically diminished ... cities' resources, irreparably damaged ... cities' commercial and social infrastructures, and increased the cost of running our cities while eroding the tax base and ability to pay for these costs" (Orfield, 1982).

It is indisputable that racial discrimination and segregation have been prominent features of U.S. life and of our housing markets. It should be acknowledged that we are paying immeasurable costs—individually and collectively, socially and economically—for this discrimination and the assumption that racial and socioeconomic homogeneity is good for growth and stability in housing markets. With the projected increase in diversity in this Nation—particularly in the cities—we need to examine alternatives to segregated neighborhoods. As former HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros remarked, "We risk societal collapse by the first decade of the next century if we tolerate racism and [the] economic isolation of millions of people" (*Chicago Tribune,* 1993).

Enforcement of fair housing laws has been an effective antidote to housing discrimination and segregation (Lauber, 1991). The activities of private fair housing groups—which the courts have referred to as *private attorneys general*—are an essential part of countering housing discrimination (*Trafficante* v. *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*, 1972). Yet another challenge to discrimination and segregation has been the existence of urban communities that have maintained racial diversity for decades. It is here that we can discover promising bases for equality of opportunity, healthy investment, and sustainable community development.

In this study, we examine external and internal factors that have contributed to the creation and maintenance of 14 stable and diverse neighborhoods in 9 U.S. cities—the positive alternative to business as usual. Although much research has focused on the roadblocks to diversity, we concentrate on policies and strategies that have brought and can bring about greater diversity and equity in our Nation's cities. Research on residential racial integration has focused heavily on suburbs, particularly on the integration of African-Americans into predominantly White, middle-class towns (Keating, 1994; Saltman, 1990; Smith, 1993). This study instead focuses on central cities that are experiencing significant changes in their racial, ethnic, and class makeup. It is here that we seek models for successful diversity. We also focus on *urban* neighborhoods because, as noted by Daniel Sharp in his preface to *Interwoven Destinies, Cities and the Nation* (Cisneros, 1993):

> Cities are critical to America's economic, political and social future. It is in our cities that the interactions must occur that will determine if the Nation functions as an integrated, civil society, or if class rigidities and racial and social disorder will characterize our future.

The research related here seeks to contribute to our knowledge of what produces stable, diverse urban communities by studying the success stories of neighborhoods that have become diverse and have sustained their diversity for the past 10 to 20 years. In a society all too familiar with the factors that encourage segregation and discourage diversity, these neighborhoods contain clues for building sustainably diverse urban communities.

A Collaborative University-Community Project

The impetus for this research was discussions at two Chicago citywide forums sponsored by the Policy Research Action Group (PRAG), a university-community research network, and the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, a Chicago-based fair housing organization.[2] PRAG is a network of 4 Chicago universities and more than 20 community-based organizations and citywide civic organizations that has supported collaborative university-community research activity. By using experience and expertise in both academic and community spheres, PRAG has been able to use more efficiently the significant resources and knowledge that exist in the metropolitan area. At a time when universities are increasingly under fire for not contributing to the community and not doing research directly relevant to the community outside college walls, PRAG works to strengthen ties between researchers and community organizations. PRAG harnesses the tensions between community organizations and universities and uses them for constructive purposes (Nyden and Wiewel, 1992).

PRAG distinguishes itself from traditional university-community research relationships by being very community driven. All funded research activity must be community based, and funded activities must involve a collaborative process: Researchers and community-based organizations must work together to identify research issues and methodologies, perform data analysis, and prepare reports and action plans.

PRAG has created a forum in which activists from the community have moved into the research office where they can be equal partners in the selection of research issues and development of methodologies. Since 1990 PRAG has supported more than 130 collaborative research projects in the Chicago metropolitan area in a broad range of policy areas. PRAG is sometimes referred to as a university-community-based think tank where ideas are freely exchanged. Both sides are free to criticize the other's ideas, but each side also listens to the other, recognizing that more accurate, useful, relevant, and powerful research can come out of such a collaborative process. These efforts bring the community fully into the research process, rather than treating it merely as a place to perform research, as a source of data, or as a variable to be manipulated.

The project reported here is an effort that goes beyond Chicago and works with collaborative research teams in 8 other cities to examine key policy issues. It is an alternative to traditional national policy research projects. Our research findings are not the result of a distant analysis of national databases or the outcome of a set of forays by researchers into communities. Instead, we formed community-based teams on which people from community organizations worked with academic researchers to collect, analyze, and report data. The research process thus was strongly anchored in the local communities studied. This collaborative, community-based research model complements more traditional research processes.

The project seeks to develop a "tool kit" of policies, community-based strategies, and government intervention mechanisms that can work to keep existing diverse neighborhoods stable and be used to develop other diverse neighborhoods.[3] The research was organized in two stages. First, before selecting the 9 cities ultimately studied, we completed a general quantitative analysis of census data for 22 cities to identify areas that have demonstrated stable diversity. Included were the 10 largest U.S. cities and 12 other midsize or smaller cities representative of various regions of the country. We then interviewed more than 130 community leaders, researchers, and government officials in the various cities to get a more detailed understanding of the neighborhoods that had appeared to be diverse and stably diverse in the census data.

The quantitative test we used to judge whether a community was stably diverse was to measure how close a census tract's racial and ethnic mix approximated that of the city as a whole. Most neighborhoods do not reflect this "statistical" city average. We analyzed census tract data in the cities studied and concentrated on the 10 percent of census tracts that came closest to the percentages of the city's racial and ethnic composition. Because we recognize that a segregated housing project in one isolated corner of a census tract could produce the statistical appearance of a "diverse" neighborhood, we also talked with local informants—city officials, university researchers, and community leaders— to get a better sense of whether the diversity we were seeing in the numbers was recognized as diversity among community leaders. We defined diversity as stable if:

- The majority of census tracts within a socially recognized community area remained within the 10 percent of the tracts closest to the city racial/ethnic averages.

- The congruent neighborhood area was recognized as diverse by most of our informants.

- The area met these criteria in both 1980 and 1990.

Most communities that we studied have been diverse for more than this 10-year minimum.

On the basis of these quantitative and qualitative data, we selected 14 communities in 9 of the cities for closer examination. These communities are West Mount Airy (Philadelphia); Vollintine-Evergreen (Memphis); Park Hill (Denver); Sherman Park (Milwaukee); Rogers Park, Edgewater, Uptown, and Chicago Lawn (Chicago); Jackson Heights and Fort Greene (New York); Southeast Seattle (Seattle); San Antonio and Fruitvale (Oakland); and Houston Heights (Houston). When making the selection, we chose a variety of neighborhoods to ensure a range of city, neighborhood, and racial/ethnic types. Then the research teams, consisting of local academic researchers and community leaders, were commissioned to complete the study. Although some of the chapters were written primarily by academic researchers, all studies were done in close consultation with neighborhood or citywide community or civic organizations.

The research teams were given a list of possible questions to address during their work to help ensure the comparability of the different case studies. A member of the research team, or James Wilson of the Leadership Council, visited each site at least once during the project to coordinate the work, answer questions, and learn about each community and its issues of importance. Following completion of preliminary reports by the research teams, a 2-day conference was held, during which the teams, the project's advisory group, the authors of this study, and several other knowledgeable individuals met to share and discuss findings and to work toward a consensus regarding conclusions and recommendations.

The findings presented below arise from the full process of research, report preparation, discussion, and reflection.

The aim of the case studies of the 14 communities was to examine ways in which broader aspects of the social, political, and economic environment facilitate or hinder the development and maintenance of stable, diverse neighborhoods. The issues analyzed included:

■   The role of community organizations.

■   The impact of government programs.

■   The effects of community revitalization efforts.

■   The influence of existing social institutions (for example, religious congregations, schools, and businesses).

■   The manipulation of public perception about "good" neighborhoods.

■   The role of local banks and real estate agents.

■   Community safety.

Models of Urban Diversity

The 14 communities we studied vary significantly both in the nature of their diversity and in the context within which diversity was achieved and is maintained. Nonetheless, we analyzed the descriptive and quantitative data from each case study, hoping not only to identify features that can help in explaining and understanding the specific form of the diversity that evolved in that community, but also to identify features that are common to all 14 communities. Our study led to the identification of two key aspects that shape the way diversity was achieved and is maintained:

■   The intentional or conscious articulation of diversity as a goal in the early stages of community change.

■   The importance accorded to diversity in the continuing process of community stabilization and development once diversity has been achieved.

Variations in these two aspects, apart from the specific contextual relationships that each community has with its city, largely explain the variations observed.

The communities we studied that had sustained diversity the longest were those that had become integrated as an outgrowth of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s. They are the kinds of neighborhoods described by Juliet Saltman in *A Fragile Movement* (1990). Initially nearly all White, they experienced in-migration of African-American households, usually from adjacent neighborhoods. Integration in these neighborhoods was a very conscious, directed, and goal-oriented act, with African-Americans and Whites generally working together both to promote the benefits of integration and to fight those entities that were perceived by residents to be involved in pushing the community toward segregation.

As it intentionally approached diversity, each community developed an array of organizations, social networks, and institutions that focused directly on the issue of diversity. These entities were intended to welcome the new minorities into the community while attempting to ensure that existing White households did not panic and to minimize forces that might undermine community stability. We have come to identify the process followed by these communities as *diversity by direction.*

The communities that have become diverse more recently seem not to have followed such an intentional, directed scenario. We initially suggested that this type of diversity could be thought of as laissez-faire diversity, but the research teams in these communities objected to this characterization, contending that it implied an undue emphasis on the notion that the market had somehow been the driving force for diversity. Since real estate economics is only one of several forces that together fashion diversity in these communities, we have adopted as a more appropriate description *diversity by circumstance.*

Diversity by circumstance seems to be the result of processes not directly related to either resident or community organization action. These can include gentrification; a stalled or poor real estate market; transition resulting from the aging of a community; revitalization of areas adjacent to a community, resulting in increased investment; establishment of a community as an immigrant port of entry; development of affordable housing projects; or a standoff between affordable housing advocates and developers promoting middle-income housing projects. Communities that are diverse by circumstance do not seek out diversity, but as they become diverse, they may begin to see the situation as a positive attribute and promote it along with other perceived community attributes.

The second key aspect of the diverse communities we studied is the degree to which maintaining diversity becomes the organizing principle for efforts to maintain and improve their quality of life. In some communities, it is the single most important characteristic, whereas in others it competes with a variety of other goals and objectives. In either case, successfully addressing issues that face all communities, such as security, education, investment, and economic development, is critical if diversity is to be sustained. Furthermore, maintaining diversity becomes a task that must be integrated into a set of activities that work to maintain both community stability and prosperity.

Some of the communities studied continue to see diversity as their primary goal. These communities tend to be diverse by direction. Leaders in these communities understand community development as being a mechanism for maintaining and strengthening diversity. In Denver's Park Hill community, for example, as will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 2, school quality and the health of local shopping districts are viewed not only as important by themselves, but as critical to maintaining diversity.

Communities that are diverse by circumstance tend to regard maintaining diversity as one objective related to a broader goal of community development. The research team in Southeast Seattle, for example, was initially reluctant even to identify diversity as a community goal or make claims about the nature of the community's diversity. The communities of Oakland, as well, have a complex situation in which diversity does not seem to be a primary goal.

Although initial intentionality and the importance of maintaining diversity relative to other community goals, as has been noted, tend to be related, no two communities are fully alike. For example, although both Park Hill in Denver and Vollintine-Evergreen in Memphis are diverse by direction, Park Hill doggedly continues to maintain diversity (integration) as its prime community objective, while Vollintine-Evergreen has adopted a more varied set of community objectives, of which diversity is only one. Such differences can also be found among communities that are diverse by circumstance.

We conceptualize the two key aspects of diversity in the 14 communities as a 2-dimensional matrix, with the first axis depicting the degree of intentionality or directedness associated with the process of becoming diverse and the second depicting a measure of the centrality of maintaining diversity as an objective with respect to all other

community objectives. Differences in the nature of diversity with such a matrix is seen as varying from a highly intentional beginning and a continuing singlemindedness about diversity, to a lack of initial intentionality and consideration of maintenance of diversity as one among a variety of ongoing community objectives. We did not attempt to locate each of the 14 communities within such a matrix, but it would be possible to do so.

Model One: The Diverse-by-Direction Community

Of the 14 communities studied, 4 fit the model of diverse by direction: Sherman Park (Milwaukee), Vollintine-Evergreen (Memphis), Park Hill (Denver), and West Mount Airy (Philadelphia). These are the most stable of the diverse communities studied because they have developed the institutional structures, social arrangements, and political-social environment needed to sustain their diversity. Among these structures are community organizations specifically developed to promote the community as racially and ethnically diverse.

As we noted above, because of the view in U.S. society that diversity means instability, diverse communities must make extraordinary efforts to market themselves. This means that the communities, as well as the institutions that exist within them (for example, parent-teacher associations, religious groups, interfaith groups, chambers of commerce, youth recreational leagues, political parties, and block clubs), must work to develop and sustain positive intergroup relations, in addition to their usual efforts to promote the neighborhood.

This more organized element of intentionally diverse-by-direction communities produces an environment that promotes more positive social relationships among individual blocks and within various civic associations, and is thus reflected in the community as a whole. A diverse-by-direction community is also more likely to recognize the need for diversity of membership in important communitywide decisionmaking bodies. The political and social environment created is one in which positive intergroup relations are valued and celebrated. The community also becomes aware that it is distinct from the average U.S. urban community.

In addition to characteristics common to all diverse communities, the characteristics of the diverse-by-direction communities we studied include the following:

Community-based organizations (CBOs) concerned with sustaining and promoting the racial diversity of the neighborhood are developed. Ways in which CBOs intervene include:

■ Efforts to promote positive perceptions of the neighborhood by those outside the community as well as by residents in the community. This is a recognition that the "desirability" of any neighborhood and the related demand for housing (rental and owner-occupied) is strongly linked to the image of the community (Goetze, 1979). Intervention takes the form of direct marketing and promotional efforts touting the positive aspects of the community, pressure on local media to report positively on the community, and monitoring media and public official statements or comments about the neighborhood and responding to such statements when they appear damaging to the community.

■ Development of affirmative marketing programs that seek to encourage inclusive-ness. These programs have varied in scope and success, but they all represent a commitment to encourage prointegrative moves.

■   Active promotion of the goals of fair housing by assisting residents and prospective residents to ensure that Federal, State, and local fair housing laws are being enforced.

■   Research activities that provide data on housing quality and sales, changing racial composition in the neighborhood, bank loan practices, and real estate sales practices. These data are useful to encourage public and private agencies to support racial diversity in the community.

■   Cooperation in citywide testing for discrimination and the development of metro-politanwide strategies to combat discrimination and thus promote greater awareness of fair housing laws.

■   Housing maintenance and repair to maintain the quality of life in the community. Diverse neighborhoods are typically older neighborhoods. Pressure is often placed on local officials to strictly enforce building codes. In some cases, community organizations have conducted "windshield" surveys of neighborhood blocks, then contacted owners to suggest repairs.

Community organizations to address and improve local quality-of-life concerns are developed. Unlike the CBOs noted above, these organizations do not explicitly address racial and ethnic diversity issues. Efforts include programs that provide crime watch patrols and graffiti cleanup, housing surveys, and investment in infrastructure improvements.

Religious institutions are encouraged to play a prominent role in promoting prodiversity values. Interfaith networks serve to link the different racial or ethnic groups that tend to dominate in individual religious congregations.

The places where different groups in the community come together on a regular basis are more prevalent and developed than those in the diverse-by-circumstance communities. These *social seams* include shopping areas, schools, parks, interfaith religious services, and other neighborhood events.

These communities have more political and financial resources than diverse-by-circumstance communities. Households, as measured by median income, are more wealthy and the community has greater professional resources—expertise that can be easily translated into political influence. Three of the four communities in this category had median incomes substantially higher than the city average in 1990 (more than 40 percent higher).

Working relationships are formed with banks and real estate agents to market the community. Early in the development of the diverse community, this relationship is often strained and is one of confrontation, for example, through Community Reinvestment Act challenges and picketing. Generally, and with time, more positive working relationships are developed with particular banks and real estate agents.

The emergence and ongoing existence of skilled, dedicated leadership is a necessary element. All of the community organizations in the intentionally diverse communities studied were established and sustained through the efforts of key leaders. Although the organizations have been able to attract the necessary support from within the community at critical times, dedicated leadership has been a necessary element to sustain diversity.

A biracial or biethnic character is developed instead of a multiracial or multiethnic character. Two racial or ethnic groups dominate the neighborhood population. In almost

all cases, this involves White and African-American populations. A middle-class White perspective tends to be dominant. Leaders in these communities trace their development to prointegration activities emerging from the civil rights movement of the 1960s. These communities historically participated in National Neighbors, a national prointegration organization created in 1969.

Model Two: The Diverse-by-Circumstance Community

Among the communities we studied, the following are diverse by circumstance: Jackson Heights and Fort Greene (New York City); Rogers Park, Edgewater, Uptown, and Chicago Lawn (Chicago); San Antonio and Fruitvale (Oakland); Houston Heights; and Southeast Seattle. Although these communities have been stable for the past 10 to 20 years, their diversity is less a product of neighborhood organization intervention and more the product of social and economic forces initially beyond the control of the residents. Such forces include an influx of immigrant groups; a change in neighborhood composition as an aging White population moves out or dies and new residents take their place; and reinvestment in formerly rundown neighborhoods that brings a modest increase in White, Anglo, middle-income residents while a sluggish real estate market inhibits wholesale gentrification and resegregation.

These locations represent a new type of community that might develop into a more directed, intentionally diverse community. The current stable diversity—and even continued diversity—is largely the product of the complexity of its mixture of racial and ethnic groups as well as the congruent mixture of diverse organizations representing the interests of those groups (for example, ethnic mutual aid societies, ethnically based religious groups, and racially based recreational groups). Diverse-by-circumstance communities are experiencing the development of organizations and networks intended to improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods (for example, community policing programs, collective marketing efforts for small businesses, affordable housing preservation programs, and community-wide economic development efforts).

In addition to the characteristics common to all diverse communities, diverse-by-circumstance communities exhibit the following traits:

■ These communities are composites of often more than two racial and ethnic groups. The relatively peaceful coexistence of groups in these communities largely results from the lack of numerical (and political and social) dominance by any one group. Typical of this kind of community are Edgewater and Uptown in Chicago—where the local public high school draws students from families that speak 65 different languages—and the Jackson Heights section of Queens in New York City—where community groups give "International Express" subway tours with riders stopping at the many different ethnic stores and restaurants.

■ The community organization network generally consists of a number of groups representing a variety of ethnic group interests (for example, ethnic mutual aid societies). Larger organizations are present, but their activity often centers on maintaining coalitions between the various ethnic groups.

■ Religious congregations are institutional vehicles for building bridges between groups and—more than is apparent in diverse-by-direction communities—religious congregations open their doors to multiple ethnic groups. It is common to see houses of worship that either have services in different languages or provide space to multiple congregations.

■ The social seams in these communities are not as visible or strong as they are in communities that are diverse by direction. Although diversity is apparent by the numbers, fewer social institutions or social accommodations have developed to weave the diversity together. Diverse retail developments (that is, a broad range of ethnic restaurants and a variety of ethnic shops) do bring together various residential groups, but intergroup relations are not a focal point of most community organizations.

■ Efforts are developed to weave together various ethnic and racial groups to protect community interests and promote interethnic and interracial harmony. Because the multiple-group character of diverse-by-circumstance communities has not been commonplace in U.S. society, organizations addressing these issues are finding themselves in new social and political territory. The past experiences (positive and negative) of White/African-American or White/Latino relations cannot always serve as guides to more complex relationships like White/Vietnamese/new Latino immigrant/established Latino/African-American residential mixes. Although most diversity present in the United States tends to include two groups, communities that are diverse by circumstance represent greater challenges to organization by virtue of their multicultural character.

■ Because of the large numbers of recent immigrants in most of these neighborhoods—immigrants who also have limited financial resources—these communities tend to have a lower median income. Unlike the diverse-by-direction communities, which generally had median incomes higher than the city average, the majority of diverse-by-circumstance communities had incomes closer to or below the city average.

■ Although all diverse communities have a broader than average range of housing options, diverse-by-circumstance communities are more likely to have a substantial number of affordable housing units. The availability of relatively good-quality affordable housing—particularly affordable rental housing—is a factor that attracts new immigrant groups to these communities.

Because the diverse-by-circumstance communities are the newest, growing wave of diverse communities, they represent a significant policy challenge to civic and government leaders at local, State, and national levels. Although these communities are the products of social, political, and economic forces outside their boundaries, the power to maintain stable diversity does not lie exclusively outside the community. Yes, continued immigration, limited opportunities for affordable housing in other communities, private investment policies, lending practices (both residential and commercial), and government fair housing policies are all outside forces that will continue to influence the racial, ethnic, and economic makeup of the communities. However, as will become particularly apparent as you read the case studies—particularly those of communities in Chicago, Houston, New York, Oakland, and Seattle—community-based initiatives also influence the diversity and stability of neighborhoods. It would be misleading to say that either outside or inside forces dominate in the strengthening or weakening of diverse neighborhoods. These forces interact; it is not an either/or situation. For example, local groups in one neighborhood may be particularly effective at using Federal laws—fair housing laws and Community Reinvestment Action regulations—to sustain diversity. In another neighborhood, the power of outside forces of commercial investment may prove formidable to a local community and thus it resegregates.

However, such obstacles have led to the creation of new multiple community-area or citywide coalitions aimed at promoting diversity. For example, in some of the diverse-by-circumstance communities studied, such interventions are taking place. In Houston, the Interethnic Forum is promoting citywide dialogues on race and ethnic relations. The

forum is particularly interested in the future of Houston Heights, the prominent diverse community in the city. In Chicago's Uptown and Edgewater communities, the Organization of the NorthEast—an umbrella grouping of religious congregations, universities, ethnic mutual aid societies, and banks—has been involved in a collaborative research project with Loyola University to develop organizing strategies intended to produce greater interracial and interethnic cooperation.

These communities might represent a new wave of diverse communities that we will see increasingly in U.S. cities. More directed intervention efforts—which we now see emerging in some of these communities—should make them more stable. However, because the stable diversity is largely a product of social, political, and economic forces not actively controlled by these communities, it is unclear whether they will be able to sustain themselves without more conscious guidance and intervention.

The case studies presented in this report should be treated as nine different models of juggling resources and influence—internal and external to the communities—to produce stable diversity. As explained in each chapter and summarized in the conclusions, some strategies have worked in all of the cities studied. Yet unique circumstances in a particular city have required unique strategies to promote diversity. The report represents a collection of organizing and policy tools that can be used in furthering stable diversity.

No one magical silver bullet will end segregation and create stable diversity in U.S. cities. It is a quest that has been and will continue to be a process negotiated by forces and organizations from local to national levels. However, more government support for such efforts can help to tip the balance in favor of more stable diverse communities.

The following chapters detail the research and outcomes relating to each of the 14 communities studied. Chapter two provides detailed descriptions of each community, especially its characteristics with respect to diversity, both those commonly shared with all or some of the others and those that are unique. Chapters 3 through 12 present the case studies of the diverse communities. Although some editing has taken place and each chapter is preceded by a brief introductory section written by a member of the project's steering committee, these chapters are written in the voice of each community research team and thus reflect their observations and emphases.

The concluding chapter draws together considerable written material, face-to-face discussions, onsite observations, and input from many individuals who have been involved in this research. We attempt not only to summarize what we have found, but also to identify, present, and discuss the tools that can be used by community leaders, planners, and policymakers to keep existing diverse neighborhoods stable and to develop other diverse neighborhoods. We recognize that, although we have much to say about diversity in U.S. cities, we still have much to learn. We hope that our work will lead to further interest in and discussions and studies of diversity and, ultimately, to many more diverse urban neighborhoods so that all who live in our cities have the opportunity to experience the vitality that we have found in the communities we studied.

Authors

Philip Nyden is professor of sociology and director of the Center for Urban Research and Learning at Loyola University in Chicago. He is also program director of the Policy Research Action Group and has completed many research projects in collaboration with community-based organizations. He has written numerous articles and reports on racial

and ethnic diversity in urban communities and recently coedited Building Community: Social Science in Action.

John Lukehart is vice president of the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, a nationally recognized, Chicago-area fair housing organization that operates enforcement, education, counseling, and advocacy programs. He is responsible for the council's community relations, public policy, housing industry initiatives, research, and pubic housing programs. He has also been a community activist in Oak Park, Illinois, which is nationally recognized for its diversity programming.

Michael T. Maly received his Ph.D. in sociology in May 1998 from Loyola University in Chicago. In addition to serving as senior researcher for this nine-city study, Dr. Maly's dissertation, "Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Select U.S. Urban Neighborhoods, 1980–1990," examined racial and ethnic diversity in New York and Chicago neighborhoods and contained an indepth study of the local efforts involved in maintaining stable diversity in Uptown (Chicago) and Jackson Heights (New York). He is currently an assistant professor of sociology in the School of Policy Studies at Roosevelt University.

William Peterman is a professor of geography and the coordinator of the Fredrick Blum Neighborhood Assistance Center at Chicago State University. He has more than 20 years of experience in conducting community-based research and has worked and written in the areas of housing, housing and lending discrimination, and community development.

Notes

1. "Testers" are matched pairs of individuals or couples with different social characteristics (for example, African-American versus White, Latino versus Anglo, disabled versus nondisabled) who both ostensibly attempt to buy or rent properties through the same real estate agents or landlords. Comparison of the experiences (for example, one couple being told an apartment is already rented and another being told it is still available) provided data that are legally recognized as determining the existence or nonexistence of discrimination.

2. More information on PRAG and the Leadership Council can be found at the following Web sites: http://www.luc.edu/depts/curt/prag and http://www.luc.edu/depts/curl/prag/pragusr/lemoc.

3. Using census data, we define diverse neighborhoods as areas with a racial and ethnic mix that approaches the average mix for the city as a whole.

References

Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bradford, Calvin, ed. 1991. *Credit by Color*: *Mortgage Market Discrimination in Chicagoland.* Chicago, IL: Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance.

Canner, Glenn B., and Delores S. Smith. 1992. "Expanded HMDA Data on Residential Living: One Year Later," in *HMDA Data and Mortgage Market Discrimination Research*, James H. Carr and Isaac F. Megbolugbe, eds. Washington, DC: Fannie Mae Research Roundtable Series, December 9.

Chandler, Mittie Olion. 1992. "Public Housing Desegregation: What Are the Options?" *Housing Policy Debate* 3(2):509–534.

Chicago Tribune. 1993. "Old Demons Still Block Fair Housing," November 14.

Cisneros, Henry G., ed. 1993. *Interwoven Destinies: Cities and the Nation.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Coser, Lewis A. (ed). 1965. *Georg Simmel.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Dane, Stephen M. 1992. "A History of Mortgage Lending Discrimination in the United States." Toledo, OH: Research paper produced for Cooper, Straub, Walinski & Cramer.

Darden, Joe T. 1987. "Choosing Neighbors and Neighborhoods: The Role of Race in Housing Preference," in *Divided Neighborhoods: Changing Patterns of Racial Segregation*, Gary A. Tobin, ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ellis, James E. 1988. "The Black Middle Class," *Business Week* (March 14):62–70.

Fannie Mae, Office of Housing Research. 1993. *Data and Mortgage Market Discrimination Research.* Washington, DC: Fannie Mae.

Farley, Reynolds, and William H. Frey. 1994. "Changes in the Segregation of Whites from Blacks," *American Sociological Review* 59(1):23–45.

Galster, George. 1990. "Racial Discrimination in Housing Markets During the 1980s: A Review of the Audit Evidence," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9:165–175.

Goetze, Rolf. 1979. *Understanding Neighborhood Change: The Role of Expectations in Urban Revitalization.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hawley, Amos. 1950. *Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure.* New York: Ronald Press.

Hunter, Albert. 1974. *Symbolic Communities: The Persistence and Change of Chicago's Local Communities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Life and Death of Great American Cities.* New York: Vintage Press.

Keating, Dennis. 1994. *The Suburban Racial Dilemma: Housing and Neighborhoods.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lauber, Daniel. 1991. "Racially Diverse Communities: A National Necessity," in *Challenging Uneven Development: An Urban Agenda for the 1990s*, Philip W. Nyden and Wim Wiewel, eds. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Massey, Douglas, and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Megbolugbe, Isaac F. 1993. "Understanding Mortgage Lending Patterns," *Journal of Housing Research* 4:185–189.

Munnell, Alicia H., Lynne E. Browne, James McEnearney, and Geoffrey Tootell. 1992. *Mortgage Lending in Boston: Interpreting HMDA Data.* Working Paper. Boston: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

National Fair Housing Alliance. 1994. Insurance study (untitled). Washington, DC.

Nyden, Philip, and Joanne Adams. 1996. *Saving Our Homes: The Lessons of Community Struggles to Preserve Affordable Housing in Chicago's Uptown.* Chicago: Loyola University and Organization of the NorthEast.

Nyden, Philip, and Wim Wiewel. 1992. "Collaborative Research: Harnessing the Tensions Between Researcher and Practitioner," *The American Sociologist* 23,4 (Winter): 43–55.

Nyden, Philip, Carol Feen, Laurie Garvin, Wanda Harold, Darrell Irwin, Brian Kinne, Jesusa Marco, Karen Pleasant, Mark Ritchie, and Jon Witt. 1987. *Perceptions of Neighborhood Quality in South Evanston.* Evanston, IL: Report to the City of Evanston Human Relations Commission, June 17.

O'Hare, William P. 1992. "America's Minorities—The Demographics of Diversity." *Population Bulletin* 47,4 (December).

Orfield, Gary. 1985. "Ghettoization and Its Alternatives," in *New Urban Reality.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

———. 1982. Quoted in the *Chicago Reader,* August 27.

Ottensmann, John. 1995. "Requiem for the Tipping-Point Hypothesis," *Journal of Planning Literature* 10(2):131–141.

Pearson, Hugh. 1996. "Conservative Blinders," *The Wall Street Journal,* March 15, p. 10.

Peterman, William, and Qi Sanshu. 1991. "Lending Discrimination in Metropolitan Chicago: Continuing Connection Between Race, Racial Change and Mortgage Credit," in *Credit by Color: Mortgage Market Discrimination in Chicagoland.* Chicago: Chicago Fair Housing Alliance.

Porter, Michael E. 1995. "The Competitive Advantage of the Inner City," *Harvard Business Review* 73,3 (May–June):55–71.

Saltman, Juliet. 1990. *A Fragile Movement.* New York: Greenwood Press.

Sampson, Robert J. 1988. "Local Friendship Ties and Community Attachment in Mass Society: A Multilevel Systemic Model," *American Sociological Review* 53(5):766–779.

Schill, Michael H., and Susan M. Wachter. 1995. "Housing Market Constraints and Spatial Stratification by Income and Race," *Housing Policy Debate* 6(1):141–167.

Simmel, Georg. 1964. *Conflict and the Web of Group-Affiliations*. New York: Free Press.

Smith, Richard. 1993. "Creating Stable Racially Integrated Communities: A Review." Indianapolis, IN: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Urban Affairs Association.

Taub, Richard P., D. Garth Taylor, and Jan D. Dunham. 1984. *Paths of Neighborhood Change: Race and Crime in Urban America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tauber, K. E., and A. F. Tauber. 1965. *Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change.* Chicago: Aldine.

Trafficante v. *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.* 1972. 409 U.S. 205.

Turner, Margery Austin. 1992. "Discrimination in Urban Housing Markets: Lessons from Fair Housing Audits," *Housing Policy Debate* 3(2):185–215.

Turner, Margery Austin, Raymond Struyk, and John Yinger. 1991. *Housing Discrimination Study: Synthesis.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Urban Institute. 1991. *Housing Discrimination Study: Methodology and Data Documentation.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Wachter, Susan M., and Isaac F. Megbolugbe. 1992. "Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Homeownership," *Housing Policy Debate* 3(2):333–370.

Wienk, Ronald E., Clifford E. Reid, John C. Simonson, and Frederick J. Eggers. 1979. *Measuring Racial Discrimination in American Housing Markets: The Housing Market Practices Survey.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Wolfe, E. 1963. "The Tipping Point in Racially Changing Neighborhoods," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 29(3):217–222.

Yinger, John. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost.* New York: Russell Sage.