

# **PRRAC**

*Poverty & Race Research Action Council*

1200 18th St. NW • Suite 200 • Washington, DC 20036 • 202/906-8023 • Fax 202/842-2885  
[www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org)

---

---

## **Annotated Bibliography: Residential Preferences & Race**

### **August 2010**

---

Prepared by Caaminee Pandit, PRRAC Policy Intern

<b>BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND REPORTS ON RACIAL PREFERENCES.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND REPORTS ON THE MALLEABILITY OF RACIAL PREFERENCES' AND PREFERENCES RELATION TO BEHAVIOR .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND REPORTS ON DEMAND FOR INTEGRATED HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES IN LOW-INCOME AREAS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND REPORTS ON RETURNING TO PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE XI) ....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Books, Articles, and Reports on Racial Preferences

**Lawrence Bobo & Camille Zubrinsky, *Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice?*, 74 Soc. Forces, 883-909 (1996), <http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/soc/faculty/bobo/pdf%20documents/AttRes.pdf>.**

Abstract: Residential segregation, especially of blacks from whites, remains the common pattern in urban America. This research examines the part that popular attitudes on residential integration may play in the process of residential integration/segregation. Using data from a large multiethnic sample survey in Los Angeles, we examine three hypotheses about the nature of attitudes toward residential integration. The perceived economic status difference hypothesis holds that attitudes about racial residential integration rest upon assumptions about likely class background differences between ethnic groups. The mere in-group preference hypothesis suggests that ethnocentrism results in mutual across-group preferences for residential contact with in-group members. The prejudice hypothesis suggests that hostile attitudes toward an out-group shape views on residential integration. Little evidence in support of the perceived economic status difference and mere in-group preference hypotheses can be found. Theories of prejudice, in particular Blumer's theory of group position, provide much greater leverage on residential integration attitudes. We discuss the implications of the results for actual behavior and aggregate patterns of racial residential segregation.

**Lawrence Bobo et al., *Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, 1992-1994 [Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles]*, (Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI), 2000.**

Summary: The Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality was designed to broaden the understanding of how changing labor market dynamics, racial attitudes and stereotypes, and racial residential segregation act singly and in concert to foster contemporary urban inequality. This data collection comprises data for two surveys: a survey of households and a survey of employers. Multistage area probability sampling of adult residents took place in four metropolitan areas: Atlanta (April 1992-September 1992), Boston (May 1993-November 1994), Detroit (April-September 1992), and Los Angeles (September 1993-August 1994). The combined four-city data file in Part 1 contains data on survey questions that were asked in households in at least two of the four survey cities. Questions on labor market dynamics included industry, hours worked per week, length of time on job, earnings before taxes, size of employer, benefits provided, instances of harassment and discrimination, and searching for work within particular areas of the metropolis in which the respondent resided. Questions covering racial attitudes and attitudes about inequality centered on the attitudes and beliefs that whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians hold about one another, including amount of discrimination, perceptions about wealth and intelligence, ability to be self-supporting, ability to speak English, involvement with drugs and gangs, the fairness of job training and educational assistance policies, and the fairness of hiring and promotion preferences. Residential segregation issues were studied through measures of neighborhood quality and satisfaction, and preferences regarding the racial/ethnic mix of neighborhoods. Other topics included residence and housing, neighborhood characteristics, family income structure, networks and social functioning, and interviewer observations. Demographic information on household respondents was also elicited, including length of residence, education, housing status, monthly rent or mortgage payment, marital status, gender, age, race, household composition,

citizenship status, language spoken in the home, ability to read and speak English, political affiliation, and religion. The data in Part 2 represent a telephone survey of current business establishments in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles carried out between spring 1992 and spring 1995 to learn about hiring and vacancies, particularly for jobs requiring just a high school education. An employer size-weighted, stratified, probability sample (approximately two-thirds of the cases) was drawn from regional employment directories, and a probability sample (the other third of the cases) was drawn from the current or most recent employer reported by respondents to the household survey in Part 1. Employers were queried about characteristics of their firms, including composition of the firm's labor force, vacant positions, the person most recently hired and his or her salary, hours worked per week, educational qualifications, promotions, the firm's recruiting and hiring methods, and demographic information for the respondent, job applicants, the firm's customers, and the firm's labor force, including age, education, race, and gender.

**Camille Zubrinsky Charles, *Can We Live Together? Racial Preferences and Neighborhood Outcomes*, in THE GEOGRAPHY OF OPPORTUNITY: RACE AND HOUSING CHOICE IN METROPOLITAN AMERICA at 45-80 (Xavier de Souza Briggs ed., 2005).**

Summary: This article begins with a review of recent trends in racial attitudes, paying particular attention to attitudes related to neighborhood racial composition and neighborhood preferences. This is followed by an analysis of both patterns of preferences among whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians and the primary forces driving those preferences, using newly available MCSUI survey data from four of the nation's largest metropolitan areas: Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles. The article ends with a consideration of the implications of racial attitudes and preferences for efforts to reshape the geography of race and reduce racial inequality.

**Nancy A. Denton & Douglas S. Massey, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Harvard University Press 1993).**

Summary: *American Apartheid* shows how the black ghetto was created by whites during the first half of the twentieth century in order to isolate growing urban black populations. It goes on to show that, despite the Fair Housing Act of 1968, segregation is perpetuated today through an interlocking set of individual actions, institutional practices, and governmental policies. In some urban areas the degree of black segregation is so intense and occurs in so many dimensions simultaneously that it amounts to "hypersegregation." The authors demonstrate that this systematic segregation of African Americans leads inexorably to the creation of underclass communities during periods of economic downturn. Under conditions of extreme segregation, any increase in the overall rate of black poverty yields a marked increase in the geographic concentration of indigence and the deterioration of social and economic conditions in black communities. As ghetto residents adapt to this increasingly harsh environment under a climate of racial isolation, they evolve attitudes, behaviors, and practices that further marginalize their neighborhoods and undermine their chances of success in mainstream American society. This book is a sober challenge to those who argue that race is of declining significance in the United States today.

**Ingrid Gould Ellen, *Continuing Isolation: Segregation in America Today*, in SEGREGATION: THE RISING COSTS FOR AMERICA at 268 (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty eds., 2008).**

**Summary:** In this article, Ellen provides an overview of trends in segregation over the past century and summarizes possible causes of racial and ethnic segregation in the present-day United States. It focuses largely on black-white segregation but also explores how the bundle of causes of segregation may differ for other racial and ethnic groups.

**Farley, Reynolds, Howard Schuman, S. Bianchi, Diane Colasanto, and S. Hatchett.** *Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs: Will the Trend toward Racially Separate Communities Continue?* 7 SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, 319, 319-44 (1978).

**Abstract:** Since the 1960s, John Kain's theory of spatial mismatch has influenced policy responses to the poor employment prospects of low-income and minority residents of inner cities by aiming to connect them with suburban jobs. This literature review examines this policy legacy using what we now know about disadvantaged jobseekers' employment searches. Recent evaluations of poverty deconcentration and employment accessibility programs show that these programs have failed to improve employment outcomes significantly. However, using evidence from studies of job search and job training programs, this article shows that local activity patterns do shape employment chances. Planners trying to improve employment outcomes for the disadvantaged should focus on policies that will provide them with opportunities to interact with a diverse social network and meet workforce intermediaries capable of linking them with jobs.

**Maria Krysan & Reynolds Farley,** *The Residential Preferences of Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?*, 80 SOC. FORCES, 937-80 (2002).

**Abstract:** For many decades, it has been argued that the U.S. remains racially segregated because of discrimination in the real-estate market reflecting whites' desire to isolate themselves from African Americans. The only modest declines in black-white segregation since the prohibition of such discrimination in 1968 have provoked a competing hypothesis: residential segregation persists because blacks prefer to live in racially isolated neighborhoods and are reluctant to live in largely white areas. These ideas have not been subject to empirical scrutiny. We use open- and closed-ended survey data from more than 2,000 African Americans in the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality to examine blacks' preferences and the important related issue of what drives those preferences. We find that African Americans overwhelmingly prefer 50-50 areas, a density far too high for most whites — but their preferences are driven not by solidarity or neutral ethnocentrism but by fears of white hostility. Moreover, almost all blacks are willing to move into largely white areas if there is a visible black presence. White preferences also play a key role, since whites are reluctant to move into neighborhoods with more than a few African Americans.

**Schelling, Thomas C,** *Dynamic Models of Segregation*, 1 JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICAL SOCIOLOGY 143, 143-186 (1971).

**Abstract:** Some segregation results from the practices of organizations, some from specialized communication systems, some from correlation with a variable that is non-random; and some results from the interplay of individual choices. This is an abstract study of the interactive dynamics of discriminatory individual choices. One model is a simulation in which individual members of two recognizable groups distribute themselves in neighborhoods defined by reference to their own locations. A second model is analytic and deals with compartmented space. A final section applies the analytics to 'neighborhood tipping? The systemic effects are found, to be overwhelming; there is no simple correspondence of individual incentive to collective results, Exaggerated separation and patterning result from

the dynamics of movement. Inferences about individual motives can usually not be drawn from aggregate patterns. Some unexpected phenomena, like density and vacancy, are generated. A general theory of 'tipping' begins to emerge.

## **Books, Articles, and Reports on the Malleability of Racial Preferences' and Preferences Relation to Behavior**

**Lawrence Bobo & Camille Zubrinsky, *Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice?*, 74 Soc. Forces, 883-909 (1996), <http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/soc/faculty/bobo/pdf%20documents/AttRes.pdf>.**

**Abstract:** Residential segregation, especially of blacks from whites, remains the common pattern in urban America. This research examines the part that popular attitudes on residential integration may play in the process of residential integration/segregation. Using data from a large multiethnic sample survey in Los Angeles, we examine three hypotheses about the nature of attitudes toward residential integration. The perceived economic status difference hypothesis holds that attitudes about racial residential integration rest upon assumptions about likely class background differences between ethnic groups. The mere in-group preference hypothesis suggests that ethnocentrism results in mutual across-group preferences for residential contact with in-group members. The prejudice hypothesis suggests that hostile attitudes toward an out-group shape views on residential integration. Little evidence in support of the perceived economic status difference and mere in-group preference hypotheses can be found. Theories of prejudice, in particular Blumer's theory of group position, provide much greater leverage on residential integration attitudes. We discuss the implications of the results for actual behavior and aggregate patterns of racial residential segregation.

**Lawrence Bobo et al., *Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, 1992-1994 [Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles]*, (Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI), 2000.**

**Summary:** The Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality was designed to broaden the understanding of how changing labor market dynamics, racial attitudes and stereotypes, and racial residential segregation act singly and in concert to foster contemporary urban inequality. This data collection comprises data for two surveys: a survey of households and a survey of employers. Multistage area probability sampling of adult residents took place in four metropolitan areas: Atlanta (April 1992-September 1992), Boston (May 1993-November 1994), Detroit (April-September 1992), and Los Angeles (September 1993-August 1994). The combined four-city data file in Part 1 contains data on survey questions that were asked in households in at least two of the four survey cities. Questions on labor market dynamics included industry, hours worked per week, length of time on job, earnings before taxes, size of employer, benefits provided, instances of harassment and discrimination, and searching for work within particular areas of the metropolis in which the respondent resided. Questions covering racial attitudes and attitudes about inequality centered on the attitudes and beliefs that whites,

Blacks, Latinos, and Asians hold about one another, including amount of discrimination, perceptions about wealth and intelligence, ability to be self-supporting, ability to speak English, involvement with drugs and gangs, the fairness of job training and educational assistance policies, and the fairness of hiring and promotion preferences. Residential segregation issues were studied through measures of neighborhood quality and satisfaction, and preferences regarding the racial/ethnic mix of neighborhoods. Other topics included residence and housing, neighborhood characteristics, family income structure, networks and social functioning, and interviewer observations. Demographic information on household respondents was also elicited, including length of residence, education, housing status, monthly rent or mortgage payment, marital status, gender, age, race, household composition, citizenship status, language spoken in the home, ability to read and speak English, political affiliation, and religion. The data in Part 2 represent a telephone survey of current business establishments in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles carried out between spring 1992 and spring 1995 to learn about hiring and vacancies, particularly for jobs requiring just a high school education. An employer size-weighted, stratified, probability sample (approximately two-thirds of the cases) was drawn from regional employment directories, and a probability sample (the other third of the cases) was drawn from the current or most recent employer reported by respondents to the household survey in Part 1. Employers were queried about characteristics of their firms, including composition of the firm's labor force, vacant positions, the person most recently hired and his or her salary, hours worked per week, educational qualifications, promotions, the firm's recruiting and hiring methods, and demographic information for the respondent, job applicants, the firm's customers, and the firm's labor force, including age, education, race, and gender.

**David Card et al., *Tipping and the Dynamics of Segregation in Neighborhoods and Schools (2006)*,  
[http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/facseminars/pdfs/2006\\_09-22\\_Rothstein.pdf](http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/facseminars/pdfs/2006_09-22_Rothstein.pdf).**

Abstract: In a classic paper Schelling (1971) showed that extreme segregation can arise from social interactions in preferences: once the minority share in a neighborhood exceeds a “tipping point”, all the whites leave. We use regression discontinuity methods and Census tract data from the past four decades to test for the presence of discrete non-linearities in the racial dynamics of neighborhoods. White mobility patterns in most cities exhibit tipping-like behavior, with a range of tipping points centered around a 13% minority share. Similar patterns emerge from an analysis of school-level data over the 1990s. A variety of specifications rule out the possibility that the discontinuity in the initial minority share is driven by income stratification or other factors, pointing to an important role for white preferences over neighbors’ race and ethnicity in the dynamic process of racial segregation. Finally, we relate the location of the estimated tipping points in different cities to measures of the racial attitudes of whites, and find that cities with more racially tolerant whites have higher tipping points.

**Camille Zubrinsky Charles, *Can We Live Together? Racial Preferences and Neighborhood Outcomes, in THE GEOGRAPHY OF OPPORTUNITY: RACE AND HOUSING CHOICE IN METROPOLITAN AMERICA at 45-80 (Xavier de Souza Briggs ed., 2005)*.**

Summary This article begins with a review of recent trends in racial attitudes, paying particular attention to attitudes related to neighborhood racial composition and neighborhood preferences. This is followed by an analysis of both patterns of preferences among whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians and the primary forces driving those preferences, using newly available MCSUI survey data from four of the nation’s largest metropolitan areas: Atlanta,

Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles. The article ends with a consideration of the implications of racial attitudes and preferences for efforts to reshape the geography of race and reduce racial inequality.

**W.A. Clark, Residential Segregation in American Cities: A Review and Interpretation, 5 Population Research & Policy Review, 95, 95 -127 (1986)**

Abstract: Despite the intensity of the recent debate between Clark and Galster, there is considerable agreement that there are multiple forces which create the patterns of residential separation found in American cities, and that government or public discrimination plays a minor role. The differences between Clark and Galster relate to the relative weight to be given to private discrimination and the role of preferences in explaining the patterns of racial separation. The actual weight to be given to private discrimination is yet to be specified.

**Ingrid Gould Ellen, *Continuing Isolation: Segregation in America Today*, in SEGREGATION: THE RISING COSTS FOR AMERICA at 268 (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty eds., 2008).**

Summary: In this article, Ellen provides an overview of trends in segregation over the past century and summarizes possible causes of racial and ethnic segregation in the present-day United States. It focuses largely on black-white segregation but also explores how the bundle of causes of segregation may differ for other racial and ethnic groups.

**Farley, Reynolds, Howard Schuman, S. Bianchi, Diane Colasanto, and S. Hatchett. *Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs: Will the Trend toward Racially Separate Communities Continue?* 7 SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, 319, 319-44 (1978).**

Abstract: Since the 1960s, John Kain's theory of spatial mismatch has influenced policy responses to the poor employment prospects of low-income and minority residents of inner cities by aiming to connect them with suburban jobs. This literature review examines this policy legacy using what we now know about disadvantaged jobseekers' employment searches. Recent evaluations of poverty deconcentration and employment accessibility programs show that these programs have failed to improve employment outcomes significantly. However, using evidence from studies of job search and job training programs, this article shows that local activity patterns do shape employment chances. Planners trying to improve employment outcomes for the disadvantaged should focus on policies that will provide them with opportunities to interact with a diverse social network and meet workforce intermediaries capable of linking them with jobs.

**Lance Freeman, *Displacement or Succession?: Residential Mobility in Gentrifying Neighborhoods* 40 URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW 463, 489 (2005).**

Abstract: This article examines the extent to which gentrification in U.S. neighborhoods is associated with displacement by comparing mobility and displacement in gentrifying neighborhoods with mobility and displacement in similar neighborhoods that did not undergo gentrification. The results suggest that displacement and higher mobility play minor if any roles as forces of change in gentrifying neighborhoods. Demographic change in gentrifying neighborhoods appears to be a consequence of lower rates of intraneighborhood mobility and the relative affluence of in-movers.

**Pat Rubio Goldsmith, *Learning Apart, Living Apart: How the Racial and Ethnic Segregation of***

**Schools and Colleges Perpetuates Residential Segregation, 112 Tchrs. C. Rec. 1605-1606 (2010).**

Summary: Despite a powerful civil rights movement and legislation barring discrimination in housing markets, residential neighborhoods remain racially segregated. This study examines the extent to which neighborhoods' racial composition is inherited across generations and the extent to which high schools' and colleges' racial composition mediates this relationship. To understand the underlying social processes responsible for racial segregation, I use the spatial assimilation model, the place stratification model, and perpetuation theory. Data for this project are from the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS), the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and the U.S. Census.

A longitudinal design tracks the racial composition of the schools, colleges, and neighborhoods from adolescence through age 26. Holding constant the percent white in teenagers' neighborhoods, socioeconomic status, and other variables, the percent white that students experience in high school and college has a lasting influence, affecting the percent white in young adult neighborhoods and explaining 31% of intergenerational continuity of neighborhood racial composition. The analyses suggest that racial segregation in high schools and colleges reinforces racial segregation in neighborhoods.

**David Harris, "Property Values Drop When Blacks Move in, Because...": Racial and Socioeconomic Determinants of Neighborhood Desirability 64 AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW 461, 461-479 (1999).**

Abstract: Are housing prices lower in neighborhoods with high concentrations of black residents? If so, is this relationship evidence of pure discrimination, or can it be explained by considering nonracial neighborhood traits? These questions derive their importance from the link between mobility patterns and residential segregation, and the consequent relationship between high levels of segregation and a host of deleterious outcomes. I assess the magnitude and motivations of racial aversion by conducting a hedonic price analysis of geocoded data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. I find clear evidence of lower property values in neighborhoods with relatively high proportions of black residents. However, whether it is blacks' race or their socioeconomic status that affects property values depends on whether housing units are rented or owner-occupied.

**Keith Ihlanfeldt & Benjamin Scafidi, Whites' Neighborhood Racial Preferences and Neighborhood Racial Composition in the United States: Evidence from the Multi-City Study of Inequality, 19 HOUSING STUDIES 325, 325-359 (2004).**

Abstract: Within the housing segregation literature major disagreements have developed over two fundamental issues: (1) the role that whites' aversion to racially mixed neighbourhoods plays in causing modern segregation in the US; and (2) the factors that underlie this aversion, including the effects of inter-racial contact on whites' neighbourhood racial preferences and whether these preferences reflect neighbourhood stereotyping as opposed to pure racial prejudice. Extant evidence on these issues is either old or indirect. This paper provides direct evidence on these issues using new data from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality. The results suggest that (1) whites' neighbourhood racial preferences play an important role in explaining the racial composition of their neighbourhoods; (2) inter-racial contact in neighbourhoods and workplaces leads to a greater willingness among whites to live with blacks; and (3) although younger and more educated whites express a stronger taste for integration than other whites, the magnitude of these differences leads to only a small increase in the black percentage of the neighbourhood. In addition, the results provide no evidence in support of the hypothesis that whites stereotype black neighbourhoods rather than blacks per se.

**Maria Krysan, *Confronting Racial “Blind Spots”* POVERTY & RACE (2008),  
[http://www.prrac.org/full\\_text.php?text\\_id=1193&item\\_id=11275&newsletter\\_id=101&header=Housing&kc=1](http://www.prrac.org/full_text.php?text_id=1193&item_id=11275&newsletter_id=101&header=Housing&kc=1).**

Summary: Maria Krysan and her colleagues at the Univ. of Illinois at Chicago and University of Michigan have developed a new concept of “racial blind spots” to further our understanding of residential racial preferences. Krysan conducted surveys in Chicago and Detroit, and found that whites, blacks, and Hispanics know more about communities in which their coethnics reside. Blacks and Hispanics are more likely than whites to know about both integrated and segregated communities. Their blind spots are neighborhoods that are predominantly white and geographically far from the inner-city, which poses a blatant impediment for minority group members hoping to integrate into such communities. Whites are least likely to know about strongly-minority communities, but their blind spots also include racially mixed communities, even those in which whites are majorities. Stable integration depends on housing demand from all racial groups, and as long as these neighborhoods remain blind spots, barriers to integration will continue.

**Maria Krysan & Reynolds Farley, *The Residential Preferences of Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?*, 80 SOC. FORCES, 937-80 (2002).**

Abstract: For many decades, it has been argued that the U.S. remains racially segregated because of discrimination in the real-estate market reflecting whites' desire to isolate themselves from African Americans. The merely modest declines in black-white segregation since the prohibition of such discrimination in 1968 have provoked a competing hypothesis: residential segregation persists because blacks prefer to live in racially isolated neighborhoods and are reluctant to live in largely white areas. These ideas have not been subject to empirical scrutiny. We use open- and closed-ended survey data from more than 2,000 African Americans in the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality to examine blacks' preferences and the important related issue of what drives those preferences. We find that African Americans overwhelmingly prefer 50-50 areas, a density far too high for most whites - but their preferences are driven not by solidarity or neutral ethnocentrism but by fears of white hostility. Moreover, almost all blacks are willing to move into largely white areas if there is a visible black presence. White preferences also play a key role, since whites are reluctant to move into neighborhoods with more than a few African Americans.

**Schelling, Thomas C, *Dynamic Models of Segregation*, 1 Journal of Mathematical Sociology 143, 143-186 (1971).**

Abstract: Some segregation results from the practices of organizations, some from specialized communication systems, some from correlation with a variable that is non-random; and some results from the interplay of individual choices. This is an abstract study of the interactive dynamics of discriminatory individual choices. One model is a simulation in which individual members of two recognizable coups distribute themselves in neighborhoods defined by reference to their own locations. A second model is analytic and deals with compartmented space. A final section applies the analytics to `neighborhood tipping'? The systemic effects are found, to be overwhelming; there is no simple correspondence of individual incentive to collective results, Exaggerated separation and patterning result from the dynamics of movement. Inferences about individual motives can usually not be drawn from aggregate patterns. Some unexpected phenomena, like density and vacancy, are generated. A general theory of `tipping' begins to emerge.

**Jeffrey Timberlake, *Still Life in Black and White: Effects of Racial and Class Attitudes on Prospects for Residential Integration in Atlanta*, 70 SOCIOLOGICAL INQUIRY 420 (2000).**

Abstract: I use the 1993 Atlanta Survey of Urban Inequality to evaluate the effects of five types of racial and class attitudes on assessments of the desirability of residential integration: (1) preferences for neighbors of the same race, (2) perceived racial differences in social class characteristics, (3) Whites' perceptions of group threat from Blacks, (4) Blacks' perceptions of discrimination, and (5) negative racial stereotypes. For Whites the strongest predictors of resistance to integration are negative racial stereotypes and perceptions of group threat from Blacks. For Blacks in-group preferences, negative racial stereotypes and, to a small extent, beliefs that Whites tend to discriminate against other groups are positively associated with resistance to integration. I conclude by arguing that since racial attitudes are linked to attitudes about residential integration, open housing advocates should focus their efforts on addressing persistent racial mistrusts and prejudices.

**Bob Van Meter, *CDCs in Gentrifying Neighborhoods*. 133 SHELTERFORCE ONLINE (2004),  
<http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/133/gentrify.html>.**

Summary: CDCs have for decades thrived in working-class and middle-class urban neighborhoods. They grew out of urban renewal battles, tenant organizing efforts and community organizing. The model of a community-controlled development entity was attractive to activists from a variety of neighborhoods. These organizations have worked to preserve affordable housing, develop new housing and organize tenants, among other activities. Today, many of those CDCs are now situated in gentrifying neighborhoods and face questions, internally and externally, about defining their role in this new environment. Van Meter expands on the critical role CDCs must play to ensure gentrification does not occur at the harm of their residents.

**John Yinger, *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination* (Russell Sage Foundation 1995).**

Summary: Nearly three decades after the passage of the Fair Housing Act, illegal housing discrimination against blacks and Hispanics remains rampant in the United States. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost* reports on a landmark nationwide investigation of real estate brokers, comparing their treatment of equally qualified white, black, and Hispanic customers. Yinger also shows how deeply housing discrimination can affect the living conditions, education, and employment of black and Hispanic Americans. Deprived of residential mobility and discouraged from owning their own homes, many minority families are unable to flee stagnant or unsafe neighborhoods. Two thirds of black and Hispanic children are concentrated in high-poverty schools where educational achievement is low and dropout rates are high. The employment possibilities for minority job-seekers are diminished by the ongoing movement of jobs from the cities to the suburbs, where housing discrimination is particularly severe. Altogether, these effects of housing discrimination create a vicious cycle—discrimination imposes social and economic barriers upon blacks and Hispanics, and the resulting hardships fuel the prejudice that leads whites to associate minorities with neighborhood deterioration.

## **Books, Articles, and Reports on Demand for Integrated Housing Opportunities in Low-Income Areas**

### **Stefanie DeLuca & Peter Rosenblatt, *Walking Away from “The Wire”: Residential Mobility and Opportunity in Baltimore* (Johns Hopkins University, Working Paper, 2010).**

Abstract: Prior research shows that African-Americans often live in poor segregated neighborhoods, even after moving. This occurs despite potential intervening factors, such as housing choice vouchers or increases in individual education, income, or wealth. Explanations for this pattern vary from structural constraints, such as discrimination in housing markets, to arguments about same race preferences. We explore these competing explanations for continued segregation using new data from the partial remedy to the *Thompson v. HUD* desegregation case in Baltimore. We examine how public housing families respond to the receipt of vouchers designated for use in low-poverty, majority-white neighborhoods. Findings indicate that low income black families from public housing projects *will* move to more integrated neighborhoods if given the chance and assistance, and many will stay in these neighborhoods for years. Eventually, a small proportion of families move to neighborhoods that are less white, but these areas are significantly less poor and less segregated than original communities. Our findings demonstrate that it is possible to help poor minority families relocate to better neighborhood conditions, in contrast to observational research, which demonstrates patterns of repeat mobility between poor neighborhoods. We also discuss current findings in light of past mobility studies, such as those based on Chicago's *Gautreaux* program and the federal Moving to Opportunity demonstration.

### **Stefanie DeLuca & James Rosenbaum, *If low-income blacks are given a chance to live in white neighborhoods, will they stay? Examining mobility patterns in a quasi-experimental program with administrative data* 14 Hous. Pol'y. Debate 305 (2003).**

Abstract: After describing the distinctive features of various policy models of residential mobility, we examine the long-term outcomes of the Gautreaux program. Administrative records provide baseline characteristics for all participants, and we located recent addresses for over 99 percent of a random sample of 1,506 participants an average of 14 years after original placement.

Although 84 percent of the families made subsequent moves, the racial composition of the current address is strongly related to program placement, even among movers, and after family attributes and premove neighborhood characteristics are controlled. Combined with our prior findings, these results suggest that residential mobility has an enduring, long-term impact on the residential locations of these families. Contrary to models that assume that families' enduring preferences will quickly erase these moves, these results suggest the need for further research to consider whether mobility alters preferences or structural barriers.

### **Jason DeParle, *An Underground Railroad From Projects to Suburbs*, N.Y. TIMES, Dec. 1, 1993, <http://partners.nytimes.com/library/national/120193projectflight-housing.html>.**

Summary: In this article, DeParle discusses the success of the Gautreaux program and the Federal Government's plan to take the mobility program national. This small Chicago program has helped the black residents of public housing quietly flee to a

suburban world that promises more jobs, better schools and safer streets. With the Federal Government planning to spend \$234 million in the next two years to help about 6,200 poor families move to middle-class neighborhoods come questions about whether the program has really accomplished as much as its supporters suggest and whether its achievements can be duplicated. Admirers of the Chicago effort say it is one of the few answers that has actually passed a field test. They point to an encouraging, though limited, body of research that suggests that families who receive rent subsidies that allow them to live in the suburbs earn more and do better in school after leaving the cities.

The national program, though limited in size, cuts against decades of Federal housing policy that has helped isolate poor minorities in increasingly dangerous and desperate areas. And it comes as leaders from President Clinton on down are searching for solutions to the inner-city poverty and violence that he discussed recently in a Memphis speech.

***Choosing a Better Life? Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration* (John Goering & Judith Feins eds., Urban Institute, 2003).**

Summary: As the centerpiece of policymakers' efforts to "deconcentrate" poverty in urban America, the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) project gave roughly 4,600 volunteer families the chance to move out of public housing projects in deeply impoverished neighborhoods in five cities—Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. Researchers wanted to find out to what extent moving out of a poor neighborhood into a better-off area would improve the lives of public housing families. *Choosing a Better Life?* is the first distillation of years of research on the MTO project, the largest rigorously designed social experiment to investigate the consequences of moving low-income public housing residents to low-poverty neighborhoods. In this book, leading social scientists and policy experts examine the legislative and political foundations of the project, analyze the effects of MTO on lives of the families involved, and explore lessons learned from this important piece of U.S. social policy.

***Edward Goetz, Clearing the Way: Deconcentrating the Poor in Urban America* (Urban Institute, 2003).**

Summary: Over the past three decades, the concentration of poverty in America's inner cities has exacerbated a wide range of social problems. School delinquency, school dropout, teenage pregnancy, out of wedlock childbirth, violent crime, and drug abuse are magnified in neighborhoods where the majority of residents are poor. In response, policymakers have embarked on a large and coordinated effort to "deconcentrate" its urban poor by dispersing the residents of subsidized housing. Despite the clean logic of these policies, however, deconcentration is not a clean process. In *Clearing the Way*, Edward Goetz goes beyond the narrow analysis that has informed the debate so far, using the experience of Minneapolis-Saint Paul to explore the fierce political debate and complicated issues that arise when public housing residents are dispersed, sometimes against their will. Along the way, he explores the cases deconcentrating the poor, the programs used to pursue this goal, and the research used to evaluate their success. *Clearing the Way* offers important lessons for policymakers, activists, and anyone interested in poverty in America.

**Susan Popkin and Mary Cunningham, CHAC Section 8 Program: Barriers to Successfully**

***Leasing Up, (The Urban Institute, Washington, DC), 1999.***

Summary:

Because of the challenges the agency faces in creating a successful Section 8 program and serving large numbers of CHA relocatees, CHAC staff are particularly concerned about identifying the barriers participants face in finding units. Their goal is both to improve their current services to better help clients overcome these barriers and to understand more about the special needs of their changing population. The Urban Institute conducted six focus groups with Section 8 enrollees who had failed to find units between June 1996 and June 1998. This report presents the results of these groups and makes recommendations that may help improve CHAC's success rate.

Generally, they find that many CHAC families face significant challenges when searching for housing. These include financial barriers (costs of public transportation, credit checks, and security deposits); limited time to search, particularly for employed participants; large family sizes; personal problems (lack of communication skills, substance abuse, family members with criminal backgrounds, and illness and disability); and discrimination.

In addition to these barriers, participants experienced problems dealing with the Section 8 program itself. The program is very complex and many participants clearly were confused about program rules and guidelines, despite having attended the briefing session and receiving information packets. Finally, a number of participants complained that CHAC staff seemed unresponsive and that it was often difficult for them to contact their housing specialists either by phone or in person.

***Florence Roisman & Hilary Botein, Housing Mobility and Life Opportunities, 27 CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW 335, 1993.***

Abstract:

Many poor people of color in the United States are isolated and segregated in neighborhoods that are egregiously underserved by government and private facilities. The social conditions associated with the isolation and segregation are devastating: terrible housing, inadequate schools, dangerous conditions, lack of employment opportunities, rampant disease, and high and early mortality. The isolation and segregation were set in place and long maintained by a hostile, dominant white majority: by laws requiring segregation, and by violence and pervasive public and private arrangements enforcing it. This article discusses one effective way of redressing segregation and isolation: housing mobility programs. These programs have been used in several communities to enable poor people of color to leave segregated, impoverished, underserved areas for predominantly white neighborhoods with better facilities and resources. Housing mobility has been remarkably successful in enabling people to improve their lives. Although mobility is not the only remedy for separate and unequal neighborhoods, it is crucially important. This article reviews the value of housing mobility, the nature of existing housing mobility programs, and ways in which advocates can participate in creating and implementing housing mobility programs.

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

Summary:

From 1976 to 1998, the Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program moved over 7,000 low-income black families from Chicago's inner city to middle-class white suburbs—the largest and longest-running residential, racial, and economic integration effort in American history. *Crossing the Class and Color Lines* is the story of that project, from the initial struggles and discomfort of the relocated families to their eventual successes in employment and

education—cementing the sociological concept of the "neighborhood effect" and shattering the myth that inner-city blacks cannot escape a "culture of poverty."

**Margery Turner, *Moving Out of Poverty: Expanded Mobility and Choice through Tenant-Based Housing Assistance*, 9 Hous. Pol'y Debate 373, 386 (1998).**

**Abstract:** Historically, federal housing policy has contributed to the concentration of poverty in urban America. Moving out of poverty is not the right answer for every low-income family, but tenant-based housing assistance (Section 8 certificates and vouchers) has tremendous potential to help families move to healthier neighborhoods. This article explores the role of tenant-based housing assistance in addressing the problem of concentrated inner-city poverty. The Section 8 program by itself does not ensure access to low-poverty neighborhoods, particularly for minority families. Supplementing certificates and vouchers with housing counseling and search assistance can improve their performance; a growing number of assisted housing mobility initiatives are now in place across the country. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) should continue to fund these initiatives and increase their number over time. HUD should also strengthen incentives for all housing authorities to improve locational outcomes in their Section 8 programs.

**Margery Turner & Stephen Ross, *How Racial Discrimination Affects the Search for Housing*, in THE GEOGRAPHY OF OPPORTUNITY at 81-100 (Xavier de Souza Briggs ed., 2005)**

**Summary:** The authors argue that sustaining homeownership for minorities is just as important as attaining homes in the first place. In their chapter, they describe: homeownership among people of color and its value in helping minorities build wealth and financial security, and how the home mortgage market evolved from one dominated by credit discrimination and shortages to one that freely grants credit. They also explain how changes in the lending market fostered predatory lending and the concentration of predatory lending in communities of color. They discuss how predatory lending impairs minority borrowers' ability to retain their homes and harms their surrounding communities, and at the end of the chapter, the authors propose policies to make minority homeownership sustainable.

### Books, Articles, and Reports on Returning to Public Housing (HOPE XI)

*Academic Perspectives on the Future of Public Housing: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Hous. & Cmtly. Opportunity of the H. Comm. on Fin. Servs., #<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2009) (statement of Edward Goetz, Director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota),*  
<http://financialservices.house.gov/media/file/hearings/111/goetz.pdf>.

**Summary:** As Congress and HUD begin to think about expanding or changing the HOPE VI program into the "Choice Neighborhoods" initiative, Goetz testifies on the current research and evaluations of the HOPE VI program. He presents research findings on improving neighborhood conditions through HOPE VI and on the effects of HOPE VI on the original residents of redeveloped public housing. He supplies explanations for the limited individual-level benefits of HOPE VI redevelopment, expands upon the disparate impact of public housing demolition, and ultimately provides federal policy recommendations.

**The Administration's Proposal to Revitalize Severely Distressed Public and Assisted Housing: The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Hous. & Cmty. Opportunity of the H. Comm. on Fin. Servs., #<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2010) (statement of Edward Goetz, Director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota),**

[https://financialservices.house.gov/media/file/hearings/111/goetz\\_march\\_2010\\_testimony.pdf](https://financialservices.house.gov/media/file/hearings/111/goetz_march_2010_testimony.pdf).

Summary: A the government moves toward expanding HOPE VI through the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Act, Goetz testifies that the current version of the Act seems to be an attempt to replicate the positive neighborhood effects of the HOPE VI program without incorporating meaningful provisions to protect or enhance the well-being of families displaced during the redevelopment process. He explains that some, but not all, of the lessons learned from HOPE VI and other public housing transformations have been integrated into CNIA, and provides a summary of those lessons that the CNIA left out. He offers recommendations to modify the existing CNIA draft bill as well as an alternative approach to CNIA.

**National Housing Law Project, Sherwood Research Associates, Poverty & Race Research Action Council, Everywhere and Now Public Housing Residents Organizing Nationally Together (ENPHRONT), *False HOPE: A Critical Assessment of the HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program*, June 2002.**

Summary: These four organization produced a report that provides background on HOPE VI and expands on the problems with the program. The program is operating on too loose a definition of “severely distressed public housing,” and thus it is nearly impossible to determine whether HOPE VI is making meaningful progress towards solving the problem of severely distressed public housing because it is not clear which developments are severely distressed. The program also worsens acute, has few meaningful opportunities for resident participation , excludes public housing families from HOPE VI opportunities, and provides a lack of data on HOPE VI outcomes. The authors end by providing policy recommendations for HOPE VI reform.

**Susan Popkin, Diane Levy, Laura Harris, Jennifer Comey, Mary Cunningham, & Larry Buron, *HOPE VI Panel Study: Baseline Report*, (The Urban Institute, Washington, DC), Sept. 2002, [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410590\\_HOPEVI\\_PanelStudy.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410590_HOPEVI_PanelStudy.pdf).**

Summary: The HOPE VI program is the major federal initiative driving the transformation of distressed public housing developments nationwide. Under HOPE VI, distressed developments are being demolished and replaced with mixed-income housing. Like welfare reform, this transformation offers both the potential to improve the quality of life for low-income households and the risk that an unknown proportion of families may be unable to make a successful transition. In particular, HOPE VI has the potential to have a major impact—positive or negative—on the lives of the many poor children who live in distressed public housing.

Congress commissioned the *HOPE VI Panel Study* in 1999 to address the question of how this transformation affects the lives of original residents of HOPE VI developments—those living in the developments prior to the grant award.<sup>1</sup> The study involves tracking the living conditions and well-being of residents from five developments where revitalization activities began in mid- to late 2001. This report describes the status of these residents at baseline, prior to relocation.

**Susan Popkin, Bruce Katz, Mary K. Cunningham, Karen D. Brown, Jeremy Gustafson, & Margery Austin Turner, *A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges*, (The Urban Institute, Washington, DC), May 18, 2004,  
[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411002\\_HOPEVI.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411002_HOPEVI.pdf).**

Summary: This report reviews the existing research literature on both the achievements and the challenges of the HOPE VI program. It seeks to help inform the ongoing debate on HOPE VI by pulling together a wide array of research to address the critical questions about the program's achievements, impacts, and the lessons it offers for public housing policy. In the absence of a comprehensive evaluation, they draw on the considerable evidence available from targeted efforts to examine different aspects of the HOPE VI program. This evidence includes large-scale studies carried out by the Urban Institute on resident outcomes, Abt Associates' baseline and interim assessments, the recent attempts to assess neighborhood impacts by the Brookings Institution and the Housing Research Foundation, as well as the many smaller studies by local evaluators and related research on mobility and scattered-site housing. In their view, this evidence strongly supports continuation of the HOPE VI approach as a way to improve outcomes for distressed developments, residents, and neighborhoods.

**Robin Smith, *Housing Choice for HOPE VI Relocated. Final Report*, (The Urban Institute, Prepared for the U.S. Dep't of Hous. & Urban Dev., Washington, DC), April 2002,  
[http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/410592\\_HOPEVI\\_Relocatedes.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/410592_HOPEVI_Relocatedes.pdf).**

Summary: This study, *Housing Choice for HOPE VI Relocatedes*, highlights the housing choices made by former residents in four cities (Baltimore, MD; Louisville, KY; San Antonio, TX; and Seattle, WA) who used housing vouchers to move from developments reconstructed under the HOPE VI program. The issues addressed in this study include: decision-making strategies; search processes; neighborhood selection criteria; available housing choices; the effects of relocation on the respondents and the affected communities; and any difficulties related to the relocation experience. Focus groups were held with different segments of the relocatee respondent population at each of the four sites including persons who stayed close to their public housing developments and those who moved to neighborhoods away from their original developments. We used these focus groups to examine various aspects of the relocation process including where residents chose to live and influences and constraints on their housing choices.