Moving Over or Moving Up? Short-Term Gains and Losses for Relocated HOPE VI Families

Susan Clampet-Lundquist
Center for Research on Child Wellbeing
Princeton University

Abstract

In late 1992 Congress created the HOPE VI program to address the concerns raised by the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing earlier that year. One of the goals of HOPE VI is to help low-income families achieve economic self-sufficiency by moving them out of an environment of concentrated poverty and by providing them with supportive services. This study uses qualitative and quantitative methods to look at the relocation of families living in a public housing development in Philadelphia. Forty-one families with school-age children were selected randomly and interviewed 2 years after their moves. More than half of these families used a Section 8 subsidy when they relocated. Census and administrative data show that families who chose to move with a Section 8 voucher were more likely than families who moved into another public housing development to end up in neighborhoods that were significantly less poor and had more employed adults. However, the neighborhood-level variables had no significant relationship with economic self-sufficiency measures 2 years after the relocation. The analysis of the qualitative data indicates that, in the short term, few of the families were able to rebuild local social ties, regardless of the kind of neighborhood into which they moved. This inability to connect with neighborhood social structures has made it difficult for adults and teenagers who moved into less poor neighborhoods to take advantage of the improved opportunities in their new neighborhoods.

Housing authorities across the country have spent much of the last decade demolishing distressed public housing developments to deconcentrate poverty and design new communities. Tenants are often relocated by the local housing authorities in the process of revitalizing the sites. The HOPE VI initiative, designed in 1992 by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), has funded much of this demolition and redevelopment. Housing officials have invoked the mantra of mixed-income living as one of the best hopes for low-income families, whether in a development funded through HUD or in a privately owned Section 8-subsidized unit.

This study looks in depth at relocation outcomes from one HOPE VI redevelopment site: DuBois Towers in Philadelphia.[1] It reports on interviews with 41 families, conducted 2–3 years after they moved from DuBois Towers. It also employs quantitative measures to compare indicators of neighborhood quality with household and individual-level outcomes for relocated DuBois families who chose three different types of housing: conventional-site public housing, Section 8 housing, and scattered-site housing. This article discusses what these families have lost and gained in the short term following their relocation and suggests what these findings may indicate for HOPE VI relocation policy.

Background

In 1992 the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing determined that 6 percent of the 1.4 million units of existing public housing stock—86,000 units—were severely distressed. In response to the need for revitalization of distressed public housing developments, HUD established the HOPE VI program in 1992. By 2001 HUD had awarded grants to 165 developments in 98 cities (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001). HOPE VI relocation and revitalization plans are uniquely shaped by many factors within the political, social, and economic contexts of each locale. For example, not all HOPE VI sites required full-scale relocation.

The two main goals of HOPE VI address community revitalization in a comprehensive way:

> 1. To [physically] transform public housing communities from islands of despair and poverty into a vital and integral part of larger neighborhoods.
>
> 2. To create an environment that encourages and supports individual and family movement toward self-sufficiency (Epp, 1998).

This article focuses on the HOPE VI goal of creating an environment for self-sufficiency. Housing authorities may spend up to 20 percent of HOPE VI funding on supportive services for residents affected by demolition and rebuilding projects. The array of HOPE VI supportive services, as well as the delivery and takeup of these services, varies from site to site, but the common goal is to bring low-income families into self-sufficiency. Supportive services include job training, drug rehabilitation, childcare, and education programs. In many redeveloped HOPE VI sites, these services are offered through a center onsite or near to the development.

Families in public housing units slated for demolition or substantial rehabilitation must relocate. Typically, families are offered the choice of moving to Section 8-assisted rental housing, to another public housing development (also known as conventional-site public housing), or to scattered-site public housing.[2] In addition, some residents move back into the revitalized development.

Ostensibly, the HOPE VI initiative aims to revitalize severely distressed public housing in an effort to reduce the deleterious effects of concentrated poverty for the tenants and to encourage community development in the immediate area of projects targeted for revitalization. The reality of what has happened over the years, however, has been an emphasis on redeveloping the physical site to include mixed-income housing, rather than getting the original tenants into mixed-income neighborhoods. A Section 8 subsidy (now called the Housing Choice Voucher program) could have allowed many relocated families to move to less poor neighborhoods.[3] However, in a study of 73 HOPE VI sites across 48 cities, Kingsley, Johnson, and Pettit (2002) found that nearly half of HOPE VI relocatees moved to other public housing developments. Thus it is likely that many moved to neighborhoods as impoverished as the ones they left. For those who opted for Section 8

housing, the poverty rates in their new neighborhoods were found to be, on average, lower than those in their original developments.

Some of the original tenants of developments revitalized under HOPE VI moved back after the redevelopment of their site, thus benefiting from the substantial improvements made to their old development. But poverty deconcentration goals dictate that the number of units available for public housing tenants in many of the revitalized developments be significantly reduced. Therefore, not all of the former tenants were able to move back, even if they chose to do so. In fact, in the HOPE VI awards made from 1993 to 1999, only 11.4 percent of the displaced tenants were slated to move back. The "temporary" relocation time is 4–5 years on average, which is a significant amount of time for families who may have been heavily dependent on local support networks for assistance with money, food, or babysitting prior to redevelopment (National Housing Law Project, 2002). Although the HOPE VI goal of economic self-sufficiency may have focused on residents of the revitalized development, evaluating this goal for relocatees as a whole is also important, because the relocation period can be quite long or even permanent.

Housing mobility research rests heavily on assumptions about neighborhood effects. Many poverty scholars believe that moving low-income families from neighborhoods of concentrated poverty into less poor neighborhoods may allow these families to take advantage of improved neighborhood resources. Studies have linked living in a high-poverty neighborhood with few working adults to poor educational and behavioral outcomes for adolescents (Billy, Brewster, and Grady, 1994; Brewster, Billy, and Grady, 1993; Brooks-Gunn et al., 1993; Coulton and Pandey, 1992; Crane, 1991; Hogan and Kitagawa, 1985; Ku, Sonenstein, and Pleck, 1993). The few studies that address neighborhood effects on adults usually look at employment outcomes and primarily use the measure of distance from their neighborhoods to job concentrations, rather than analyzing neighborhood compositional effects (Ellen and Turner, 1997). Neighborhood-effects researchers have theorized a variety of transmission mechanisms by which neighborhood-level characteristics affect individual-level outcomes. These mechanisms rely heavily on social relations between neighbors, and assessing them empirically is more difficult than measuring, for example, associations between neighborhood-level and individual-level variables (Jencks and Mayer, 1990; Tienda, 1991; Ellen and Turner, 1997; Briggs, 1997).

The two main housing mobility programs that researchers have evaluated are the Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program and the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program. Though the programs differ in important ways—for example, MTO was set up as a randomized experimental design in five cities—their essential components are similar. In both programs families in public housing or on the waiting list for public housing applied to a program that provided a Section 8 subsidy to move into a privately managed unit (one-third of MTO program participants were assigned to a control group and therefore did not receive a subsidy). Gautreaux participants received a Section 8 subsidy they could use in predominantly White suburbs or predominantly African-American Chicago neighborhoods, depending on the unit that was available when their name was next on the waiting list. One-third of MTO participants (those in the experimental group) received a Section 8 subsidy that they could only use in a neighborhood that was less than 10 percent poor; another third could use their Section 8 subsidy with no geographical restrictions; and the remaining third continued to stay in their public housing units, as the control group.

Evaluators have found only modest positive employment outcomes for adult participants in these programs. There was a slight improvement in employment for suburban Gautreaux movers compared with city movers, but no increase in pay rates or number of hours worked (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum, 2000; Popkin, Rosenbaum, and Meaden,

1993; Welfeld, 1998). Researchers conducted an interim evaluation survey of MTO families across the five cities 4–7 years after they had signed up for the program. They found that although families in the experimental group were in less poor neighborhoods than those in the control group, there were no significant differences between experimental and control adults on employment measures (Orr et al., 2003).

The findings for adolescents who participated in the Gautreaux or MTO program have generally shown more positive outcomes than the adults. More Gautreaux suburban youth finished high school and went on to college than did their urban counterparts (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum, 2000). Most of the significant differences found in the latest MTO survey were among older adolescents (15–19 years old) rather than younger children. Older girls in the experimental group reported feeling less psychologically distressed or anxious than girls in the control group and were also less likely to engage in risky behavior. On the other hand, older boys in the experimental group were arrested more often for property crime than those in the control group (Orr et al., 2003).

Most research on neighborhood effects and housing mobility has employed quantitative methodology. This research has provided many valuable findings, but it has also raised key questions that can perhaps only be answered with qualitative methods. For example, it has been observed that the proportion of neighborhood residents in professional/managerial occupations is negatively correlated with the high school dropout rate (Crane, 1991). But what is happening on the ground in the neighborhood? What is the process through which this effect occurs?

This research examines the neighborhood environments of relocated public housing tenants from DuBois Towers and uses interviews to examine the social processes within those neighborhoods. Taking a closer look at these processes provides insight into the larger question of how the transfer of place-based social capital may work for relocated families in the short term. Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods, this article moves across three levels of analysis: description of the neighborhoods of the sample at the neighborhood level, analysis of the neighborhood environment's impact on individual outcomes, and exploration of the social transmission mechanisms through which individuals may tap into neighborhood resources or fail to do so.

Methods

In fall 1999 the four 12- to 15-story highrises that composed the DuBois Towers public housing development in Philadelphia were imploded. Demolishing DuBois Towers eliminated 536 apartments—home to more than 250 families—from the public housing stock.[4] These buildings are being replaced by a mixed-income housing development funded through HOPE VI. Former DuBois tenants will be eligible for slightly more than 100 of the new rental units (Wood, 1999; Nicholas, 1999). DuBois tenants chose either (1) to move to a privately managed unit, using a Section 8 housing subsidy, or (2) to move to another public housing unit (scattered site or conventional site) in the city.

To address the process and short-term consequences of the HOPE VI relocation from DuBois Towers, this article examines the following three research questions:

- Do the neighborhood environments that DuBois families moved into differ from their previous neighborhood, and do the characteristics of destination neighborhoods differ by subsidy type?
- What is the short-term impact of the move on adults' economic self-sufficiency?
- How have families' social networks been affected by the relocation?

This study uses both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative interviews were useful for examining social processes in former and current neighborhoods, whereas quantitative methods made it possible to examine the larger neighborhood context.

Qualitative Methodology

Indepth, face-to-face interviews, lasting about 1.5–2 hours for adults and 0.5–1 hour for teenagers, were the main method of qualitative data collection. DuBois had a mixture of household types, with 60 percent of families having at least one child under age 18 (Philadelphia Health Management Corporation, 2000). Only families with children were interviewed.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) provided a list of names of the heads of households with children age 18 and younger at the time of the data request (July 2000). The sample comprised 50 names chosen randomly from the 148 unique households on the list. The findings from the qualitative analysis are not representative of other household types, such as elderly-only households. However, because 60 percent of DuBois households consisted of families with children, the sample does reflect the majority of household types in the original development. Thus the study findings are generalizable to families with children who were relocated.

A total of 41 families were interviewed, representing a response rate of 82 percent.[5] Interviews took place from February 2001 to January 2002, roughly 2–3 years after they had moved from DuBois Towers. The families interviewed were predominantly headed by African-American single mothers.[6] One of the adult respondents was Puerto Rican, two were single fathers, and two were women raising their grandchildren. In addition, 22 teenagers—one from each household having a child ages 12–18—were interviewed to learn more about their situations. The interview guide was semistructured, covering a set list of topics but also including open-ended questions through which respondents could discuss unanticipated topics and tell their stories. Each respondent chose a pseudonym.

Data from interview transcripts and field notes were entered into NVivo qualitative analysis software. This software manages interviews and field notes, allows multiple levels of coding, and retains analytic memorandums that researchers write during the coding process. The analysis of the qualitative data was both deductive and inductive. The data were initially coded for the topics set forth in the interview guide. However, part of the value in qualitative data analysis lies in identifying unanticipated patterns. For example, many people used the phrase “everyone was family” to describe the quality of neighborly relationships at DuBois. These instances were coded into a “fictive kin” node for further exploration.

Quantitative Methodology

Analyzing quantitative data concerning the relocated families and the neighborhoods into which they moved made it possible to look at neighborhood context as well as individual-level outcomes. One goal of this study was to examine the extent to which the destination neighborhoods differed from the DuBois environment. Another was to identify any differences in neighborhood environment between families who moved to another public housing unit and those who used a Section 8 subsidy to relocate. An important objective of recent housing policy has been to reduce concentrated neighborhood poverty with the expectation of improved employment and education outcomes for poor families. The regression models in this study explore the relation of income to both relocation and type of housing to which DuBois residents moved.

The study used administrative data from several city agencies and Census data to compare the destination neighborhoods to DuBois Towers on key indicators of neighborhood quality, such as unemployment and poverty rates, percentage of households receiving public assistance, and minority composition. Regression models were run to examine the associations between income, neighborhood context, individual-level variables, and HOPE VI relocation. Block-group-level data from Summary File 3 of the 1990 and 2000 Census were used for several measures of neighborhood quality. Data from the 1990 Census were used to construct measures for DuBois Towers, because the development no longer existed by the time of the 2000 Census. The measures for the destination neighborhoods were constructed using 2000 Census data. For neighborhood-level child well-being measures, the study used 1998 Census tract data from the Services Utilization Monitoring System (SUMS) database. These data were collected by the University of Pennsylvania Cartographic Modeling Laboratory (CML) at the end of the 1990s from Philadelphia municipal agencies that serve children and families.

For the regression models the sample was expanded to examine the broader population of families with children who moved from DuBois Towers. The models included housing authority administrative data. The PHA administrative data consist of a series of downloads made to the CML from January 1997 through January 2001. The separate data systems for public housing tenants and Section 8 tenants have been combined for this study. Public housing and Section 8 tenants are required to verify their income eligibility each year, and this income information is input into the system, along with address and family-size changes. The administrative records were stripped of identifiers and merged across the files by a client identification number (ID). The tenants' addresses were then geocoded in order to attach Census tract and block-group-level data.

In addition, a data set was constructed to compare DuBois households with households of a demographically similar, highrise public housing development, which was given the pseudonym *Northfield Plaza.* Northfield Plaza, comprising three buildings, is one of the few highrise public housing developments that remain in the city. There has been no HOPE VI intervention at Northfield. Only administrative records of families with children who lived in DuBois Towers or Northfield Plaza were used for this study.

The client IDs of the 148 households with children who moved from DuBois Towers at the time it was demolished were then matched to the public housing tenant and Section 8 systems. Of these households 111 matched with households in the system as of January 2001.[7] Of these DuBois households, 61 moved into Section 8 units, 34 into conventional-site public housing, and 16 into scattered-site housing.

All of the Northfield Plaza households where the head was between the ages of 16 and 61 in January 1997 and where the family size was greater than one (as a proxy for households with children) were then selected.[8] By January 2001 only three of the original Northfield households had moved into Section 8 housing and only one had moved into scattered-site housing. The scattered-site tenants and the Northfield Section 8 tenants were excluded from the regression analyses for a clearer comparison. This procedure resulted in a total of 219 cases for this portion of the analysis (n = 95 for DuBois, n = 124 for Northfield).

Limitations of Study

The design of this research is essentially a random sample within a case study. Focusing on one case makes possible a more finely detailed description of life at DuBois Towers, the process of relocation, and life in the new neighborhoods. Because the sample was

drawn randomly, and because the response rate was quite high, the sample of respondents is representative of families with children who moved from DuBois.[9]

One weakness of this design is that its findings occur in the context of a case study. Determining the "transferability" of findings from a case study must be carried out on the basis of how well a new context fits with the case study context (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). One unusual aspect of Dubois was its location, which was only a three-block walk to the downtown district. Although the highrise design of DuBois acted to set it apart from the surrounding community, there were no other spatial barriers between DuBois and the row houses directly across the street. In the 1990s DuBois residents had the type of close, easy access to downtown shopping, recreation, and other amenities that only affluent households could afford at that time. In this respect, the site is similar to that of Cabrini Green in Chicago, which is also undergoing significant redevelopment as part of a larger neighborhood gentrification process (Bennett and Reed, 1999).

The study research design suffers from two timing issues. First, relocated residents were not interviewed before they moved from DuBois Towers. By the time of the interviews nostalgia may have softened the harsh realities of living in a deteriorating highrise public housing development. Moreover, feelings of social isolation in a new neighborhood can heighten the tendency to romanticize the past (Kasinitz and Hillyard, 1995). The second timing issue is that the families interviewed had moved into their new neighborhoods 2–3 years before the interview. They had lived at DuBois for more than 18 years on average. Strong social networks take a long time to build, and the study may have caught them on the early side of building these foundations. The full positive impacts of the relocation on adult and child outcomes may not be evident until much more time has passed. For example, research has shown that low-income adults tend to use strong ties in their search for jobs, so they may need a much longer time to cultivate these relationships before their new networks may affect their employment outcomes (Granovetter, 1995; Kleit, 2001a). That limitation acknowledged, it remains important to examine, as this study does, the process of early social integration, for what happens to families in the years immediately after relocation can affect the later employment and educational trajectories for adults and children.

The following section reports on three levels of analysis undertaken to explain how the neighborhood environments changed for HOPE VI relocatees from DuBois Towers and ascertain how these new environments may benefit them. First, the section discusses basic demographic characteristics of the relocatees. Second, the section compares the neighborhoods of residents choosing the two main types of housing subsidy: Section 8 and conventional-site public housing. Third, the section examines whether the neighborhood environment had an effect on the sample's short-term employment outcomes, independent of individual-level variables. The section concludes by discussing the gains and losses of the HOPE VI relocatees in terms of local social connections

Results

Relocated Families: Basic Demographics

Under the HOPE VI program Philadelphia housing officials gave DuBois Towers tenants a choice to relocate into another conventional-site public housing unit, a scattered-site public housing unit, or a Section 8-subsidized private rental unit. The most popular option for DuBois tenants was Section 8: 56 percent of the movers chose Section 8, 32 percent chose conventional public housing units, and 12 percent chose scattered-site units. The respondents in these three groups were quite similar in many ways, as exhibits 1 and 2 show. Although those who chose Section 8 had lived at DuBois Towers, on

Exhibit 1

Characteristics of Families Relocating from DuBois Towers, by Subsidized Housing Type

Housing Type	*n*	Years of Residence at DuBois Towers	Age of Respondents[a] (Years)	Number of Children in Household[a]	Less Than High School Education (%)
Section 8	23	19.3 (8.2)	37.7 (9.0)	3.0 (1.2)	43.5
Conventional-site public housing	13	17.7 (8.9)	36.0 (11.5)	3.1 (1.3)	84.6
Scattered site	5	16.4 (7.6)	37.8 (6.6)	3.0 (1.2)	60.0

[a]At time of interview.
Notes: Values are means, with standard deviations in parentheses. *n* is number of families.

average, slightly longer than the others, the three groups were almost exactly the same in terms of age of household head and the average number of children in the household.

Differences were more evident in educational attainment and current employment. Among relocaters who chose public housing, 84.6 percent did not have a high school diploma or a general equivalency degree (GED), compared to 60.0 percent of the scattered-site group and 43.5 percent of the Section 8 group. This variation in education existed before the relocation and in fact was associated with the type of subsidy the household chose. A related analysis not shown here found that, controlling for other individual characteristics, those respondents who had a high school diploma or GED were seven times more likely than nongraduates to relocate to a Section 8-subsidized unit than to a conventional-site public housing unit. Section 8 respondents were much more likely to be employed at the time of the interview, and more than 40 percent of these respondents were employed full time. These differences in employment, however, were not reflected in the monthly income reported by the respondents.[10] Nearly 70 percent of Section 8 and public housing respondents reported monthly income that was below the poverty line for a family of three ($1,100).[11]

Family gains from the move were largely related to the type of housing they chose. The next section focuses on the two main options that DuBois tenants chose: conventional-site public housing (within a development) and Section 8.

Exhibit 2

Employment and Income of Relocated Families Approximately 2 Years After Relocation, by Subsidized Housing Type (%)

Housing Type	*n*	Monthly Income <$1,100	Unemployed	Working Full Time
Section 8	23	69.5	43.5	43.5
Conventional-site public housing	13	69.3	69.2	23.1
Scattered site	5	80.0	40.0	20.0

Notes: Data are from time of interview. *n* is number of families.

Neighborhood Indicators: DuBois Towers and New Neighborhoods

Public housing developments in Philadelphia are commonly located in high-poverty areas, but Section 8 housing can potentially be located anywhere. Were the DuBois movers able to move to neighborhoods that were less poor and more diverse racially and economically? Did the Section 8 movers end up in neighborhoods with significantly better indicators than the public housing movers?

This descriptive analysis, which used Census data from 1990 and 2000 as well as SUMS data, divided the new neighborhoods by subsidy type and compared them with one another. The scattered-site respondents were left out of this analysis because there were so few and leaving them out allowed for a more focused comparison of conventional-site public housing neighborhoods with Section 8 neighborhoods. The one-tailed *t*-test of means was used in this comparison to test the prediction that the neighborhood indicators would be more positive for Section 8 than for conventional-site public housing neighborhoods. The significance test for the means was adjusted for a small sample size.[12]

Most of these variables used the block group as an approximation for neighborhood because interviewees tended to define their neighborhood as their particular block and a few surrounding streets—an area much smaller than the Census tract. However, the Census tract was used for the child well-being variables from the SUMS data because the numbers were too small at the block-group level. For this reason it was not possible to compare DuBois Towers with the new neighborhoods for the child well-being variables. DuBois Towers spanned two Census block groups across two tracts that were demographically quite different from the block groups for the DuBois site. All of the neighborhood-level variables (from the Census) for DuBois Towers are actually a compilation of raw numbers for the two block groups.[13]

Exhibit 3 displays the results for measures of concentrated poverty/racial segregation and child well-being. Indicators of both neighborhood disadvantage and child well-being show that DuBois residents who chose a Section 8 subsidy moved to a better neighborhood than those who moved to another public housing development. Both groups, however, showed improvements on most measures after leaving DuBois Towers. The median household income in the neighborhoods of the Section 8 movers was more than twice that of those who moved to conventional public housing, and accordingly, the level of public assistance use, the level of poverty, and the level of unemployment were significantly less in the Section 8 neighborhoods. In addition, the average Section 8 respondent was more likely than the average public housing relocatee to move to a neighborhood that was substantially more racially diverse than the average public housing relocatee from DuBois.

Some changes were positive for both groups of respondents. Those who chose to relocate in public housing were found to be living in neighborhoods that were less poor and populated with more people working formal jobs than their former neighborhood at DuBois Towers. However, the apparent improvement in the public assistance and unemployment measures may very well have been affected by policy and economic issues unconnected with the relocation, given that welfare receipt and unemployment dropped dramatically nationwide during the late 1990s.

The children in the neighborhoods of the Section 8 movers performed better academically than those in the neighborhoods of the public housing movers. The truancy rates of students in grades 6–12, on average, were significantly lower in the neighborhoods of the Section 8 movers than in the neighborhoods of the public housing movers. The proportion of eighth-grade students performing at or above the basic level for math was twice

Exhibit 3

Neighborhood and Child Well-Being Indicators for DuBois Towers and New Neighborhoods

Indicator	Philadelphia	DuBois Towers	Relocation Housing Type: Section 8	Relocation Housing Type: Conventional-Site Public Housing
Neighborhood disadvantage/ racial segregation				
Median household income (1999 $)	30,746	9,827[a]	25,137***	10,497
Household characteristics (%)				
In poverty	22.9	62.9	32.5***	58.0
Receiving public assistance	8.7	54.0	16.0***	27.4
Adults (16+) unemployed	10.9	36.5	14.2**	25.3
Non-Hispanic African-American	43.1	96.6	59.8***	92.6
Child well-being (%)				
Students absent 25+ days				
Grades 6–8	23.4		29.2***	38.1
Grades 9–12	49.4		60.6**	67.3
Grade 8 students at or above basic level[b]				
Reading	59.6		55.0***	42.6
Math	35.3		32.5***	16.2

**$p < .005$, ***$p < .0005$, significant difference between relocation housing types.
[a]Adjusted for 1999 dollars using Consumer Price Index to make it more comparable with other income estimates in exhibit.
[b]As determined by SAT–9.
Note: Values are means. Data for DuBois Towers from 1990 Census; data for child well-being variables from 1998. All other data from 2000 Census.

as high in the Section 8 neighborhoods. On both measures of academic testing, the Section 8 neighborhoods scored at nearly the same level as that of the city as a whole.

In sum, respondents who chose to relocate with a Section 8 subsidy moved to substantially better neighborhoods, compared with both their former DuBois neighborhood and the destination neighborhoods of their public housing counterparts. Nevertheless, DuBois Section 8 movers were still living in neighborhoods where nearly one in three people was poor—a poverty rate nearly 10 percentage points higher than the city average.

Employment and Income Outcomes of DuBois Towers Movers

Did the HOPE VI intervention of moving residents away from a distressed public housing development help DuBois families with children to become more economically self-sufficient? Do families relocating with Section 8 subsidies perform better economically than those who move to conventional-site public housing or than public housing residents who have not had the opportunity to relocate afforded by the HOPE VI program? What can this research contribute to the understanding of whether moving to a neighborhood environment with less poverty and higher employment rates can improve self-sufficiency outcomes for poor families, at least in the short term? This section addresses these questions.

The study operationalized economic self-sufficiency with two variables: annual income (a continuous variable) and welfare receipt as reported in January 2001. The welfare receipt variable measured whether cash assistance (Temporary Assistance for Needy

Families) was the main income source for a household. A model that regressed annual income and income source on neighborhood-level variables was run to fully explore these relationships.[14] For the dependent variable annual income, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used. For the dependent variable income source, logistic regression was used. The individual-level control variables, age, family size, recent work history, and previous income (measured at the time of relocation), covered basic demographic characteristics that could have had an effect on employment outcomes. The neighborhood-level variables represented the opportunity structure within which people live, and they were measured at the block-group level. The analysis also used dummy variables to represent Northfield Plaza residents (who never participated in a HOPE VI-type relocation program) and former DuBois residents who had relocated to conventional-site public housing. DuBois residents who opted for Section 8 housing were the omitted category in the models. The results are shown in exhibit 4.

No association was found between income and relocation from the HOPE VI DuBois Towers site, as exhibit 4 shows. Furthermore, the type of relocation housing appears to have no effect on income, controlling for individual- and neighborhood-level variables. DuBois families relocating to Section 8 housing moved to neighborhoods with lower poverty and unemployment rates compared with their counterparts who relocated to other public housing developments. Nonetheless, these neighborhood contextual differences showed no impact on respondents' income in the short term, as measured 2 years after their relocation. Other analyses not shown here omitted the neighborhood-level variables, using only the dummy variables of DuBois relocaters who moved to other conventional-site public housing and Northfield Plaza residents to represent the neighborhood-level differences. Another model retained only neighborhood-level variables, leaving out the type of subsidized housing. In all these models, the only variables with significant coefficients were the individual-level control variables. Recent employment history and previous income were the strongest coefficients.

The other measure of economic self-sufficiency examined was welfare receipt. Does the HOPE VI relocation process affect welfare receipt for DuBois Towers residents in the short term, as measured in January 2001, approximately 2 years after the move? Exhibit

Exhibit 4

OLS Regression of Respondent Income on Type of Subsidized Housing and Neighborhood- and Individual-Level Variables: January 2001

Variable	*B*	*t*
Northfield Plaza tenant	–2,197.45	–1.07
DuBois relocatee to conventional-site public housing	–678.27	–0.35
Neighborhood level (%)		
Unemployed	9,110.38	1.49
Poor	418.30	0.07
College or higher degree	2,879.41	0.23
Individual level		
Age	159.79	3.41**
Family size	1,003.56	3.02**
Employed since May 1999	6,104.04	4.39***
Income in May 1999	0.44	4.24***

**$p < .005$, ***$p < .0005$; constant = –3,792.14; R^2 (adjusted) = 0.286.
B = unstandardized coefficient.

5 displays the log odds of the coefficients from the logistic regression analysis of welfare receipt. Only two variables, family size and baseline income, had significant coefficients. Neither type of subsidized housing nor neighborhood-level variables were significantly associated with welfare receipt, controlling for individual-level variables.

Exhibit 5

Logistic Regression of Welfare Receipt on Type of Subsidized Housing and Neighborhood- and Individual-Level Variables: January 2001

Variable	*B* (SE)		Exp(*B*)
Northfield Plaza tenant	–0.50	(1.09)	0.61
DuBois relocatee to conventional-site public housing	1.36	(0.97)	3.89
Neighborhood level (%)			
Unemployed	–3.59	(3.18)	0.03
Poor	3.20	(2.65)	24.63
College or higher degree	9.63	(7.60)	15,255.14
Individual level			
Age	0.03	(0.02)	1.03
Family size	0.69***	(0.18)	2.00
Employed since May 1999	–10.02	(15.26)	0.00
Income in May 1999	–0.00010**	(–0.00006)	1.00

**$p < .005$, ***$p < .0005$; constant = –3.15 (1.57).
B = unstandardized coefficient, SE = standard error.

The finding of no effect of neighborhood-level variables or type of relocation housing on individual outcomes is important. Why does there appear to be no effect of HOPE VI relocation on income or employment outcomes for adults? There are two mechanisms through which HOPE VI relocation could affect economic self-sufficiency: access to better community networks and utilization of supportive services. As to the first mechanism, even if families move to neighborhoods with more neighbors who are employed, this does not mean that they actually have relationships with these neighbors—even casual ones—through which job information could potentially flow. What about benefits from HOPE VI supportive services for affected tenants? These services include childcare, job training, substance abuse counseling—anything that can assist people in becoming or remaining economically self-sufficient. For DuBois relocatees case management for these services began in September 2000, 1.5 years after the relocation occurred. Participation rates in these supportive service activities were quite low; therefore, it is difficult to make any assessment about the effectiveness of this intervention.

Three methodological considerations may help explain why no association was found between HOPE VI relocation and income and employment outcomes: (1) the timeframe for the study, (2) weaknesses in the administrative data, and (3) the small size of the sample. Perhaps the most likely explanation is that the time span of approximately 2 years is simply too short for neighborhood-level characteristics to manifest themselves in the individual outcomes of families. It is also possible that the administrative data used for income and other individual-level data could be of questionable quality. There is reason to be more confident about the relationships among groups within the data set than about exact income levels reported for individual households. Income information from this data set was used for all three groups, and it is to be expected that any errors were random across the households, which would suggest valid associations among the independent variables and income. In addition, the size of the sample may affect the comparison

among DuBois movers. After dividing the DuBois sample into conventional-site public housing and Section 8 groups, each group had fewer than 65 people.[15] In the regression model on income, the signs of the coefficients for the Northfield tenants and for the DuBois public housing movers were negative, in comparison with the Section 8 movers. These differences may have become statistically significant with a larger sample of DuBois movers.

The next section uses data from indepth, face-to-face interviews with former residents of DuBois Towers to examine interviewees' perceptions of their success in creating connections to people and institutions in their new neighborhoods and to highlight their gains and losses in the social landscape.

Social Gains and Losses for Relocated Families

The relocated residents of DuBois Towers reported a mixed picture of social gains and losses resulting from the move. Anyone who has not lived in DuBois Towers may have a hard time understanding that residents might have had something to lose by moving. When DuBois was built in 1959 most public housing was constructed with the minimum necessities and in the classic cinderblock and concrete style of public housing (Bauman, 1987). During the next four decades mismanagement by some of the public housing administrations and vandalism by some of the tenants took their toll on the apartments, stairwells, elevators, and the grounds in front of the 12- to 15-story buildings. Though DuBois did not have the gang warfare that paralyzed many Chicago public housing tenants with fear, its families frequently had to protect themselves from shootings, robberies, and other assaults (Popkin et al., 2000). With 63 percent of one's neighbors living below the poverty line, and 70 percent without a high school diploma or a GED, DuBois tenants had few neighbors with much human and financial capital, and many were struggling to make it.[16] Despite this economic context of scarcity most former residents interviewed reported that their social networks had provided them with substantial benefits: material goods, childcare, and informal social control. These locally based social networks were devastated by the relocation.

Although DuBois families who relocated to other public housing developments may have moved to a less physically deteriorated and less violent development, they nonetheless found themselves in neighborhoods with poverty rates that averaged 58 percent and where one-quarter of adults were unemployed. Thus moving tenants from one public housing development to another goes against a basic HUD goal of deconcentrating poverty. Although their new public housing developments may have had slightly lower poverty rates, none of them were as well situated as DuBois Towers, with its downtown location and proximity to a wide range of amenities. Interviews show that families relocating from DuBois did not gain much in the way of bridging social capital, because their neighbors in the new development shared the same kind of economically redundant ties as their old neighbors did. Respondents who were socially connected in their former public housing development reported that they had lost this social support, and few reported having made strong ties in their new neighborhoods. Pamela, a 42-year-old mother of three who lives in a newly redeveloped public housing development, described the disconnect she felt with her new neighbors:

> I know a couple of people but I don't go in their house, nothing like that. It's like it's not safe no more, you know what I mean. So it's like I go through this little depression stage and you know, I watch the kids, I go out and do whatever but other than that, I been in the house the last 3 months, I didn't go nowhere, just depression just sitting in, you know what I mean. I don't need to go outside because they out there fighting or somebody out there shooting and you don't wanna be here, you know what I mean.

As this example makes clear, the lack of social ties also involves the loss of informal networks that help protect public housing residents from real dangers of violence in the developments. Crime data indicate, however, that the developments to which interviewees moved are less violent than DuBois. The children in interviewed families benefited from this reduced violence, and several of their parents reported giving them more leeway to play outside. Even so, the children did not have the same level of recreational opportunities in their new public housing developments, and they could no longer benefit from their parents' local ties. The DuBois public housing relocatees exchanged a dilapidated housing unit for (it is hoped) one in better shape physically. But they are living without the long-term social ties that sustained them in many ways, and most have not created local social networks.

Although the quantitative measures show that DuBois families who chose Section 8 housing gained quite a bit from the relocation, not all of them seemed to recognize this fact. Their new neighborhoods averaged half the rate of poverty of and 60 percent less unemployment than DuBois Towers, making for a very different social environment. The physical environment was different, too. They were no longer living in 12- to 15-story highrise buildings with half of the apartments vacant, but instead were living in 2- to 3-story row houses where, on average, just 13 percent of the units were vacant. Their new neighborhoods were less violent than DuBois Towers, and by the respondents' testimony, the drug transactions were less out in the open. In addition, living in a "regular" neighborhood meant that they would no longer have to contend with the DuBois stigma when they filled out a job application or attended school. These new neighborhood environments, therefore, have the potential to offer DuBois families a better opportunity structure for children and for adults.

Liz, a 53-year-old mother of five, had lived at DuBois Towers for 38 years. Although two of her five children had been able to move out of DuBois into middle-class lives elsewhere, she was concerned enough about the stigma of living in "the projects" for her 15-year-old son, Roscoe, to choose to move into a Section 8 unit rather than another public housing development. She explained:

> Yeah, [Roscoe] have more opportunities because it's, you're not supposed to, but they look at it like that. If you come from the projects you know you ain't nothing, you ain't about nothing, and they [other people] do that. And it's wrong but they do that.

Although Roscoe had recently been released from a year in disciplinary school at the time of this study, he clearly recognized that his new neighborhood was safer for him than DuBois Towers. After stating that police come by regularly to move people standing on the corners on his new street, he added:

> If I was still down there [at DuBois] I don't think, I don't think I'd still be alive right now. [I: Why do you say that? What kind of things went on there?] Just crazy stuff like, there's guns, drugs. Just the average kid's day.

In spite of these clear gains, most DuBois Section 8 movers lacked social ties with their new neighbors. Several of them reported missing the easy social relationships they had formed at DuBois. Having only lived in their new neighborhoods for 2–3 years and having fewer casual opportunities of getting acquainted with people, the Section 8 respondents for the most part reported having no ties with their neighbors and did not exchange support or information with them as they had at DuBois. Hope, who raised her four children at DuBois for 14 years, described her own issues in relating to her new neighbors:

> They're not as friendly [as those at DuBois]. And, and they may feel the same way about me. It may be me. You know, 'cause I may be shut off, 'cause I just, you speak, everybody around here speaks and stuff. But it's just not the same. You know how you grew up and you met people, and you knew them. And just don't connect with [the new people], you don't connect.

Although the Section 8 respondents moved to neighborhoods where 14 percent of adults were unemployed (compared with 37 percent at DuBois and 25 percent for those who moved to public housing developments), none of the Section 8 respondents 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 DuBois. Low-income people typically use strong ties when looking for jobs; thus the Section 8 relocatees may not have considered using the weak ties with their neighbors for this purpose (Granovetter, 1995; Elliott, 1999; Kleit, 2001a). Not having ties with neighbors poses a problem not only for the families but also for policy prescriptions concerning the dispersal of public housing tenants. The findings of this study suggest that the assumptions about former public housing tenants benefiting from job contacts with their more successful neighbors may not be entirely realistic, at least in the short term.

The gains for DuBois children who moved to Section 8 housing were tempered by losses as well. Although public housing developments are usually sites of concentrated poverty, they can also be well supplied with free or affordable activities and programs for children. At DuBois Towers it was easy for children and adolescents to participate in recreational and educational activities because they were nearby. In addition, their mothers or other adults frequently got them involved in the programs through their own participation in or knowledge of them. Because the parents were not as connected to institutions or people in the new neighborhoods, it was more difficult for the young people to participate in the activities that existed. Moreover, some of the adolescents reported that they either did not know about activities at the local recreation centers or felt uncomfortable about getting involved. For example, 14-year-old Ray lives near one of the city recreation centers that is located in a neighborhood where drug-related violence has recently escalated. He explained why he started avoiding this center:

> But, it wasn't, it wasn't too fun there because it was a lot of violence in the park. [I: Like what kind of things?] Well, they used to be dog fights, used to fight with dogs. Then you played basketball, a certain team lose, they start shooting around there. So it wasn't too fun to go around there.

Moving to a new neighborhood can often involve moving to a new school. Although the neighborhood elementary school serving DuBois Towers offered many recreational activities, it was one of the worst academically in the city. Transferring could have been an improvement, academically. Attending a new school seems likely to make it easier for students to get to know others, especially for elementary or middle school students who attend schools in their neighborhoods. Yet, despite these possible gains, nearly all of the high school-age respondents (both Section 8 and public housing relocatees) chose to attend the two high schools that serve the DuBois Towers area, so they experienced no change in their school environments.

The lack of local social ties among parents affected the adolescents' relationships as well. Their parents rarely knew the parents of their new friends, and the adolescents interviewed did not know the adults in the neighborhood as they had at DuBois Towers. While the children and adolescents clearly benefited from less frequent gunfire in their

new neighborhoods, many of them reported feeling less safe because they lacked protection from their social networks.

Nevertheless, in the long run, moving to Section 8 housing may turn out to benefit the children and adolescents in DuBois families. Less exposure to violence and drug dealing and more exposure to working adults is likely to positively affect at least some of the children. Furthermore, living in neighborhoods where their peers are more likely to attend school and score higher on academic assessment tests may improve their academic achievement relative to their counterparts who moved to public housing. They are still, however, living in neighborhoods where one out of every three people is poor.

Discussion

The findings of this study suggest that at least in the short term, the DuBois relocation seems to have created winners and losers. The families in the public housing group apparently have lost the most. Any support networks built on close local ties were imploded with DuBois itself, and tenants did not gain much with their move to other public housing developments. Their bid to maintain the status quo left them, on average, with few improvements to their economic and social situations. However, the Section 8 families, who were (for the most part) already better situated in terms of human capital, landed in neighborhoods that may eventually prove to provide fuller opportunity structures than would have been available at DuBois Towers. It is worrisome, in this regard, that so few reported forming social ties in their new neighborhoods.

Many of the adults and teens interviewed seem to have learned a repertoire of cultural rules and cues that enabled them to survive at DuBois Towers. This repertoire aided families economically and also helped them to protect themselves against violence. Although these rules and practices vary within families and by individual, they are also community specific, with different rules for different neighborhoods (Young, 1999). This concept is very important to keep in mind in considering the outcomes for adults and teens who moved into neighborhoods that by objective measures would seem to promise more opportunities for social mobility. Although several of the interviewees successfully transferred the repertoire of social skills they used at DuBois to form ties in their new neighborhoods, others appeared to be more socially and economically isolated and less able to protect themselves against violence (albeit reduced) in the new neighborhoods. Will these relocated public housing residents be able to break into the social structures of the new neighborhoods and benefit from the social capital there? How long is this process likely to take? Can families who move from public housing benefit from having a higher proportion of employed neighbors if they cannot connect with the local social structure?

This study has explored what happens to public housing residents' social capital when they move out of large distressed public housing developments, such as those the HOPE VI program specifically targets. Relocated tenants, especially adults, who come to Section 8 housing appear to have a difficult time re-creating their social networks in such a way as to take advantage of the resources in their less poor neighborhoods. This inability to become a part of the local social structure, at least in the short term, may help account for the lack of dramatic effects on family outcomes for families in housing mobility programs, after controlling for individual-level variables. Policymakers should bear these considerations in mind when they attempt to enhance self-sufficiency by moving families out of concentrated poverty areas. Although opportunity structure is affected by place, it is not clear how long it takes for relocated families to gain the benefits of spatially specific social capital.

For the adults in particular, the delay in building social connections is the missing link. The regression models predicting individual-level income measures from neighborhood-level variables found no effect, net of individual-level controls. The small size of the sample or the short timeframe of the research after the move may have contributed to the lack of effect. The interview data, however, suggest another cause: the lack of a social structure linking what happens at the neighborhood level to individual outcomes. The qualitative data stresses over and over again the difficulty of rebuilding local ties in a short time period after forcible relocation. This task appears to be most difficult for adults with older children, but even teenagers have a hard time rebuilding community connections.

The implications of a lack of a social transmission mechanism for neighborhood effects are most concerning for families who move into economically diverse neighborhoods through housing voucher programs. The new neighborhoods of DuBois residents who chose to stay in conventional public housing do not offer very different opportunities from what they had at DuBois. The new neighborhoods of the Section 8 families do appear to offer better opportunities. But if relocated families are not connected with their neighbors and so are not exchanging information, and if teenagers do not have ties with employed adult neighbors who can provide a crucial job contact, then the higher percentage of employed residents at the block-group level may have little effect on individual outcomes. Without a social structure in place how do these new opportunities get translated from the neighborhood social environment to individuals?

Implications for Policy and Practice

Some generalizations emerge from the findings in this study that may inform policies and practices in local housing authorities. This section focuses on the specific situation of public housing families who are relocated due to public housing rebuilding or poverty deconcentration programs. Several researchers have written comprehensive reports about improving the Section 8 program in general or revamping the public housing system (Turner, Popkin, and Cunningham, 2000; Marcuse, 1998; Nenno, 1998). The policy implications discussed here concern two main areas: choosing a relocation subsidy and establishing connections in new neighborhoods.

Choosing a Relocation Subsidy

The findings of this study suggest that HOPE VI has the potential to do more than it is doing. Currently, HOPE VI efforts are targeted toward deconcentrating poverty at selected distressed public housing sites, a goal that it is probably achieving at DuBois and at most sites. Of equal concern, however, are the tenants who have been relocated, temporarily or permanently, from the HOPE VI site. It is important to ensure that public housing tenants who are about to be relocated clearly understand the differences between what the different subsidies offer and what the cost may be, so that they can make informed decisions.

First, tenants who move from public housing need to be aware that a Section 8 subsidy may be their best option if they want to move to a less impoverished neighborhood that may offer improved opportunities for themselves and their families. The use of Section 8 subsidies to relocate HOPE VI families varies from site to site and from city to city, and the public housing infrastructure and real estate market of the larger metropolitan area may limit its utilization. Thus there is no one-size-fits-all solution to the issue of relocation from HOPE VI sites. But it is clear that moving people from one public housing development into another does little or nothing to deconcentrate poverty. Currently, half of all HOPE VI relocatees move to other public housing developments (Kingsley,

Johnson, and Pettit, 2002). Although the poverty rate at these developments may be somewhat lower than at the prerevitalization HOPE VI sites, clearly the mobility potential for these families is not being fully realized.

Affected tenants should also be aware of the extra cost of living in a Section 8 unit, which may be too much for some families to take on. The adults interviewed for this study who chose to move with a Section 8 subsidy seemed to be on a different social mobility trajectory than those who went to another public housing development. These families seemed better prepared to take on the extra costs and the extra financial management that living in a Section 8 unit requires. Respondents who chose to move to another public housing development reported very real concerns about going the Section 8 route. Some of these concerns came from second- or third-hand stories about landlords or from fears of possible future cutbacks in the Section 8 program.[18] Moreover, the Section 8 option may not work for those who are relocating on a fixed income, such as elderly tenants or tenants with disabilities. And it may not work for those with a sketchy rent payment history, since many private landlords would understandably not be willing to take on an unreliable tenant.

The scattered-site option may provide a middle way for families who may not feel prepared to move to the next step of covering all of their own utility bills or other market costs. Some housing authorities have used this tool to disperse poor families in more affluent neighborhoods; while in other housing authorities, the scattered-site stock is concentrated in poor neighborhoods (see Briggs, 1998; Kleit, 2001b). Housing authorities may want to place more emphasis on this option.

When public housing tenants are forced to move from their homes, it is important to balance their neighborhood and housing preferences and to preserve their freedom to choose the kind of subsidy that fits best with their situations. The HUD goal of poverty deconcentration should be included in this balancing act. The Section 8 relocatees in this study moved to neighborhoods that were relatively much less poor than DuBois Towers, but their neighborhood poverty rate, on average, remains in the moderate to high poverty range (Khadduri, 2001). Policy can increase poverty deconcentration for Section 8 relocatees by influencing both the demand and supply sides of the equation. Right now, housing mobility through Section 8 (now called the Housing Choice Voucher program) is the main tool available for desegregation and for deconcentration of poverty. More targeted and extensive housing counseling and case management can assist families in moving to unfamiliar but less poor neighborhoods. On the supply side, outreach and improvements in Section 8 management can make participation in the Section 8 program more attractive to landlords with units in more affluent areas (Turner, Popkin, and Cunningham, 2000).

Establishing Connections in New Neighborhoods

The findings also suggest that housing authorities need to do more to help relocated families connect with institutions in their new neighborhoods and to foster stronger cross-status ties in economically and/or racially diverse neighborhoods. This kind of activity is needed in both newly redeveloped HOPE VI sites and in the neighborhoods where affected families relocate. Targeted counseling during the relocation may help. For those families who continue to live in public housing, these connections can be encouraged through supportive services that are eligible for funding under HOPE VI implementation grants. Up to 20 percent of the HOPE VI grant may be spent on supportive services, but local housing authorities have averaged only approximately 9 percent in recent years (Epp, 1998; National Housing Law Project, 2002).

Families who are going to be permanently relocated need to connect with institutions such as recreation centers, afterschool programs, and other community-based organizations in their new neighborhoods. Giving families specific information on the resources in their neighborhoods as well as introducing them to neighborhood leaders like block captains can help to reduce the anonymity of a new neighborhood. Counselors should also inform those relocatees who have new responsibilities for utility costs of utility assistance programs.

Ongoing counseling for relocated families can also assist with school transitions for the children. Sometimes families who move from a public housing site choose to keep their children in their former schools because the schools are something familiar in a time of change or because they are concerned that a new school may not offer the specialized services that their children need. A counselor who provides information about new local schools and works with the families to ensure that their children will get the services they need may help more families feel comfortable about transferring their children to schools in their new neighborhoods. Assisting relocated families in rebuilding social ties with new neighbors and new institutions may go a long way in building positive social capital that can facilitate social mobility.

Future Research

Current research projects are addressing many of the areas analyzed in this study. Research on families who participated in the MTO program is ongoing, and because these families moved more than 5 years ago, it is now possible for researchers to examine longer term outcomes for both adults and children. Researchers are following up on these families with closed-ended surveys and with indepth interviews to examine the processes through which change may be occurring. Furthermore, longitudinal research studies that use both qualitative and quantitative methods are continuing to follow families who move through the HOPE VI program. Most of these studies address issues such as social integration for adults and children as well as schooling and employment outcomes. However, there is still much to learn.

Choosing schools is part of managing opportunities for one's children. Moving to a less poor neighborhood can be an opportunity to move one's children into better schools, but parents do not always consider this option. For example, only two of the Section 8 relocatees interviewed for this study had thought about their children's school options before choosing their new neighborhoods. Findings from a recent study of MTO in all five cities indicate that families who move to other neighborhoods, even low-poverty neighborhoods, sometimes continue sending their children to schools in the high-poverty neighborhoods where they used to live (Popkin, Harris, and Cunningham, 2001). This situation raises some important questions. What kind of tradeoffs do parents in this situation think about when they choose between transferring their children and keeping them in their old school? How can counseling help these relocated families make these decisions?

Another set of policy considerations emerges from the fact that throughout the process of HOPE VI relocation, many tenants have been "lost" to the administrative systems of housing authorities. Some of these residents were evicted, some are probably still in public or Section 8 housing but undetected by the data system, and some have moved to the private housing market voluntarily. Who decides to take this latter option? Have they had the ability to rent or own in the private market for some time and simply needed this "push" to move out on their own? Understanding their transition and their ability to find and retain housing can be informative for the people who eventually will no longer be eligible for Section 8 housing. Looking more carefully at all families affected by HOPE VI can inform relocation procedures in many ways.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded through a HUD doctoral dissertation research grant, the Otto and Gertrude K. Pollak Summer Research Fellowship, and the Philadelphia Housing Authority.

Author

Susan Clampet-Lundquist received her Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Pennsylvania. She is currently a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for Research on Child Wellbeing at Princeton University.

Notes

1. The name of the public housing development and the names of the respondents are pseudonyms.
2. Both scattered-site and conventional-site public housing are managed by the local housing authority.
3. In 1999 the Section 8 program was officially changed to the Housing Choice Voucher program. However, all of the respondents in this study, as well as the public housing officials interviewed, still refer to it as the Section 8 program, so this is the terminology used in this article.
4. Many apartments were vacant at the time PHA applied for HOPE VI funding to destroy the development.
5. The PHA administrative database was used to compare the basic demographic characteristics of DuBois tenants who refused to participate in the study with those of the study participants in January 1997, approximately 2 years before relocation. The median family size for refusers was one member fewer than for participants, the median income for refusers was $740 more than for participants, and the median age of refusers was 1 year less than for participants.
6. According to a needs assessment survey of former DuBois households, 98 percent were headed by African Americans, and 89 percent were headed by women (Philadelphia Health Management Corporation, 2000).
7. Households are missing from the data for a variety of reasons. Some may no longer be living in federally subsidized housing. One of the interviewees from the qualitative sample was among the missing, and because she is still in Section 8 housing, she is clearly missing in error. A large portion of the missing were probably evicted. Some households who matched into the January 1997 database but were missing in January 2001 had a very high rent balance due compared to the rest of the DuBois and Northfield tenants. On average, they owed more than $3,000, compared to around $600 for the rest of the tenants.
8. This would make the household heads at least ages 19–64 by January 2001.
9. *t*-Tests were run on the neighborhood variables for the whole population to explore the degree to which the sample was representative of the population of DuBois families. The associations between neighborhood characteristics and subsidy types were exactly the same as the sample's.
10. Income can be difficult to pin down. Low-income people can receive income contributions from a variety of sources, such as earnings from employment, food stamps, cash assistance, Social Security, Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), and network sources (Edin and Lein, 1997). The interview protocol listed potential income categories and asked residents into what category they thought that their monthly income

fell. It is likely that people who were working did not include their EITC, for example, because this amount comes in one check after filing the income tax form, so it is unlikely to consider EITC in terms of monthly income. Nonetheless, the EITC contribution alone could boost an individual's monthly income by $150–250.

11. This figure is the 1999 poverty guideline.
12. One of the assumptions for this *t*-test for small sample sizes is that the population standard deviations are equal. Although similar for some variables, they are quite dissimilar for others. Related to this, some of the respondents are clustered in block groups. The 23 Section 8 families live in 18 block groups, while the 13 public housing families live in 8 block groups. In spite of these difficulties the *t*-tests produced the same results as an *F* test for ANOVA models run with these same variables.
13. This method, rather than weighting the block groups equally by averaging, was used because three buildings were in one block group and one building was in the other.
14. Unfortunately, the PHA database contains few variables. Significantly for this study, it lacks educational attainment, a crucial factor for predicting current income. However, it seems unlikely that its addition would have changed the relationship between the dependent variables and the neighborhood-level or subsidized housing variables. It may very well have increased the fit of the model and been a significant coefficient, but it probably would not have made the neighborhood-level variables significant.
15. Public housing group (n = 34); Section 8 group (n = 61).
16. These 1990 Census measures are from the two block groups DuBois spanned.
17. Measured 3 years before their move.
18. As of April 2003 current and future Section 8 tenants in Philadelphia can only use their voucher for 7 years. (PHA has made an exception for elderly and disabled tenants.) There is currently no time limit for living in public housing.

References

Bauman, J.F. 1987. *Public housing, race, and renewal: Urban planning in Philadelphia, 1920–1974.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bennett, L., and A. Reed, Jr. 1999. The new face of urban renewal: The Near North Development Initiative and the Cabrini Green neighborhood. In *Without justice for all: The new liberalism and our retreat from racial equality,* edited by A. Reed, Jr. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Billy, J.O.G., K.L. Brewster, and W.R. Grady. 1994. "Contextual effects on the sexual behavior of adolescent women," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56:387–404.

Brewster, K.L., J.O.G. Billy, and W.R. Grady. 1993. "Social context and adolescent behavior: The impact of community on the transition to sexual activity," *Social Forces* 71:713–740.

Briggs, X. de Souza. 1998. "Brown kids in white suburbs: Housing mobility and the many faces of social capital," *Housing Policy Debate* 9(1):177–221.

———. 1997. "Moving up versus moving out: Neighborhood effects in housing mobility programs," *Housing Policy Debate* 8(1):195–234.

Brooks-Gunn, J., G.J. Duncan, P.K. Klebanow, and N. Sealand. 1993. "Do neighborhoods influence child and adolescent development?" *American Journal of Sociology* 99:353–395.

Coulton, C.J., and S. Pandey. 1992. "Geographic concentration of poverty and risk to children in urban neighborhoods," *American Behavioral Scientist* 35:238–257.

Crane, J. 1991. "The epidemic theory of ghettos and neighborhood effects on dropping out and teenage childbearing," *American Journal of Sociology* 96:1226–1259.

Edin, K., and L. Lein. 1997. *Making ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ellen, I.G., and M.A. Turner. 1997. "Does neighborhood matter? Assessing recent evidence," *Housing Policy Debate* 8(4):833–864.

Elliott, J.R. 1999. "Social isolation and labor market insulation: Network and neighborhood effects on less-educated urban workers," *Sociological Quarterly* 40(2):199–216.

Epp, G. 1998. Emerging strategies for revitalizing public housing communities. In *New directions in urban public housing,* edited by D.P. Varady, W.F. Preiser, and F.P. Russell. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

Granovetter, M.S. 1995. *Getting a job: A study of contacts and careers.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hogan, D.P., and E.M. Kitagawa. 1985. "The impact of social status, family structure, and neighborhood on the fertility of Black adolescents," *American Journal of Sociology* 90:825–855.

Jencks, C., and S. Mayer. 1990. The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighborhood. In *Inner city poverty in the United States,* edited by L.E. Lynn, Jr., and G.H. McGeary. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Kasinitz, P., and D. Hillyard. 1995. "The old-timers' tale: The politics of nostalgia on the waterfront," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 24(2):139–164.

Khadduri, J. 2001. "Deconcentration: What do we mean? What do we want?" *Cityscape* 5(2):69–84.

Kingsley, G.T., J. Johnson, and K.L.S. Pettit. 2002. Spatial patterns in relocation: HOPE VI relocation national study. Paper presented at the Urban Affairs Annual Meeting, March 2002, Washington, DC.

Kleit, R.G. 2001a. "The role of neighborhood social networks in scattered-site public housing residents' search for jobs," *Housing Policy Debate* 12(3):541–573.

———. 2001b. "Neighborhood relations in suburban scattered-site and clustered public housing," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23(3):409–430.

Ku, L., F.L. Sonenstein, and J.H. Pleck. 1993. "Neighborhood, family, and work: Influences on the premarital behaviors of adolescent males," *Social Forces* 72:479–503.

Lincoln, Y.S., and E.G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Marcuse, P. 1998. Mainstreaming public housing: A proposal for a comprehensive approach to housing policy. In *New directions in urban public housing,* edited by D.P. Varady, W.F.E. Preiser, and F.P. Russell. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research Press.

National Housing Law Project. 2002. False HOPE: A critical assessment of the HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program. Press release. June 2002.

Nenno, M. 1998. New directions for federally assisted housing: An agenda for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In *New directions in urban public housing,* edited by D.P. Varady, W.F.E. Preiser, and F.P. Russell. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research Press.

Nicholas, P. 1999. Towering reminders of failure to fall soon. *The Philadelphia Inquirer,* 4 June, B1.

Orr, L., J. Feins, R. Jacob, E. Beecroft, L. Sanbonmatsu, L. Katz, J. Liebman, and J. Kling. 2003. *Moving to Opportunity: Interim impacts evaluation.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Philadelphia Health Management Corporation. 2000. *W.E.B. DuBois Towers Redevelopment Project needs assessment, final report.* Philadelphia: Philadelphia Health Management Corporation.

Popkin, S., V. Gwiasda, L. Olson, D. Rosenbaum, and L. Buron. 2000. *The hidden war: Crime and the tragedy of public housing in Chicago.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Popkin, S., L. Harris, and M. Cunningham. 2001. *Families in transition: A qualitative analysis of the MTO experience.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Popkin, S., J. Rosenbaum, and P. Meaden. 1993. "Labor market experiences of low-income black women in middle-class suburbs: Evidence from a survey of Gautreaux program participants," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 12(3):556–573.

Rubinowitz, L.S., and J.E. Rosenbaum. 2000. *Crossing the class and color lines: From public housing to white suburbia.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tienda, M. 1991. Poor people and poor places: Deciphering neighborhood effects on poverty outcomes. In *macro-micro linkages in sociology,* edited by J. Huber. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Turner, M.A., S. Popkin, and M. 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 (HUD). 2002. "National fact sheet, FY 2001 HOPE VI Revitalization Grant awards," www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/grants/fy01/natl_factsheet.pdf. Accessed November 22, 2002.

Welfeld, I. 1998. Gautreaux: Baby steps to opportunity. In *New directions in urban public housing,* edited by D.P. Varady, W.F.E. Preiser, and F.P. Russell. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research Press.

Wood, A.R. 1999. Memories come crashing down within a minute. *The Philadelphia Inquirer,* 18 October, B1.

Young, A., Jr. 1999. "The (non)accumulation of capital: Explicating the relationship of structure and agency in the lives of poor black men," *Sociological Theory* 17(2):201–227.