Better Neighborhoods, Better Outcomes? Explaining Relocation Outcomes in HOPE VI

Edward G. Goetz
University of Minnesota

Abstract

The HOPE VI Program for redeveloping public housing has been in operation since 1993. Previous studies have shown weak and inconsistent benefits for families forcibly displaced by the program, despite the fact that families are uniformly moved into better neighborhoods (as measured on a range of indicators at the census-tract level). This article reviews studies of HOPE VI and presents the findings of an additional case study, in Duluth, Minnesota. Improving on the design of most previous studies, this study connected changes in outcomes at the individual level with changes in neighborhood conditions. The results confirm the conclusion of previous studies: the degree of neighborhood change is not statistically related to changes in individual-level outcomes. These findings suggest that the HOPE VI model of dispersal reflects an oversimplified view of urban poverty and, in particular, may neglect the importance of informal networks of support and attributes at the individual level in determining the outcomes of forced relocation.

Introduction

The HOPE VI policy of public housing redevelopment is based on the idea that neighborhood environments make an important difference in the opportunities and quality of life of public housing residents. HOPE VI has been in operation since 1993, and the growing body of evidence from evaluations of the program converges on two points: (1) the residents who are displaced from public housing units by redevelopment tend to move to neighborhoods that are much better than the original neighborhoods, based on measures of well-being of residents in the respective census tracts; and, (2) somewhat conversely, the degree of improvement in quality of life reported by the

residents is mixed, being quite modest in most cases and frequently nonexistent. This article is an attempt to grapple with this seeming contradiction. How is it that public housing residents can be relocated to better neighborhoods yet report only modest changes in their own conditions?

Previous studies have focused either on measuring changes—using census data—in the neighborhood environments of people displaced by HOPE VI or on measuring the benefits of relocation—using data from surveys or interviews with public housing families. Even when a study uses both objective census indicators of change and subjective assessments of change provided by residents, the two sets of data are not linked at the individual level (see, for example, Goetz, 2003). In this study I improve on these approaches by linking objective and subjective measures for families displaced through a HOPE VI redevelopment in Duluth, Minnesota. This design allows for a direct analysis of whether individual benefits are related to the improved neighborhood conditions that displaced families experience.

The HOPE VI Model

The HOPE VI Program is designed to provide a range of benefits to the residents of distressed public housing. These benefits are a central justification for the program (see, for example, Wexler, 2001) and thus a major criterion for program success (Epp, 1996). The program is based on a body of social science work that is generally referred to as the "neighborhood effects" literature (see, for example, Atkinson and Kintrea, 2001; Ellen and Turner, 1997; Jencks and Mayer, 1990). This literature suggests that neighborhoods shape residents' opportunities in important ways, and that people living in distressed public housing projects suffer from residing in neighborhoods high in crime, low in social capital, lacking economic opportunity, and receiving only low-quality public services.

HOPE VI imposes involuntary displacement and relocation on residents in the short term. People move to neighborhoods that are not burdened by the adverse conditions present in their original public housing project, and eventually can move back to the redeveloped project. Even if they do not return, by dint of having been removed from the adverse environment of distressed public housing, the expectation is that they will receive a range of individual benefits. Families feel safer and thus experience less psychological stress. Family members can get out of their units more frequently and interact with neighbors more regularly, and because their new neighbors are not as uniformly poor as neighbors in the housing project were, residents begin to benefit from the social capital generated by a more differentiated social network. In addition, the hope of the program is that residents will move to neighborhoods that put them in closer proximity to economic opportunities, so that their chances of employment will increase. These short-term benefits (reduced stress, greater feelings of safety and neighborhood satisfaction, and employment) will in time produce the longer term benefits of increased economic self-sufficiency and reduced dependence on social services. In other words, a move out of the projects will be accompanied by a move up the socioeconomic ladder.

The HOPE VI Dispersal Record

Several studies have been done in cities across the country that document the experiences of HOPE VI families. In this section the record of HOPE VI dispersal is summarized.

Where Do They Go?

The first consistent finding in the HOPE VI research is that, when displaced from public housing, very-low-income families do not move far. Most do not leave the central city: Comey (2007) reported that in a five-city study of HOPE VI sites, only 14 percent of the families moved to the suburbs. In Chicago, less than 2 percent of the first 3,000 families displaced by public housing redevelopment have left the city (Fischer, 2003; see also Kataria and Johnson, 2004). In Minneapolis, 87 percent of families displaced by a HOPE VI-like demolition remained in the central city, more than one-half within a 3-mile radius of their original homes (Goetz, 2003). Trudeau (2006) reported that "nearly all" households that moved as a result of the *Comer* v. *Cisneros* plan to reduce the concentration of poverty in Buffalo, New York, remained in the city, moving an average of only 1.5 miles from their previous residence. Kingsley, Johnson, and Pettit's (2003) national study showed a median distance of 2.9 miles for moves by people displaced by HOPE VI redevelopments (see similar findings in Comey, 2007). Although the distances in some cases are greater (an average of more than 5 miles in Chicago, according to Reed, 2006), what is consistent across sites is the tendency of residents to remain within communities with which they are familiar and in which they maintain social or historical ties. In Portland, Oregon, for example, two-thirds of the 382 households displaced by HOPE VI wanted to remain in the same neighborhood (Gibson, 2007; see also Varady and Walker, 2000, for evidence from four other cities, and Johnson-Hart, 2007, for similar patterns in Richmond, Virginia).

Kleit and Manzo (2006) found that place attachment is important in determining the degree to which HOPE VI families move away. Trudeau (2006) argues that the pattern of relocation to other, nearby neighborhoods in the central city is a result of low-income families' need to rely on social supports as they negotiate the demands of work, childcare, and other family obligations (see Reed, 2006, for similar findings in Chicago).

Although HOPE VI families do not move far, nonetheless they tend to move to better neighborhoods, according to a range of measures related to economic activity and livability, with the possible exception of segregation levels. Aggregate census data for the new neighborhoods typically show much lower poverty rates than in the original neighborhoods (Boston, 2005; Buron et al., 2002; Clampet-Lundquist, 2004; Fischer, 2003; Fraser et al., 2004; Goetz, 2003; Kingsley, Johnson, and Pettit, 2003; Popkin et al., 2004; Trudeau, 2006). Nationally, HOPE VI residents who received vouchers (which allowed them to rent housing in the private market), for example, moved from neighborhoods with an average poverty rate of 61 percent to neighborhoods with an average poverty rate of 27 percent (Kingsley, Johnson, and Pettit, 2003). The neighborhoods to which displaced families move also tend to be lower on other measures of disadvantage, such as unemployment and participation in public assistance programs (see, for example, Clampet-Lundquist, 2004).

Poverty rates in the new neighborhoods, however, are typically higher than the average for their cities (Boston, 2005; Buron et al., 2002; Fraser et al., 2004; Goetz, 2003). For example, the Buron et al. (2002) analysis of data from the HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study found that 40 percent of displaced residents who did not return to the rehabilitated HOPE VI development lived in census tracts with poverty rates of less than 20 percent, a substantial improvement. However, another 40 percent lived in high-poverty tracts (those with poverty rates of more than 30 percent). Clampet-Lundquist (2004), Johnson-Hart (2007), and Comey (2007) reported similar findings. In addition, although the original neighborhoods may have higher poverty rates than the new neighborhoods, many of the latter have increasing, rather than decreasing, poverty rates (Goetz, 2003).

Moreover, improvements in racial integration are not as pronounced for poor families who move as a result of forced relocation. Fischer (2003) reported only "slight improvements" in census-tract racial diversity among relocated people in Chicago, noting that most voucher recipients moved to the highly segregated south and west sides of the city. Less than 2 percent moved to the predominantly White suburbs. The Buron et al. (2002) analysis of the five projects in the Urban Institute HOPE VI Panel Study found only modest improvements in levels of racial diversity in residents' new census tracts.

Finally, evidence suggests significant residential instability among families displaced by public housing redevelopment. Brooks et al. (2005) found that 40 percent of people relocated by HOPE VI who had vouchers to use in the private market moved again within 2 years. Buron, Levy, and Gallagher (2007) reported the same percentage among those relocated with vouchers in five different HOPE VI cities. Studies of subsequent moves under the Gautreaux program found much greater regression to the mean in terms of neighborhood poverty and racial characteristics among those moving within the city (Keels et al., 2005). Goetz (2003) found that subsequent moves of displaced families tended to be to neighborhoods with higher (and growing) poverty rates and with higher (and growing) levels of racial segregation. Comey (2007), however, found that residents who have moved multiple times slightly reduce their exposure to neighborhoods with high poverty rates.

Children's School and Social Experiences

Although the most promising result of the Gautreaux program was an increase in children's educational achievement (Kaufman and Rosenbaum, 1992), achievement among children relocated by HOPE VI has not improved at the same rate. The schools to which children move as a result of HOPE VI are typically racially and economically segregated, in part because many HOPE VI moves are within the same, underperforming urban school systems (Popkin, 2006). Jacob (2004), however, found that "even students who did move to substantially better neighborhoods did not end up in significantly better schools" (Jacob, 2004: 235; see also Clampet-Lundquist, 2004). Gallagher and Bajaj (2007) reported no major changes in school engagement for children in five HOPE VI Panel Study sites across the country. Jacob (2004) found that children in households relocated due to HOPE VI-like public housing redevelopment show no educational improvements relative to control group members on a range of academic achievement measures. In Minneapolis, Goetz (2003) reported no positive effects on children's schooling—either comparing children before and after the move, or comparing them to control groups—and significant reductions in positive social

outcomes for children who were involuntarily displaced compared with their situation before the move (Goetz, 2003).

Employment and Financial Security

The evidence from research consistently indicates that dispersed households do not benefit from relocation in terms of employment, earnings, or overall income. This indication has been true of Gautreaux, Moving to Opportunity (MTO), HOPE VI, and the involuntary displacement that resulted from Hurricane Katrina (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004; Curley, 2006; Goering and Feins, 2003; Goetz, 2002; Levy and Woolley, 2007; Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum, 2000; Turney et al., 2006; Vigdor, 2007). For those relocated by HOPE VI, the same lack of improvement is evident across the five Urban Institute Panel Study sites, which showed no employment or earnings effects from being moved out of these severely distressed public housing projects (Levy and Woolley, 2007).

Evidence suggests that the social capital arguments made to support HOPE VI relocation may actually work in reverse: relocation could destroy the useful support networks that lower income families construct to get by. Clampet-Lundquist (2004) reported that, among the relocated people who moved into units subsidized with vouchers, "none … reported having learned of a job opportunity from their new neighbors, nor did they talk to their neighbors about jobs. By contrast, several interviewees reported having found a job through a friend or other local connection while living at (the old public housing site)" (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004: 71). Barrett, Geisel, and Johnston (2006) found that lack of transportation and childcare were barriers to employment.

Although HOPE VI relocations (and other mobility programs) may resolve the spatial mismatch of jobs and residence for low-income households, this improvement might be less important than other changes, such as reducing deficits in human capital, overcoming family effects (Oreopolous, 2003) and racial and ethnic discrimination in the job market (Carlson and Theodore, 1997; Immergluck, 1998), or improving health (Levy and Woolley, 2007; see the review in Chapple, 2006). In the end, Levy and Woolley (2007) conclude: "HOPE VI relocation and voluntary supportive services are unlikely to affect employment or address the many factors that keep disadvantaged residents out of the labor force" (Levy and Woolley, 2007: 1).

These disappointing findings related to employment, along with the increased housing costs that generally accompany relocation from public housing, contribute to greater financial insecurity among people relocated by HOPE VI, according to a number of studies. Barrett, Geisel, and Johnston (2006) found that, of those relocated in Fort Worth, Texas, two-thirds worried about having enough money for food, a large increase over the percentage of concerned residents before the move.

Economic insecurity can be one reason for the residential instability of people displaced from public housing (Barrett, Geisel, and Johnston, 2006; Gibson, 2007; Reed, 2006). Nationwide, for example, three out of five people who had been relocated and given vouchers by HOPE VI reported difficulties paying rent or utilities within the previous year (Popkin, 2006). Among displaced public housing residents in Fort Worth, one-half reported that they feared eviction because of their economic insecurity (Barrett, Geisel, and Johnston, 2006). In Portland, one-third of those displaced by HOPE VI reported hardship making their rent payments, 60 percent reported difficulties paying for utilities, and 17 percent were deemed by the local housing authority to be

at risk because of these financial difficulties (Gibson, 2007). Such outcomes are troublesome in and of themselves, but they are especially worrisome because the HOPE VI Program is intended to improve the economic self-sufficiency of public housing families.

Health and Behavior

Although data on displaced people's health are limited, Popkin's (2006) analysis of interview data from the Urban Institute's HOPE VI Panel Study found that participants faced serious health problems before relocation. More than one-third of the adults reported having a chronic illness or health condition. More than 20 percent of the adults reported having asthma, and the rate of children's asthma was more than three times the national average (Popkin, 2006). Mental health problems—including depression, stress, fear, and anxiety—were also common and occurred at a rate nearly 50 percent higher than the national average (Popkin, 2006). Manjarrez, Popkin, and Guernsey (2007) found that these conditions have not improved for people relocated by HOPE VI, despite the passage of time. Three-fourths of the panel study respondents reported no change or a decline in their health. The number of respondents indicating health conditions that required regular, ongoing care increased significantly (Manjarrez, Popkin, and Guernsey, 2007). The mortality rate for African-American women in the HOPE VI Panel Study is higher than for African-American women in general and in the MTO control group that did not move (Manjarrez, Popkin, and Guernsey, 2007).

The HOPE VI Panel Study data also show no improvements in overall health for relocated children (Gallagher and Bajaj, 2007). Boston (2005), on the other hand, reported greater mortality among a comparison group of public housing residents living in projects that were not renovated than among those displaced by HOPE VI-like redevelopments in Atlanta.

Safety

Studies consistently show that families that move out of neighborhoods of concentrated poverty report an increased sense of safety (see Buron et al., 2002; Goetz, 2003; Popkin and Cove, 2007). Residents report a significant decline in drug-related activity, a greater personal sense of safety, and improvements in safety for their children. Among people displaced by HOPE VI, those who moved into other public housing reported fewer benefits (Popkin and Cove, 2007). Interestingly, no statistical correlations exist between these findings and any secondary benefits, such as improved mental or physical health (Popkin and Cove, 2007). Gibson (2007) reported that 30 percent of displaced households in Portland's Columbia Villa HOPE VI project thought their new neighborhoods were safer, but 18 percent thought they were less safe in their new neighborhoods.

Housing and Neighborhood Characteristics

Most (63 percent) of the people relocated by HOPE VI who participated in the panel study reported their new housing to be in "good" or "excellent" condition (Popkin, 2006: 216). Brooks et al. (2005) found a similar outcome for those relocated in Atlanta, although families using vouchers reported much higher levels of satisfaction. Goetz (2003) found that former residents of public housing in Minneapolis were more satisfied with the quality of their new housing than were comparison groups, whether they had moved voluntarily or involuntarily. Satisfaction was greater,

however, among families who had chosen to move, suggesting that people who were involuntarily displaced—particularly those who were hard to house—may have found it challenging to obtain good-quality housing in the private market.

The HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study found that displaced households reported less crime, better housing conditions, and improved neighborhoods when compared with their former residences (Buron et al., 2002; Popkin et al., 2004). Displaced households do not always view their new neighborhoods in favorable terms, however. People displaced by HOPE VI tend to evaluate their new homes more favorably than the housing projects they left and tend to report fewer neighborhood problems (Comey, 2007). But this is not always the case: in interviews and focus groups with former residents of a Seattle HOPE VI development, Manzo, Kleit, and Couch (2005) found that 60 percent of the people interviewed thought their former public housing residence was a better place to live than their new neighborhoods.

Social Networks

Research has shown that HOPE VI redevelopments have done little to help displaced families with social integration into their new neighborhoods. In interviews with 41 displaced Philadelphia families conducted 2 years after relocation, Clampet-Lundquist (2004) found that very few households built social ties in their new neighborhoods, regardless of neighborhood poverty levels. Young people in these families were more likely to build friendship networks than the adults were; however, young people were unlikely to view their new neighbors as role models or to interact with adults in their new neighborhoods (Clampet-Lundquist, 2007). Barrett, Geisel, and Johnston (2006) reported fewer neighboring behaviors (such as talking to a neighbor for more than 10 minutes or watching a neighbor's child) and fewer supportive relationships after a HOPE VI displacement in Fort Worth. Curley (2006) reported similar findings for families in Boston who were displaced by HOPE VI. Such data suggest that the process of forming social networks is complex and may depend on several factors, including attitudes and perceptions of neighbors, whether relocation was voluntary or involuntary, and characteristics of households being displaced.

Kleit and Manzo (2006) found that HOPE VI relocations result in objective improvements in neighborhood conditions but may also include "some negative social outcomes" (Kleit and Manzo, 2006: 271). Place attachment, according to these authors, is important in determining whether residents want to leave the site (see also Vale, 1997). Those who have lived in public housing the longest are the least willing to move because they regard their particular development as home: they had put down roots and become attached to the community (Kleit and Manzo, 2006; Vale, 1997). Gibson (2007) found that two-thirds of the residents of the Columbia Villa project in Portland did not want to leave. Even after being forced to move, many residents reminisced about the community and mourned the loss of their neighbors, the open space in the project, and the level of comfort they had felt there. Most did not believe that their new neighborhoods provided as much sense of community as Columbia Villa had; only one-third felt a greater sense of community in their new neighborhood. Goetz (2003) found that relocated people experienced only limited interactions with their neighbors. Families who moved voluntarily—and whose immediate neighbors lived in subsidized, rather than market-rate, housing—reported higher levels of interaction with their neighbors than did families who moved involuntarily. Finally, the Urban Institute's HOPE VI Panel

Study data showed a greater level of social isolation for children of displaced families, although the authors suggested that the isolation might be good for the children, because it would protect them from the negative influences of their surroundings (Gallagher and Bajaj, 2007).

Summary

The findings related to individual benefits from HOPE VI are mixed. No evidence suggests that the program is producing benefits such as increased economic self-sufficiency and access to enhanced social capital. The best outcomes are related to perceptions of safety and of neighborhood quality (as expressed through measures of satisfaction). The next section of the article presents evidence from a single HOPE VI case in Duluth, Minnesota, used to investigate the relationship between neighborhood conditions and individual outcomes.

Harbor View HOPE VI

Duluth is a small city (population 87,000) on the edge of the Iron Range region northeast of Lake Superior. The city's population has shrunk during the past several decades, reflecting a general decline in iron mining. Duluth's major employers are now hospitals and the University of Minnesota. The city's Harbor View public housing project, built in 1951, provided 200 townhouse units in a series of two-story, barracks-style buildings on a 20-acre site north of downtown. In 2003, the Duluth Housing Authority (DHA) received a HOPE VI grant for $20 million to completely demolish the project and build a new, mixed-income development on site. Families were relocated during the demolition and redevelopment.

Data

The research combines information on where families moved with survey data from two points in time, capturing how residents felt about their lives and living conditions before being displaced and then again up to 30 months after displacement. Measures of neighborhood change are generated by comparing the characteristics of new neighborhoods to the characteristics of the original public housing site. Combining the measures of neighborhood change with personal evaluations of the families allows an examination of the relationship between changes in neighborhood conditions (as measured by census-tract data) and changes in residents' perceptions.

In 2003, as part of the intake process to facilitate relocation counseling and to establish needs for community and social services, the DHA interviewed residents in 216 households. The intake interviews included a number of questions related to health, income, employment, neighborhood satisfaction, and social integration. In late 2005, the author mailed surveys to 192 addresses, with 111 questionnaires returned (a 58-percent response rate).[1] The mail survey asked many of the same questions as the interviews, providing data points for before and after the move. Exhibit 1

[1] At the time of the mailing, the DHA did not have address or contact information for 9 of the 216 households that responded to the initial intake survey, leaving 207 potential respondents to the mail survey. Of the 207 surveys mailed to former residents, 192 turned out to be valid addresses. The response rate for the relocation survey, therefore, is based on a denominator of 192.

compares the survey respondents with nonrespondents, based on data collected at the initial interviews in 2003. The groups differ significantly on just one attribute: education. Survey respondents are significantly more likely to have earned a high school diploma than those who did not respond. Survey data show no statistically significant differences in race, gender of the head of household, first language spoken, presence of young children, or whether a family member has a physical or mental disability. In addition, data show no differences in the employment rate in year 1 of the study, in the reported level of satisfaction with the Harbor View neighborhood, or in the reported sense of safety in that original neighborhood.

The neighborhoods to which respondents and nonrespondents moved are largely identical from a statistical standpoint. Exhibit 2 shows census-tract data for nine different social and housing characteristics. The new neighborhoods for respondents and nonrespondents are statistically the same for eight of the nine characteristics. The one difference is that nonrespondents tend to live in neighborhoods with a higher percentage of non-White residents (17.8 and 15.5 percent, respectively). But for a range of other characteristics—employment, median income, poverty, and homeownership—the data show no statistically significant differences across groups.

Exhibit 1

Characteristics of Survey Respondents and Nonrespondents (Percent)

	Respondents (N = 111)	Nonrespondents (N = 101)
White	51	54
Female	78	84
Nonnative speaker of English	15	10
Some college	53	41
High school diploma**	86	64
Disabled family member	45	46
Children less than 5 years of age	31	31
Employed in year 1 of the study	37	37
Satisfied or very satisfied with old neighborhood	78	70
Felt safe or very safe in old neighborhood	66	68

*** p < .01.*

Exhibit 2

Conditions in New Neighborhoods

	Relocation Neighborhoods of Survey Respondents	Relocation Neighborhoods of Nonrespondents
Percent non-White*	15.5	17.8
Percent African American	4.6	4.9
Percent female-headed household	9.7	9.9
Percent employed	91.6	91.5
Median family income	$30,119	$30,767
Percent receiving public assistance	9.6	10.1
Percent below poverty level	23.1	22.7
Percent homeowner	48.7	50.2
Median value of home	$71,547	$75,257

** p < .05. (Statistical significance is based on difference-in-means T-tests.)*

The following analysis, which focuses on the change in responses before and after the respondents moved, attempts to determine whether and how these changes are related to changes in neighborhood conditions. Neighborhood conditions were measured for two points in time: premove conditions are defined by the characteristics of the census tract in which all families lived while at the Harbor View site and postmove conditions are defined by the characteristics of the census tracts to which families moved as a result of relocation. For residents who moved more than once since the initial relocation, the analysis uses the characteristics of their neighborhoods at the time of the survey. As with the neighborhood data, change variables (the difference between the respondents' assessment in year 3 of the study and their assessment at intake) were created for all items analyzed.

The following five outcome measures, which come from the survey instruments, are computed as change variables. Appendix A provides details about question wording and the construction of indices. Coding was done so that higher values indicate a positive change in the variable.

1. **Neighborhood satisfaction.** A summary question about the respondent's overall satisfaction with the neighborhood provided five answer categories. The computed change variable ranges from -4 to +3.

2. **Sense of safety.** A summary question about how safe the respondent feels in the neighborhood provided five answer categories. The computed change variable ranges from -4 to +4.

3. **Neighboring behaviors.** An index of six questions related to the degree to which the respondent engages in neighboring activities or behaviors, such as talking to people in the neighborhood, borrowing things, and providing informal childcare, had six answer categories for each of the six neighboring behaviors. The index was a simple average of responses across the six questions and thus could range from 1 to 6. The Cronbach's Alpha, testing the reliability of the indices, was 0.746 for the intake interview items and 0.738 for the year-3 survey items. These values exceed the commonly used threshold for the Alpha statistic, suggesting that the items constitute valid indices. The computed change variable ranges from -3.17 to +1.67.

4. **Economic security.** A question about whether the respondent has enough money to pay for basic needs each month (with three answers: "never," "sometimes," and "always") had answers coded so that higher values mean greater economic security. The computed change variable ranges from -3.0 to +1.5.

5. **Employment.** A binary variable taking the value of 1 for respondents who were employed and 0 otherwise had a computed change variable that ranges from -1 to +1.

From the census-tract data, the analysis uses the following nine items:

1. Percent of the population that is non-White.
2. Percent of the population that is African American.
3. Percent of the households headed by a woman.
4. Percent of the labor force employed.
5. Median family income.
6. Percent of the population receiving public assistance.

7. Percent of the population below the poverty level.
8. Percent of residences that are owner occupied.
9. Median value of owner-occupied housing.

Change variables were computed for each of the nine census measures by subtracting the value for the new neighborhood from the value of the Harbor View neighborhood. Thus, if a resident moved into a neighborhood with more poverty, the change variable would register a positive number.

Findings

Neighborhood-Level Outcomes

The relocation of families from the Harbor View site took place between April 2003 and August 2004. Most of the families remained in a central city neighborhood: 77 percent stayed in Duluth's inner city and another 7 percent moved to the inner cities of Minneapolis or St. Paul. Most of the relocated families moved to neighborhoods with significantly lower levels of distress than their original public housing neighborhood (exhibit 3). Unemployment in the new neighborhoods was around 8 percent compared with 12 percent for the Harbor View neighborhood. Poverty rates in the new neighborhoods were roughly one-half that in the original neighborhood, median incomes were almost twice as high, homeownership rates were significantly greater, and the percentage of the population on public assistance was less than one-half (9.6 percent instead of 28 percent).

These findings are similar to those reported in other studies of HOPE VI: families typically remain in the central city, and relocation from HOPE VI sites seems invariably to result in moves to better neighborhoods, as measured by census-tract indicators. The reasons for such consistent outcomes are not a mystery. Most HOPE VI sites are located in what had been the most disadvantaged neighborhoods of their respective cities. The public housing projects subject to the redevelopment were concentrations of poverty in and of themselves, and typically the immediately surrounding communities have similar socioeconomic profiles. Thus, almost by definition, moving out of such neighborhoods means moving to neighborhoods with fewer indicators of economic distress.

Exhibit 3

Conditions in Old and New Neighborhoods for Survey Respondents (N = 111)

	Harbor View Neighborhood	New Neighborhood	Significance
Percent non-White	31.4	15.5	***
Percent African American	7.3	4.6	**
Percent female-headed household	15.8	9.7	***
Percent employed	88.3	91.6	***
Median family income	$17,500	$30,119	***
Percent receiving public assistance	28.1	9.6	***
Percent below poverty level	45.5	23.1	***
Percent homeowner	32.9	48.7	***
Median value of home	$69,700	$71,547	—

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$.

One in five families (21 percent) had moved more than once by the time of the survey, in year 3 of the study. Multiple-movers live in neighborhoods that are statistically similar to single-movers' neighborhoods, with one exception: multiple-movers' neighborhoods have a significantly lower median income ($27,140 compared with $31,745). Although the two types of neighborhoods have slight differences in poverty, homeownership, and percentage of residents on public assistance (all of which indicate that multiple-movers are in neighborhoods with slightly higher levels of distress), these differences do not reach statistical significance.

Individual-Level Outcomes

Exhibit 4 describes the changes that residents reported before and after relocation. The first row of figures indicates that 35 percent reported less neighborhood satisfaction, 40 percent reported the same degree of satisfaction, and 25 percent reported more satisfaction. The difference between the two time points was not statistically significant (either as a difference in mean response or by Wilcoxon Signed Rank test).

On the other hand, statistically significant numbers of respondents reported fewer neighboring behaviors after moving (57 percent engaged in fewer behaviors, 37 percent in more, and 6 percent in the same). This outcome may be a result of the families' having only recently moved into their new neighborhoods, although other research has indicated that length of time in the new neighborhood was not related to the frequency of neighboring behaviors among relocated people (Goetz, 2003). Residents also reported significantly less economic security after the move, indicating that they more frequently lack enough money to buy basics or more frequently make use of local food banks. The data also show a higher rate of families with health problems after relocation. Either these health problems are unrelated to environmental conditions (and are thus coincidental to relocation) or the relocation process or the new neighborhood environment is producing negative health outcomes. On the positive side, respondents felt significantly safer in their new neighborhoods: 44 percent felt safer, 22 percent felt less safe, and 34 percent were unchanged. No data suggested a significant difference in employment rates. On the whole, these outcomes are largely negative. Only in their sense of safety did Harbor View families report an improvement after moving. The other five measures showed no change or showed negative outcomes.

Taken together, the findings in exhibits 3 and 4 mirror the outcomes seen in many studies of families involuntarily displaced by HOPE VI. Families in the Duluth HOPE VI project seem to have moved to better neighborhoods by the objective indicators available from the census (exhibit 3),

Exhibit 4

Change in Individual-Level Outcome Measures, Before and After Relocation

	Percent Reporting Each Type of Change			Significance	N
	Less/Fewer	No Change	More/Greater		
Neighborhood satisfaction	35	40	25	—	96
Neighboring behaviors	57	6	37	**	94
Sense of safety	22	34	44	*	98
Economic security	31	61	8	***	91
Employment	5	85	10	—	91

*** = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$. (Statistical significance is based on difference-in-means T-tests.)

yet they reported little to no improvement on a range of subjective individual-level measures (exhibit 4).

The lack of benefits for the sample as a whole, however, may mask patterns of benefits to certain subpopulations. Some relocated people do report benefits, although the number doing so varies from measure to measure. If the same respondents are reporting benefits across different measures, it might be possible to identify subpopulations for which HOPE VI relocation works well. Bivariate correlations among the outcome measures indicate the degree to which respondents who report change (one way or the other) on one item are more likely to report similar change on other items. A look at the correlation matrix for change in individual outcomes indicates that little overlap exists between these outcomes (exhibit 5). Change in economic security is positively correlated with change in employment but is statistically unrelated to all other changes measured. An increased sense of safety is correlated with a higher level of neighborhood satisfaction but is unrelated to changes in neighboring behaviors and employment. Changes in neighboring behaviors are not correlated with any other individual-level variables examined.

These patterns suggest that the individual changes reported by residents displaced from Harbor View are not cumulative. Those who report a positive change in one area, in general, are not more likely to report positive changes in other areas. Thus, it is not the case that some residents report uniformly rosier outcomes, while others consistently report worse outcomes. These findings suggest that models that explain one set of outcomes may not explain others.

Exhibit 5

Intercorrelation of Individual-Level Outcomes

	Economic Security	Sense of Safety	Neighboring Behaviors	Neighborhood Satisfaction
Sense of safety	.131			
Neighboring behaviors	.027	– .059		
Neighborhood satisfaction	.128	.697***	.061	
Employment	.214*	– .020	– .100	.139

N = 91.

**** = p < .001, * = p < .05. (Statistical significance is based on bivariate Pearson correlations: all variables are measured as changes from year 1 to year 3.)*

Linking Better Neighborhoods and Better Individual Outcomes

To examine more closely the link between neighborhood outcomes and individual outcomes, the analysis tested the hypothesis that the degree of neighborhood change is related to the degree of individual-level change. Bivariate correlations were calculated for each of the six individual outcome variables and each of nine measures of neighborhood change described earlier. Of the 54 bivariate correlations produced, only 4 achieved statistical significance (data not shown), and all 4 were related to changes in the racial characteristics of the neighborhood (both an increase in non-White population and an increase in African-American population were correlated with decreases in economic security and employment). At the bivariate level, it seems, changes in the objective conditions of the neighborhoods were largely unrelated to the changes that people relocated by HOPE VI reported in their own lives.

It is possible, however, that when multiple dimensions of neighborhood change are considered, better outcomes might occur. Thus, an index of neighborhood change was created, using changes in poverty, racial composition, and housing market value. Displaced people were then divided into two groups, with those who experienced the greatest change on all three dimensions put into one group and everyone else put in the other group. Respondents reporting a reduction of more than 20 percentage points in the non-White population of their neighborhood (41 percent of the sample) *and* a reduction of more than 30 percentage points in poverty (40 percent of the sample) *and* an increase of more than $10,000 in median housing value (30 percent of the sample) were classified as having had significant change in neighborhood. This categorization classified 21 respondents (19 percent of the sample) as having experienced the greatest neighborhood change on all three dimensions. These 21 people reported individual outcomes that were not statistically different than the rest of the sample for all five outcome measures examined (data not shown). Thus, even a combination of different types of neighborhood change is unrelated to individual outcomes.

If neighborhood change is not related to individual outcomes, what is? The literature suggests a range of individual-level attributes may influence the relocation experience. Senior citizens may be more adversely affected by being forced to move away from their long-time community, and residents for whom English is not a first language may also experience more difficulties in a relocation process (Kleit and Manzo, 2006). Other characteristics, such as household size, gender, marital status, the presence of small children in the family, education level, and, of course, race, may have important effects on how HOPE VI families fare during relocation.

Attachment to the original neighborhood (and thus a person's willingness to move) may color a person's perceptions of the new neighborhood. Respondents who felt a close attachment to the old neighborhood may resent being forced to move. These respondents may report worse outcomes than those for whom HOPE VI provided the opportunity to leave a neighborhood they wanted to escape.

The following multivariate analysis tests each of these propositions. Regression models were run for each of the six individual change variables. Equation 1, which is estimated using a linear ordinary least squares (OLS) model, was rerun for three additional dependent variables: changes in sense of safety, neighboring behaviors, and economic security.

$$Y = a + b_1[NBHDCH] + b_2[IND] + b_3ATTACH + e, \quad (1)$$

where Y equals the respondent's change in neighborhood satisfaction, NBHDCH is a vector of neighborhood change measures, IND is a vector of individual attributes, and ATTACH is the respondent's lack of desire to have moved from Harbor View.

Equation 2 is estimated as a binary logistic model. The independent individual-level variables are described in exhibit 6.

$$EMPLOY3 = a + b_1EMPLOY1 + b_2[NBHDCH] + b_3[IND] + b_4HEALTH3 + b_5ATTACH + e, \quad (2)$$

where EMPLOY3 equals the respondent's employment status at the time of the year-3 survey (a binary variable taking the value of 1 if the respondent is employed and 0 otherwise), and EMPLOY1 is the employment status at the time of the intake interview (coded in the same manner as the previous variable).

Exhibit 6

Independent Variables in the Multivariate Analysis

	Variable Name	Description	Mean	Standard Deviation
Education	POSTHS	Equals 1 if the respondent had attended school beyond high school at the intake interview; otherwise equals 0.	.53	.50
	HSPLUS	Equals 1 if the respondent had at least a high school diploma or GED at the intake interview.	.85	.35
Family characteristics	CHILDREN	The number of children in the household aged 5 years or younger at the intake interview.	.47	.77
	DISABILITY	Equals 1 if "any person in the family has a physical or mental disability," measured at the intake interview; otherwise equals 0.	.38	.49
Social network	FRIENDSandFAM	The number of close friends and family members living in the respondent's neighborhood in year 3.	1.40	2.40
Age	AGE	The age of the head of household at the intake interview.	34.44	14.83
	SENIOR	Equals 1 if the head of household is aged 55 or older at the intake interview.	.15	.36
Gender	MALE	Equals 1 if the head of household is male; equals 0 if the head is female.	.22	.58
Race/ethnicity	ASIAN	Equals 1 if the respondent is Asian.	.22	.41
	BLACK	Equals 1 if the respondent is African American.	.13	.34
	AMERINDIAN	Equals 1 if the respondent is Native American.	.14	.35
	HISPANIC	Equals 1 if the respondent is White with Hispanic ethnicity.	.04	.19
	NONWHITE	Equals 1 if the respondent is non-White and Hispanic; equals 0 if the respondent is White non-Hispanic.	.51	.50
Employment	EMPT1	Equals 1 if the head of household was employed at the intake interview.	.42	.50
Health	FAMHEALTH3	Equals 1 if the respondent answered yes to the survey question: "Does anyone in your family have a health problem?"; otherwise equals 0.	.50	.50
Neighborhood attachment	ATTACHMENT	Equals 1 if the respondent answered yes to the survey question: "Before you found out that Harbor View was going to be torn down, did you want to move out?"; equals 2 if the respondent answered not sure and 3 if the respondent answered no.	2.37	.77

The mix of individual-level variables for any given dependent variable was determined so as to maximize the explanatory power of the equation (that is, to produce the highest adjusted r-squared). In some cases, the analysis uses alternative measures of the same concept. For example, with education, the data were collected in ordinal categories. Two alternative dummy variables were created: one variable differentiated those with at least a high school diploma from those without and a second differentiated those with any education beyond high school from those without. Family characteristics, such as the number of small children and a dummy variable indicating whether any member has a physical or mental disability, are included. The age of the head of household is measured in years and also as a dummy variable separating seniors (aged 55 or older) from the rest. Race/ethnicity is measured as a series of dummy variables for the categories of Asian, African American, Native American, and Hispanic. When these variables are used in the multivariate analysis, the excluded group is White non-Hispanics. Alternatively, another dummy variable is computed to differentiate White non-Hispanics from all other groups. The respondent's potential support network is measured by a variable indicating the number of close friends and family members living in the same neighborhood. Gender is measured by a dummy variable, taking the value of 1 for a male head of household. The employment status of the head of household at year 1 (coded as a dummy variable) is also included as a control variable.[2]

Exhibit 7 presents the findings for OLS regressions with changes in neighborhood satisfaction, sense of safety, neighboring behaviors, and economic security as dependent variables. Neighborhood change variables are unrelated to the change in the first three dependent variables—respondents' neighborhood satisfaction, sense of safety, and neighboring behaviors. Economic security, however, is negatively related to a move to a neighborhood with more White residents. This finding could be capturing the higher cost of living, including higher rents, in White neighborhoods. In any case, the relationship is the opposite of what program advocates hope for; that is, relocation to neighborhoods with a smaller proportion of non-Whites may reduce economic self-sufficiency.

A number of individual-level variables are significantly related to the dependent variables. The age of the head of household is important in all the models. Younger heads of households show greater improvement in neighborhood satisfaction, sense of safety, and economic security (at the more marginal $p < .10$ level) than do older heads. Seniors are much more likely to increase their neighboring behaviors after relocation than are younger families. Families with fewer young children also report more positive change in neighborhood satisfaction and sense of safety than those with more young children. Respondents with a high school diploma or more education report more neighboring behaviors and less economic insecurity after relocation than do those who lack a high school education. Asian respondents, most of whom are recent Hmong immigrants to the United States, report a significantly greater reduction in neighborhood satisfaction and sense of safety than do Whites. African-American respondents also report less improvement in neighborhood satisfac-

[2] Two additional individual-level variables were left out of the final analysis. First, English-language proficiency was omitted because of its very high correlation with the variable measuring Asian racial status. Second, whether the family made an intermediate move (between the time of relocation and the survey in year 3) was omitted because it was unrelated to any of the dependent variables examined, and its inclusion did not improve the explanatory power of any of the models. In addition, interaction terms between the desire to move and the neighborhood change variables were examined. These terms were statistically insignificant in all cases and did not change the substantive findings from those discussed in this analysis.

Exhibit 7

Multivariate OLS Regressions for Four Dependent Variables

Variable	Variable Definition	Dependent Variable: Change in Neighborhood Satisfaction			Dependent Variable: Change in Sense of Safety			Dependent Variable: Change in Neighboring Behaviors			Dependent Variable: Change in Economic Security		
		ß	SE	p	ß	SE	p	ß	SE	p	ß	SE	p
CHNONWH	Change in percent of non-White residents	– .01	.01	.670	.01	.01	.653	.00	.01	.998	– .02	.01	.024
CHPOV	Change in percent of residents in poverty	.01	.01	.349	– .01	.02	.479	.01	.01	.318	– .00	.01	.859
CHHMVALUE	Change in median home value	.00	.00	.428	.00	.00	.957	.00	.00	.474	.00	.00	.187
EMPT1	Head of household employed at year 1							– .29	.23	.210	.08	.17	.646
FRIENDSandFAM	Number of friends and family in neighborhood	.09	.06	.128	.08	.06	.239	.08	.05	.132	– .02	.03	.623
AGE	Age of head of household	– .04	.01	.001	– .05	.01	.001				– .01	.01	.085
SENIOR	Head of household aged 55 or older at year 1							1.03	.43	.019			
CHILDREN	Number of young children in household at year 1	– .48	.22	.031	– .60	.24	.016	.16	.17	.339	– .11	.20	.588
MALE	Male head of household	– .46	.39	.242	– .39	.43	.366	.45	.32	.163	– .29	.21	.169
POSTHS	Head of household with education beyond high school	.19	.29	.515	– .10	.33	.769						
HSPLUS	Head of household with high school diploma GED							.75	.34	.032	– .56	.24	.022
DISABILITY	Physical or mental disability in household at year 1										.11	.18	.549
ASIAN	Asian head of household	– .83	.41	.047	– 1.20	.46	.012				– .03	.25	.928
BLACK	African-American head of household	– .87	.43	.045	– .43	.47	.365				.06	.23	.789
AMERINDIAN	Native American head of household	.27	.45	.541	.78	.49	.118				– .05	.25	.832
HISPANIC	Hispanic head of household	– 1.20	.76	.101	– .21	.84	.800				– .86	.50	.088
NONWHITE	Non-White, non-Hispanic head of household							.17	.24	.473			
ATTACHMENT	Desire to remain in original neighborhood	– .72	.19	.000	– .78	.21	.000	– .13	.16	.430	– .02	.16	.928
$\bar{R}^2$ / F statistic / p level for F		.242 / 3.036 / .001 N = 85			.263 / 3.338 / .000 N = 86			.061 / 1.412 / .189 N = 78			.083 / 1.480 / .139 N = 80		

OLS = ordinary least square.

tion than Whites. Families in which someone has a physical or mental disability show a significant improvement in economic security after the move compared with other families. This relative improvement seems counterintuitive but may reflect a greater level of income stability for families receiving disability assistance.

The last variable added to the model is the attachment of the family to the Harbor View neighborhood. This variable is extremely important to an increase in both neighborhood satisfaction and sense of safety. Families that wanted to move report significant positive changes in safety and satisfaction compared with those that did not want to move. Those more attached to the Harbor View development reported significantly less change in satisfaction and sense of safety. Neighborhood attachment, however, is unrelated to changes in neighboring behaviors and economic security.

The logistic model largely repeats the findings of the OLS analysis (exhibit 8). Employment at year 3 is unrelated to the degree of neighborhood change in race, poverty, or housing value. Having been employed in year 1 is the most important determinant of employment at year 3, but age and family health are also statistically significant. In this case, older respondents and those who report no health problems among family members are more likely to have improved their employment status.

Exhibit 8

Binary Logistic Regression for Employment at Year 3

Variable	Variable Definition	Dependent Variable: Employment at Year 3			
		ß	SE	p	Exp(ß)
EMPT1	Head of household employed at year 1	4.89	1.30	.000	133.71
CHNONWH	Change in percent of non-White residents	– .08	.06	.198	.920
CHPOV	Change in percent of residents in poverty	– .01	.06	.901	.993
CHHMVALUE	Change in median home value	.00	.00	.753	1.000
FRIENDSandFAM	Number of friends and family in neighborhood	– .08	.21	.684	.919
AGE	Age of head of household	.11	.06	.048	1.121
CHILDREN	Number of young children in household at year 1	1.83	1.10	.098	6.227
MALE	Male head of household	– 1.50	1.46	.315	4.336
POSTHS	Head of household with education beyond high school	.92	.94	.325	2.522
ASIAN	Asian head of household	– .64	1.61	.690	.526
BLACK	African-American head of household	.51	1.49	.735	1.657
AMERINDIAN	Native American head of household	.14	1.49	.926	1.148
HISPANIC	Hispanic head of household	.29	6.31	.963	1.345
FAMHEALTH3	Family health problems at year 3	– 4.60	1.72	.008	.010
ATTACHMENT	Desire to remain in original neighborhood	.19	.58	.738	1.214

86 percent correctly predicted Model $\chi^2 = 61.935$
Cox and Snell $R^2 = .553$
N = 79

Summary and Implications

These findings are based on a single case study and cannot be generalized to all HOPE VI sites. Nevertheless, many of the attitudes and outcomes reported by residents in Duluth are consistent with those reported in other locations. Relocation outcomes and neighborhood change among displaced families in Duluth, for example, mirror the national pattern: most families remained in the central city and moved to neighborhoods that exhibited significantly less disadvantage on a range of measures based on census-tract data. Also mirroring national trends, the Duluth families reported very little overall improvement on a range of individual-level outcomes. Thus, the Duluth case offers the potential for understanding why self-reported individual benefits from the HOPE VI Program have been so limited for displaced households.

One explanation for these findings is that, because neighborhood benefits are not a linear phenomenon, relocated people must experience a certain threshold of change before reporting short-term benefits. It might be the case that HOPE VI does not move families to neighborhoods that are good enough to generate benefits. This explanation is suggested by the findings here and elsewhere showing that, although HOPE VI families' new neighborhoods are better than their original ones, the new areas are nevertheless high in conditions such as poverty, unemployment, and racial segregation compared with local averages. One form of the threshold hypothesis was tested in this study, but it was found that residents who had experienced the greatest degree of change across three different dimensions—racial segregation, poverty, and housing market value—did not differ from others in the extent to which they reported individual-level benefits.

A second explanation for the lack of relationship between objective improvements in neighborhood environment and subjective assessments of individual benefits is that individual attributes play a more central role in determining how and whether families benefit from displacement and relocation. The Duluth case supports this explanation. The age of the head of household and the presence of young children are consistently important predictors of the benefits from relocation that respondents report. Race, health, and the education level of the head of household are also important predictors of the individual benefits examined in this analysis. By contrast, the indicators of neighborhood change as measured by census-tract data are statistically insignificant in virtually all cases.

This analysis provides empirical support for a third explanation of why objective measures of neighborhood change are unrelated to individual benefits among relocated families. The attachment to place as measured by the willingness of the families to move away from the original public housing site was significantly related to improvements in neighborhood satisfaction and perceptions of safety. Respondents who expressed a desire and readiness to move away from the public housing site experienced greater benefits from relocation than those who did not wish to move. This finding is an extension of previous evidence that those participating in voluntary programs of dispersal report greater benefits than those who are involuntarily displaced (Goetz 2003). The Duluth findings show that even among those who were involuntarily displaced, some families are ready and willing to move, and that these families report the most benefits from relocation. In Duluth and elsewhere (see, for example, Gibson, 2007; Goetz, 2003; Kleit and Manzo, 2006; Vale 1997), however, the number of people who do not wish to move is very sizable (more than

one-half of the people who were relocated in most cases in which researchers have collected that information).

The preceding analysis contains two additional findings that are instructive for a more general assessment of the policy of dispersion. First, individual-level outcomes from relocation tend not to be consistent across a range of measures. That is, relocated people who show positive change on one type of outcome do not necessarily show the same magnitude of change on other outcomes. Equally, negative outcomes in some areas do not imply a negative experience across the entire spectrum of outcomes. This finding suggests a need to refine the logic of the HOPE VI model by, at the very least, differentiating between the presumed individual-level benefits and the processes that are presumed to bring them about.

Second, this analysis of HOPE VI outcomes in Duluth directly relates the degree of neighborhood change to the degree of individual changes reported by residents. The findings confirm evidence from other studies indicating that neighborhood change is largely unrelated to the individual-level benefits. The Duluth case found no relationship between any measures of neighborhood change—even indices that compounded positive changes across three dimensions of change—and several measures of individual outcomes. The one exception was a finding that ran counter to the dispersal hypothesis: a move to neighborhoods inhabited by more Whites was associated with a decline in economic security among relocated people.

As argued previously, these findings invite a systematic deconstruction of theoretical linkages so as to provide a more realistic assessment of changes from involuntary relocation in a HOPE VI project. Among the range of possible outcomes from relocation, for example, previous studies (although not this one) seem to indicate that perceptual changes, such as feelings of greater safety and perceptions of greater social order, can be influenced by a change in neighborhood. On matters related to actual behavioral change, to the achievement of goals such as employment and self-sufficiency, and to improvement in physical conditions such as health, environmental change alone is unlikely to produce consistently positive results. As Levy and Woolley (2007) argue in relation to employment outcomes and as Clampet-Lundquist (2007) argues in the context of social networks, the policy assumptions and program interventions of HOPE VI probably underestimate the complexity of the social and economic changes they aim to induce.

Changes in employment, income, health, and social interactions involve systems that are complex and not fully determined by environment. Perhaps the most obvious is employment and related indicators such as income and economic self-sufficiency. These and other outcomes are likely to be influenced by a mix of systems operating at different scales. Varying factors—such as the availability of appropriate jobs in a metropolitan area, traditions of urban segregation by class and race that vary by region, the willingness of employers to hire, individual attributes such as adequate training and education, and the variable social interactions involved in the job search, the interview, and the hire—play different roles in determining economic outcomes for poor and minority households. Similarly complex systems could be described to help explain the development of social networks and neighboring behaviors that vary by race and income.

Thus, a reevaluation of the dispersal hypothesis requires a more explicit set of theoretical connections between neighborhood change and specific individual-level outcomes. Indeed, one step

would be to identify those areas in which positive change may reasonably be expected and those that involve larger systems that may be more resistant to such a simplified and problematic stimulus for change such as forced relocation.

Of significance, the degree of neighborhood change was unrelated to feelings of greater safety and neighborhood satisfaction among relocated people in Duluth. Instead, the most prominent factor associated with these outcomes was the desire to move away from the Harbor View site. This finding is important for two reasons. First, it locates the origin of attitudinal change in residents' evaluation of their original neighborhood. If residents found the existing environment wanting and desired to move away, they were likely to experience the short-term perceptual benefits hypothesized by the program model. At the same time, if this finding is replicated elsewhere, it suggests that the HOPE VI model of involuntary displacement will probably not produce consistent benefits for a substantial number of relocated families. Among the residents in many public housing redevelopment projects, a substantial portion does not wish to move. In Duluth, for example, one-half of the residents did not want to move; in Portland, two-thirds did not want to leave (Gibson, 2007). Thus, voluntary relocation programs might be a more appropriate approach for achieving outcomes such as a greater sense of safety and a higher level of neighborhood satisfaction.

For families involuntarily displaced from their homes, the questions of safety and neighborhood satisfaction may be more dependent on the families' networks of social support. To the extent that forced displacement disrupts those informal webs of support, HOPE VI may engender resentment among the displaced and fail to produce the outcomes desired by the program's architects.

Appendix A. Description of Variables

Independent Variable	Survey Question	Answer Categories	Year of Study
ATTACHMENT	"Before you found out that Harbor View was going to be torn down, did you want to move out?"	1. Yes 2. Not sure 3. No	3
FRIENDSandFAM	"How many of your close friends live in the same neighborhood as you?"		1 and 3
	"How many family members live in the same neighborhood as you, not counting family members who live in your household?"		1 and 3
DISABILITY	"Does anyone in your family have a physical, mental health, or learning disability?"	0. No 1. Yes	1
FAMHEALTH3	"Does anyone in your family have any health problems?"	0. No 1. Yes	1 and 3
EMPT1 and EMPT3	"Are you currently employed?"	0. No 1. Yes	1 and 3
Dependent Variable			
Neighborhood satisfaction	"Overall, how satisfied are you with your neighborhood?"	1. Very dissatisfied 2. Somewhat dissatisfied 3. Neither 4. Somewhat satisfied 5. Very satisfied	1 and 3
Sense of safety	"Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighborhood?"	1. Very unsafe 2. Somewhat unsafe 3. Neither safe nor unsafe 4. Somewhat safe 5. Very safe	1 and 3
Neighboring behaviors	"In your neighborhood in the past 6 months, how often did you … A. Say hello to a neighbor in the street or hallway? B. Talk with a neighbor for more than 10 minutes? C. Borrow things from a neighbor? D. Have lunch or dinner with a neighbor? E. Borrow a neighbor's car? F. Watch a neighbor's child?"	1. Never 2. Less than once a month 3. Once a month 4. Once a week 5. Two to four times a week 6. Daily	1 and 3
Economic security	"Does your family have enough money to buy food and clothing and pay bills?"	1. Never 3. Sometimes 5. Always	1 and 3

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Rick Bell, Dan Moore, and Susan Jordan of the Duluth Housing Authority for their support of the research and assistance in compiling the data. All interpretations are the author's.

Author

Edward G. Goetz is director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs and professor of urban and regional planning in the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota.

References

Atkinson, Rowland, and Keith Kintrea. 2001. "Disentangling Area Effects: Evidence From Deprived and Non-Deprived Neighbourhoods," *Urban Studies* 38 (12): 2277–2298.

Barrett, Edith J., Paul Geisel, and Jan Johnston. 2006. *The Ramona Utti Report: Impacts of the Ripley Arnold Relocation Program: Year 3 (2004–5)*. Paper prepared for the city of Fort Worth, Texas.

Boston, Thomas D. 2005. "The Effects of Mixed-Income Revitalization and Residential Mobility on Public Housing Residents: A Case Study of the Atlanta Housing Authority," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 71 (4): 1–19.

Brooks, Fred, Carole Zugazaga, James Wolk, and Mary Anne Adams. 2005. "Resident Perceptions of Housing, Neighborhood, and Economic Conditions After Relocation From Public Housing Undergoing HOPE VI Redevelopment," *Research on Social Work Practice* 15 (6): 481–490.

Buron, Larry, Diane K. Levy, and Megan Gallagher. 2007. *Housing Choice Vouchers: How HOPE VI Families Fared in the Private Market.* Brief No. 3. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Buron, Larry, Susan Popkin, Diane Levy, Laura Harris, and Jill Khadduri. 2002. *The HOPE VI Resident Tracking Study*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Carlson, Virginia, and Nic Theodore. 1997. "Employment Availability for Entry Level Workers: An Examination of the Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis in Chicago," *Urban Geography* 18 (3): 228–242.

Chapple, Karen. 2006. "Overcoming Mismatch: Beyond Dispersal, Mobility, and Development Strategies," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72 (3): 322–336.

Clampet-Lundquist, Susan. 2004. "Moving Over or Moving Up? Short-Term Gains and Losses for Relocated HOPE VI Families," *Journal of Policy Development and Research* 7 (1): 57–80.

Comey, Jennifer. 2007. *HOPE VI'd and on the Move*. Brief No. 1. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Curley, Alexandra M. 2006. "HOPE and Housing: The Effects of Relocation on Movers' Economic Stability, Social Networks, and Health." Ph.D. diss., Boston University.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Margery Austin Turner. 1997. "Does Neighborhood Matter? Assessing Recent Evidence," *Housing Policy Debate* 8 (4): 833–866.

Epp, Gayle. 1996. "Emerging Strategies for Revitalizing Public Housing Communities," *Housing Policy Debate* 7 (3): 563–588.

Fischer, Paul. 2003. *Where Are the Public Housing Families Going? An Update*. Available at http://www.viewfromtheground.com/view.cfm/stories/sullivanreports.html.

Fraser, James, William Rohe, Shannon Van Zandt, and Chris Warren. 2004. *Few Gardens HOPE VI Evaluation: Baseline Values for Economic Development and Neighborhood Revitalization.* Report for the Durham Housing Authority. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, The Center for Urban and Regional Studies.

Gallagher, Megan, and Beata Bajaj. 2007. *Moving On: Benefits and Challenges of HOPE VI for Children*. June Brief No. 4. The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Gibson, Karen J. 2007. "The Relocation of the Columbia Villa Community: Views From Residents." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Urban Affairs Association, April 26, Seattle, WA.

Goering, John, and Judith Feins. 2003. *Choosing a Better Life? Evaluating the Moving To Opportunity Social Experiment.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Goetz, Edward G. 2003. *Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

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

Immergluck, Daniel. 1998. *Neighborhood Jobs, Race, and Skills: Urban Unemployment and Commuting.* New York: Garland.

Jacob, Brian. 2004. "Public Housing, Housing Vouchers, and Student Achievement: Evidence From Public Housing Demolitions in Chicago," *American Economic Review* 94 (1): 233–258.

Jencks, Christopher, and Susan Mayer. 1990. "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood." In *Inner-City Poverty in the United States,* edited by Laurence Lynn and Michael McGeary. Washington, DC: National Academy Press: 111–186.

Johnson-Hart, Lallen T. 2007. Residential Outcomes of HOPE VI Relocatees in Richmond, VA. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Joseph, Mark, Robert Chaskin, and Henry Webber. 2007. "The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty Through Mixed-Income Development," *Urban Affairs Review* 42 (3): 369–409.

Kataria, Guarav, and Michael P. Johnson. 2004. Neighborhood Selection of Public Housing Residents in the Housing Choice Voucher Program: Quasi-Experimental Results From Chicago. Unpublished manuscript. Carnegie Mellon University.

Kaufman, Julie, and James Rosenbaum. 1992. "The Education and Employment of Low-Income Black Youth in White Suburbs," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 14 (3): 229–240.

Keels, Micere, Greg J. Duncan, Stefanie Deluca, Ruby Mendenhall, and James Rosenbaum. 2005. "Fifteen Years Later: Can Residential Mobility Programs Provide a Long-Term Escape From Neighborhood Segregation, Crime, and Poverty?" *Demography* 42 (1): 51–73.

Kingsley, G. Thomas, Jennifer Johnson, and Kathryn S. Pettit. 2003. "Patterns of Section 8 Relocation in the HOPE VI Program," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 25 (4): 427–447.

Kleit, Rachel Garshick, and Lynne Manzo. 2006. "To Move or Not To Move: Relationships to Place and Relocation Choices in HOPE VI," *Housing Policy Debate* 17 (2): 271–308.

Levy, Diane K., and Mark Woolley. 2007. *Relocation Is Not Enough: Employment Barriers Among HOPE VI Families.* June Brief No. 6. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Manjarrez, Carlos A., Susan J. Popkin, and Elizabeth Guernsey. 2007. *Poor Health: Adding Insult to Injury for HOPE VI Families*. June Brief No. 5. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Manzo, Lynne C., Rachel Garshick Kleit, and Dawn M. Couch. 2005. "Social Sustainability in HOPE VI: The Immigrant Experience." Paper presented at the Urban Affairs Association 35th annual meeting.

Oreopoulos, Philip. 2003. "The Long-Run Consequences of Living in a Poor Neighborhood," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (4): 1533–1575.

Popkin, Susan J. 2006. "The HOPE VI Program: What Has Happened to the Residents?" In *Where Are Poor People To Live? Transforming Public Housing Communities,* edited by Larry Bennett, Janet L. Smith, and Patricia A. Wright. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe: 68–90.

Popkin, Susan J., and Elizabeth Cove. 2007. *Safety Is the Most Important Thing: How HOPE VI Helped Families.* Brief No. 2. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Popkin, Susan J., Bruce Katz, Mary K. Cunningham, Karen Brown, Jeremy Gustafson, and Margery A. Turner. 2004. *A Decade of Hope VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Reed, Matthew Z. 2006. "Moving Out: Section 8 and Public Housing Relocation in Chicago." Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, Department of Sociology.

Rubinowitz, Leonard S., and James E. Rosenbaum. 2000. *Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trudeau, Daniel. 2006. "The Persistence of Segregation in Buffalo, New York: *Comer* vs. *Cisneros* and Geographies of Relocation Decisions Among Low-Income Black Households," *Urban Geography* 27 (1): 20–44.

Turney, Kristin, Susan Clampet-Lundquist, Kathryn Edin, Jeffrey R. Kling, and Greg J. Duncan. 2006. Neighborhood Effects on Barriers to Employment: Results From a Randomized Housing Mobility Experiment in Baltimore. Working paper #511. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, Industrial Relations Section.

Vale, Lawrence. 1997. "Empathological Places: Residents' Ambivalence Toward Remaining in Public Housing," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 16: 159–175.

Varady, David, and Carole Walker. 2000. "Vouchering Out Distressed Subsidized Developments: Does Moving Lead To Improvements in Housing and Neighborhood Conditions?" *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (1): 115–162.

Vigdor, Jacob L. 2007. "The Katrina Effect: Was There a Bright Side to the Evacuation of Greater New Orleans?" *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy* 7 (1): 1–38.

Wexler, Harry J. 2001. "HOPE VI: Market Means/Public Ends—The Goals, Strategies, and Midterm Lessons of HUD's Urban Revitalization Demonstration Program," *Journal of Affordable Housing* 10 (3): 195–233.

Additional Reading

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

Clark, Sherri. 2002. "Where the Poor Live: How Federal Housing Policy Shapes Residential Communities," *Urban Anthropology* 31 (1): 69–92.

Cunningham, Mary K., Susan J. Popkin, and Martha R. Burt. 2005. *Public Housing Transformation and the 'Hard to House.'* Brief No. 9. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center.

Feins, Judith D., and Rhiannon Patterson. 2005. "Geographic Mobility in the Housing Choice Voucher Program: A Study of Families Entering the Program, 1995–2002," *Cityscape* 8 (2): 21–47.

Kearns, Ade. 2002. "Response: From Residential Disadvantage to Opportunity? Reflections on British and European Policy and Research," *Housing Studies* 17 (1): 145–150.

Kearns, Ade, and Phil Mason. 2007. "Mixed Tenure Communities and Neighbourhood Quality," *Housing Studies* 22 (5): 661–691.

Newman, Sandra J., and Ann B. Schnare. 1997. "... And a Suitable Living Environment: The Failure of Housing Programs To Deliver on Neighborhood Quality," *Housing Policy Debate* 8 (4): 703–741.

Popkin, Susan J., Larry F. Buron, Diane K. Levy, and Mary K. Cunningham. 2000. "The Gautreaux Legacy: What Might Mixed-Income and Dispersal Strategies Mean for the Poorest Public Housing Tenants?" *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (4): 911–942.

Popkin, Susan J., Laura E. Harris, and Mary K. Cunningham. 2001. *Families in Transition: A Qualitative Analysis of the MTO Experience*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Rosenbaum, James E. 1995. "Changing the Geography of Opportunity by Expanding Residential Choice: Lessons From the Gautreaux Program," *Housing Policy Debate* 6 (1): 231–269.

Schwartz, Alex, and Kian Tajbakhsh. 1997. "Mixed-Income Housing: Unanswered Questions," *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 3 (2): 71–92.

Smith, Robin E. 2002. *Housing Choice for HOPE VI Relocatees*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

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

Turner, Margery Austin, Susan J. Popkin, and Mary Cunningham. 2000. *Section 8 Mobility and Neighborhood Health: Emerging Issues and Policy Challenges*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2003. *Moving To Opportunity Interim Impacts Evaluation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.