Mixed-Tenure Orthodoxy: Practitioner Reflections on Policy Effects

Ade Kearns
University of Glasgow

Martin McKee
UK Medical Research Council

Elena Sautkina
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

George Weeks
Transport for London

Lyndal Bond
Centre for Excellence in Intervention and Prevention Science

Abstract

This article examines mixed tenure as a policy orthodoxy. It first sets out how mixed tenure may be considered to constitute an orthodoxy within planning, being generally accepted as a theory and practice even in the absence of supporting evidence. Five elements of this orthodoxy are identified, relating to (1) housing and the environment, (2) social change, (3) economic impacts, (4) sustainable communities, (5) and socio-spatial integration. Interviews with practitioners involved with three social housing estates that have experienced mixed-tenure policy interventions are reported to consider why the implementation and effects of mixed tenure might not correspond with the ortho-dox understanding. It is argued that policy ambiguity and weaknesses in policy theory and specification, alongside practical constraints, lie behind incomplete and counter-productive policy implementation, but a belief in pursuing the policy orthodoxy persists nevertheless.

Introduction

Planning has been described as, or in some cases accused of, from time to time having orthodox approaches to creativity and problem solving. The most famous critic in this regard was Jane Jacobs, who railed against the "saints and sages of *modern orthodox planning*" (emphasis added) and what they had to say "about how cities ought to work and what ought to be good for people and business in them" (Jacobs, 1961: 8). Planning orthodoxies are not unchanging however; as Dudley (2012: 1) said, "one generation's orthodoxies … may be subject to condemnation in the next." Thus, although in urban planning we can find critical commentary on the orthodoxy in favor of "fast and efficient freeways" for U.S. cities in the 1950s (Dudley, 2012) and the negative consequences of associated "urban renewal" (Anderson, 1964), more recently we can observe the opposite in the form of resistance to what has been called the "planning orthodoxy" of compact cities and higher density redevelopment (Randolph, 2006).

Orthodoxy can be defined as an "authorized or generally accepted theory, doctrine, or practice" (http://www.oxforddictionaries.com) or "the generally accepted beliefs of society at a particular time" (http://www.dictionary.cambridge.org). Professions like to operate with orthodoxies because doing so gives the impression of authority, expertise, and coherence within the body of practitioners, in that a marshaling of the evidence and their professional experience leads them to adhere to the general approach. The orthodox approach may eventually achieve the status of unassailable conventional wisdom, something that is hard to shift and where appropriate evidence is often not collected to enable a challenge to be made from within or outside the profession. When the orthodox approach is perpetuated without any evidence of effectiveness or successful outcomes, or even in the face of evidence of negative effects, then it may be all the stronger for surviving as belief as much as on authority.

We would argue that the promotion and development of mixed-tenure communities have constituted an orthodoxy within housing, urban, and planning policies during the past two decades, at least within the United Kingdom if not also in a number of other Western European countries. Accounts of the rise and persistence of mixed-tenure policies have been given in several reviews: see Kleinhans (2004); Bond et al. (2011); and Sautkina, Bond, and Kearns (2012). Having pursued mixed-tenure policies since at least the early 1990s (Tunstall, 2003), governments in both England and Scotland recently commissioned evidence reviews on the subject. Tunstall and Lupton (2010) concluded that mixed tenure has a limited role and is unlikely (alone) to improve individuals' life chances, thus questioning its function as an antidote to concentrated poverty or multiple disadvantage (see Berube, 2005). In relation to council estates, Tunstall and Lupton said that the evidence of mixed-tenure benefits is not strong enough to justify the financial and social costs of restructuring social housing areas. Monk, Clarke, and Tang (2011) also concluded that, although the evidence is supportive of mixed tenure in new developments, the evidence is less clear that mixed tenure is effective in existing social housing estates, over and above traditional renewal (in physical, environmental, and service terms). Lastly, Tunstall and Lupton (2010) highlighted that the evidence is too weak to offer guidance about the levels of mixing required to produce benefits. These reviews highlight the weakness of the evidence base for mixed-tenure policy, and thus help confirm its position as orthodoxy.

Mixed-Tenure Orthodoxy

This section reviews some of the main tenets of mixed-tenure housing policy, in terms of both how policy intends or expects them to operate and what is known about their functioning and effects.

The most immediate effects of mixed tenure on existing social housing areas are expected to be on housing and environmental quality within neighborhoods, possibly due to the provision of a greater variety of house types and designs by private developers, because of associated physical improvements made as part of mixed-tenure developments, or as a result of the care and maintenance behaviors of owner occupiers. Several U.K. studies have reported greater resident satisfaction with the surrounding physical environment in mixed-tenure neighborhoods, although its attribution to mixed tenure rather than to other planning policies has been questioned (Atkinson and Kintrea, 1998; Beekman, Lyons, and Scott, 2001; Pawson, Kirk, and McIntosh, 2000). Whether or not the expected caring behaviors of homeowners—as might be observed in mono-tenure, suburban situations—can be translated to mixed-tenure, inner-city neighborhoods is also uncertain. Evidence on the extent of owner occupier reinvestment in their properties shows that owners' attitudes to their neighborhoods are very influential on their maintenance behaviors, particularly their feelings of solidarity with their neighbors and their short- or long-term plans to move (Galster, 1987), both of which might be expected to reduce maintenance behaviors in mixed-tenure neighborhoods.

Tenure mix is also intended to have significant social effects within communities, partly through the increased responsibility that comes with home owning rather than renting, and partly through altering the social composition of neighborhoods through the introduction of higher income groups. Two difficulties emerge in this regard. First, tenure mixing is not guaranteed to deliver substantial income mix; one of the few empirical studies of this issue in Europe concluded that "the association between housing mix and social mix is not very strong" (Musterd and Andersson, 2005: 26). Second, it has been argued that if the income or social-class gap between co-resident groups is too great, then the transmission of social changes from one group to another may not happen.

Thus, the assumption is that having a greater diversity of residents, especially including higher income groups alongside poorer and more deprived residents, has the potential to change the attitudes and behaviors of the disadvantaged group. This change is expected to happen through a number of social mechanisms (Galster, 2007), some operating on an individual basis (for example, through peers and role models) and some on a collective basis (for example, through social pressures to conform and the exercise of informal social control). These mechanisms may serve to change the aspirations and behaviors of individual residents and the transmitted expectations and norms of the community. Key behavior areas of concern in this regard are attitudes to the local environment (as discussed previously); to education and employment; and to crime, antisocial behavior, and the exercise of informal social control.

A number of studies have indicated the operation of social-mix neighborhood effects on education, albeit with different minimum levels of affluent neighbors required for beneficial influences on specific outcomes: school-leaving age and teenage childbearing (Crane, 1991), educational attainment (Duncan, Connell, and Klebanov, 1997; Kauppinen, 2004), and intellectual and behavioral development scores (Chase-Lansdale et al., 1997).

Two propositions relate to informal social control regarding mixed communities. First, that owners or higher income residents will be less likely to put up with crime and antisocial behavior and will either intervene directly or call on the authorities to act, and they will generally support enforcement of rules (Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis, 1998). Second, communities with more middle-class residents will be more socially organized and therefore better able to supervise their members, develop and transmit social norms, and ensure compliance with those norms so that problems occur less often. Although studies have shown that crime and informal social control are generally related to community characteristics such as socioeconomic status, residential stability, levels of homeownership, and organizational participation (Sampson and Groves, 1989; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997; Veysey and Messner, 1999), "the available evidence is inconclusive about whether increased levels of social control have been observed in existing mixed-income developments and, if so, what the source of that increased control is" (Joseph, 2006: 219). A recent review of U.K. research on existing developments reported very inconclusive evidence about the relationship between tenure mix and perceptions of crime and antisocial behavior among residents (Sautkina, Bond, and Kearns, 2012), and the review found only one study showing that mixed tenure resulted in a reduction in crime (Page and Boughton, 1997).

The economic impacts of mixed communities are held to be of two broad types. With the first type, a social-capital argument asserts that weak social ties between neighbors who are different from each other will particularly benefit lower income groups by providing access to employment information and job opportunities (Granovetter, 1995; Lin and Dumin, 1986). The European evidence for such employment or income effects of residential mixing is limited and inconsistent, however. Scottish longitudinal research has found no effect of tenure mix on individuals' ability to obtain employment over time and an only minimal positive effect on their ability to remain in employment (van Ham and Manley, 2010). Swedish evidence, on the other hand, points to some gains in earnings for low-income groups from having middle-income neighbors as a dominant group; having other lower income neighbors, however, can erode the positive effect (Galster et al., 2008), indicating that precision in mixing may be important to deriving the best outcomes for residents.

Despite the empirical evidence for social-interactive effects of mixing—be it for the environment, employment, education, and so on—questions remain about the mechanisms involved. Galster (2012) asked whether the effects of affluent neighbors derive from role-model effects or from the extra resources brought into local institutions, like schools. Joseph (2006) questioned whether role modeling concerns the transmission of values or relates more to skills and opportunities; that is, whether it involves observation ("distal role-modelling") or direct contact involving advice, feedback, and accountability ("proximal role-modelling"). He concluded that, "Although the presence of middle-class role models has become a fundamental and commonly accepted rationale for mixed-income development, my review raises serious questions about the relative importance of this proposition" (Joseph, 2006: 221). These things matter for our purposes, as the mechanisms involved in neighborhood effects from social mix have different implications for the other neighborhood conditions required for those effects to operate.

The second type of economic effect of mixed communities is that higher income residents are expected to help "create a market for services" (Smith, 2002) through their spending power, thus attracting private investment into the local area. By contrast, some U.K. research has reported that

more affluent residents in deprived areas "are able to escape [the] area by car to access external services" (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2004: 451), thus undermining the local economic impact of mix. On the area economic impact, however, Joseph (2006: 221) remarked, "Despite a lack of empirical evidence, this proposition remains a compelling argument."

Mixed communities are often discussed as part of the "sustainable communities" policy agenda (ODPM, 2003), with tenure mix seen as a means to developing greater sustainability for the future. For existing social housing areas, the sustainability question relates to issues of housing, reputation, and management. In housing terms, the identified problem was of low demand to live in some social housing estates, attributed to poor-quality housing or a lack of the right types and sizes of dwellings to meet people's needs or aspirations (Bramley and Pawson, 2002). This issue was seen to be exacerbated by the fact that some areas had negative reputations, being seen as run down, poverty stricken, suffering problems of crime and antisocial behavior, and lacking a sense of cohesion or community, all of which could lead existing residents to leave and deter others from moving to the area (Permentier, van Ham, and Bolt, 2007). Mixed-tenure communities are intended to improve the external reputation of social housing or deprived areas.

The management issue is a slight variant on the issue identified in Joseph's version of the "political economy of place" (Joseph, 2006). The case of social housing areas has raised dual concerns. One concern has been not so much that such estates were ignored by the authorities and lacked effective advocates for public-sector attention, but rather that they relied too heavily on public interventions and services and would benefit from more self-governance, aided by the participation and voice of higher income groups and homeowners. More recent research, however, has indicated that deprived areas may still suffer from a level of public services that is insufficient to compensate for the problems of disadvantage. This lack may be because of low expectations, rationing, discrimination, or competition with other areas (Hastings, 2009), all of which effects may be reduced by having a more diverse resident group.

As we have seen, some of the intended benefits from residential social mix are expected to be produced via social interaction between income or tenure groups, although recent reviews have been pessimistic on this point. Galster (forthcoming) concluded that social mix was probably insufficient to generate substantial interactions between groups, and Tunstall and Lupton (2010: 20) went further to state that "Limited social interaction between tenure, employment and income groups … [was] partly … because of design and layout which tend to mean people from different groups are not literally neighbours." Similarly, Kleinhans (2004: 378) observed that cross-tenure interactions were "hampered by spatial separation between tenures as a result of neighbourhood layout." This observation echoes Kleit's (2005) finding that social connections were greater with spatial proximity and shared attributes.

This consensus of view about the causes of limited social interaction in mixed situations is consistent with the view among housing and planning professionals that fuller spatial integration of housing tenures is more beneficial. Thus, a best-practice guide to mixed communities recommends that through a "pepper-potted" or "dispersal" approach, "the greatest integration between tenures is achieved" and stigmatization of groups avoided (Bailey et al., 2006: 49).

To summarize, we identify the following elements of orthodoxy within mixed-tenure housing and planning policies.

• Tenure mix will deliver improvements in the quality of the residential and physical environments.

• Tenure mix will result in social change within communities, in terms of both social composition and social behaviors.

• Tenure mix will have a positive effect on the local economy, helping to reduce unemployment and boost local spending.

• Communities will become more sustainable because of tenure mix, through increased housing demand and reduced public-sector inputs.

• Spatially integrated forms of tenure mix will be the more successful in producing positive results.

Our aim in this research is to see how practitioners who have been involved in developing and managing mixed-tenure housing estates reflect on their achievement of these objectives and then to consider why such orthodoxies might be clearer and simpler in theory than in practice.

Methods

This section describes the urban setting for our study, the specific study areas involved, and the composition of our qualitative sample of interviewees.

Study Communities

We studied three postwar council estates—that is, "rationally planned schemes" (Ravetz, 2001)—in Glasgow, each changed in different ways from being entirely socially rented housing to becoming mixed tenure during the past 20 years or so. Castlemilk and Drumchapel are two of Glasgow's four peripheral estates, built on the edges of the city in the 1950s and now containing approximately 7,000 and 6,000 dwellings, respectively. The tenure structure is identical for the two estates, with 74 percent social renting, 23 percent owner occupation, and 3 percent private renting (GCC, 2011). Part of the tenure change in each estate was a result of Right to Buy, a policy of the 1980s that gave council tenants the option to buy their homes at discounted prices. Furthermore, Castlemilk was subject to a government-led regeneration program in the 1990s, which reduced densities on the estate and allowed for infill private development, especially along the southern and eastern boundaries of the estate (CPC, 1999). Drumchapel was extended on its western edge through a new access road that opened up green land for private housing development (GCC, 1992). More recently, several infill private housing developments have been started as part of the council's New Neighbourhoods Initiative, intended to bring middle-income families into social housing areas (DAHP, 2002). In the case of the two peripheral estates, the housing tenures tend to exist in segregated and segmented developments, for example, in separate culs-de-sac or across the street from one another.

The third study area is what is now called New Gorbals, comprising the redevelopment in the 1990s of part of the wider Gorbals estate through large-scale demolition and a master-planning

exercise (CZWG, 1990; Tiesdell and MacFarlane, 2007) with a strong emphasis on urban design and mixed-use (residential and commercial) buildings and boulevards, a grid street layout, and higher densities (Thompson-Fawcett, 2004). According to local property tax records, New Gorbals consists of 1,800 dwellings with a tenure mix of 50 percent social renting, 38 percent owner occupation, and 12 percent private renting. Because of the redevelopment, the tenures are more integrated in New Gorbals than in the two peripheral estates, with the tenures sometimes alternating between staircases ("closes") in the same street block.

Interviews

Interviewing "stakeholders" and "implementers" has been identified as a useful, perhaps even necessary, part of understanding how programs and policy actions might have effects through aiding an evaluator's understanding of the intended outcomes, contextual influences, and resource requirements and "the sheer complexity of the interventions" (Mackenzie and Blamey, 2005: 155). Using practitioners as key informants in the study of urban, community-level policy interventions has been done before. In the field of urban health, research has used "key stakeholders," including local policymakers and practitioners, to investigate how programs are developed in the absence of good evidence to guide community and environmental interventions (Goodwin et al., 2012). A previous study in Scotland targeted practitioners to examine area effects on life chances in deprived areas consisting of both social housing and mixed tenure by selecting for interview public service and welfare professionals with knowledge of the patterns of social life on the estates (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2004). Given the fact of policy orthodoxy, practitioners may be inclined to view the policy in a positive light, but in asking them to consider a range of outcomes, we are more likely to open up a space within which they can consider how well-founded that belief is.

We purposively sampled practitioners through our contacts with the city council, using a snowballing method to reach others thereafter, and we sought to include people involved in decisions about the development of the three estates in the 1990s and people working on the estates today. In total, 17 practitioners were recruited and interviewed, including urban planners, housing management staff, regeneration agency staff, and head teachers at local schools for all three estates. One socioeconomic development officer, one chair of a community organization, and one architect were also interviewed. The interviews were equally balanced among the three estates, 11 interviewees were male and 6 female, and the response rate was 84 percent. The semistructured interviews lasted 45 to 60 minutes, were digitally recorded, and were professionally transcribed before being thematically analyzed. The first part of the interview concerned previous conditions on the estate and the history of its redevelopment. The second part of the interview concerned the operation and contribution of tenure mix and the improvements still required on the estates.

Findings

In this section, we present the findings from our interviews with policymakers and practitioners pertaining to each of the five main elements of planning orthodoxy around mixed-tenure communities.

Housing and the Environment

In the case of all three estates, physical improvements were emphasized as one of the main achievements of the past two decades, but this achievement was attributed to several factors, not solely tenure mix. The two peripheral estates saw many of the 1950s tenements improved, others demolished, and houses with front and back doors developed, both by social landlords and private developers.

> *There is also a better housing conditions (sic) for residents, a better fit between household type and dwelling type.*
>
> —Urban planner, Drumchapel

The role of design in environmental improvement was stressed, particularly in the case of New Gorbals but was also mentioned to a lesser degree in the case of Castlemilk.

> *There was money put into it … to achieve better standards of building, like stone and better materials in the roads and that, some public art and things like that.*
>
> —Urban planner, New Gorbals

> *The first thing I was impressed with was the attention to detail that the planners had used. There were a lot of small parks, or areas where there's little bits of artwork—and they'd obviously tried to make each street different and give it a bit of identity and also create places that encouraged people to be out, other than the shops—so they were encouraging people to sit outside and play outside.*
>
> —Teacher, New Gorbals

Also, as might be expected, improved maintenance of housing and its surroundings was identified, although this improvement was attributed not so much to tenure mix as conventionally understood. Rather, it was attributed to diversification of ownership of the social housing stock on the estates and the localization of management that came with it.

> *At one time, there was nearly 10,000 houses, you know, that were all council. … So what has been achieved is not just diversification of broad tenure; it's the, how many different landlords have we got, social landlords have we got in Castlemilk? Probably about 10 or 11, if you count all the housing associations. So, you know, that's been something that has been achieved.*
>
> —Urban planner, Castlemilk

This tenure diversification was linked to improved maintenance through the operation of competitive behaviors among landlords, landlords' desire to protect their recent investment in the housing stock, and their use of behavioral contracts with tenants. Reference was also made, however, to the effects of housing improvements and the *good neighbor effect* of having owners around to influence others.

> *I'm sure, if you've got nice houses round about you and people are looking after their houses better because they have bought them, rather than rented them, then you would have to think that people feel better about their own locale within Castlemilk.*
>
> —Teacher, Castlemilk

More than any other change, the physical improvements were attributed with psychological gains for residents.

> *I think people … generally do feel more confident in themselves, and there's a feeling of pride in if a child goes to this school to be associated with it. … To say that you come from Castlemilk has a better feel to it now than it may well have done in the past.*
>
> —Teacher, Castlemilk

> *A good, warm, safe, protected environment gives people more peace of mind.*
>
> —Housing officer, Drumchapel

> *Well, I think it's positive because what you have, … it's helped to raise the overall quality of, you know, visual appearance, it's taken away the kind of stigma of poor housing, particularly where we were in the '80s.*
>
> —Housing officer, New Gorbals

Social Change

Social change was considered insufficient in all three areas, with interviewees describing persistent poverty and deprivation, social fragility, and a set of behavioral problems. These issues were identified most readily, but not exclusively, by teachers.

> *The HMI [Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education] report, the background says that we've got a number of issues of alcohol abuse, drugs, gang cultures, poor diet, breakdown in relationships between families … there are many, many families with social-work connections. … So I think, in terms of the regeneration, there may well be houses out there that are better stock and healthier places to live in, but I think it's things like the diet, the social and emotional well-being of adults and young people, and I think that's still a factor.*
>
> —Teacher, Castlemilk

The interviewees shared a common view that tenure mixing within council estates could not be expected to shift social problems or alter communities on its own.

> *The community as a whole being improved, simply by tenure diversification? Never seen that happening anywhere, including Drumchapel. … A sprinkling of homeowners doesn't really affect the chronic unemployment and the deprivation.*
>
> —Socioeconomic development officer, Drumchapel

Social change was described more in the case of New Gorbals than in the case of the two peripheral estates, with an influx of young professionals since redevelopment partly because of the types of properties for sale (of the right size and price), but also because of the area's location near the city center.

> *I do believe that the tenure mix and the change has helped, because then you don't have an overconcentration of a certain type of group of people, … you've got a community that can be a working community, you can have a community that's an aging community, but you can also have a community that's a young community and that's coming up, so I think that has helped to rebuild a variety of people within the Gorbals.*
>
> —Housing officer, New Gorbals

Although it may have helped the situation, redevelopment with tenure mix was also seen as giving an inflated view of progress in an area.

> *It's definitely changed. It's certainly not as bad as it was before … but it's not quite as trans-formed, in my opinion, as people who have nothing to do with the area think it has.*
>
> —Teacher, New Gorbals

> *I think the slight downside with all the new buildings is that it's put a little bit of a veneer over the area, because there are still problems that, compared to other areas of the city, are higher in number than it looks.*
>
> —Teacher, New Gorbals

Economic Impacts

Economic compositional changes within the areas are evident, in that owner-occupied houses are now on the estates. Practitioners were uncertain, however, about whether these changes were affecting the local economy through greater local expenditures.

As previously noted, the estates are still considered deprived, and persistent unemployment was referred to in the interviews. There was little talk of change at a household level.

> *There are a third generation of workless people living in Castlemilk; this cannot be improved immediately by renewing houses. And nothing can be done alone; there is a need of partnerships.*
>
> —Teacher, Castlemilk

> *We've got 64 percent of children living in workless households in the Gorbals. That's people who are traditionally Gorbals born and bred. That's the Gorbals; that's the Gorbalites.*
>
> —Regeneration officer, New Gorbals

In relation to employment, rather than talking about the effects of employed, owner-occupier residents on their neighbors (for example, through raising aspirations or through informational or job networks), interviewees spoke about the need to develop the local economic base in and around the estates to provide job opportunities and to overcome poor transport connections. In respect to the two peripheral estates, the general view was that these things had not been achieved sufficiently.

> *Drumchapel Business Village still hasn't been completely developed; it is currently a partly vacant serviced site. All the infrastructure's in place, waiting for a developer to come along to a serviced plot.*
>
> —Urban planner, Drumchapel

> *It's that issue of proximity to where the economic base actually sits. We have a business park in Castlemilk, which has got 70 businesses on it. They employ around 750 people, and about 60 percent of those are Castlemilk residents. And that's fabulous; but outside of that, there's very little employment in terms of an economic base.*
>
> —Regeneration officer, Castlemilk

It's bus services from Castlemilk; whilst there, those bus services are reasonably well connected if you're coming into the city. To cross the area, at all, is virtually impossible. … If you take recent employment opportunities in places like Silverburn, where there was a new retail development, … it was hugely difficult for people to pick up employment in somewhere like Silverburn, simply because of the transport infrastructure.

—Regeneration officer, Castlemilk

When economic impacts were discussed, the discussion related to improved local amenities, especially for the peripheral estates, such as new high schools, supermarkets, leisure and sports facilities, and family centers, among other things. These improvements were attributed to tenure mix for two reasons: (1) selling land to developers, or striking planning-gain deals, provided the resources for facilities; and (2) the development of tenure mix provided confidence within the public sector for investment in the areas.

Tenure diversification absolutely helped changing the infrastructure of Castlemilk, because the council would never have had enough money to do it.

—Housing officer, Castlemilk

In Drumchapel's case, it was nevertheless held that despite the new school and new leisure center, and the existence of a master plan for improving the town center, amenities were still very poor.

… there is a limited amount of things available for social interaction in terms of, you know, where mothers could meet or, you know, take their kids, you know, for a coffee or things like that. That's quite limited in Drumchapel. The shops are very limited, so you couldn't wander around.

—Regeneration officer, Drumchapel

Food shops were particularly criticized in Drumchapel.

If you look at the shopping center, there are no good quality food shops. You've got Farmfoods, which sells processed frozen food, cheaply. The nearest supermarket is Sainsbury's. Sainsbury's is one of the most expensive supermarkets. There's nothing in Drumchapel Shopping Centre where they can go and buy fresh fruit and stuff like that.

—Teacher, Drumchapel

Sustainable Communities

In all three cases, interviewees considered the creation of a viable housing market in the area as a success, reflecting both the confidence in the area and the quality of housing provided.

I think that most of what's been built in the last 20 years is good and worth keeping. I don't think there's much that I would say wasn't a success.

—Urban planner, New Gorbals

Owner occupation was seen as having provided stability to the estates, either as an innate characteristic of the tenure or as a result of providing greater housing opportunities for locals.

Yes, well, it's [owner occupation] a positive contributing factor because it's a stability.

—Housing officer, Drumchapel

> *A lot of the locals are moving into the houses for sale. If they're getting good enough jobs to be able to move on, a lot of them are moving up within the area, rather than moving out of the area, so I've seen a big, big change that way.*
>
> —Housing officer, Castlemilk

Owner occupation was not necessarily seen as making the estates self-sustainable or self-managing, however. The estates were viewed as still requiring more attention and ongoing maintenance than many other areas.

> *We have to make sure that people care for their area and we care for the houses, you know? If we don't do that, it'll go back the way it was years ago… We still have to deal with the people from day to day, you know? If there's a repair needing done, they might report it to us, or if they want to complain about a neighbor or if a neighbor complains about them, we still have to take a certain amount of responsibility for them.*
>
> —Housing officer, Castlemilk

In the case of all three estates, issues of local control were raised with regard to the question of sustainability. For the two peripheral estates, the absence of estate-level management was considered an obstacle.

> *One of the things that Castlemilk lacks now, ever since '06, has been a dedicated body that looks at Castlemilk itself and looks at it in a strategic manner. And that's unfortunate; I think … the area is suffering from not having local residents and officials from various agencies getting together and hammering out the problems and trying to find solutions.*
>
> —Urban planner, Castlemilk

A different issue of control, indirectly stemming from the switch to mixed tenure, was identified in the case of New Gorbals, so that stability was not discussed to the same degree in this area. Much of the private housing had changed tenure from owner occupation to private renting, over which the community could not exercise control. The expansion of private renting was seen to cause problems of antisocial behavior, lack of commitment to the area, and unfamiliarity with one's neighbors, resulting in local frustration with the situation.

> *It's not amazing; it is disgusting to people who have saved hard to buy their own property. And they don't know who's moving in next door to them.*
>
> —Community chair, New Gorbals

Interviewees talked about how visitors to the estates and service providers such as taxi drivers often remarked on how much the areas had changed and improved, but in the case of both Drumchapel and New Gorbals, a view remained that the negative reputations of the areas had not been shifted and that many potential residents did not consider them suitable places to bring up children.

> *We've got lots of—we've got a member of staff who grew up in Drumchapel, which a whole lot of others, he's a deputy head in the school, but he moved out of Drumchapel because of the perception that it wasn't a good place to raise a family.*
>
> —Teacher, Drumchapel

There does seem to be a feeling that, if you're moving here with children, there's more to consider about whether or not you'd want to come here.

—Teacher, New Gorbals

Although the Gorbals has got a bad name, it shouldn't have the bad name. The bad name's from years ago.

—Community chair, New Gorbals

Sociospatial Integration

The two peripheral estates suffered from a longstanding problem of parochialism, which interviewees thought had been exacerbated by the way in which tenure diversification (including mixed tenure) had been implemented. It was still thought to be the case that social-sector tenants living on the estates were reluctant to move elsewhere or to go elsewhere for jobs or training. The fact that a significant proportion of the owner-occupied housing was bought by people with a local connection had not helped to change the outlook of the estate residents.

It was people returning to Castlemilk—but it was then also people who would have left Castlemilk were also staying—one, to either be in a housing association, or two, to buy and buy locally, close to their parents and things like that. So we didn't, there weren't a huge number of new people, really.

—Housing officer, Castlemilk

Tenure diversification within the socially rented sector, through the splitting up of the council housing stock into local housing associations, likewise may have solidified or exacerbated issues of local identity.

There are small pockets of very self-contained groups, and you know … to a certain extent, the housing associations have contributed to that. ... They identify more closely with their housing association as their area than they do as people from Castlemilk.

—Regeneration officer, Castlemilk

Just from the youth diversionary work that we've done, they definitely have a new sense of place and attachment to Drumchapel, but it tends to be a particular part, whichever part they come from.

—Housing officer, Drumchapel

In Castlemilk and Drumchapel, unlike in New Gorbals, the two main tenures are visually and spatially distinct, mostly existing in separate pockets of development in certain parts of the estates.

They're only mixed within the areas where we originally owned the houses. If you get, the areas that have been built for owner occupation are aside from our rented areas. There's not a house next door that's rented and one private.

—Housing officer, Castlemilk

This physical distinction (in appearance and location) did not assist with integration, and the prospect of polarization was mentioned.

I would say that there's a pretty healthy number of private houses out in this area and the northern edge. But they might not think they're part of Drumchapel.

—Housing officer, Drumchapel

> *Castlemilk could become even more polarized into two communities: a stable work-rich, owner-occupation sector and a more vulnerable work-poor, socially rented sector.*
> —Housing officer, Castlemilk

In New Gorbals, where the housing tenures were much more spatially integrated, difficulties of generating social interaction were still reported, again attributed to the localized nature of the development and its separate identity.

> *The housing has been significantly improved, but there are no people moving around. If you go into the central square of Gorbals—sorry, New Gorbals—there are people moving around. If you go less than 100 yards away from there, there are no people. It doesn't connect in a—I don't feel it connects as a community in the way that it did previously.*
> —Regeneration officer, New Gorbals

> *People in Gorbals now live in a very, very small proximity. Gorbals used to be linked—it was Laurieston, it was Gorbals, it was Oatlands, etc. Oatlands is now absolutely separate, and people in Oatlands object that they've got to go to Gorbals Cross to shop. … So there's a different mentality in terms of the way that we've created this infrastructure and created the tenure. And I'm not convinced that it's absolutely right at the moment. What I think it does is, it's created a very sterile atmosphere.*
> —Regeneration officer, New Gorbals

Low levels of social integration in New Gorbals, however, were also seen to be a product of the fact that the owner-occupied housing was predominantly lived in by nonfamily households.

> *So, some people are quite happy being single, or being a couple with no children, having their friends, wherever they are, and not needing to feel fully engaged in the community.*
> —Teacher, New Gorbals

Discussion and Conclusion

From the practitioners' accounts of change, we know that they identify advances for all three estates during the past 20 years. We can also see that they realize that many components of the mixed-tenure orthodoxy have not been achieved, and some of them clearly have not been attempted. In this section, we identify a number of possible reasons why this might be the case.

There has been a *selective emphasis* within the attempt to transform these neighborhoods, with a predominant focus on housing and physical changes, including housing-quality improvements and housing-tenure change at the estate level, with the development of a housing market within the estates considered a major success. The practitioners' many concerns about the continued deprived status of the estates, however, undermine the notion that mixed-tenure policy success can be measured through housing price impacts (Groenhart, 2013). Indeed, the practitioners raised concerns about problems of ongoing affordability of homeownership lying beneath the aggregate tenure-change statistics, especially in relation to maintenance and utility bills for new owners on the estates.

The desire to develop a housing market on the estates also reveals an *ambiguity and vagueness of intention* behind mixed-tenure policy. Sometimes practitioners talk about bringing "new blood" to the estates as a means of transformation and rejuvenation, but at other times they emphasize the expansion of house purchase opportunities for those living on the estates or with roots in the estate but currently living elsewhere. Both goals are legitimate, although they have yet to be compared as effective routes to change for social housing estates. They also reflect a classic case of "vagueness" in policy goals (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984), however, because the objective of achieving "mixed communities" (Holmes, 2006) is not specified in terms of the types or levels of tenure or other mix desired within any locality. This ambiguity of intention is hidden by means of "framing success" in terms of aggregate tenure change at the level of the estates (McConnell, 2010).

Practitioners would identify that the "job is not finished" on the three estates, but whether it will ever be so is open to question as a result of *incomplete implementation*. Elements of the transformation of places that are necessary for the creation of sustainable places have either not been tackled, such as area reputation (Kearns, Kearns, and Lawson, 2013), or weakly or incompletely tackled, such as the provision of local amenities and commercial premises. This *implementation gap*, an apparent inability to address the estates' social and market failures, may partly reflect pragmatism (Hill and Hupe, 2002)—that is, that policy cannot "buck the market"—but it is also partly a product of not envisioning the task of neighborhood and community change as more than a spatial planning process.

We can also identify what we might term *counterproductive delivery*, which goes against the tenets of the prescribed orthodoxy. In the case of the two peripheral estates, little attempt was made to spatially integrate the main housing tenures. On the contrary, delivery has taken the form of segregated and segmented mono-tenure developments alongside one another, which is often what most suits housing providers of either tenure. Social landlords argue for clustering of properties for efficiency of management purposes; private house builders argue for separate developments to assist with property values and marketing. Practitioners now admit, however, that the estates suffer from forms of parochialism, with identities and boundaries hardened by the developments and tenure diversifications that have taken place. They also identify a lack of strategic, estate-level governance—such community organization and management being a key principle of sustainable communities—to assist the future development of the areas (Power, 2003). Although the spatial integration of tenures was achieved to a greater degree on the one estate (New Gorbals) where a master-planning process occurred than on the two estates that followed a process of incremental adaptation (Castlemilk and Drumchapel), across all three estates the general criticism of traditional planning could be applied that "land use and physical planning remained the central concern, with little attention to environmental, economic and social dimensions" (Todes et al., 2010: 415).

This last point reflects the fact of *weak belief in an underspecified policy theory* (Knoepfel et al., 2007), despite adopting mixed tenure as a policy instrument. The interviews contained little evidence that practitioners believed in the social-interactive, behavioral effects of tenure mixing beyond, perhaps, some influence on property-maintenance behaviors. Policy documents at the national and local levels in the United Kingdom contain little if any specification as to how, or under what conditions, any of the various social-interactive mechanisms associated with mixed communities within neighborhoods (Galster, 2012) are meant to operate. This lacuna in policy guidance, including on

the role of mediating amenities and social venues and the possible importance of thresholds of mix (Galster, Quercia, and Cortes, 2000), has arguably left practitioners to focus on what they were familiar with, hoping at least for policy effects on housing and environmental quality and possibly also area reputation (for example, through housing market formation), if nothing more.

In effect, policy for these estates has turned out to be about the production of a *static tenure mix*, rather than the nurturing of *dynamic social mixing* (see Livingston, Kearns, and Bailey, forthcoming). In addition, despite weaknesses in the policy process at all stages (Hill, 2005)—from problem identification, through policy formulation (including weaknesses in evidence and theory), to policy implementation—practitioners nonetheless subscribe to the mixed-tenure approach, believing that it has not done any harm even if it has not achieved all it might. They do not ask the counterfactual questions, "What would have happened in the absence of mixed tenure?" or "What else might we have done?" The belief that mixed tenure is "the only game in town" for social housing estates, ir-respective of context, how it is delivered, and what types of mix are produced and with or without other supporting elements, indicates that it has achieved the position of orthodoxy in the critical terms set out by George Orwell (1949: 56):"Orthodoxy means not thinking—not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness."

To overcome this adoption of unconscious orthodoxy, policymakers and practitioners might need to change the lens through which they view social change brought about by tenure mix within social housing estates. The scale of focus is often too broad; that is, aggregate change at the estate level is not the same thing as neighborhood changes within the estate. In addition, the focus on tenure mix, although seemingly fundamental, does not equate to comprehensive improvement; that is, other key elements of the physical, social, and economic environment also need plans for transformational change. Even in relation to tenure mix, insufficient attention is given to outcomes of interest and mecha-nisms for neighborhood effects, right from policy formulation to implementation and evaluation.

Policymakers and practitioners would do well to question the easy adoption of policy trends and conventional wisdoms, remembering that although "process success" is valuable within policy communities it is not the same thing as "programme success" in the real world (McConnell, 2010). The effects of mixed-tenure policies involve a great deal of context-related variability. To properly understand this variability, and to be able to tailor policy implementation accordingly, requires a greater acquisition and use of available evidence through systematic reviews of research findings and through consultations with and the use of expert panels. In this way, practitioners might be able to adjust orthodoxy to suit the circumstances in which it is to be pursued.

Acknowledgments

Authors

Ade Kearns is professor of urban studies in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland.

Martin McKee is a research assistant in the UK Medical Research Council/Chief Scientist Office, Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, Glasgow, Scotland.

Elena Sautkina is a research fellow in the Department of Social and Environmental Health Research at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, England.

George Weeks is an urban designer at Transport for London, London, England.

Lyndal Bond is the principal research officer at the Centre for Excellence in Intervention and Prevention Science, Carlton, South Victoria, Australia.

References

Anderson, Martin. 1964. *The Federal Bulldozer*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Atkinson, Rowland, and Keith Kintrea. 2004. "Opportunities and Despair, It's All There: Practitioner Experiences and Explanations of Area Effects and Life Chances," *Sociology* 38 (3): 437–455.

———. 1998. *Reconnecting Excluded Communities: The Neighbourhood Impacts of Owner Occupation*. Research Report 61. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Scottish Homes.

Bailey, Nick, Anna Haworth, Tony Manzi, Primali Paranagamage, and Marion Roberts. 2006. *Creating and Sustaining Mixed Income Communities: A Good Practice Guide*. Coventry, United Kingdom: Chartered Institute of Housing.

Beekman, Tony, Frank Lyons, and John Scott. 2001. *Improving the Understanding of the Influence of Owner Occupiers in Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Scottish Homes.

Berube, Alan. 2005. *Mixed Communities in England: A US Perspective on Evidence and Policy Prospects*. York, United Kingdom: JRF.

Bond, Lyndal, Elena Sautkina, and Ade Kearns. 2011. "Mixed Messages About Mixed Tenure: Do Reviews Tell the Real Story?" *Housing Studies* 26 (1): 69–94.

Bramley, Glen, and Hal Pawson. 2002. "Low Demand for Housing: Incidence, Causes and UK National Policy Implications," *Urban Studies* 39 (3): 393–422.

Cambridge Policy Consultants (CPC). 1999. *An Evaluation of the New Life for Urban Scotland Initiative in Castlemilk, Ferguslie Park, Wester Hailes and Whitfield*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Scottish Executive.

Chase-Lansdale, P. Lindsay, Rachel A. Gordon, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Pamela K. Klebanov. 1997. "Neighborhood and Family Influences on the Intellectual and Behavioral Competence of Pre-School and Early School-Age Children." In *Neighborhood Poverty*. Vol. 1, *Context and Consequences for Children,* edited by Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, J. Lawrence Aber, and Greg J. Duncan. New York: Russell Sage Foundation: 79–118.

Crane, Jonathan. 1991. "The Epidemic Theory of Ghettos and Neighborhood Effects on Dropping Out and Teenage Childbearing," *American Journal of Sociology* 96 (5): 1226–1259.

CZWG. 1990. *Crown Street Regeneration Project Masterplan Report*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: Crown Street Regeneration Project.

Drumchapel Area Housing Partnership (DAHP). 2002. *Final Area Housing Plan*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: Glasgow City Council.

Dudley, Michael. 2012. "Professional Planning Literature: Between Orthodoxy and Contrarianism in Challenging Times." Available at http://www.planetizen.com (accessed May 21, 2013).

Duncan, Greg J., James P. Connell, and Pamela K. Klebanov. 1997. "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Estimating Causal Effects of Neighborhoods and Family Conditions on Individual Development." In *Neighborhood Poverty*. Vol. 1, *Context and Consequences for Children,* edited by Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, J. Lawrence Aber, and Greg J. Duncan. New York: Russell Sage Foundation: 219–250.

Galster, George. Forthcoming. "Neighborhood Social Mix: Theory, Evidence, and Implications for Policy and Planning." In *Policy, Planning, and People: Promoting Justice in Urban Development*, edited by Naomi Carmon and Susan S. Fainstein. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 2012. "The Mechanism(s) of Neighbourhood Effects: Theory, Evidence and Policy Implications." In *Neighbourhood Effects Research: New Perspectives*, edited by Maarten van Ham, David Manley, Nick Bailey, Ludi Simpson, and Duncan Maclennan. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer: 23–56.

———. 2007. "Neighbourhood Social Mix As a Goal of Housing Policy: A Theoretical Analysis," *European Journal of Housing Policy* 7 (1): 19–43.

———. 1987. *Homeowners and Neighbourhood Reinvestment*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Galster, George, Roger Andersson, Sako Musterd, and Timo M. Kauppinen. 2008. "Does Neighbourhood Income Mix Affect Earnings of Adults? New Evidence From Sweden," *Journal of Urban Economics* 63 (3): 858–870.

Galster, George, Roberto G. Quercia, and Alvaro Cortes. 2000. "Identifying Neighbourhood Thresholds: An Empirical Exploration," *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (3): 701–732.

Glasgow City Council (GCC). 2011. *Housing Stock by Tenure for Glasgow's SP Areas, LHF Areas and Neighbourhoods*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: Glasgow City Council, Development & Regeneration Services, Development Plan Group.

———. 1992. *Drumchapel Housing Strategy for the 1990s*. Glasgow, United Kingdom: Glasgow City Council.

Goodwin, Denise May, Steve Cummins, Elena Sautkina, David Ogilvie, Mark Petticrew, Andy Jones, Katy Wheeler, and Martin White. 2012. "The Role and Status of Evidence and Innovation in the Health Towns Programme in England: A Qualitative Stakeholder Interview Study," *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. doi:10113/jch-2012-201481.

Granovetter, Mark. 1995. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Groenhart, Lucy E. 2013. "Evaluating Tenure Mix Interventions: A Case Study From Sydney, Australia," *Housing Studies* 28 (1): 95–115.

Hastings, Annette. 2009. "Neighbourhood Environmental Services and Neighbourhood 'Effects': Exploring the Role of Urban Services in Intensifying Neighbourhood Problems," *Urban Studies* 46 (13): 2907–2928.

Hill, Michael. 2005. *The Public Policy Process*, 4th ed. Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Education.

Hill, Michael, and Peter Hupe. 2002. *Implementing Public Policy*. London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.

Hogwood, Brian W., and Lewis A. Gunn. 1984. *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, Chris. 2006. *Mixed Communities: Success and Sustainability*. Foundations 0176. York, United Kingdom: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

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

Joseph, Mark L. 2006. "Is Mixed Income Development an Antidote to Urban Poverty?" *Housing Policy Debate* 17 (2): 209–234.

Kauppinen, Timo M. 2004. "Neighbourhood Effects in a European City: The Educational Careers of Young People in Helsinki." Paper presented at European Network for Housing Research meeting, Cambridge, United Kingdom, July.

Kearns, Ade, Oliver Kearns, and Louise Lawson. 2013. "Notorious Places: Image, Reputation, Stigma: The Role of Newspapers in Area Reputations for Social Housing Estates," *Housing Studies* 28. doi 10.1080/02673037.2013.759546.

Kleinhans, Reinout. 2004. "Social Implications of Housing Diversification in Urban Renewal: A Review of Recent Literature," *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 19 (4): 367–390.

Kleit, Rachel Garshick. 2005. "HOPE VI New Communities: Neighbourhood Relationships in Mixed-Income Housing," *Environment & Planning A* 37 (8): 1413–1441.

Knoepfel, Peter, Corinne Larrue, Frederic Varone, and Michael Hill. 2007. *Public Policy Analysis*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Policy Press.

Lin, Nan, and Mary Dumin. 1986. "Social Resources and Occupational Attainment," *Social Forces* 59 (4): 1164–1181.

Livingston, Mark, Ade Kearns, and Nick Bailey. Forthcoming. "Delivering Mixed Communities: The Relationship Between Housing Tenure Mix and Social Mix in England's Neighbourhoods," *Housing Studies* 28 (8).

Mackenzie, Mhairi, and Avril Blamey. 2005. "The Practice and the Theory: Lessons From the Application of a Theories of Change Approach," *Evaluation* 11 (2): 151–168.

McConnell, Alan. 2010. *Understanding Policy Success: Rethinking Public Policy*. Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Monk, S., A. Clarke, and C.P.Y. Tang. 2011. *Mixed Communities Literature Review*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Scottish Government Social Research.

Musterd, Sako, and Roger Andersson. 2005. "Housing Mix, Social Mix, and Social Opportunities," *Urban Affairs Review* 40 (6): 1–30.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). 2003. *Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future*. London, United Kingdom: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Orwell, George. 1949. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.

Page, David, and Rosie Boughton. 1997. *Improving the Design and Management of Mixed Tenure Estates in London: A Study Undertaken for Notting Hill*. London, United Kingdom: Notting Hill Housing Association.

Pawson, Hal, Karen Kirk, and Sarah McIntosh. 2000. *Assessing the Impact of Tenure Diversification: The Case of Niddrie, Edinburgh*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Scottish Homes.

Permentier, Matthieu, Maarten van Ham, and Gideon Bolt. 2007. "Behavioural Responses to Neighbourhood Reputations," *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 22: 199–213.

Power, Anne. 2003. *Sustainable Communities and Sustainable Development: A Review of the Sustainable Communities Plan*. London, United Kingdom: Sustainable Development Commission.

Randolph, Bill. 2006. *Housing Renewal and the Compact City: The Social Implications of a Planning Orthodoxy*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales, City Futures Research Centre.

Ravetz, Alison. 2001. *Council Housing and Culture: The History of a Social Experiment*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Rosenbaum, Dennis, Arthur Lurigio, and Robert Davis. 1998. *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sampson, Robert, and William Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social Disorganization Theory," *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (4): 774–802.

Sampson, Robert, Stephen Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy," *Science* 277 (5328): 918–924.

Sautkina, Elena, Lyndal Bond, and Ade Kearns. 2012. "Mixed Evidence on Mixed Tenure Effects: Findings From a Systematic Review of UK Studies, 1995–2009," *Housing Studies* 27 (6): 748–782.

Smith, Alastair. 2002. *Mixed-Income Housing Developments: Promise and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Joint Center for Housing Studies.

Thompson-Fawcett, Michelle. 2004. "Reinventing the Tenement: Transformation of Crown Street in the Gorbals, Glasgow," *Journal of Urban Design* 9 (2): 177–203.

Tiesdell, Steve, and Garry MacFarlane. 2007. "The Part and the Whole: Implementing Masterplans in Glasgow's New Gorbals," *Journal of Urban Design* 12 (3): 407–433.

Todes, Alison, Aly Karam, Neil Klug, and Nqobile Malaza. 2010. "Beyond Master Planning? New Approaches to Spatial Planning in Ekurhuleni, South Africa," *Habitat International* 34: 414–420.

Tunstall, Rebecca. 2003. "'Mixed Tenure' Policy in the UK: Privatisation, Pluralism or Euphemism?" *Housing, Theory and Society* 20 (3): 153–159.

Tunstall, Rebecca, and Ruth Lupton. 2010. *Mixed Communities.* Evidence Review. London, United Kingdom: Department for Communities and Local Government.

van Ham, Maarten, and David Manley. 2010. "The Effect of Neighbourhood Housing Tenure Mix on Labour Market Outcomes: A Longitudinal Investigation of Neighbourhood Effects," *Journal of Economic Geography* 10 (2): 257–282.

Veysey, Bonita M., and Steve F. Messner. 1999. "Further Testing of Social Disorganisation Theory: An Elaboration of Sampson and Groves's 'Community Structure and Crime,'" *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency* 36 (2): 156–174.