

The New Stigma of Relocated Public Housing Residents: Challenges to Social Identity in Mixed-Income Developments

Naomi J. McCormick*
University of Chicago

Mark L. Joseph
Case Western Reserve University

Robert J. Chaskin
University of Chicago

Public housing residents have long experienced stigma as members of an urban “underclass.” One policy response is the creation of mixed-income developments; by deconcentrating poverty and integrating residents into communities in which their residences are indistinguishable from neighbors, such efforts might reduce stigma associated with residency in traditional public housing. Through in-depth interviews with 35 relocated public housing residents and 184 field observations at three mixed-income developments in Chicago, we find this is not the case. Stigma associated with living in public housing is ameliorated, yet residents report that their experience of stigma has intensified in other ways. The negative response of higher-income residents, along with stringent screening and rule enforcement, amplifies the sense of difference many residents feel in these contexts. We demonstrate that this new form of stigma has generated a range of coping responses as relocated public housing residents seek to maintain eligibility while buttressing their social identity.

Residents of public housing have long been stigmatized for their reliance on government subsidies, perceived self-destructive and nonmainstream behavior, and the crime and gang culture entrenched in and around public housing developments (MacLeod 1995; Wacquant 2008). The enduring stigma of public housing residents is exacerbated, if not generated, by their segregation from “mainstream” society (e.g., Hannerz 1969; Jencks and Peterson 1991; Wilson 1987). Indeed, Xavier de Souza Briggs and his colleagues have suggested that in the aftermath of welfare reform in the 1990s, public housing residents have replaced welfare recipients as the primary focus of the general public’s resentment of the “undeserving poor” (Briggs, Popkin, and Goering 2010; Katz 1990).

Policymakers in the United States have made a concerted effort during the last two decades to deconcentrate poverty through the dispersal of public housing residents into

*Correspondence should be addressed to Naomi McCormick, Department of Comparative Human Development, 5730 S. Woodlawn Avenue, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637; n.mccormick@uchicago.edu.

lower-poverty neighborhoods and through the replacement of selected public housing developments with mixed-income housing (Cisneros and Engdahl 2009; Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007; Khadduri 2001; Kleit 2005; Popkin et al. 2004). With its strategic focus on high-quality design with externally indistinguishable units, extensive screening criteria, and balance of higher- and low-income residents, mixed-income development holds the promise, according to its proponents, of creating environments where public housing residents might be able to shed the stigma with which they were formerly burdened, integrating them into new, well-functioning, better-connected neighborhoods (Chicago Housing Authority 2000).

To what extent does a change of address and transformation of the surrounding environment translate into a reduced sense of stigmatization of public housing residents? This article explores this question. Drawing from research at three new, mixed-income developments in Chicago, we examine changes in the regulatory and social environment and the perspectives and experiences of public housing residents living there. We find that although some forms of perceived stigma may have been ameliorated in these new settings, in other ways stigma and isolation has intensified.

This article proceeds as follows. First, we draw on the seminal work of Erving Goffman (1963) to lay out a theoretical framework with which to consider the phenomenon of social stigma in mixed-income settings. We then establish some theoretical expectations for how the relocation of residents from public housing to mixed-income housing might influence their sense of stigmatization and provide a scan of existing research on stigmatization and relocated public housing residents' experiences in mixed-income developments. After introducing the Chicago context, methods, and data for our study, we then consider the extent to which living in mixed-income environments has engendered positive changes in residents' pride and sense of self-worth or created new kinds of stigmatizing dynamics in the regulatory and social environment they must navigate. Finally, we investigate the types of defensive and self-affirming responses that are emerging as these residents interact in these new environments. We conclude by considering some ways in which the massive investment to construct mixed-income communities in Chicago and elsewhere might be better leveraged to create more acceptance and an enhanced social status of relocated public housing residents.

THEORIZING STIGMA: THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE "DISCREDITED"

Over the last 50 years, social scientists have sought to define stigma and explain its societal function (e.g., Crocker, Major, and Steele 1998; Fanon 1967; Goffman 1963, 1967; Link and Phelan 2001; Wacquant 2008). Although definitions vary widely (Link and Phelan 2001), a common thread is the suggestion that stigma serves a social-regulatory purpose by maintaining hierarchical positions of power through shunning and discrediting those individuals who are presumed to exist outside the confines of mainstream social roles and norms (Foucault 2003; Goffman 1963; Povinelli 2002). Crocker, Major, and Steele (1998, p. 505) provide a concise definition of social stigma as "an attribute, or characteristic, that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular social context."

Goffman's book *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (1963) pioneered the contemporary sociology of stigma. It pointed out that in modern society, certain traits and

attributes—physical disability, mental illness, race, social class—function as a signal of an “undesired differentness” from other members of society (1963, p. 5). The latter keep the stigmatized at a distance, forcing them to inhabit a “half world” of sympathetic others, either people like them or those who are prepared to offer support, within which a sense of separateness, alienation, and withdrawal is exacerbated. Link and Phelan (2001) build on Goffman’s treatment of stigma by emphasizing the role of power and societal position. Elements of stigma include the labeling of persons based on distinguishing characteristics (often with substantial oversimplification), the linking of those labels to negative stereotypes, the establishment of social position and distance from those labeled, the assumption of fundamental differences between groups, and, finally, status loss, differential treatment, and unequal outcomes for those labeled. Stigma is a form of mental shortcutting, facilitating quick and effortless judgments about people we encounter so that we can determine the threat or opportunity they represent and shape our actions toward them. Link and Phelan’s essential contribution to the analysis of stigma is the argument that differential access to social, economic, and political power is critical to the construction and maintenance of stigma and its consequences. Crocker, Major, and Steele (1998) further explicate the mutually reinforcing relationship between social stigma and social inequity by pointing out that stigma also serves to justify the disadvantaged positions of certain groups in our society, thus preserving inequality.

Social psychologists, most notably Kahneman and Tversky (1973), have explored the “cognitive heuristics” process through which individuals develop stereotypes about the expected behaviors of others based on the “availability bias” of limited information (also see Kahneman, Slovic, and Tversky 1982; Tversky and Kahneman 1973; Taylor 1982). Research suggests that while this “mental shortcutting” may facilitate and simplify decision making about social interactions, it can reinforce discriminatory actions and outcomes.

There is “overemphasis in stigma research on microinteractions” (Link and Phelan 2001) and a lack of investigation into the broader implications of stigma for those individuals who are stigmatized and for group relations in society as a whole. For example, Lee, Farrell, and Link’s (2004) surveys of attitudes toward homeless individuals confirm Allport’s (1954) classic contact hypothesis that greater exposure of “in-group” to “out-group” members can reduce stigma and discrimination. Such contact has implications for increased understanding and tolerance. Similarly, there is a huge literature on welfare stigma (Besley and Coate 1995; Currie 2006; Moffitt 1983). Stuber and Kronenbusch (2004) examine whether anticipation of stigmatization and poor “treatment” might explain low enrollment rates in government programs and conclude that “stigma does intimidate and threaten potential recipients, and is thus an instrument of social control” with implications for efforts to boost enrollment in potentially stigmatizing programs (Stuber and Kronenbusch 2004, p. 527). Recent empirical work on the challenges and coping strategies related to stigma do not directly address stigmatization in mixed-income developments, but do complement our research findings. Mixed-income developers have found it unexpectedly difficult to recruit eligible public housing residents for available units in the new mixed-income developments in Chicago (Joseph 2010). Stuber and Kronenbusch’s findings about anticipated stigma as a barrier to enrollment by those eligible for public subsidies may provide at least part of the explanation.

Stuber and colleagues follow this line of inquiry into the coercive nature of stigma and its implications for policymakers. Bayer and Stuber (2006) argue that the campaign against tobacco smoking is evidence of stigmatization well used by public policy to

decrease harmful individual behavior. Link, Castille, and Stuber (2008) examine the use of coercion to influence individuals with mental illness to seek psychiatric treatment. They conclude that coercion can have both beneficial and harmful effects. It may get some individuals into treatment that is ultimately therapeutic and possibly reduces the stigmatizing condition, yet for others it exacerbates a sense of isolation and labeling through both the coercion and subsequent treatment. These researchers question the potential social benefits of intentional stigmatization as a means of social influence. Even if unintentional on the part of policymakers, our research similarly makes clear that new policies, practices, and dynamics in mixed-income settings have implications for understanding the forms and consequences of stigma.

MIXED-INCOME DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL IDENTITY: MAINSTREAMING OR A NEW STIGMA?

In Chicago and some other cities in the United States, tens of thousands of low-income, largely African American households were deliberately isolated socially and economically in communities characterized by physical deterioration, low-quality services, joblessness, violence, and crime (Hunt 2009; Popkin et al. 2000). The national push toward poverty deconcentration was initiated in the early 1990s. Under the \$6.7 billion federal HOPE VI program, dilapidated and crime-ridden public housing high-rises began to be demolished across the United States, many to be replaced by mixed-income developments (Brophy and Smith 1997; Cisneros and Engdahl 2009; Popkin et al. 2004; Popkin 2007).

This policy was based upon the expectation that mixed-income developments would benefit public housing residents who are able to relocate in them. Some theories underlying mixed-income development presume that the urban poor have dysfunctional personal attributes and behavior (DeFilippis and Fraser 2010), reflecting a generally accepted stigma about public housing residents (Briggs, Popkin, and Goering 2010). HOPE VI therefore emphasizes behavior modification through heightened rules, monitoring, and role modeling. As Pattillo (2007) has argued, this emphasis on behavior relies on an incomplete reading of William Julius Wilson's (1987) analysis of the causes of persistent urban poverty. Although Wilson did suggest that social isolation and a lack of mainstream role models contributes to deviant behavioral patterns and value frameworks (Wilson 1987, 1996), his analysis primarily focused on major structural constraints—economic restructuring, spatial mismatch—that led to the creation of areas of concentrated disadvantage. The impact of structural barriers to opportunity has been largely overshadowed by the public's preoccupation with the supposed social deviance of public housing residents (see Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007).

A critical dynamic in stigmatization is becoming identified by one's stigma, as if it is an inherent attribute rather than simply a situational condition (Link and Phelan 2001). This essentializing logic can be extended to the label of "public housing resident" which carries informational weight about the presumed nature of the individual, rather than simply a description of place of residence. Residing in public housing has come to signal differentness from "normal" society (Briggs, Popkin, and Goering 2010). In theory, by moving public housing residents out of the housing complexes that are the mark of their stigmatization, these individuals and their families might be freed to seek more social and economic opportunities.

Racial segregation is a critical factor in the enduring stigmatization of public housing residents in Chicago. Brad Hunt's thorough review of the history of Chicago public housing (2009) demonstrates how that city turned a national program intended to provide transitional, subsidized housing to both blacks and whites into a racially segregated one. As maintenance of public housing deteriorated and whites moved out, many of Chicago's high-rise public housing developments became characterized by disrepair, crime, and violence. Since most Chicago developments were inhabited by African Americans in segregated African American neighborhoods, the public perception of public housing was racialized (e.g., see Turner, Popkin and Rawlings 2009 and Hunt 2009). These layered signifiers of otherness—housing subsidy (a proxy for income), race, and more controversially, lifestyle and norms of behavior (which in combination with income represent class status)—have remained difficult if not impossible to separate.

The development of mixed-income housing was an intentional effort to counteract public housing stigma, but produced countervailing forces. The developers and housing authority in Chicago sought to reduce the stigmatization of public housing in the new mixed-income developments through several strategies. First, the developments have all been given new names to break with their identity as former public housing sites. Second, there has been heightened attention to safety and security at the developments and in the surrounding neighborhoods. Third, design choices were intended to make the subsidized units externally indistinguishable from the market-rate ones and, to a large extent, integrated them throughout the developments. That should have made it harder to identify relocated public housing residents by the appearance or location of their housing unit. Fourth, stringent screening and monitoring procedures and rules had the stated objective of ensuring that the public housing residents who move into mixed-income developments are well positioned to assimilate smoothly among residents of other backgrounds.

However, the very screening and monitoring procedures that are intended to help make mixed-income housing successful may also exacerbate public housing residents' feelings of scrutiny and differential treatment and increase their sense of insecurity and anxiety. There is deep skepticism about the integrationist claims for mixed-income housing policy. Critics argue that it is fundamentally driven by a neoliberal approach to urban redevelopment and, therefore, oriented toward creating environments that will generate market demand, rather than facilitating access to opportunity for the urban poor (August 2008; DeFilippis and Fraser 2010; Fraser and Kick 2007; Imbroscio 2008; Lees 2008; Smith and Stovall 2008). Ruming, Mee, and McGuirk (2004, p. 235) assert that the stigmatization of public housing residents has its roots in the entire system that gave rise to subsidized housing: "Housing policy has, since the early 1900s, been implicated in the development of a system of binary opposites which positions ownership as the natural and correct tenure, and public housing as abnormal and, hence, inferior." It is this premise, they argue, that stigmatizes public housing residents and betrays the false hope for what social mixing can accomplish.

EMERGING EVIDENCE FROM OTHER MIXED-INCOME DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

Increasingly around the world, mixed-income housing policy is being adopted as a poverty deconcentration strategy. The evidence from these developments, however, raises

questions about the expectation of positive effects of social mixing on the stigmatization of public housing residents. Rather than an end to stigma through economic and (sometimes) racial integration, one might just as likely expect stigma to be exacerbated.

A small but growing number of empirical studies in countries such as Australia, Canada, Ireland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States have analyzed the social dynamics in emerging mixed-income communities. A starting point for several authors is that, by virtue of their reliance on a public subsidy for their housing, residents of public housing are widely stigmatized and associated with negative characteristics such as a propensity for criminal behavior and a weak work ethic (Arthurson 2010; Jupp 1999; Ruming, Mee, and McGuirk 2004). From their study of a mixed-income development in Australia, Ruming, Mee, and McGuirk (2004, p. 244) concluded that “public tenants actively experience oppression and stigmatization” in the new mixed development. Owners make a “clear association between social problems and public housing tenants” and attribute social instability to the presence of public housing tenants. In Scotland, poorer residents at a mixed-income development felt that they were being purposely excluded from meetings among other residents (Atkinson and Kintrea 2000). At new mixed developments in the United States, Graves (2010) and Joseph (2008) found that not only higher-income residents, but also management staff stigmatized the former public housing residents. Subsidized residents felt that rules and regulations were directed against their lifestyle choices specifically, which left “subsidized residents feeling marginalized and alienated from their market-rate neighbors” (Graves 2010, p. 127; see Chaskin and Joseph 2010).

Our research adds to the relatively limited body of empirical work investigating the impact of socially mixed housing on stigma. While much of the research above frames “stigma” in a general colloquial sense, we construct a more theoretically robust definition grounded in the broader literature on stigma. We examine the effect on stigma of moving to multiple mixed-income developments replacing public housing in Chicago. Further, we examine several other neglected questions about the dynamics of stigma in these new environments. For example, to the extent that stigma persists, what is the role of formal actors and regulations in perpetuating it? To the extent that they are needed, what are the coping strategies of relocated public housing residents? What types of dynamics emerge *among* relocated public housing residents, and is there evidence of a perpetuation of an isolated “half-world” among the subsidized residents, as anticipated by Goffman?

CONTEXT, DATA, AND METHODS

The Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) Plan for Transformation was announced in 1999 as a 10-year, \$1.5 billion strategy and is now slated to last at least 15 years and to cost considerably more. It involves the demolition of about 22,000 units of public housing, the rehabilitation of over 17,000 units, and new construction of about 7,700 public housing units out of about 17,000 in 15 new mixed-income developments (Chicago Housing Authority 2008). All of the developments are being built and managed through public/private partnerships with eight different private developers having lead responsibility at various sites for securing financing, overseeing design and construction, marketing to subsidized and unsubsidized residents, and contracting for property management and

social service provision. The mix of units is negotiated among the developer, CHA, and local community stakeholders according to a rough guideline of one-third public housing, one-third subsidized, and one-third market-rate. Most of the developments include a mix of rental and for-sale housing (for more details on the developments in Chicago see Joseph 2010). Although in some parts of the United States, such as the Pacific Northwest, the public housing population is much more diverse in terms of ethnicity and country of origin, the resident population in public housing in Chicago, and thus the population of public housing residents returning to the mixed-income developments, is almost entirely African American. Thus in the Chicago context, issues of race and class are conflated and difficult to isolate analytically.

This article focuses on three mixed-income developments: Oakwood Shores, Park Boulevard, and Westhaven Park. Oakwood Shores replaces the Ida B. Wells/Madden Park development on the south side of Chicago and will be the largest of these three new developments at full build-out. Park Boulevard is being built in place of Stateway Gardens, a collection of eight high-rise buildings that were part of the “State Street Corridor,” which also included the 28 high-rise towers of the Robert Taylor homes (Venkatesh 2000), among other public housing developments. Westhaven Park is the second phase of the redevelopment of Henry Horner Homes, which was a primarily high-rise development on the city’s west side, and will have a larger proportion of public housing residents than any other site.

A few key differences should be noted among the three developments, and we will indicate throughout the article instances where these differences may be relevant to our findings (see Table 1 for more details). All redevelopment at Westhaven Park is governed by a consent decree that is the result of a successful class-action lawsuit brought against the CHA (see Wilen 2006 for a history of this lawsuit and the subsequent redevelopment at Horner Homes). Beyond lease compliance, residents from Horner who want to move into Westhaven Park are not subject to the same kinds of eligibility requirements in place at other mixed-income developments, for example, with regard to employment or drug testing (Park Boulevard has a work requirement but no drug testing). Westhaven Park also includes a 113-unit, nine-story midrise building that, at the time of our interviews, was the only building at any of the three sites to have such a critical mass of owners and renters living side-by-side within the same building. Occupancy at Park Boulevard took place later than at the other two sites due to financing and construction delays, so respondents have been living at the site for a shorter period of time. While official statistics on the racial mix among residents in the developments are not available, based on our random samples, observations, and information from development staff, we know that, in general, the public housing and subsidized rental populations at all three developments are almost exclusively African American. The market-rate and ownership population at all three sites is more racially and ethnically diverse, including whites, Latinos, and some Asians, particularly among homeowners. The homeownership population at Oakwood Shores is primarily African American, unlike the other two sites, but even there the development team estimates that about a third of the homeowners are not African American.

Our analysis is based on three sources of data: two waves of in-depth, semistructured interviews with 35 public housing residents residing in the three developments, 184 field observations from community meetings and events, and archival material on the Plan for Transformation and the developments in each site. Two waves of interviews were

TABLE 1. Mixed-Income Developments*

	Oakwood Shores	Park Boulevard	Westhaven Park
Former public housing site	Ida B. Wells/Madden Park	Stateway Gardens	Henry Horner Homes
Neighborhood	North Kenwood-Oakland, Southside Chicago	Bronzeville, Southside Chicago	Near Westside, Westside Chicago
Total projected units on site	3,000	1,316	1,317
Relocated public housing units (#/%)	1,000 (33%)	439 (33%)	824 [†] (63%)
Affordable units (#/%)	680 (23%)	421 (32%)	132 (10%)
Market-rate units (#/%)	1,320 (44%)	456 (35%)	361 (27%)
% For-sale units	27%	42%	23%
Initial occupancy dates	Renters—2005 Homeowners—2006	Renters—2007 Homeowners—2007	Renters—2003 Homeowners—2006
Site-specific criteria for public housing resident eligibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 hours per week work requirement for head of household • 5-year criminal background check • credit screening • residential history check • drug test for all household members 18 and over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 hours per week work requirement for head of households; 30 hours per week work, training, or school requirement for all other household members 18 and over • 5-year criminal background check • credit screening • residential history check 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 hours per week engagement in work, training, school, volunteer activities, or social services for all household members 18–55 • criminal background check • credit screening • residential history check
Guiding legal authority for returning residents	Relocation rights contract for all CHA residents	Relocation rights contract for all CHA residents	Legal consent decree to redress housing discrimination

* Numbers and percentages represent development plans as of 2010.

[†] Includes off-site, scattered-site units and the Villages, a “superblock” of 100 percent public housing residences located in the middle of the mixed-income development.

conducted at Westhaven Park and Oakwood Shores, roughly one year apart in 2007 and 2008; the analysis here draws primarily on the second wave of interviews. Interviews at Park Boulevard were conducted once, during the second wave of data collection, as the development was not yet completed during the first phase.

The sample of residents from each site was randomly drawn from developer lists. From an initial pool of 262 residents, 47 residents were contacted to generate the final sample of 35 respondents. Twenty-three residents were interviewed in Wave 1 and 31 in Wave 2, including 19 repeat interviews at Oakwood Shores and Westhaven Park and 12 new interviews at Park Boulevard. It is difficult to speculate about the direction of any potential nonresponse bias; reasons for nonresponse could include personal and household challenges, avoidance of engagement with perceived authorities, or lack of time due to workforce engagement and other responsibilities.

Interview protocols were semistructured and provided latitude for respondents to reflect at length on a series of open-ended questions, including those asking for reflection on the challenges and positive features of current residence, thoughts on screening and rules, the nature of social interaction with their neighbors, and perspectives on their lives at these mixed-income developments. As in all interview research, there is a possibility that respondents were framing their answers with social desirability in mind, engaging in “impression management,” to use Goffman’s term, even with the interviewers. To build rapport with respondents and promote genuine responses, interviews were conducted in person and usually in the respondent’s home. Interviews were conducted by a racially diverse team of interviewers, but we did not systematically match interviewers to respondents by race or any other characteristics. There were two waves of interviews with respondents where possible, and most questions were open-ended to allow respondents to frame responses in their own words as much as possible.

Interviews were transcribed in their entirety and coded for analysis based on a set of deductively derived thematic codes and refined based on inductive interim analysis. Data from observations of community meetings, programs, events, and interactions allow us to contextualize interview data within the specific dynamics of each site and capture social dynamics among resident groups as they unfolded in private and public settings. Coding of interviews and field observations focused on a range of issues concerning identity and sense of self, perceptions and attitudes regarding social stigma, social interactions and tensions among residents, rules, norms and staff sanctions, and coping mechanisms. Coding was undertaken through multiple reviews of the interview and observation transcriptions, with categorizing and creation of summary matrices using basic word processing software.

SHEDDING THE STIGMA OF PLACE: ADDRESS PRESTIGE AND IMPROVED ENVIRONMENT

Our interviews with relocated public housing residents who were able to move back into mixed-income developments made clear that the massive investment in the construction of brand new developments and associated physical revitalization of landscaping, streets, and parks has had a major payoff in terms of ending the stigma that they felt about living in an unattractive, deteriorated, unsafe public housing complex. They describe two related types of destigmatizing benefits of their new residence: improved external perceptions and increased quality of surroundings.

Address Stigma

Living in the old public housing high-rises, residents had become used to the indignity of outsiders’ negative perceptions of their community and refusal to come to the so-called “projects.” As a resident of Oakwood Shores explained:

I used to get my feelings hurt over and over, like special programs that my son is on . . . we had girlfriends that we know lived outside of [public housing]. Therapists would come to the home, you know do therapy on their children, but with me, they wouldn’t even come . . . you know, so people shut down on us because of where we lived.

Now, with the demolition of the old buildings and construction of the new developments has come a very different outside perception. Another Oakwood Shores resident discussed her pleasure that restaurants would now deliver to her door:

It's hard, like where the food is good, they didn't used to come over there to the area and stuff. All our food now is what do you call it, delivered? They'll be like, "Where you live at?" I'll tell them the new development, they hurry up and get over here.

Many of these residents described experiencing shame about their former communities. Their change of residence has led them to feel more pride about where they live. A current Oakwood Shores resident described how she felt more comfortable with others knowing her address:

[Moving here] has helped us a whole lot. It is so funny because when I go places and I tell them my address, people start treating me different like I've got all this money: "Wow, you're over there." 'Cause I had a person tell me, 'Oh you got money,' and I didn't dispute it, if you didn't know, of course. So it's affected me in a really good way, you know. And I'm on the Board of Directors at my son's school. . . . I'm sitting up on the Board with all these rich attorneys and all these people, and they drive me home when meeting is over. Back in the day, I was embarrassed.

In discussing the benefits of moving to the new developments, almost two-thirds of the respondents across the three sites mentioned now being much more at ease when telling outsiders their address and discussed being proud when their families come to visit them at their new homes.

Quality of the Surrounding Environment

In addition to appreciating the improved perceptions of outsiders, respondents described a number of substantive changes to their surroundings that help them feel better about themselves and their place in society. These changes include physical revitalization, decreased crime, increased population diversity, and improvements in services and amenities. In one example, a Park Boulevard resident described a situation where a family member coming to visit her for the first time had to keep calling to make sure he was not in the wrong place:

Compared to all them buildings that was tall up there, windows broken out, boarded up, fire [damage], people had fires and the outside caught on fire, oh it [now] looks—you can't tell this is the [same area] after [redevelopment]. . . . One of my brothers came to visit me and he keep calling me [as he got closer], "Where is you?" I'm like, "Thirty-fifth and State." When he got here . . . he was like, "Girl, this don't even look like State Street."

The increased diversity of community residents is another specific change that makes residents feel generally better about their surroundings and, by extension, themselves. Over two-thirds of respondents described their satisfaction with the end to concentrated

poverty or increased presence of people of other races and ethnicities. A Westhaven Park resident discussed the changes in this way:

They're making it better and it's not just low income, low income, low income. You're starting to see different people in the area which makes you feel like it's—you're not just labeled as one group of individuals, so that's a good thing.

Several respondents hoped that integration would help them and their children grow more comfortable among people of other races and backgrounds. As a Westhaven Park resident explained, "This area used to be predominantly African American. We are [now] learning to live with any culture." Others felt that it would be good for their children to be exposed to a wide variety of people as they grew up—"let them get used to different nationalities and different types of people and their views and . . . how they live," as an Oakwood Shores resident described it. However, while the increased racial and economic diversity of the community has some positive aspects, this is tempered for many respondents by concerns about possible gentrification and displacement and the changing dynamics of power and influence in the community.

Thus, as intended, the redevelopment of public housing into mixed-income developments with new names, high-quality designs, and improved security has provided public housing relocatees who are able to take up residence there with an address they can be proud of and a diverse social environment that exposes them and their children to neighbors of different socioeconomic and (in some cases) racial backgrounds. Yet this is only part of the story. The new environments have also generated new social challenges for the residents that have resulted in subtle and not-so-subtle shifts in the nature of stigmatization.

NEW FORMS OF STIGMATIZATION: ADMINISTRATIVE INTRUSION AND SOCIAL PREJUDICE

Although most respondents described no longer feeling stigmatized by outsiders for their residence and its surroundings, many of them indicated that this improvement was offset by the sense of stigma that they now felt from insiders. They reported being singled-out and differentially treated by both the Housing Authority's administrative procedures for resident relocation and by their new, higher-income neighbors.

Administrative Intrusion

As mentioned earlier, in designing the resident relocation process, the CHA gave priority to put stringent screening and monitoring procedures in place to attempt to select and manage closely the relocated public housing residents who move into the new mixed-income developments.

Preoccupancy: The screening and readiness process. Stigmatized groups must often deal publicly with those aspects of their lives that are the most personal in order to achieve certain rights and access (Goffman 1963). This is certainly found at most of the mixed-income developments studied. Selection criteria include housekeeping checks, lease compliance, drug testing, criminal background checks, credit checks, and employment verification. Although these were designed to screen public housing residents, legal

advocates have successfully argued that any lease compliance regulations, including drug testing, must be applied to renters of all income levels. The criteria do not apply to home purchasers. As mentioned earlier, due to the consent decree in place, residents moving from Henry Horner Homes into Westhaven Park were not originally subject to any selection criteria beyond lease compliance, and at Park Boulevard the developer elected not to impose drug testing. In all three sites, relocating residents also had to attend orientation sessions where they were shown such things as how to wash dishes and use certain appliances. Several relocated public housing residents expressed finding these classes condescending. As one Oakwood Shores resident stated:

We had a workshop on how to wash dishes. Don't tell me how to wash dishes. I know what I'm doing. . . . Y'all trying to bring me down. This is supposed to be a change for the good.

Postoccupancy: New rules and regulations. In addition to careful screening of public housing residents, the CHA and the private property managers of the new developments were also concerned about maintaining strict norms of behavior through explicit, comprehensive rules and vigilant monitoring.

Relocated public housing residents at all three sites are required to undergo frequent housekeeping checks that are considered by many to be invasive and anxiety-provoking, as poor marks can lead to write-ups and even transfer or eviction. Some respondents found the development rules unduly restrictive. As one resident from Oakwood Shores complained:

I was very stressed out here because it takes more to live under these rules as opposed to [in my former public housing development]. We didn't have the rules and people here watch [your behavior]. [They] make sure you empty the garbage right or the kids [are not] too loud, so I've been stressed here.

The new regulations extend well beyond unit upkeep. All three sites have mandates against gathering in public spaces outside and inside the development buildings. In private meetings, we heard property managers discuss the challenges of maintaining a certain image and marketability for the development when there are large gatherings of people in the lobbies and entrances at all hours of the day, as there used to be in the public housing developments. Other rules, described in lease documents and by interviewees, include no loud music after a certain hour in the evening, no barbecuing on the balconies (which does not apply to owners whose barbecuing can be seen and smelled by their neighboring renters), no pets (also not applicable to owners), no unapproved furniture or belongings kept on the balconies, no unattended children, and no littering or inappropriate garbage disposal.

Respondents across the sites complained about the level of monitoring, with over two-thirds of the sample across sites expressing concerns about this intrusion and its differential impact on low-income and relocated public housing residents. An Oakwood Shores resident exclaimed:

Well, believe me, you are being watched. They watch you come in and watch you go out. . . . The cameras. The cameras. And if anything goes wrong and they pull

you in the office, they're gonna tell you every detail. I say damn! Damn! 'Cause the [property manager] told us, she said there's some other people in here paying some good, tall money for staying here, and they ain't gonna let nobody just, you know, mess up the deal. They'll throw you out and put somebody else in here.

Respondents seemed keenly aware of the threat of eviction for rules infractions and, as one put it, feel like they are constantly “walking on eggshells.” Over half of the respondents at Westhaven Park, almost half at Park Boulevard, and over a quarter at Oakwood Shores reported having been cited for a violation.

The anxiety about eviction seemed most broadly shared among Oakwood Shores respondents, who do not have the protection of the consent decree at Westhaven Park, as described earlier, and, having lived in the new development for longer than residents at Park Boulevard have had more opportunity to reflect on their seemingly tenuous position in the development. CHA has no obligation to transfer households to other subsidized housing once they have been placed in a mixed-income development.

The restrictiveness of the rules and threat of eviction is an issue that is a troubling but acceptable reality of the new developments for most respondents, especially if that is the price to be paid for an environment that is more orderly and peaceful. However, the rules become particular problematic and stigmatizing through their perceived inequitable enforcement. Many respondents (three-quarters of the sample at Westhaven Park, well over half at Park Boulevard, and over a third at Oakwood Shores) expressed concerns that the rules were being enforced in an uneven manner and feel that they, themselves, are monitored and investigated at a higher frequency than their higher-income neighbors (also see Chaskin and Joseph 2012).

The stringent barriers and bureaucratic hurdles to eligibility for the new developments, along with the perceived differential treatment by property management, have served to heighten relocated public housing residents' sense of alienation and disrepute. And this is without considering the informal social dynamics of prejudice and marginalizing treatment from their new higher-income neighbors, the topic to which we turn next.

SOCIAL DYNAMICS: PREJUDICE AND UNEVEN POWER

In its most hopeful framing, mixed-income development is a strategy to move public housing residents from being trapped in poverty conditions into communities of opportunity where they can forge new social identities and new social bonds and move their families into mainstream society. We find that the reality, for many respondents, is that the new developments offer a patronizing and unwelcoming social environment where they feel judged as a group, resented for their presence, and have unequal relative access to power brokers and decision makers.

What is the basis for stigmatization by their neighbors? Every respondent in our sample is African American, low-income, reliant on government rental housing subsidies, and formerly lived in public housing developments with high crime rates. In describing what makes them different from their new neighbors (and vice versa) and the characteristics on which they feel they are being judged, they often touch on these attributes. For example, one resident at Park Boulevard mentioned rental status, race, and fear about her

behavior in describing interactions with her neighbors; another included income, race, and employment as multiple reasons for being looked down upon:

So you know them people wouldn't look at us down and our people wouldn't look at them people down: we all here together. You know? So they won't be like, "How you get here?" [They] don't know if I've got money or not. [They] are just looking at me being black [and thinking] "How did she get here . . . [when] I work, I own mine."

As we will discuss in more detail later, these dynamics are further complicated by the fact that a substantial proportion of relocated public housing residents themselves voice similar blanket statements about the behaviors and attitudes of their fellow relocated public housing residents.

At meetings and public forums at all three sites, higher-income residents discussed the need to "fix" or "alter" the behaviors and values of public housing residents. This stance has been endorsed at the highest levels of local government. In public statements, both former Mayor Richard M. Daley and the former CEO of the CHA Lewis Jordan described the public housing transformation as being about much more than just "rebuilding buildings" but indeed about "rebuilding souls" (Hemphill 2005). Echoing this theme, a Chicago Park District official at an Oakwood Shores residents meeting argued that the relocation process requires social services to teach public housing residents to be "better role models to their children" and better "citizens."

From their public comments, higher-income residents and institutional stakeholders appear to imagine the worst about public housing residents, and, as in typical labeling behavior, the individual actions of specific relocated public-housing families often become generalized to the entire population (see Chaskin and Joseph 2010). Many homeowners express the apparent belief at these resident meetings that most relocated public housing residents are potential troublemakers who do not hold mainstream norms and values.

As we have observed in condo association and community policing meetings, many of the higher-income residents operate under the assumption that if there has been a rule transgression, such as improperly disposing of trash, it must have been committed by a public housing resident. This serves as a justification for aggressive demands and scathing comments. For example, at one community policing meeting, a Westhaven Park homeowner asked Lewis Jordan if CHA would pay for damages to the buildings as they have been "caused by public housing residents." Jordan refused to affirm this presumption and told the homeowner that, while CHA would help to investigate who might be responsible, they would not take responsibility for paying for the damages, given that no one knew who was actually to blame. It is interesting to note that the framing of the bases for stigmatization is different in public settings than the perception we heard in private from public housing residents. Public statements by condo owners and others focused on public housing status, sometimes rental status, and issues of behavior, but never mentioned race, which was a frequent reference point in our interviews with relocated public housing residents.

Although unspoken, the specter of racial prejudice clearly hangs over these public and private accusations and denunciations of public housing residents and makes the stigmatization that much more devastating. Stereotypes about deviance or criminality that

in a different era might have been expressed in racial terms are now subsumed under the label “public housing resident.” Given that virtually all relocated public housing residents in these developments are African American, race—combined with dress, comportment, and other signifiers of socioeconomic status—serves as a quick proxy for public housing status. Race, and the media-fueled images of danger that it represents, also heightens the sensitivity of higher-income residents, black or white, to perceived transgressions by individuals around the development. An African American stranger passing through the development or a group of black teens hanging out are quickly seen as threats or lead to strict rules about “loitering” (see Chaskin and Joseph 2012 for more on race and the dynamics of social control).

Some of the new homeowners express feeling misled with regard to their residential proximity to relocated public housing residents. Some state in meetings that they were never told they would be moving into a mixed-income development, while others suggested that potential issues were glossed over in the marketing process. As an owner at Westhaven Park said at a community policing meeting: “I did not pay \$300,000 for a condo to live next to the projects.”

Relocated public housing residents are well aware of the disdain that many of their higher-income neighbors feel about their presence in the development. As one respondent from Westhaven Park stated:

They don’t want to live with us, and I see a lot of that. And they be saying that behind our back because like I said, they can’t whisper. We can hear what they be saying. And then when they have their board meeting downstairs, they don’t have their door closed, they have it opened.

Over half of the respondents at Oakwood Shores and about a quarter of respondents at Westhaven Park and Park Boulevard expressed concerns that higher-income residents were actually aiming to push relocated public housing residents out of the neighborhood and, as one said, “take it over for themselves.” An Oakwood Shores resident expressed her concern that “write-ups” by property management for rules infractions would be used to push public housing residents out:

It’s three write-ups. I guess I don’t know how many call-ins but it’s three write-ups. I mean they want to try to put you out. . . . And see, [this is now] a different neighborhood. We got mixed people over here. You have some white. And you got people that’s paying a lot of money for rent that’s probably mad ‘cause you ain’t paying as much rent as they paying.

Further exacerbating the marginalization felt by relocated public housing residents is the uneven access to institutional decision makers with responsibility for the development. Institutional stakeholders appear to play into this by privileging the residents of market-rate units, particularly owners. For example, speaking at a meeting of mixed-income developers, one developer suggested that owners must set “the norms for the highest common denominator.” Owners at the three sites have used their networks and prestige to pressure both private developers and public-sector decision makers. Homeowners at Westhaven Park and Oakwood Shores have used their economic, social, and political power to organize meetings with Police Commanders, the CEO of CHA, and

other top officials. At one field site, a condominium association president sent an email to Mayor Daley and to the local Police Commander which resulted in a quickly arranged visit from Lewis Jordan to meet with the condo association.

Relocated public housing residents in mixed-income developments enjoy the benefits of residence in a revitalizing neighborhood, but face challenges of heightened scrutiny, prejudice from neighbors, and exclusion from decision making in the new development. They must determine how they will cope with these challenges in order to retain the improved housing in which they and their children now live.

COPING RESPONSES TO NEW STIGMA IN MIXED-INCOME DEVELOPMENTS

How are relocated public housing residents responding to the new forms of stigmatization that they are encountering in the mixed-income developments? We distinguish among residents' responses in terms of their stance toward themselves, toward the stigmatizers, and toward other relocated public housing residents. These coping strategies were far from mutually exclusive. As will be shown, however, some specific types of responses were more common among respondents than others.

Stance Toward Self

Relocated public housing residents may perceive screening procedures, stringent rules and monitoring, and the sense of being the object of pervasive social prejudice and undesirability as an attack on social identity and self-esteem. One possible coping response is to internalize the external perceptions and prejudices and begin to question their self-worth. Goffman (1963) suggested that the stigmatized individual might demonstrate feelings of shame, self-doubt, and even self-hate. However, empirical research demonstrates that self-esteem of the stigmatized can remain high in the face of alienation (Crocker, Major, and Steele 1998). Our own research confirms this. We found that most relocated public housing respondents retain a quite strong sense of self-esteem and self-worth, at least in their interviews with us and descriptions of their experiences, perceptions, and outlook. As we will see below, many of them lived with some degree of anxiety about their circumstances, but this appeared to be externally oriented and not perceived as self-doubt or shame. A resident at Oakwood Shores described her strong sense of self and her perception that her values and outlook are similar to those of her higher-income neighbors, stating that she has "a lot of things" in common with them:

I eat, sleep, get up, I love my family. I want good things. I want to stay in a beautiful community, neighborhood. I want to have somewhere decent to raise my family.. .. But like I said, my personality, my character, I have very high self-esteem. Nobody could make me feel any less anyway, you know.

A few respondents asserted that they did not need to move into a mixed-income development to "fix themselves." About a quarter of the respondents described their background as having been "raised right." For example, an Oakwood Shores resident told us:

I can't give credit to Oakwood Shores about the lifestyle that I have adopted. I give credit to my mom who raised us to be this way, because even when I was living in

Ida B. Wells, anybody who knows me would tell you what I called that. I called that my condominium.

In sum, about half of the residents asserted that they had gotten to the place they are now in life on their own and not through the CHA or anyone else's help or example.

On the other hand, almost half of the respondents described ways in which they were attempting to adapt their behavior and attitudes to meet the demands and expectations of the new development. As a relocated public housing resident at Westhaven Park put it:

I feel that's the whole purpose of [the mixed-income developments] . . . Don't just sit back and depend on government assistance for the rest of your life. Use [this opportunity] to move ahead.

Stance Toward Stigmatizers

The media and institutional actors responsible for the mixed-income developments present the higher-income residents as upstanding, productive citizens who can serve as role models to relocated public housing residents who are lacking in values and social competence (Joseph, Chaskin, and Webber 2007). However, these higher-income residents also engage in derogation and marginalization of their lower-income neighbors. In response to this, almost half of relocated public housing respondents adopt a self-protective strategy, isolating themselves and avoiding contact with other residents, including other relocated public housing residents. Respondents explained that this self-protection was to avoid trouble and not risk having complaints made against them. As a resident at Westhaven Park told us:

I pretty much stay to myself. That's how you live longer around here, stay out of trouble. . . . That's why I say it's best to just mind your own business and just speak to people "hi" and "bye" and not socialize or fraternize with them, then that way you won't be one of the ones that they calling into the office on.

Although some chose to isolate themselves and made no effort to connect with other residents, almost half described ways in which they had tried to break down barriers with their higher-income neighbors. These residents talked about trying to be friendly, making small talk with their neighbors, petting their dogs. One resident at Westhaven Park described how her son was the one who made the first move to interact with some higher-income neighbors who had seemed very "mean" up until that point:

My son actually was the one that broke the ice. . . . She was takin' in groceries, and he went over and picked the milk up and was like, "Here, I'll get it for you." . . . And from that day on, this woman, I mean, she smiled more. She spoke more, and she was like real content.

Whether or not they attempted to engage with other residents, over four-fifths of respondents rejected the idea that their higher-income neighbors were any different from them in terms of values. For example, a resident at Park Boulevard explained:

Well, I don't feel [the owners are] different. They might feel they different. . . . Well, I know they have more . . . but the way I was raised, my parents were strict. So some of these with money, I probably had got a better upbringing.

When asked to describe any ways in which she considered herself to be different from her higher-income neighbors, a resident at Westhaven Park stated: "Just the color of their skin, that's all. They ain't no different from me. Just straighter hair, that's it!" This determination by respondents to articulate their commonalities with their new neighbors may be heightened by the challenges they perceive to their own social identity.

In spite of this general orientation, some respondents described ways that they engaged in "information management" to conceal their identity and avoid tension when possible (Goffman 1963). Respondents described ways they altered their language and mannerisms to portray a more acceptable and normative affect. As one Oakwood Shores respondent explained:

I have found myself that when I talk to the people at market rent or homeowners, it will have to be on a different kind of behavior, and I think it's just psychological, 'cause they don't tell me to or ask me to, but I immediately want to impress them that "You know I can blend over here with you all."

Some respondents discussed masking their status by keeping "mum" when their stigmatized identity is threatened. One Oakwood Shores resident described a particularly galling encounter at a community meeting:

And the lady [homeowner] was sitting up there saying, "I'm telling everything. The people from the projects, they ain't no good." I'm from the projects but I didn't, you know, I didn't say nothing. I'm getting heated and my blood getting heated. And [other] people from the projects was there.

Despite her anger, she elected to conceal her stigmatized identity

In general, the greater the distance (socially and physically) of relocated public housing tenants from their new development, the easier it was to conceal their identity. Their better-reputed address provided significant camouflage to outsiders in settings away from the neighborhood. General neighborhood meetings allowed it to a degree, but around the development, where neighbors or the Housing Authority staff interact, race and other aspects of appearance, such as the presence of children, often prevented the use of concealing strategies as "information management."

Stance Toward other Relocated Public Housing Residents

Goffman maintained that stigmatized individuals very often have ambivalent feelings about members of their own group and face a choice of accepting a collective identity apart from the norm or distancing themselves from other members of their stigmatized group. He underscored the fact that to distance themselves from others supposedly "like them" required the affirmation of the stigma itself. We found that about three-fifths of the respondents talked about how they themselves were different from those public housing residents who more closely fit the stereotypes that were being assigned to all relocated

public housing residents. A resident at Westhaven Park described keeping her distance from those relocated public housing residents who were described as carrying themselves very differently from how she does:

Some of them still be running back and forth all, you know, doing any of the things that they don't 'posed to be doing, but they do it anyway. That's everywhere. . . . Goin' to the corner, looking for drugs, . . . So I ain't got nothing to do with it. No one don't bother me, I don't bother them. They'll do their own thing.

No respondents articulated a willingness to interact only with other relocated public housing residents and live in the "half-world" that Goffman described. Those who withdrew from interactions with the larger population withdrew from virtually everyone in the development. However, while respondents may not have claimed to be accepting an enclave for themselves within the development, we observed numerous situations where relocated public housing residents were in social situations with no higher-income residents and appeared quite comfortable. Further, at several contentious meetings, relocated public housing residents were observed coming together to defend themselves collectively against the negative statements and stereotypes promulgated by staff at the development and their new neighbors.

Stigma Not Perceived by All

About a fifth of the respondents did not raise the issue of stigma or mistreatment in the mixed-income development. These respondents tended to describe their residential experience in positive terms. In general, they were younger on average than the sample as a whole, had fewer children, more education, and were less likely to be unemployed. They were the relocated public housing residents who could be considered closer to the social and economic "mainstream." Unlike others, none of these respondents discussed changes that they personally needed to make to maintain residence in the new development. If they raised the issue of stigma, it was with reference to the stigma associated with living in public housing and how this sense of marginalization had decreased since their move to a mixed-income development.

CONCLUSION

The relocated public housing residents who have been able to navigate the screening criteria and administrative hurdles to move to the new mixed-income developments are benefiting from these relatively more peaceful and stable residential environments. However, a combination of intrusive screening and vigilant monitoring by institutional staff and social prejudice from higher-income neighbors generates new forms of stigma. The new stigma is based on a mix of race, rental housing subsidy receipt, and behavior. Away from the development, relocated public housing tenants are able to manage the information about their backgrounds and conceal their stigmatization in ways that their former addresses would not allow. However, at the mixed developments, the prevailing vigilance of higher-income neighbors, property managers, and other staff about their appearance and comportment prevent them from avoiding continued marginalization. The dominant us-versus-them dynamic that we document in three mixed-income sites in Chicago

supports the findings of other research on social interactions in mixed-income developments in other cities and countries (Arthurson 2010; Breitbart and Pader 1995; Graves 2010; Pader and Breitbart 1993; Ruming, Mee, and McGuirk 2004; Tach 2009). Our research adds an understanding of the way that differential rules, surveillance, and enforcement by development staff and authorities reinforce the sense of stigmatization (see also Chaskin and Joseph 2012).

Relocated public housing residents living in mixed-income developments will not be able to reshape, in Goffman's terms, their "spoiled social identity" without the breaking down of prevailing assumptions about the link between public housing residence, values and behavior, and social worth and status. Perhaps their fellow neighbors, the actors responsible for managing the developments, and the broader society hold these stereotypes about public housing residents so deeply that destigmatization cannot be expected. In an environment where individuals can be identified, by their appearance and comportment, as former residents of high-poverty public housing, enduring stigma may simply be an unfortunate fact of life. For relocated public housing residents who wish to take advantage of improved physical quality of life in new mixed-income developments, especially those whose circumstances, outlook, and employment status suggest an indefinite reliance on public subsidies, stigmatization takes on new forms. Fully shedding the burden of stigma may require a generational shift. Perhaps the children growing up in these households will go out into the world from a stable environment, respectable address, and revitalizing community.

More immediately, concerted action might confront and mitigate the stigma of relocated public housing residents in mixed-income developments. Where possible, residents and stakeholders should help distinguish general stereotypes and perceptions from the actual conduct of specific residents within the development, thus correcting faulty perceptions about specific actions that lead to claims-making about relocated public housing residents in general. The enduring stigma about antisocial norms and behavior is maintained in large part through assumptions that relocated public housing residents are the individuals responsible for transgressions in the mixed developments, but these actions are often the acts of individuals from outside or by other residents.

Most residents agree that rules and norms are necessary to establish and uphold expectations for appropriate behavior. However, those formal and informal expectations should be reasonable and, most importantly, fairly monitored. Procedures that enable more inclusive input into establishing standards and that provide more careful identification of transgressors may help lead to more equitable treatment and less scapegoating of relocated public housing residents.

To the extent that the behaviors of relocated public housing residents are indeed different from a "norm" more familiar to other residents but are not particularly harmful, like lively public gatherings and congregating in front of buildings rather than in back, it seems that greater tolerance would go a long way. Underlying the enduring stigma is a strong conviction that residents who were living in public housing are inherently different from others and thus unworthy of acceptance. Accepting differences in behavior without blanket judgments about personal character could reduce the stigmatization. Actors responsible for the development—property managers, developers, service providers, leaders of resident associations—have a key role to play here in discouraging intolerance and providing transparency about community building and constructive problem solving.

Our findings raise specific implications for mixed-income development practice and policy. In the marketing and recruitment phase of the development, it is important to be clear with potential residents of all incomes and tenures about the expected diversity in the new community and the need for tolerance of differences as well as a commitment to working together to establish shared norms and expectations. This will help decrease the element of surprise some market-rate residents might feel about relocated public housing residents being a significant proportion of the population. It may also attract a more tolerant population of buyers, people who are interested in being a part of a pioneering social project and not just investing in a home.

In the postoccupancy phase of the development, early and consistent management of expectations and social dynamics is critical. In order for this to occur, it must be clear who shares responsibility for instigating and sustaining this process, including property managers, service providers, and others. Given the particular difficulties of managing life in a mixed-income development, orientation and training for staff is vital, along with continued support navigating the challenges that can be expected. Local and national intermediaries could provide ongoing technical assistance and brokered peer-to-peer exchanges and support for developers, property managers, service providers, housing authority staff, and other local partners. In addition, careful thought and policy development should be focused on the advisory and decision-making structures in the new developments, and on how residents will be selected and managed in inclusive and constructive ways.

The parallels between our findings from Chicago and those from studies of other contexts lead us to assert that our conclusions can be usefully generalized to other mixed-income contexts. However, some key distinguishing features in Chicago may make the dynamics of stigma in mixed-income developments more stark and challenging there. These particularities include the predominance of African Americans in public housing and the enduring racial inequities in access to opportunity; the history of deliberate segregation and subsequent court-ordered desegregation efforts decision; the scale of the effort in Chicago, which generated more public, media, and legal attention than in many other cities; and the extreme breadth of economic diversity in the Chicago sites, with the inclusion of market-rate homeownership in all three sites we examined.

Our findings about social dynamics in mixed-income housing settings also have implications for research on stigma. While Lee, Farrell, and Link's (2004) survey research on homelessness generally found support for Allport's contact hypothesis even in conditions with low levels of status equality, our findings suggest that in conditions of high contact and social distance, but low status equality, comfort and tolerance may decrease rather than increase. Indeed, Lee, Farrell, and Link (2004: 59) anticipated this possibility: "heavy exposure to homelessness—especially through observation or interaction—may push a small segment of the population past the 'tipping point,' eroding sympathy and promoting avoidance." Rather, to prevent this "tipping point" from being reached, intentional community building is needed to facilitate constructive interactions (Kleit 2008). More generally, our research lends further support for Link and Phelan's (2001) appeal for examining the dynamics and roots of stigma not only in "microinteractions" among individuals, but also in the structures of institutionalized practices and stereotypical assumptions formalized through public policy.

The social project to deconcentrate poverty in public housing and create a path to social inclusion and acceptance of relocated public housing residents has proven to be considerably more difficult and complicated than anticipated. The "natural" course of

mixed-income development seems to be leading to new forms of stigma and rising isolation of relocated public housing residents. It will take a more intentional effort to create compromise and tolerance among residents of such vastly different backgrounds.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation with additional funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. We are grateful to members of our research team including Marisa Berwald, Brenda Copley, James Crawford, Ranada Harrison, Amy Khare, Danielle Raudenbush, Florian Sichling, and Sara Voelker. We also want to thank the many individuals who have helped facilitate this research project including representatives of the CHA, development team members at the study sites, and, most importantly, the residents of the mixed-income developments who discussed their experiences with us.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Arthurson, Kathy. 2010. "Operationalising Social Mix: Spatial Scale, Lifestyle and Stigma as Mediating Points in Resident Interaction." *Urban Policy and Research* 28(1):49–63.
- Atkinson, Rowland, and Keith Kintrea. 2000. "Owner-Occupation, Social Mix and Neighbourhood Impacts." *Policy and Politics* 28(1):93–108.
- August, Martine. 2008. "Social Mix and Canadian Public Housing Redevelopment: Experiences in Toronto." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 17(1):82–100.
- Bayer, Ronald, and Jennifer Stuber. 2006. "Tobacco Control, Stigma and Public Health: Rethinking the Relations." *American Journal of Public Health* 96(1):28–31.
- Besley, Timothy, and Stephen Coate. 1995. "The Design of Income Maintenance Programs." *Review of Economic Studies* 62(2):187–221.
- Breitbart, Myrna M., and Ellen J. Pader. 1995. "Establishing Ground: Representing Gender and Race in a Mixed Housing Development." *Gender, Place, and Culture* 2(1):5–20.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza, Susan J. Popkin, and John Goering. 2010. *Moving to Opportunity: The Story of an American Experiment to Fight Ghetto Poverty*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Brophy, Paul C., and Rhonda M. Smith. 1997. "Mixed-Income Housing: Factors for Success." *Cityscape* 3(2):3–31.
- Chaskin, Robert J., and Mark L. Joseph. 2010. "Building 'Community' in Mixed-Income Developments: Assumptions, Approaches, and Early Experiences." *Urban Affairs Review* 45(3):299–335.
- . 2012. "'Positive' Gentrification, Social Control, and the 'Right to the City' in Mixed-Income Communities: Uses and Expectations of Space and Place." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01158.x.
- Chicago Housing Authority. 2000. *Chicago Housing Authority: Plan for Transformation*. Chicago, IL: The Chicago Housing Authority.
- . 2008. *FY2008 Moving to Work Annual Plan: Plan for Transformation Year 9*. Chicago, IL: The Chicago Housing Authority.
- Cisneros, Henry G., and Lora Engdahl, eds. 2009. *From Despair to Hope: Hope VI and the New Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Currie, Janet. 2006. "The Take Up of Social Benefits." In *Public Policy and the Income Distribution*, edited by Alan J. Auerbach, David Card, and John M. Quigley. New York: Russell Sage.
- Crocker, Jennifer, Brenda Major, and Claude M. Steele. 1998. "Social Stigma." Pp. 504–553 in *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- DeFilippis, James, and Jim Fraser. 2010. "Why Do We Want Mixed-Income Housing and Neighborhoods?" Pp. 135–147 in *Critical Urban Studies: New Directions*, edited by J. S. Davies and D. L. Imbroscio. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*, translated by C. L. Markmann. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2003. *Abnormal: Lectures at the College de France, 1974–1975*, translated by G. Burchell. New York, NY: Picador.
- Fraser, James C., and Edward 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(2): 2357–77.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- . 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Graves, Erin M. 2010. "The Structuring of Urban Life in a Mixed-Income Housing 'Community.'" *City & Community* 9(1): 109–31.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1969. *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hemphill, Temple. 2005. *State and 35th Street to Become Mixed-Income Community*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Defender.
- Hunt, Bradford D. 2009. *Blueprint for Disaster: The Unraveling of Chicago Public Housing*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Imbroscio, David. 2008. "'United 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.
- Jencks, Christopher, and Paul E. Peterson, eds. 1991. *The Urban Underclass*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Joseph, Mark L. 2008. "Early Resident Experiences at a New Mixed-Income Development in Chicago." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30(3):229–57.
- . 2010. "Creating Mixed-Income Developments in Chicago: Developer and Service Provider Perspectives." *Housing Policy Debate* 20(1):91–118.
- Joseph, Mark L., Robert J. Chaskin, and Henry S. Webber. 2007. "The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty Through Mixed-Income Development." *Urban Affairs Review* 42(3):369–409.
- Jupp, Ben. 1999. *Living Together: Community Life on Mixed Tenure Estates*. London, UK: Demos.
- Kahneman, Daniel, Paul Slovic, and Amos Tversky, eds. 1982. *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1973. "On the Psychology of Prediction." *Psychological Review* 80(4): 237–51.
- Katz, Michael B. 1990. *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Khadduri, Jill. 2001. "Deconcentration: What Do We Mean? What Do We Want?" *Cityscape* 5(2):69–84.
- Kleit, Rachel G. 2005. "HOPE VI New Communities: Neighborhood Relationships in Mixed-Income Housing." *Environment and Planning A* 37(8):1413–41.
- . 2008. "Neighborhood Segregation, Personal Networks, and Access to Social Resources." Pp. 237–260 in *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America*, edited by J. Carr and N.K. Kutty. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, Barrett A., Chad R. Farrell, and Bruce G. Link. 2004. "Revisiting the Contact Hypothesis: The Case of Public Exposure to Homelessness." *American Sociological Review* 69:40–63.
- Lees, Loretta. 2008. "Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance?" *Urban Studies* 45(12):2449–70.
- Link, Bruce G., Dorothy M. Castille, and Jennifer Stuber. 2008. "Stigma and Coercion in the Context of Outpatient Treatment for People with Mental Illnesses." *Social Science and Medicine* 67(3):409–19.
- Link, Bruce G., and Jo C. Phelan. 2001. "Conceptualizing Stigma." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27(1):363–85.
- MacLeod, Jay. 1995. *Ain't No Makin' It: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood*, Expanded Edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Moffitt, Robert. 1983. "An Economic Model of Welfare Stigma." *American Economic Review* 75:1023–35.
- Pader, Ellen J., and Myrna M. Breitbart. 1993. "Transforming Public Housing: Conflicting Visions for Harbor Point." *Places* 8(4):34–41.
- Pattillo, Mary. 2007. *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Popkin, Susan J. 2007. Proposed HOPE VI Improvement and Reauthorization Act: Testimony before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development, and the U.S. Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity. Retrieved October 28, 2010, from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/901088_HOPE.VI.pdf.
- Popkin, Susan J., Victor E. Gwiasda, Lynn M. Olson, Dennis P. Rosenbaum, and Larry Buron. 2000. *The Hidden War: Crime and the Tragedy of Public Housing in Chicago*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Popkin, Susan J., Bruce Katz, Mary K. Cunningham, Karen D. Brown, Jeremy Gustafson, and Margery Austin Turner. 2004. *A Decade of Hope VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute and The Brookings Institution Press.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2002. *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of the Australian Multiculturalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ruming, Kristian J., Kathleen J. Mee, and Pauline M. McGuirk. 2004. "Questioning the Rhetoric of Social Mix: Courteous Community or Hidden Hostility?" *Australian Geographical Studies* 42(2):234–48.
- Smith, Janet J., and David 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.
- Stuber, Jennifer, and Karl Kronebusch. 2004 "Stigma and Other Determinants of Participation in TANF and Medicaid." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 23(3):509–30.
- Tach, Laura M. 2009. "More than Bricks and Mortar: Neighborhood Frames, Social Processes, and the Mixed-Income Redevelopment of a Public Housing Project." *City & Community* 8(3):269–99.
- Taylor, Shelley E. 1982. "The Availability Bias in Social Perception and Interaction." Pp. 190–200 in *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*, edited by D. Kahneman, P. Slovic, and A. Tversky. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, Margery A., Susan J. Popkin, and Lynette Rawlings, eds. 2009. *Public Housing and the Legacy of Segregation*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1973. "Availability: A Heuristic for Judging Frequency and Probability." *Cognitive Psychology* 5(2):207–32.
- Venkatesh, Sudhir Alladi. 2000. *American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Wilen, William P. 2006. "The Horner Model: Successfully Redeveloping Public Housing." *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy* 1(1):62–95.
- Wilson, William J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York, NY: Knopf.

El Nuevo Estigma de los Residentes de Programas de Vivienda Pública: Retos a la Identidad Social en Proyectos de Vivienda de Ingresos Mixtos.
(Naomi J. McCormick, Mark L. Joseph y Robert Chaskin)

Resumen

Residentes de programas de vivienda pública han experimentado desde tiempo estigmas como miembros de una "infra-clase" urbana. Una respuesta de política pública es la creación proyectos residenciales de ingresos mixtos. Al desconcentrar la pobreza e integrar residentes en comunidades en que sus viviendas son indistinguibles de las de sus vecinos, tales esfuerzos podrían reducir los estigmas asociados con el lugar de residencia en proyectos tradicionales de vivienda pública. A través de entrevistas en profundidad con 35 residentes reubicados de proyectos de vivienda pública y 184 observaciones de campo en los tres proyectos de vivienda de ingresos mixtos en Chicago, encontramos que este no es el caso. El estigma asociado con el vivir en viviendas públicas se reduce, pero los residentes reportan que su experiencia de estigma se ha incrementado de otras formas. La respuesta negativa de los residentes de mayores ingresos junto a vigilancia rigurosa y el endurecimiento de normas amplifica el sentido de ser diferente que muchos residentes sienten en estos contextos. Demostramos que esta nueva forma de estigma ha generado un conjunto de respuestas para sobrellevar esta situación, mientras que los residentes de viviendas públicas buscan mantener su elegibilidad para participar en estos proyectos a la vez que afirman su identidad social.