Urban Affairs Review

**Building "Community" in Mixed-Income Developments :
Assumptions, Approaches, and Early Experiences**

Building "Community" in Mixed-Income Developments

Assumptions, Approaches, and Early Experiences

Robert J. Chaskin
University of Chicago
Mark L. Joseph
Case Western Reserve University

As an urban-redevelopment strategy, the goals of mixed-income development are often talked about in terms of building "community"—the shaping of environments, opportunities, and social arrangements that promote healthy neighborhood life, particularly for the low-income people who live there. This article explores the strategies engaged, expectations for, and early responses to efforts to build "community" in three mixed-income developments being built on the footprint of former public housing developments in Chicago. In doing so, it investigates the expectations among residents and stakeholders, distills and explores three major strategic orientations being engaged by developers and their partners, and examines how these strategies in particular—and the building of community more generally—is playing out across sites, including the dynamics and conditioning factors that promote or inhibit participation, engagement, interaction, and the shaping of social cohesion and social control.

Keywords: *community building; mixed income; public housing*

In cities across the United States and Western Europe, policy makers are turning to mixed-income development—the construction of housing developments with a mix of subsidized and market-rate homes and apartments—as

299

a means of deconcentrating urban poverty, often replacing high-density public housing (Bailey et al. 2006; Galster 2007; Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007; Khadduri 2001; Kleit 2005; Musterd and Anderson 2005; Popkin et al. 2004). As a redevelopment strategy, mixed-income development is fundamentally about transforming urban neighborhoods formerly characterized by high levels of deprivation, isolation, and the concentration of social problems—poverty, crime, deteriorating housing, poor services, weak institutional infrastructures—into safer, more sustainable, better-functioning neighborhoods that are meant to provide access to a better quality of life for low-income families and the opportunity for people with a variety of levels of income and wealth to benefit from living there. These goals are often talked about in terms of building "community"—the shaping of environments, opportunities, and social arrangements that promote healthy neighborhood life (Naparstek, Dooley, and Smith 1997; Naparstek et al. 2000). But what does this mean, and what are reasonable expectations for building community within the context of mixed-income developments?

Community, in the context of urban neighborhoods and the process of urbanization more broadly, can be construed in different ways, and has been a point of theoretical debate and empirical investigation since the emergence of sociology as a discipline (see Chaskin [1997]; Sampson [1999] for reviews). Although clearly a spatial unit (as difficult as it may be to determine precise boundaries to everyone's satisfaction), urban neighborhoods are also seen as social units in several ways. For example, they may be seen as symbolic and affective units of identity and belonging (Park 1982 [1936]; Zorbough 1926; Firey 1982 [1945]; Hunter 1974); functional sites for the production and consumption of social goods and processes[1]—such as religion, education, socialization, social control, institutional participation, and mutual support (Warren 1978; Shaw and McKay 1942; Suttles 1972; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Guest and Lee 1983); contexts for the development and utilization of social norms, social networks, and social capital (Sampson 1999); and sites of investment, disinvestment, and political contention shaped by actors in the broader political economy as well as of potential mobilization and political action from within (Molotch 1976; Suttles 1990; Warren 2001; DeFillipis, Fisher, and Shragge 2006; Sites, Chaskin, and Parks 2007).

As a response to the problems of urban poverty, community is invoked in at least two ways. First, it is invoked as a critical context to be both taken account of and changed. Following on the heels of the publication of William Julius Wilson's influential 1987 book *The Truly Disadvantaged*, two decades of research has been generated seeking to clarify the nature,

extent, and causal relationships between living in particular neighborhood circumstances and a range of individual and developmental outcomes (see Gephardt [1997]; Small and Newman [2001]; Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley [2002] for reviews). Although findings are complex and hotly debated, these investigations into "neighborhood effects" suggest that both compositional factors (e.g., concentrated poverty, housing quality, crime, residential stability) and aspects of social organization (e.g., collective efficacy, social networks, and organizational participation) have an impact on the well-being and developmental trajectories of neighborhood residents, especially children and youth. Second, community is invoked as a unit of belonging and action that can be mobilized to effect change, in which the resources, skills, priorities, and participation of community members can be drawn on to inform, shape, and contribute to solutions to social problems and efforts to improve neighborhood life as it is affected by both material circumstances and social dynamics.

"Community building" approaches to addressing poverty have proliferated since the late 1980s, supported by both philanthropic and public-sector initiatives, and have drawn on both of these orientations, seeking to reshape the circumstances of disadvantaged communities through investments in material development and by mobilizing community-level action. Spearheaded initially by philanthropy, for example, a large number of comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs) have been launched that seek to revitalize neighborhoods through the combination of a comprehensive focus on community needs and circumstances and a focus on "community building" by supporting resident participation, promoting collaboration among community-serving organizations, and fostering social interaction and networks of support among community members (Kubisch et al. 1997; Kubisch et al. 2002; Kingsley, McNeely, and Gibson 1997; Chaskin et al. 2001; Briggs 2002). The basic principles behind these efforts have also been reflected (rhetorically at least) in public-sector efforts such as the federal Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community programs and the HOPE VI Urban Demonstration Program, though with a relatively greater emphasis on commercial and industrial development and creating employment opportunities in the former, and focusing on housing, the physical environment, and support services to foster self-sufficiency and community integration in the latter (Naparstek et al. 2000; Joseph and Levy 2001; Popkin et. al. 2004).

In practice, in addition to supporting a range of targeted community-development and service strategies (from housing production to job training to counseling and support services), CCIs have relied on various

combinations of several broad strategies: leadership and human capital development; organizational development and capacity building; community organizing, mobilization, and advocacy; and interorganizational collaboration and support (Chaskin 2001; Chaskin et al. 2001). These approaches all seek to build community capacity and human and social capital in disadvantaged communities, and to connect them to structures of opportunity beyond the neighborhood. In addition, some community development efforts (HOPE VI among them) draw on New Urbanist design principles and assumptions which suggest that particular aspects of the physical environment—e.g., diversity of population, land use, building and unit size and type; access to common "civic" space; pedestrian-friendly roads and pathways—can enhance and promote social interaction, positive interpersonal networks, and community cohesion (Bohl 2000; Day 2003; Jacobs 1961; Katz 1994; Leccese and McCormick 1999; Talen 2002).

"Community" in Mixed-Income Developments: Orientations and Expectations

The goals, as well as the possibilities and challenges, of building community in distressed urban neighborhoods are thrown into particular relief in the context of mixed-income development responses to the failures of public housing. In the most positive light, mixed-income development in these contexts is extolled as a way to reshape both blighted urban neighborhoods and the opportunities and quality of life of low-income people living there—building both human capital and social capital; providing safe, healthy environments; and connecting poor people to supports, relationships, and opportunity (Epp 1996; Naparstek, Dooley, and Smith 1997; Naparstek et al. 2000; von Hoffman 1996). In the most critical views, such policies are essentially a return to Urban Renewal, promoting the "displacement and containment of poor people of color" (Smith and Stovall 2008, 135) and the appropriation of public housing for market-driven development that benefits the middle class and affluent at the expense of the most disadvantaged (Fraser and Kick 2007; Imbroscio 2008).

Orientations and expectations for mixed-income development as a response to urban poverty in general, and to the problems of public housing in particular, differ significantly. While some focus on the possible impacts on the *people* who end up living in the new developments, others focus more broadly on the impact of the redevelopments on the *places*—neighborhoods and inner cities—around them. However, much of the emphasis on the

potential benefits of mixed-income development focuses on expectations for what may be gained by public-housing residents living among working, middle-class, and more affluent residents. Essentially, these expectations focus on what the "mix" might provide for the development of social capital, the establishment and maintenance of social control, the reshaping of normative expectations (toward work and self-sufficiency), and the availability of quality goods and services (Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007). It should also be noted that, along with possible beneficial impacts on low-income families, mixed-income development also presents potential downsides to these very same families. Increased stigma and monitoring, a relative loss of local power and influence, and the demoralizing effects of relative deprivation could characterize the experiences of public housing residents in mixed-income developments (Briggs 1997; Patillo 2007).

Briefly, arguments for the potential benefits of income mix as they relate to notions of building community fall into four broad categories. First, *social capital* arguments focus on the ways in which people living in concentrated poverty may suffer from the limitations of relatively closed, dense social networks which, while potentially useful for providing social support and mutual assistance, lack "weak ties" or "bridging" relationships that connect them to the networks of others, and that may provide access to information and opportunity not available to them through their own relational networks (Granovetter 1973, 1983; Gittel and Vidal 1998; Lin and Dumin 1986; Briggs 1998a; Kleit 2001, 2002). Living in mixed-income communities may provide the opportunity for interaction with people who have more diverse relational networks and the potential, through such interaction, to benefit from them. Second, *social control* arguments suggest that, since crime is highly correlated with socioeconomic status, residential stability, and homeownership (Sampson and Groves 1989), and higher-income people may be more likely to exert pressure to maintain order and enforce rules (Rosenbaum, Stroh, and Flynn 1998), the presence of higher-income residents may promote a context of greater safety and a foundation for more harmonious community dynamics. Third, arguments about the establishment and maintenance of "mainstream" *social norms and expectations* suggest that the presence of higher-income people may contribute to the modification of aspirations and behavior toward more prosocial engagement in community and society and the possibility of upward mobility (Wilson 1987; Anderson 1990; Kasarda 1990). These three orientations are also connected, and may contribute, to the nature and level of "collective efficacy" in these contexts—the ways in which social ties are activated to act on shared norms, trust, and the perceived willingness of neighbors to

intervene in response to neighborhood problems (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997; Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2002). Fourth, arguments about *political and market influence* suggest that the presence of higher-income residents can attract greater investment and the provision of higher quality and more responsive services from both public- and private-sector sources, because of their greater financial resources, social connections, and political engagement, which will lead to improvements in the physical, service, and organizational infrastructure of local communities (Logan and Molotch 1987; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997; Khadduri 2001). (For a more detailed exploration of these theoretical arguments and an assessment of empirical evidence to date, see Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber [2007].)

These arguments notwithstanding, there is to date little empirical evidence about the outcomes experienced by low-income families in mixed-income communities, or agreement on the strategies that might help foster positive outcomes within these contexts, or clarity about the extent to which those involved in shaping them—developers, service providers, housing authorities, residents—share these expectations. The evidence that does exist about social interaction across income levels in mixed-income developments suggests that such interaction is limited (Brophy and Smith 1997; Buron et al. 2002; Hogan 1996; Joseph 2008; Kleit 2005; Ryan et al. 1974). This suggests some need for caution with regard to shaping expectations for building community in these contexts, to the extent that such expectations rely on cross-group social interactions. There are also questions about how to think about responsibility for promoting community building within these contexts.[2] Although the broad goal of building "community" (in the sense of shaping the physical environment and promoting social dynamics that are conducive to fostering well-functioning neighborhoods that can contribute to the quality of life of residents) is clearly a component of mixed-income development schemes, the extent to which these efforts conceptualize the task or adopt an explicitly "community-building" orientation and set of strategies—particularly with regard to notions of participatory planning, problem-solving, and community action—is less clear. Although development teams and service providers engaged in this work shoulder some responsibility for thinking strategically and providing inputs that seek to foster positive community dynamics, they have different orientations to this work, and different assessments about what is possible, and from whom.

What can mixed-income development strategies be expected to accomplish on this front? To what extent are they really about recreating urban

neighborhoods and building community—beyond the physical production of housing and infrastructure? How are low-income families expected to benefit from these redevelopments? What are the strategies being engaged to work toward such goals? How are they being received (recognized, acted on, embraced or resisted) by the people living in these places? In this article, we seek to provide some early answers to these questions in the context of three mixed-income development sites being created in place of former public housing complexes in the city of Chicago.

First, we explore the rationale for and expectations of the creation of mixed-income developments as expressed by a broad range of stakeholders (developers, service providers, housing authority officials, public housing advocates, and the range of residents currently living in these sites, from market-rate owners and renters to relocated public housing residents).[3] Second, we examine the different strategic orientations to "building community," however that is defined, across the three sites. Finally, we explore how these strategies in particular—and the building of community more generally—is playing out across sites.

Method, Sample, and Analysis

The analysis presented here is based on in-depth interviews, field observations, and a review of documentary data concerning three mixed-income developments that are being built in place of public housing complexes that have been demolished as part of the Chicago Housing Authority's Plan for Transformation, launched in 1999. These three developments—Oakwood Shores, Park Boulevard, and Westhaven Park—offer a useful illustration of mixed-income development in the context of Chicago's Plan for Transformation, providing insight into how these efforts are playing out within different types of developments and neighborhoods and managed by different developers through varying organizational arrangements (see table 1 for a summary comparison of the three developments). *Oakwood Shores*, for example, is the development taking the place of Ida B. Wells/ Madden Park, one of the oldest public housing developments in Chicago (and, unlike the others, a low-rise development). It will be the largest of the three new developments and is being developed by a national organization, The Community Builders, which has significant experience creating and managing mixed-income housing around the country. *Park Boulevard* represents the transformation of Stateway Gardens, one of the more notorious high-rise public housing developments in the country, in which the

Table 1
Units by Housing Category and Site

	Oakwood Shores	Park Boulevard	Westhaven Park
Developer(s)	The Community Builders / Granite	Stateway Associates, LLC	Brinshore Michaels
Total units	3,000	1,316	1,317
CHA units (#/%)	1000/33	439/33	824/63
Affordable units (#/%)	680/23	437/33	132/10
Market-rate units (#/%)	1,320/44	439/33	36/27
% For-sale	27	50	23
Service provider	The Community Builders, UJIMA	Stateway Community Partners	TASC, Project Match

Note: CHA = Chicago Housing Authority
Source: Chicago Housing Authority, 2008

development plan includes the creation of a nonprofit organization to manage the social-support and community-building efforts in the new development. *Westhaven Park* is the second phase of the redevelopment of Henry Horner Homes, the first phase of which started prior to the Plan for Transformation. Units produced in the initial, pre-Transformation phase were only for public housing residents, so ultimately the new development will have a larger proportion of public housing residents (63%) than any other site. It will also have the lowest proportion of for-sale units (27%).

Interviews were conducted with a total of 111 individuals. This includes 47 key informants involved in some way in the Transformation, either as "development-team" stakeholders (developers, service providers, and property managers), as "community stakeholders" (such as service providers, community activists, and public officials active in the neighborhoods in which developments are being built), or as participants and active observers operating at the city level in connection with the Transformation (including officials with the Chicago Housing Authority and public housing advocates). Interviews were also conducted with 65 residents of different housing tenures, including 23 relocated public-housing residents, 21 residents of "affordable" units (either rented or owned, subsidized by tax credits), and 21 residents of "market-rate" units (again, either rented or owned).[4] The socioeconomic differences between upper-income and lower-income residents in these developments is more extreme than in many mixed-income redevelopments of public housing, and in some cases, the social

Table 2
Resident Sample Selected Characteristics

	Overall	ACC	AFF RTR	AFF FS	MKT RTR	MKT FS
Number of respondents	65	23	10	11	11	10
% Female	77	96	100	64	64	40
Race						
% African American	82	100	100	64	100	20
% white	9	0	0	18	0	40
% other	9	0	0	18	0	40
Average age	41	41	45	35	45	37
% married	25	9	20	27	36	50
Education level						
% high school grad	85	61	90	100	100	100
% college grad	39	0	20	81	54	80
% employed	69	39	60	100	91	90
% with children in household	44	65	50	18	36	20
Income						
% under $20,000	31	74	30	0	0	0
% over $70.00	14	0	0	18	27	50

Note: ACC: Relocated public housing residents in units financed with a public housing sub-sidy; AFF: Renters and owners in units priced "affordably" with the use of tax credits; MKT: Renters and owners in units priced at market-rates; RTR: All renters including relocated pub-lic housing residents; FS: All owners.

distance between these residents is quite significant. For example, 90% of owners of market-rate units in our sample (20% of whom are African-American) have a college degree and 50% have household incomes over $70,000; among relocated public-housing residents in our sample (all of whom are African-American), 74% earn less than $20,000 and none have completed college (see table 2).

In addition to interviews, documentary data and, especially, data from approximately 70 structured observations of community meetings, pro-grams, events, and interactions, allow us to contextualize interview data within the specific dynamics of each site, and provide both a check on and new insight into the dynamics described by interviewees. In our analysis, we explore site variations where they have relevance for understanding dif-ferences in the strategies, processes, and dynamics of building community within them; our primary purpose, however, is to distill and draw conclu-sions about assumptions, approaches, and responses to building community across sites.

Perspectives on the Potential
of Mixed-Income Development

There was significant variation among the stakeholders with whom we spoke regarding the promise and potential effects of mixed-income development on individuals, community, and social dynamics. Perspectives on this issue fell into four broad categories: (1) expectations for promoting social interaction and connection among residents, (2) expectations for neighborhood change, (3) expectations for promoting changes and improvement for individuals (almost invariably focusing on relocated public housing residents), and (4) expectations for addressing broader issues of racism and prejudice.

Expectations for Social Interaction

Interviewees most often focused on expectations for social interaction and for broader neighborhood change. The former focus, however, was not often framed in terms of the kinds of instrumental benefits that income mixing is sometimes argued to provide. Social capital arguments, for example, such as the notion that mixed-income developments would foster relational networks that provide relocated public housing residents with "weak ties" (Granovetter 1973, 1983; Briggs 1998a; Kleit 2001, 2002) to more affluent residents' networks, allowing them access to information and opportunities for jobs and other supports, although sometimes invoked, did not figure prominently in the minds of either stakeholders or residents as a reasonable expectation for these developments, at least in the short term. Nor did strong, affective notions of community solidarity and connection hold much sway. Although visions of these new, mixed-income communities as vibrant urban villages were sometimes invoked, more tempered notions of communal life often quickly took their place. In the words of one development stakeholder:

> I think we came in with the idea that it was going to be like this big, happy community where all mixed income—you know, public housing, market rate—were going to be playing together, neighbors were going to be chatting it up. And we've kind of scaled that back.

Or, in the words of another:

> It's not a question of expecting people to sing Kumbaya around the fire. . . I don't think you're going see that. But then if you look at some of your other communities, you don't have that either.

Instead, most people most directly connected with these developments—whether developers, property managers, service providers, or residents—described much more moderate expectations for the kinds of social interaction and the nature of "community" likely to be engendered. These focused in particular on casual, positive (or at least unproblematic) informal relations with neighbors and a context of mutual respect and acceptance. Stated expectations for the development of social networks beyond the most casual were limited, though these casual exchanges were certainly valued by those who talked about them. For example, the opportunity to meet, talk, and interact with people from different backgrounds was mentioned by many residents, but their expectations of what might result from these interactions was relatively modest. As one resident (the owner of an affordable unit) put it, "just having people understand and acknowledge and just be considerate to one another—I think it would be a great place to live." To the extent that interviewees focused on *instrumental* benefits of such interaction, they most often focused on the potential effects on relocated public-housing residents that casual observance and more distal interaction with the working middle class might have. This reflects a kind of enduring "underclass" orientation in the minds of some regarding the poorest members of these communities, in which the circumstances and patterns of behavior of those living in (or, in this case, coming from) concentrated poverty are characterized by the adoption of antisocial behaviors and rejection of (or loss of touch with) "mainstream values and positive work ethics" (Kasarda 1990, 314). These circumstances are seen to be exacerbated by the lack of exposure to middle-class "role models" and the demonstrated norms of behavior their presence provides (Wilson 1987; Anderson 1990). In the words of one resident (the owner of a market-rate unit):

> It used to be empty on the sidewalks in the morning, but now there's people going to work . . . and I think that's the whole, kind of somewhat of the point of doing the mixed neighborhood is to show people different ways of life and to be aspiring to have that 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. job if you didn't before.

Some aspects of this notion of the benefits of exposure to different lifestyles were noted by residents across incomes and tenures (as well as by some development and community stakeholders), though the relative focus on its instrumental value (to change behavior versus more neutrally to see "how other peoples lives," as one relocated public housing resident put it, for example) differed, with relocated public housing residents much less likely to invoke expectations for changing their own or their neighbors' behavior.

Expectations for Neighborhood Change

Expectations for neighborhood change were also frequently invoked, most notably by macro-level and development stakeholders and by some residents—particularly relocated public-housing residents. This is unsurprising, given that, if nothing else, these developments are fundamentally changing the physical infrastructure of the neighborhoods in clear and dramatic ways. At the most basic level of expectation, the new developments are intended to make clean, well-constructed, well-maintained residential units accessible to families from public housing. For most, however, the emphasis was on more than housing and included a broad range of community-level improvements, particularly increased safety, improved services, and better-quality amenities. Relocated public-housing residents particularly stressed peace and quiet, social order and stability, safety, and increased caretaking of the environment by residents. Other stakeholders focused on a broader array of resources and amenities. A development stakeholder's description is representative of this latter perspective:

> The goal here is really to try to create a community that is inclusive for everyone and makes everyone feel comfortable and brings the basic services that have been missing, so that when you—you can walk down [the street] with your kids or on your bike and the stores are there and the restaurants are there, and it's a wide variety of stuff that will give people the quality of life that you shouldn't have to go to the North Side . . . to experience.

Most interviewees were fairly optimistic that these benefits would accrue to all residents, though the relative emphasis on the importance of different kinds of improvements differed among interviewees (especially between relocated public housing residents and others), and some saw in the development process a broader sorting dynamic that privileged upper-income groups. In the words of one community stakeholder, a service provider and long-time community activist:

> There used to be a saying when we were opposed to—when we were actively opposed to this whole process that the goal was to create a middle- and upper-middle-income ring around [downtown Chicago]. That's going to happen. . . . I think that's going to be successful and I think the few public-housing residents who have been able to take advantage of the opportunities that it provides will participate in that success, though I'm a little shaky about that.

Expectations for Individual Change

A third set of expectations, invoked relatively less often by interviewees, focused on individual-level changes, almost exclusively for relocated public housing residents living in the mixed-income developments, that are seen to derive in part from the kinds of community-level change and social interactions described above, and in part from particular services, supports, and inputs provided to them (ranging from job training and placement programs to case-management services to youth development activities) in these contexts. The focus on these kinds of outcomes was particularly pronounced among macro-level stakeholders, and included changes in particular outcomes, especially for children and youth (better school achievement, higher future aspirations) but also for adults (employment, increased financial literacy); changes in behavior (responsibility, public decorum); and access to opportunity.

Expectations Regarding Attitudes About Race

The fourth set of expectations, pertaining to an impact on prejudice and racist attitudes among residents, was the least commonly emphasized, though a notable number (about 20%) of interviewees from across the spectrum of stakeholders raised the issue when discussing their perspectives on the potential value of mixed-income development. For most of them, the mixed-income developments presented at least some promise of beginning to break down the pervasive racial divisions so long established in the historically highly segregated city of Chicago, if only by establishing some basis for mutual (positive) exposure and awareness. In some cases, however, race appears to continue to be a barrier, as well as a marker of difference, such as in Westhaven Park, where renters (of whatever tenure) are more likely to be African American while owners are more ethnically diverse.

Strategic Orientation and "Community-Building" Inputs

Given these expectations for the potential (and limitations) of mixed-income development, how have the development teams and their partners begun to approach the task of recreating neighborhoods and building "community" on the footprint of former public housing developments? To date, there have been three major strategic orientations to building community

across the three sites. The first strategy focuses on intentionally promoting or shaping specific opportunities to foster interaction among residents. The second focuses on shaping the environment and conditions to enhance "natural processes" of neighborhood functioning. The third focuses on targeting specific services and supports to some residents to equalize opportunity and access, essentially seeking to "level the playing field" in ways that facilitate the potential for all residents to participate actively and effectively as community members. Some combination of these approaches is used across the sites.

Promoting Interaction

Although expectations for interaction among residents are relatively modest, development teams and service providers place a significant focus on efforts to intentionally promote interaction through several different strategies, including creating or supporting various participatory mechanisms for planning, decision-making, and governance; shaping a range of community events; and establishing different kinds of projects meant to incorporate a broad range of resident participation in concrete activities.

Interaction Through Participatory Mechanisms

Planning and decision-making bodies take many forms, from periodic public meetings, to ongoing, informal mechanisms, to formally constituted associations. Some of these bodies function within the development and others operate at the broader neighborhood level. At each development, condominium boards and townhome associations have been established to take over building governance as for-sale buildings become occupied. At the neighborhood level, a number of forums were either already in existence or emerged as a normal by-product of development progress. CAPS (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy) meetings, for example, which are regularly held public meetings organized by the Chicago Police Department in each of the city's police beats, were frequently noted by interviewees as important contexts for resident interaction and the expression of community concerns. Other community organizations and neighborhood associations active in the broader neighborhoods were also, though less frequently, mentioned.

Beyond these kinds of forums, others have been launched by development teams and their partners as new, intentional efforts to promote resident interaction across income groups, including town-hall meetings and efforts to organize block clubs. These mechanisms have somewhat different functions, town-hall and community meetings largely serving to provide an

opportunity for information exchange and planning input to the development process; block clubs being meant to provide a mechanism for interaction and planning resident-led activities. They also remain largely nascent or aspirational so far, and there are different opinions about what kinds of participatory mechanisms would be most desirable in the long term. Most commonly invoked across sites is the notion of creating some kind of overarching, inclusive neighborhood council in which all residents can participate and have a voice. To date there has only been concrete action toward the establishment of such an entity in one of the three sites, the Oakwood Shores development, and the effort by the developer there to form a resident-driven neighborhood association was, at time of writing, in its very early stages. However, the need for some kind of integrating mechanism like this was frequently invoked, especially by development and community stakeholders. In the words of one:

> I do believe there's a need because just from the town hall meetings with the market-rate [residents], there's so many stigma. Like when the market-rate [residents] get together, they don't blatantly say it but it's little comments like, you know, something happened in the building: "What's the process for evicting public-housing people?" It's like, how'd you get from like there was trash in the elevator to what's the process for—you know? Then when you get all the public-housing people together it's "they don't want us here. They're trying to take over our neighborhood." So just to crush a lot of that, if everyone was in the same room and then people could see that a lot of your concerns are my concerns.

However, although there is a good deal of concern about ways to promote interaction *across* income groups, many of the available mechanisms that focus on planning and governance are geared to different groups, particularly homeowners, through their condo associations and, to a lesser extent, relocated public-housing residents, through the local advisory councils (LACs) that represented them when they were residents in the public-housing development and that continue to operate at some level, although these mechanisms are begin dismantled.[5] In this way, governance mechanisms may be promoting cohesion among subgroups but division between them (cf. Joseph 2008), and some groups (e.g., nonpublic housing renters) have no clear participatory mechanism in which their particular interests are represented.

These factors notwithstanding, the complexity of fostering inclusive participatory mechanisms in communities—especially in the context of significant diversity—are substantial (Briggs 1998b; Chaskin 2003, 2005;

Day 1997; Gittel 1980; Piven 1966), and different stakeholders have different notions about the relative benefits of such efforts for promoting interaction versus, for example, promoting multiple opportunities for residents, across income groups, to participate in activities of various sorts that speak to common interests. Thus, beyond these kinds of deliberative bodies, there has been an additional focus on events and projects designed to provide the opportunity for resident interaction and relationship building.

Interaction Through Community Activities

Community events—block parties, neighborhood festivals, barbeques, bingo nights, skating parties, performances, field trips—have been organized as ways to provide low-key opportunities for neighbors across the board to meet and interact. The principal rationale here is to provide space and opportunity for interaction that is geared toward as broad a cross-section of residents as possible, and that is low-cost and easy to participate in. Often, the challenge to these events is framed in terms of attracting higher-income residents to them, and children and youth are sometimes invoked as playing a potentially bridging role to pull various members of the community together. In the words of a development stakeholder:

> You might be interested in your kids going to a basketball camp, and that's something that we would offer the opportunity here, or like a community spelling bee, you know. A market-rate kid would love to be in a community spelling bee just as much as a public housing kid. So those things don't have a social service stigma. There's not a worker attached to it, you don't have to be in a program per se. If you're interested, you just kind of attach to the activity or the event.

The lack of social service orientation to these events is clearly attractive to some (as one relocated public housing resident put it: "It was not pick-and-choose discrimination of who gets to go; they just put up flyers and say everyone's welcome"), but for the most part events such as these have attracted substantially more relocated public housing residents than others, and have not largely provided a forum for cross-income group interaction. We will explore the reasons for this in the next section.

Interaction Through Community-Focused Projects

Specific community projects provide another mechanism to promote interaction, here organized around particular interests or tasks. Some of these are focused on community issues (a "neighborhood challenge" to foster planning for community projects among residents; a tenant patrol to

address issues of safety; a newsletter to promote community-wide communication). Others are focused on individual enrichment and recreation. Unlike community events, projects such as these are sometimes looked to as a way to engage different residents in different kinds of roles; for example, attempting to generate interest among market-rate residents in community volunteering roles in which they can interact with lower-income residents. To date, there have been relatively few projects generated in this way, and success has been limited in forging cross-income group connections through these efforts. This is in part because of the relative newness of the developments, and in part to the relative focus on other aspects of their build-out (especially the physical infrastructure and the challenges of lease-up, property management, and support services for relocated public-housing residents). But there are likely more fundamental limitations to these strategies by themselves, and many recognize that expectations for their connective power need to be tempered by a realistic view of residents' lives, interests, and lifestyle preferences. As one community stakeholder put it:

> I think what we have to kind of do is understand that people are not coming into these developments as infants. You know, they already have lives. They already have relationships. This is a place to live. That's what it is for them—a place to live, and hopefully live in harmony.

Enhancing "Natural" Processes[6]

In line with this perspective on neighborhood use and involvement, a substantial degree of focus on building community rests on shaping the environment itself to provide the groundwork for longer-term, normative community functioning. These are, in some sense, foundational efforts, and have focused on three aspects of community structure and functioning, in particular: physical design, community norms, and community institutions.

Building Community Through Physical Design

Three aspects of design were most frequently invoked—either as positive aspects of the developments as they are evolving or as issues that might be addressed. One concerns the design coherence of units, which endeavors to reduce obvious distinctions between residents. Thus, buildings are designed to be outwardly indistinguishable by tenure type, so that from the outside one would be unable to identify public housing from affordable from market-rate units.[7] Another focuses on the geographic integration of units, which is meant to enhance opportunities for positive interaction and reduce potential residential clusters of antisocial activity by dispersing residents of different

incomes throughout the development. Together, these factors seek to reduce both the spatial distance between residents of different "types" and obvious markers of social distance, both of which contribute to the likelihood of interaction (Kleit 2005; Gans 1961). These aspects of design are seen to provide an important foundation for the (re)creation of a "normal" neighborhood. In the words of a development stakeholder:

> Our mission is to do what we did. To get rid of what was here, to put back units that are indistinguishable from market-rate units. Give people a safe, decent, nice place to raise their families in good conditions with good housing, and deliver market-rate units and affordable-rate units at the same time.

The total and relative number of units by income category—public housing, affordable, market rate—differs across sites (see table 1), as does the degree of geographic integration among them. The Chicago Housing Authority's general guidelines for developers regarding unit mix was one-third of each income category, but all 10 mixed-income developments in Chicago have a different mix, depending on the neighborhood context and the design negotiations with stakeholders in each community. Some developments keep for-sale and rental buildings separate, while others fully integrate tenures within (at least some) buildings. Among the three sites we focus on, the buildings are separate by tenure at Oakwood Shores, where the for-sale developer is a separate entity. At Park Boulevard, where there is no rental housing apart from the units for relocated public-housing residents, those units are integrated into buildings with for-sale units. In Westhaven Park, for-sale and rental buildings are separate but largely integrated at the block level, with the exception of a 113-unit midrise tower in which condominiums are integrated with rental apartments for relocated public-housing residents, and which include common elevators, lobby space, and activity rooms. This midrise tower is unique across the three sites in the degree to which residents of different tenures and incomes are integrated within a single building. (At the time of writing, the 113 occupied households included 72 condo owners, seven affordable-unit owners, and 34 relocated public-housing residents.) We will explore the relationship between physical design and social interaction among residents in greater detail in a subsequent article. For current purposes, it is worth noting that while this level of integration may have facilitated more interaction among residents (for example, open house meet-and-greet events hosted by the property manager, as well as through casual interaction moving through common areas), it has also intensified the challenges of establishing a comfortable shared environment among residents of such different backgrounds.

A third aspect of design concerns the availability of common (civic) space. This takes various forms, including common outdoor space, like parks or a town-center area, and indoor space available for meetings and functions, like a "community room" that residents can sign out for various purposes. Such space was noted as both an important amenity and a source of potential tension, given its differential use by different residents (cf. Patillo 2007). For example, in one site, the lack of immediate access to outdoor gathering space (although a public park is in walking distance) led to the appropriation of transitional spaces like parking lots and front yards by neighborhood youth for recreational activities, and by adult (presumed to be public housing) residents for socializing and "hanging out" with friends. Similarly, some tensions in the midrise tower at Westhaven Park arose around the use of the lobby as an area for socializing, in which some condo residents complained about the extensive use of the lobby area and furniture by low-income residents as a social gathering place. To address the situation, the condo association board voted to remove the furniture from the lobby, thus preventing anyone from the benefit of the common area. The developer intervened to encourage the reversing of this decision and instead suggested clearer communication of expectations that the lobby be used as a transitional space rather than a lounge.

Building Community Through Shared Norms of Behavior

These instances of tension around the use of common areas reflect a more general set of issues around expectations for normative behavior and efforts to shape and enforce those expectations through both formal and informal means. Informally, there is the expectation that the tenor of public sentiment and the exercise of collective efficacy will shape public behavior toward "acceptable" norms, particularly with regard to safety and public order. In keeping with the "underclass" orientation noted earlier, informal social control in this regard is generally focused on changing the behavior of some relocated public-housing residents to behave differently than they did in "the projects." In the words of a community stakeholder, "people are not made to feel comfortable hanging out, so that's a shift."

More formally, the establishment, monitoring, and enforcement of rules play an important role. At one level, this is a basic function of property management, and although the issue of fairness—of enforcing the same rules for everyone (at least all renters)—was frequently stressed, much of the discussion about rules with interviewees across the spectrum focused on the need to monitor and enforce behaviors among relocated public-housing residents. At another level, the focus is on active attention to safety and order, through both community monitoring and working with the

police. This attention, built on the foundation of a new physical infrastructure and significant population change through the relocation process prior to demolition, has had some noted effects. In the words of a relocated public housing resident:

> The appearance change of the hanging out. The appearance change of seeing all the gang-bangers and the drugs being sold and young ladies exploiting themselves. I couldn't let my kids go out. The physical change that I came here. It's quiet. You don't see these things. You don't hear these things. You don't have to worry about shooting. Like, "Oh, my God, they shooting, come on, y'all, run in the house." That's what's changed.

Building Community Through Local Institutions

Finally, efforts to enhance "natural" processes for community integration and functioning focus on local institutions. In some cases, this is primarily about connecting with and helping to strengthen existing institutions—for example, schools, parks, police. In others, the focus is on planning for the creation of new institutions and amenities that might serve as unifying amenities, such as the planning at Oakwood Shores for an arts and recreation center that could attract broad use and offer a context for informal interaction. Such amenities—particularly quality schools—are clearly critical for attracting and retaining middle-income families, and are seen as a potentially fundamental anchoring context for relationship development. There is a new charter school located at the Oakwood Shores development. One development stakeholder in Oakwood Shores describes the value of the investment in a new neighborhood charter school in this way:

> This is very simple when you think about kids because . . . the fact that we have homebuyers who have kids who are going to that school, those homebuyers are going to have to interact and are interacting with renters from that neighborhood. So that's a natural way for them to evolve hopefully into friendships and relationships.

In the context of a city in which public schools have been largely abandoned by the white middle class (about 86% of Chicago public school students are black or Latino, and 85% are from low-income families),[8] such a vision is clearly ambitious, and requires significant effort beyond the immediate responsibilities of development stakeholders, including working closely with elected officials, school principals, and supporting institutions. Even so, these are longer-term goals. As one community stakeholder in the same neighborhood put it:

I think we'll increasingly become more diverse. I think that's going to change over time, but I think families have options, they take advantage of their options. And I do think there is that feeling of wanting their kids to be in a school with kids like them and not feeling comfortable yet sending their kids to this school. So I think it's going to take some time.

Services and Supports

The third strategy relevant for building community in these sites focuses on providing formal services and supports, in particular for relocated public-housing residents. The rationale, often implicit, is that for residents from such different socioeconomic backgrounds to engage effectively in the work of building and sustaining a neighborhood together—or even to live passively but harmoniously within it—a prerequisite is to build the skills and individual and family stability of those who have been previously socially and economically marginalized. The services that are emerging include some combination of programs to promote skill- and knowledge-building, remedial and supportive social services, and efforts to reshape both behavior and perceptions seen to help prepare residents to be "successful" in the private market and work toward self-sufficiency. Programs and social services include a broad range of supports, from case management and counseling, to financial literacy and home-maintenance instruction, to training, education, and employment support. Much of the focus here is on helping relocated public-housing residents continue to meet requirements for (or, for those in the "working-to-meet" category,[9] attain) eligibility to remain in the development. Beyond that, the focus is on facilitating their ability to work toward self-sufficiency within the context of a new community that operates largely in the private sector under assumptions that govern market and civil-society behavior rather than the more rarified (isolated, protected, institutionalized) public-sector management of their prior housing context. As a development stakeholder put it:

As far as what we're doing, we're all about building a community, because what's happening is this area is changing, and so we want to make sure that our residents are ready for the change and we want to make sure that they're provided with all the things that they're going to need to be able to be successful in this area, because there's going to be a lot of things going on, and being able to adapt is one of the biggest things.

Facilitating such adaptation includes both the kinds of instrumental supports outlined above, but also a focus on perceptions and behavior that

are seen to condition the possibility of success. The focus on behavioral changes reflects the orientations about community norms discussed above—a work ethic, respect for property, adherence to public decorum (e.g., curbs on noisy behavior and public "hanging out"). In addition to individual services and rule enforcement, development and community stakeholders are also concerned with programs and facilities that can provide alternative contexts and opportunities, particularly for young people, and that will give them, as one put it, "something positive and constructive to be involved in." But for several interviewees, adaption and the ability to be successful is also in part about changing *mindsets*. To some extent, this includes changing the perspectives of owners and market-rate residents regarding their low-income neighbors, but to a larger extent the issue was discussed in terms of changing some relocated public-housing residents' perspectives on their lives, aspirations for their future, and orientations toward longer-term goal setting and achievement. In the words of a development stakeholder at a different site:

> When you really get a chance to go inside of these people's home and you sit down and talk with them and you take five or ten minutes, you realize that the community building, the community itself, the returning residents have issues. . . . So even though they switched housing overnight, their mentality is not switching like their housing has and so, like they say, you can take the person out of the projects but you can't take the project out of the person . . . and if you don't have enough services to try and transition them mentally, regardless of what community you put them in, it's not going to work.

Early Responses: Participation, Community Dynamics, and Conditioning Factors

These strategies—and the building of community more generally—are beginning to play out in complex ways across sites. Early responses to them suggest a set of dynamics around the extent, nature, distribution, and implications of participation, both in particular participatory opportunities like governance bodies and events, and more generally as neighbors with one another. In addition, a set of conditioning factors are at play that serve to promote or inhibit participation, engagement, interaction, and the shaping of social cohesion and social control.

As noted above, participation in the kinds of participatory governance mechanisms, public events, and projects being generated to promote engagement and interaction is uneven, and to a large extent compartmentalized. Events, projects, and participatory boards tend to be seen by residents

as being primarily "for" certain subpopulations. In some cases, this is formally true; condominium boards, for example, are by definition associations of and for homeowners. As a market-rate owner in one site points out:

> They have meetings for the residents in the rental buildings, and we have meetings for residents in the condo buildings, but there's never like one unified—so it's always like, "they did this," or they're saying "they did this." And their complaints are different, and no one ever hears what they are.

In other cases, resident perceptions, different interests, and personal proclivities lead to selective participation in certain things and not others. Most programs, as well as most general social events and gatherings sponsored by the development, for example, have tended to attract far more relocated public housing residents than others. In the words of a development stakeholder:

> We do community bingo, we have salsa class, we have stepping class, we had financial workshops, and 90% of our participants would be public housing. We had very few [residents of] market-rate or [affordable units] that would sort of attach because there was a stigma that any offerings were sort of social service.

This kind of social compartmentalization by class (and, sometimes, race) occurs informally as well, as residents perceive and act on perceptions of difference.[10] A number of relocated public-housing residents, for example, describe their own tendency to "keep to myself" and note the tendency of homeowners to do the same, or to connect primarily with one another. As one put it:

> The owners, they had their own little get-together as far as, like, meeting each other when they first moved in. And it's like they all met over there in the little courtyard area between those two buildings right there in the middle, and I've seen—like, one day I was coming from the store or something, and they were all there, and they had their dogs, and they were all mingling and having a little get-together and everything. It was like, just for them.

In some cases, organizing participation around particular issues of common concern may provide an opportunity to serve as a potential bridge across these divides, and certain forums—most notably CAPS meetings and some other resident meetings, especially organized around issues of safety—have served this role, though even issues of general concern, of course, are not without contention. Many of the stated concerns by middle- and

upper-income residents about safety and general public order, for example, implicitly if not explicitly lay blame at the feet of relocated public-housing residents and their visitors.

More fundamentally, a set of conditioning factors and dynamics are emerging as important in informing (promoting or constraining) participation and community engagement. These include pragmatic concerns such as the extent and nature of interest in participation and the time that residents have available to allow such participation. They also include aspects of local context that contribute to shaping resident interaction, as well as the ways in which perspectives of difference—among income groups, around race, concerning youth, and in light of differential responses to community dynamics—inform individuals' choices and actions.

Regarding pragmatic concerns, the typical limitations to community participation anywhere (see, e.g., Day [1997]; Scavo [1993]; Chaskin [2003])—lack of time, competing responsibilities, limited energies, desires for privacy, interests lying elsewhere—are clearly at play. The lack of time and energy, given the competing demands of work and family, was noted frequently by interviewees across the board. As a relocated public-housing resident put it:

> For me working third shift, I don't really be up to interact with most of the things that they have going on because it's in the daytime and I'm working from 7:00 to 7:00.

Or, in the words of a market-rate owner:

> Like with other commitments I've had I wasn't able to give my time to it. And just the meeting times were not convenient to what I had. It would involve me, what do you call it, like missing prior engagements and things like that.

Contextual issues also play a role, particularly the pull of preexisting relationships, on the one hand (which limit people's inclination to make an effort to engage actively with "new" people), and the influence of some neighborhood dynamics (particularly crime and fear of crime, or lack of trust in one's neighbors), on the other. Preexisting relationships play a role across income groups, though seem to have a somewhat different impact on local neighborhood dynamics, in that relational networks among relocated public-housing residents are often much more locally grounded. The fact that relocated public-housing residents returning to the mixed-income developments often return as part of a cohort of long-term residents of the

former projects (rather than as individual newcomers, as is the case for many affordable and market-rate residents) has promoted continued solidarity among that group and created a perception among some of their higher-income neighbors of a lack of interest in establishing new relationships. As a market-rate renter told us:

> I didn't notice until it got warmer that they all know each other. They all hang out. They take their kids to the park together but I think they just like—I don't know how to put it. They're just comfortable with what they know I guess. I guess they don't feel like they have to open up to me because they already have people around that they'd rather prefer to speak to.

These relationships also extend to relocated public-housing residents currently living elsewhere, and (in two sites) to public-housing residents in one portion of the development that still stands as an enclave of public-housing units managed by the housing authority. This contributes to sometimes contentious issues around the use of public space and public behavior and to perceptions among many residents about broader issues of safety and access. In the words of a market-rate owner:

> Because there's gangs that form on corners, and I'm just—I don't want to set myself up for anything. So when there's big groups of people hanging out I'll be like, "Okay, I can't walk through that corner." And there are still some areas in this area that are just not safe areas to be walking through.

Concerns about safety and the extent to which it constrains interaction were raised by residents across income groups, though with somewhat different emphases (for example, interviewees differed in the extent to which they perceived public gathering in itself is an indication of danger). Some concerns were based as much on former experience as current reality. As described by a development stakeholder:

> My East End residents and their kids that were prior public-housing residents won't come to the West End, and my West End residents won't go to the East End because of gang affiliations and wherever they lived previous, according to the color of the buildings, they don't cross over the street and so that becomes a nuisance because on one end you have a park and one end you don't, which might make one end of my property better than the other end.

Beyond issues of safety, other perceptions held by residents about one another—essentially perceptions about *difference*—also condition, in

fundamental ways, the possibilities for interaction, participation, and community engagement. Part of this difference is about differential interests and the "stake" different residents may have in the neighborhood. As one community stakeholder put it:

> The incoming residents, the homeowners see a community for themselves as homeowners, but as a homogeneous community. The renters are by and large singles or young couples, so they're sort of there until they make another decision. The public-housing residents are there as a community coming from public housing, who want to maintain what was that closeness of the public-housing community but, at the same time, avoid being stigmatized as "those people."

Another issue concerning perspectives of difference is about how residents view one another in terms of their values, culture, behavior, accessibility, and desirability as neighbors. Again, these perspectives reflect, at least on one side, the continued resonance of notions of "underclass" behavior and a "culture of poverty," (Lewis 1966; Valentine 1968) but they also go both ways. They are grounded in both lived experience and in the ways that experience gets extrapolated from and integrated into socially constructed notions of who the "other" is, what they value, and how they view others. Thus, public gathering and socializing (loud interactions in the street, lawn chairs pulled up in front of building entrances, late-night parties) become emblematic of fundamental differences in culture and lifestyle and come to characterize the relocated public housing residents as a group. Similarly, the day-to-day behavior of owners—retreating to their homes after work, walking their (often large) dogs, not greeting people on the street, calling the police to respond to the public behavior of neighbors—becomes emblematic of a kind of standoffishness and unsociability or, more forcefully, opposition to the presence of low-income people. Some residents thus end up stereotyping (often self-consciously) one another, and shaping their behavior accordingly. An affordable owner puts it this way:

> I guess in theory you're not supposed to be able to tell who's low-income, who's middle-income, who's high-income. But even in this mixed-income neighborhood, you can tell. Do you know what I mean? Renters for example—I mean I'm sorry I'm assuming a lot of them, or you can assume a lot because you see a bunch of kids on bikes and so forth. . . . I mean that the park's dirty here and clean here, it's not so much safety but it's like they still treat the area

like it's the old area—we ain't got to keep the streets clean. We don't have to pick up the trash—like it's still the projects.

Or, as a relocated public-housing resident puts it:

We know each other because we that kind of people but I think the other culture, because their culture they just don't interact but they should. . . . They're acting like we're the problem when our community has been like this. They have a problem with us standing on the corner. We're colored. That's what we do. We gather in groups. We don't have to be no drug activity or nothing like that for us to gather around.

Obviously, different residents have different perspectives on these issues, and act in different ways, but the general dynamic around perceived differences of class and culture and their influence on neighborhood interaction is clear. Interestingly, although children and youth are often cited as a potential lever for bridging this divide, at least between families of different backgrounds who have children, young people—especially older and unsupervised youth—are also often cited as a particular point of contention, and sometimes elicit particularly divisive action. An affordable owner in a different site notes:

I went to the meeting, the condo meeting, and all they talked about was, you know, the kids in the neighborhood. You know, how they're cussing, how they're smoking pot, how they're banging against their new garages—and I'm like, well, maybe if you go out and you talk to them and you communicate with them, maybe some of that will cease. You know, stop calling the police all the time.

Conclusions

These complex dynamics of behavior, perception, interpretation, and response highlight some of the particular challenges to building community in the context of mixed-income development and public-housing transformation. No community is monolithic, and differences in interests, priorities, values, behaviors, commitment, and engagement are to be expected. The particular circumstances presented by these contexts, however, in which diversity is intentionally promoted and the social distance (income, education, race) between neighbors is in some cases extreme, throw into relief, and present some unique challenges (in degree if not always in kind) of building community.

For the most part, on-the-ground expectations for "community" in these contexts are, however, more modest than the policy rhetoric or theoretical arguments for mixed-income development sometimes imply. Affective bonds of solidarity and connection that characterize *gemeinschaft* notions of the "urban village" (Toennies 1965; Park 1925) are less anticipated than are more casual interactions and shared instrumental interests (see table 3). Community-change expectations are, for the most part, similarly instrumental: high-quality housing, safe streets, an improved physical environment, better services and amenities. Similarly, few interviewees express expectations for the development of social capital and the instrumental benefits it would bring. Expectations for individual-level benefits mostly focus on those that might redound to relocated public-housing residents, in large part by virtue of the benefits of living in a "better" neighborhood that, in part, provides a context of opportunity (services and supports to help them get and retain jobs, training and education opportunities, counseling and case-management services), and in part a context of social expectation and interaction that can change their aspirations and reshape their orientations toward work, leisure, and public behavior. This latter focus suggests the continued vitality of a kind of "culture of poverty" orientation to the urban "underclass" among some providers and more affluent neighbors that, in addition to contributing to framing expectations for the impact of mixed-income communities on individual change, shapes barriers to interaction, participation, and engagement.

The strategies through which development teams seek to build "community"—through fostering interaction, shaping the physical and normative environment, and providing services and supports—confront both instrumental challenges (time constraints on engagement, compartmentalization of participation) and challenges grounded in social structure (e.g., pre-existing relationships) and socially constructed notions of the "other." In particular, perceptions of difference based in part on observed reality and preconceived notions and extrapolated from them inform choices about how certain neighbors will engage with, or avoid, other neighbors. These dynamics lead, in part, to an increased concern about social order, social control, and public behavior within these developments that serve both to unite and divide. They also keep the focus on local manifestations of inequality and its outcomes, rather than seeking to address more macrostructural factors that lie behind the generation and reproduction of poverty and inequality—factors that mixed-income development is not designed to address.

Table 3
Summary of Theoretical Expectations and Emerging Findings
Regarding Building "Community" in Mixed-Income Developments

Perspectives on "Community"	Theories Related to the Potential Benefits of Mixed-Income Development	Emerging Findings
Symbolic unit of belonging and identity; affective ties; "urban village"	Social control; "bonding" social capital	Modest expectations for community identity and intimate relations; little evidence of their emergence; prevailing sense of "us" and "them" rather than shared identity and belonging
Functional site of production and exchange of goods and social processes ("community of limited liability")	Investment and provision of higher-quality services, infrastructure, institutions; formal social control	Differential participation in forums of exchange (governance entities, town-hall meetings, community events); service development and provision, largely for lower-income residents; interaction with police around social control issues
Site of local production, use, and protection of social norms and social networks	Social capital ("bonding" and "bridging"); informal social control; role modeling; social learning	Some conflict over normative expectations for behavior and use of public space; perceived potential for role modeling among development stakeholders and higher-income residents; little early evidence of social capital development
Site of investment, disinvestment, and political action	Investment and provision of higher-quality and more responsive services, infrastructure, institutions	Most investment so far in housing and physical infrastructure; improved physical environment (quality housing, safety, public space); some differential priorities among residents few other amenities (e.g., commercial) developed to date

Given this, what might be some of the implications for policy and practice that seek to more effectively "build community" in such contexts? One concerns crafting reasonable expectations regarding the nature of such communities and the kinds of interactions and instrumental connections that are likely to be fostered in them, especially over the short term. Social cohesion, social interaction, and the development of social capital are all much more easily facilitated in contexts of relative homogeneity and stability, and develop over time (Gans 1961; Sampson and Groves 1989; Putnam 2007). Furthermore, many urban dwellers are quite comfortable with thinking

about local community in essentially functional ways, about their membership in it as partial and contingent, and about their local relationships as largely casual and flexible.

Second, the legacy of public housing, assumptions about those who have lived there, and the dynamics of difference that play out in part based on these perspectives needs to be addressed and negotiated. Current arrangements to foster resident participation and engagement seem largely to reinforce rather than break down divisions among different "kinds" of residents—renters and owners, low-income and high-income, relocated public-housing residents and others. The imperatives of the market, and the need to attract and retain higher-income residents to make these developments profitable and viable over the long term, shape expectations and demands (e.g., for particular kinds of amenities; about access, use, and behavior in public spaces) in ways that sometimes place residents in tension with one another. The mechanisms emerging so far to shape processes of deliberation, governance, and problem solving are less well-suited for negotiating these tensions across groups than for providing forums for their expression within groups, and management responses to the outcomes of these deliberations often target particular groups (especially low-income renters) over others. Furthermore, not all residents (renters in general, and increasingly relocated public-housing residents in particular, given the recent dissolution of the LACs) have equal access to such mechanisms, and so may have less "voice" in the deliberations around these tensions than do others—particularly those with an ownership stake in the neighborhood. This suggests the need to be intentional about rethinking approaches to community governance and deliberation that foster broader participation and take account of the differential influence and power that inheres among different groups within the community (cf. Chaskin 2003, 2005). The particular role of young people, and considering ways to engage them in positive opportunities and neighborhood action, might be worthy of special consideration given their potential to either bridge or exacerbate divisions.

Finally, efforts to provide services and supports such as training, job-placement assistance, case-management services, and the like to "level the playing field" and move relocated public-housing residents (and other low-income residents) to self-sufficiency so they can participate more fully and effectively in community (as well as improve their basic quality of life and potential future opportunities) are essential, but necessarily limited in the broader context of shifting economic opportunity and other structural constraints that low-income people face. The recent economic downturn and foreclosure crisis throws this into sharp relief. Local efforts focusing on the

human capital and connection aspects of moving to self-sufficiency need to be promoted along with a broader policy focus on structural barriers and inequality, and on economic development, infrastructure, and institutional investment in education, technology access, and other foundational resources that are often either of inferior quality or out of reach for many low-income people.

Notes

1. One version of this is the "community of limited liability" in which resident attachment is seen to be contingent, voluntary, and based on instrumental values (connected with investment, function, and use) rather than intimate, affective relations among neighbors (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Suttles 1972).

2. As noted earlier, "community building" has come to be defined by some scholars and practitioners in the community development field as a specific, intentional process of building local capacity and networks to promote change that is shaped and sustained by local residents and community members. Briggs (2002, 16), for example, has defined community building as "locally focused approaches to collective problem-solving that aim to solve public problems and to promote socially valuable forms of connectedness, sustained stakeholder engagement, a sense of common purpose, and greater institutional capacity" (cf. Kubisch et al. 1997, 2000; Kingsley, McKneely, and Gibson 1997; Chaskin et al. 2001).

3. We use the term "relocated public-housing residents" to refer specifically to those residents who moved from traditional public housing into mixed-income developments, whether they have returned to the development built on the site of the complex in which they lived prior to demolition or have moved to a mixed-income development from a different complex. They are thus distinct from residents of traditional public housing, in which buildings are owned and operated by the public-housing authority, and from those who moved into the subsidized private-housing market using Housing Choice Vouchers. There is some debate among stakeholders as to the appropriate language to describe these residents, since they are in some ways in a liminal position between the public and private spheres, living in units subsidized with public-housing funds and remaining on the rolls of the public-housing authority, but at the same time residents of developments that are privately owned and managed. Some argue that they should be referred to as "former" public housing residents, based on the aspiration that they are moving toward the status of residents in the private market; others argue that they are still public-housing residents, for which the public-housing authority continues to bear responsibility; others that they should be referred to simply as "residents," making no distinction between them and other members of these new communities.

4. Key informants were selected based on a purposive sampling strategy (Patton 1990) that targeted individuals playing different instrumental roles in the development process and with different perspectives on the process based on the nature and intensity of their involvement. Resident interviewees were randomly selected from developer occupancy lists in each site. Because the pace of occupancy was delayed in Park Boulevard at the time of fieldwork, only residents from Oakwood Shores and Westhaven Park were interviewed during this phase of the study. Interviews were guided by a semi-structured interview instrument comprised primarily of open-ended questions covering a broad range of topics, and (in the case of resident interviews) some closed-response questions on, for example, social interaction and demographics. A core set of topics was covered across interviews, with some specific variations

targeted to particular interviewees based on their position and role. This allows for comparison of perspectives across interviewees, while providing the opportunity for individuals to generate narratives in response to basic interview themes that speak to their particular experience and perspectives. Interviews were recorded digitally and transcribed in their entirety, then coded for analysis based on a set of deductively derived thematic codes and refined based on inductive interim analysis. Interviews were initially double-coded to ensure intercoder reliability, then a periodic sample of coded interviews was reviewed to ensure continued reliability. Summary matrices of responses were created to allow for systematic comparison of perspectives across interviewee "type" as defined by role, site, and, in the case of residents, housing tenure.

5. In April 2008, the Chicago Housing Authority announced that there would be no LACs in the new mixed-income developments and instead proposed that a centralized "ombudsman" would represent residents' concerns.

6. We use the term "natural" in quotes, and with caution. The strategies here are obviously intentional, but geared toward more foundational aspects of neighborhood environment, norms, and processes that are seen by respondents as being about setting the stage for informal, ongoing development of social interaction and positive community dynamics over time.

7. In the UK this has been referred to as "blind tenure;" see, for example, Roberts (2007).

8. Chicago Public Schools, http://www.cps.k12.il.us/AtAGlance.html.

9. The Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) has established the following general criteria for relocated public-housing households to be eligible to move into the new mixed-income developments: The head of household must be working at least 30 hours per week (unless he or she has a disability or is of retirement age), must not have unpaid rent or utilities, must not have any recent criminal convictions, and must pass a drug screening (Metropolitan Planning Council 2005). At each site, the developer and a "working group" of local community stakeholders is free to modify this general list to create "site-specific criteria." So, for example, there is no drug-testing requirement at Park Boulevard and (because of a preexisting legal consent decree governing redevelopment at the site) no work requirement at Westhaven Park. There is an allowance that households who are engaging with a social service provider and making progress toward these goals can be designated as "working to meet" eligibility requirements and, on this basis, be allowed to move into the development with the expectation that they will meet the criteria within one year.

10. The particular role of race relative to other indicators of "difference" (socioeconomic status, family structure, housing tenure) will be explored more thoroughly in subsequent articles based on this research. Early analysis suggests that race, per se, is a more explicit factor in Westhaven Park, where owners are more likely to be of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, than in Oakwood Shores or, in all likelihood, Park Boulevard, where a higher proportion of the population is African-American, regardless of housing tenure.

References

Anderson, E. 1990. Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Bailey, N., A. Haworth, T. Manzi, O. Paranagamage, and M. Roberts. 2006. Creating and sustaining mixed income communities. Coventry, England: Chartered Institute of Housing/ Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Bohl, C. C. 2000. New Urbanism and the city: Potential applications and implications for distressed inner-city neighborhoods. *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (4): 761-801.

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

———. 1998a. Brown kids in white suburbs: Housing mobility and the many faces of social capital. *Housing Policy Debate* 9 (1): 177-221.

———. 1998b. Doing democracy up close: Culture, power, and communication in community planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 18:1-13.

———. 2002. Community building: The new (and old) politics of urban problem-solving. John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Faculty Research Working Papers Series. RWP02-003.

Brophy, P. C., and R. N. Smith. 1997. Mixed-income housing: Factors for success. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy and Development Research* 3 (2): 3-31.

Buron, L., S. Popkin, D. Levy, L. Harris, and J. Khadduri. 2002. The HOPE VI resident tracking study: A snapshot of the current living situation of original residents from eight sites. A report prepared by Abt. Associates, Inc. and the Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Chaskin, R.J. 1997. Perspectives on neighborhood and community: A review of the literature. *Social Service Review* 71 (4): 521-47.

———. 2001. Building community capacity: A definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban Affairs Review* 36 (3): 292-323.

———. 2003. Fostering neighborhood democracy: Legitimacy and accountability within loosely coupled systems. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32 (2): 161-89.

———. 2005. Democracy and bureaucracy in a community planning process. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (4): 408-19.

Chaskin, R. J., P. Brown, S. Venkatesh, and A. Vidal 2001. *Building community capacity*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Day, D. 1997. Citizen participation in the planning process: An essentially contested concept. *Journal of Planning Literature* 11 (3): 421.

Day, K. 2003. New Urbanism and the challenges of designing for diversity. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 23:83-95.

DeFillipis, J., R. Fisher, and E. Shragge 2006. Neither romance nor regulation: Reevaluating community. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (3):673-89.

Epp, G. 1996. Emerging strategies for revitalizing public housing communities. *Housing Policy Debate* 7 (3): 563-88.

Firey, W. 1982 [1945]. Sentiment and symbolism as ecological variables. In *Urban patterns*: *Studies in human ecology,* edited by G. A. Theodorson, 129-36. University Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press

Fraser, J. C., and E. L. Kick. 2007. The role of public, private, non-profit and community sectors in shaping mixed-income housing outcomes in the US. *Urban Studies* 44 (12): 2357-2377.

Galster, G. 2007. Neighbourhood social mix as a goal of social policy: A theoretical analysis. *European Journal of Housing Policy* 7 (1): 19-43.

Gans, H.J. 1961. Planning and social life: Friendship and neighbor relations in suburban communities. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 27 (2): 131-40.

Gephardt, M. 1997. Neighborhoods and communities as contexts for development. In *Neighborhood Poverty Vol. 1: Context and consequences for children*, edited by J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, and J. L. Aber. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gittel, M. 1980. Limits to citizen participation: The decline of community organizations. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gittel, R., and A. Vidal 1998. Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guest, A. M., and B. A. Lee 1983. The social organization of local areas. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 19 (2): 217-40.

Granovetter, M. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6): 1360-80.

———. 1983. The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory* 1:201-33.

Hogan, J. 1996. Scattered-site housing: Characteristics and consequences. Seattle: Prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Hunter, A. 1974. Symbolic communities: The persistence and changes of Chicago's local communities. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Imbroscio, D. 2008. "[U]nited and actuated by some common impulse of passion": Challenging the dispersal consensus in American housing policy research. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30 (2): 111-30.

Jacobs, J. 1961. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Vintage Books.

Joseph, M. 2008. Early resident experiences at a new mixed-income development in Chicago. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30 (3): 229-57.

Joseph, M., R. J. Chaskin, and H. S. Webber. 2007. The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development. *Urban Affairs Review* 42 (3): 369-409.

Joseph, M. and J. Levy. 2002. Voices from the empowerment zones: Insights about launching large-scale community revitalization initiatives. Baltimore: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Kasarda, J. D. 1990. City jobs and residents on a collision course: The urban underclass dilemma. *Economic Development Quarterly* 4 (4): 313-19.

Kasarda, J. D., and M. Janowitz. 1974. Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review* 39 (3): 332-39.

Katz, P. 1994. *The New Urbanism: Toward an architecture of community*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Khadduri, Jill. 2001. Deconcentration: What do we mean? What do we want? *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 5 (2): 69-84.

Kingsley, T. G., J. McNeely, and J. O. Gibson 1997. *Community building: Coming of age*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Kleit, R. G. 2001. The role of neighborhood social networks in scattered-site public housing residents' search for jobs. *Housing Policy Debate* 12 (3): 541-73.

———. 2002. Job search networks and strategies in scattered-site public housing. *Housing Studies*. 17 (1): 83-100.

———. 2005. HOPE VI new communities: Neighborhood relationships in mixed-income housing. *Environment and Planning A* 37:1413-41.

Kubisch, A., P. Auspos, P. Brown, R. Chaskin, K. Fulbright-Anderson, and R. Hamilton. 2002. *Voices from the field II: Reflections on comprehensive community change*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.

Kubisch, A., P. Brown, R. J. Chaskin, J. Hirota, M. Joseph, H. Richman, and M. Roberts. 1997. *Voices from the field: Learning from comprehensive community initiatives*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.

Leccese, M., and K. McCormick, eds. 1999. *Charter of the New Urbanism*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewis, O. 1966. La Vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty. New York: Random House.

Lin, N., and M. Dumin 1986. Access to occupations through social ties. *Social Networks* 8:365-85.

Logan, J. R., and H. L. Molotch. 1987. *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Metropolitan Planning Council. 2005. CHA plan for transformation July 2005 update. Chicago: Metropolitan Planning Council.

Molotch, H. L. 1976. The city as a growth machine. *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (2): 309-32.

Musterd, S., and R. Anderson. 2005. Housing mix, social mix and social opportunities. *Urban Affairs Review* 40:761-90.

Naparstek, A. J., D. Dooley, and R. Smith. 1997. *Community building in public housing: Ties that bind people and their communities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Naparstek, A. J., S. R. Freis, and G. Thomas Kingsley with D. Dooley and H. E. Lewis. 2000. HOPE VI: Community building makes a difference. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Park, R. E. 1925. The city: Suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the urban environment. In *The city*, edited by R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess, and R. D. McKenzie, 1-46. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

———. 1982 [1936]. Human ecology. In *Urban patterns: Studies in human ecology*, edited by G. A. Theodorson, 20-27. University Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.

Patillo, M. 2007. *Black on the block: The politics of race and class in the city*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Patton, M.Q. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Piven, F. 1966. Participation of residents in neighborhood community action programs. *Social Work* 11 (January): 73-80.

Popkin, S. J., B. Katz, M. Cunningham, K. D. Brown, J. Gustafson, and M. Turner. 2004. *A decade of Hope VI: Research findings and policy challenges*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute and The Brookings Institution.

Putnam, R. 2007. E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2):137-74.

Roberts, M. 2007. Sharing space: Urban design and social mixing in mixed income new communities. *Planning Theory and Practice* 8 (2): 183-204.

Rosenbaum, J. E., L. K. Stroh, and C. Flynn. 1998. Lake Parc Place: A study of mixed-income housing. *Housing Policy Debate* 9 (4):703-40.

Ryan, W., A. Sloan, M. Seferi, and E. Werby. 1974. *All in together: An evaluation of mixed-income multifamily housing*. Boston: Housing Finance Authority.

Sampson, R. J. 1999. What community supplies. In *Urban problems and community development*, edited by R. F. Ferguson and W. Dickens. Washington, DC: Brookings.

Sampson, R. J., and B.W. Groves 1989. Community structure and crime: Testing social disorganization theory. *The American Journal of Sociology* 94 (4): 774-802.

Sampson, R. J., J. Morenoff, and T. Gannon-Rowley. 2002. Assessing neighborhood effects: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443-78.

Sampson, R. J., S. Raudenbush, and F. Earls 1997. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277:918-24.

Scavo, C. 1993. The use of participative mechanisms by large U.S. cities. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15 (1): 93-109.

Shaw, C. R., and H. D. McKay. 1942. *Delinquency and urban areas.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Sites, W., R. J. Chaskin, and V. Parks 2007. Reframing community practice for the twenty-first century: Multiple traditions, multiple challenges. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29 (5): 519-41.

Small, M. L., and K. Newman 2001. Urban poverty after *The truly disadvantaged*: The rediscovery of the family, the neighborhood, and culture. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:23-45.

Smith, J. L., and D. Stovall. 2008. "Coming home" to new homes and new schools: Critical race theory and the new politics of containment. *Journal of Education Policy* 23 (2): 135-52.

Suttles, G. 1972. *The social construction of communities.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

———. 1990. *The man-made city: The land-use confidence game in Chicago.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Talen, Emily. 2002. The social goals of New Urbanism. *Housing Policy Debate* 13 (1): 165-88.

Toennies, F. 1965. Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. In *Theories of society: Foundations of modern sociological theory*, edited by T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. D. Naegele, and J. R. Pitts, 191-201. New York: Free Press.

Valentine, C. A. 1968. *Culture and poverty: Critique and counter proposals*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

von Hoffman, A. 1996. High ambitions: The past and future of American low-income housing policy. *Housing Policy Debate* 7 (3): 423-46.

Warren, M. 2001. Dry bones rattling: Community building to revitalize American democracy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Warren, R. J. 1978. *The community in America.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wilson, W. J. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Zorbough, H. W. 1926. *The Gold Coast and the slum.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Robert J. Chaskin is an associate professor at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration and a research fellow at Chapin Hall at the University. Among other topics, his publications have explored the conceptual foundations and principal strategies of contemporary community intervention; issues of participation, planning, and neighborhood governance; comprehensive community initiatives and other efforts to promote "community capacity" in urban neighborhoods, and approaches to knowledge utilization and the challenges of learning from complex community initiatives. Recent publications include "Reframing Community Practice for the Twenty-First Century: Multiple Traditions, Multiple Challenges," with William Sites and Virginia Parks in the *Journal of Urban Affairs*; "The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty through Mixed-income Development," with Mark Joseph and Henry Webber in *Urban Affairs Review*; and *Research for Action: Cross-National Approaches to Connecting Knowledge, Policy and Practice for Children*, edited with Jona Rosenfeld (Oxford University Press).

Mark L. Joseph is an assistant professor at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University and a Faculty Associate at the Center on Urban Poverty and

Community Development. His research interests include urban poverty, community development, mixed-income development, and comprehensive community initiatives. Recent publications include "Early Resident Experiences at a New Mixed-Income Development in Chicago" in the *Journal of Urban Affairs*; "The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty through Mixed-Income Development," with Robert Chaskin and Henry Webber in *Urban Affairs Review*; and "Is Mixed-Income Development an Antidote to Urban Poverty?" in *Housing Policy Debate*.

For reprints and permission queries, please visit SAGE's Web site at http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav.