

DRAFT * PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE * DRAFT

**How Does Leaving High Poverty Neighborhoods Affect the
Employment Prospects of Low-Income Mothers and Youth?:
Evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment**

Xavier de Souza Briggs
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Elizabeth Cove
The Urban Institute

Cynthia Duarte
Quinnipiac University

Margery Austin Turner
The Urban Institute

July 2007

Three-City Study of Moving to Opportunity

Working paper #3

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association in Montreal, Canada, August 11-14, 2006. This research was supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Fannie Mae Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and W.T. Grant Foundation. Please direct comments and questions to xbriggs@mit.edu

How Does Leaving High Poverty Neighborhoods Affect the Employment Prospects of Low-Income Mothers and Youth?: Evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment

July 2007

Abstract. We examine job-related social processes and outcomes in a randomized housing experiment in which “treated” families relocated from public housing in high poverty, inner-city neighborhoods to privately run housing in low poverty ones. We test three hypotheses about how exiting the ghetto might affect employment—*spatial mismatch*, *networks*, and *norms*—with a unique, mixed method strategy. Combining qualitative interviews, ethnographic fieldnotes, and survey data on the adults with census and administrative data on the changing geography of jobs, we conclude that the lack of generalized treatment effects for job-ready participants so far owes to: the challenges of securing jobs-housing-support matches where the markets are turbulent and informal social support is vital but unpredictable; and the challenges for parents of “converting” new locations into new social and institutional resources while retaining pre-move resources, such as accessible childcare. Yet neighborhoods can matter (as locations) even where neighbors do not: “Successful” relocation actually led to a loss of spatial access to entry-level job centers, new job creation, and net job growth, but relocating enabled some youth to build much more diverse friendships and a broader repertoire of “soft skills” that they perceive to be important for upward mobility—notwithstanding some pains of acculturation. These findings indicate the usefulness and limits of a broadly targeted, relocation-only policy strategy for the inner-city poor, as well the dangers of assuming that less poor neighborhoods are advantageous for poor residents across the board.

Introduction

Consider two very different cases of the role of relocation in the economic lives of low-income black women. Anique and her daughter Clara (pseudonyms) left public housing in a high poverty, high crime neighborhood of South Los Angeles seven years ago. Since then, Anique has struggled to line up steady work and childcare while bouncing from apartment to apartment in L.A.’s sprawling housing market. At one point, her daily commute was 70 miles each way, from Long Beach where her mother and sister provided childcare, to her job in Riverside County. But Anique had considerable work experience, and the skills and confidence that often come with that experience, at the time of her move. As we completed our visits with her in 2005, she and Clara were living in a neighborhood that felt safe, across the street from Anique’s steady new job as a child support investigator with county government.

Kimberlyn and her two teenaged boys also relocated from public housing projects in South L.A., to a much safer neighborhood in the San Fernando Valley. Kimberlyn credits that relocation—her “last chance,” she recalls—with getting her away from an abusive relationship. Although the new neighborhood provided safer, better schools for her sons, which Kimberlyn

prized, she experienced racial harassment from white neighbors in her apartment complex. Plus, Kimberlyn was on welfare when she moved and had almost no work experience or credentials. When she could not or would not secure, in the Valley, the job training and other resources she knew she needed, she moved her family back to South L.A. and put her sons back into the much more disruptive and dangerous schools there. Kimberlyn has been unable to line up steady work and is back on welfare after stints as a security officer and brief spells in training. The childcare her sister had provided in South L.A. abruptly disappeared, and her mother's needs are a major burden.

For roughly half a century, policymakers and researchers have debated the impacts of place, and in particular of living in inner-city ghettos, on employment and self-sufficiency. Images of the welfare-dependent or socially isolated ghetto poor, together with evidence of a “spatial mismatch” between increasingly decentralized job locations and the neighborhoods where low-skilled people are concentrated, fueled an interest in housing policy as a tool for shifting the “geography of opportunity” (Abrams 1955; Briggs 2005; Downs 1973; Wilson 1987). Created in 1974, the federal rental housing voucher program allows low-income families to use government-provided housing subsidies to move away from poor and high-risk communities. Yet these families, minorities most of all, continue to face extraordinary barriers, such as racial discrimination, landlord refusal to accept the vouchers, the exclusion of affordable rental housing from more affluent and white communities, search costs, and more (Massey and Denton 1993; Pendall 2000; Turner 1998). Plus, some families have their own reasons for preferring poorer, more racially segregated areas to the unwelcome alternatives they perceive.

Yet research on the long-run effects of programs that seek to expand housing choice by *facilitating* access to better neighborhoods—an approach known as “assisted housing mobility”—has suggested that these efforts can improve the life outcomes of low-income, mostly minority adults and their children in several dimensions, including education, safety and security, mental health, employment and self-sufficiency. Two programs, in particular, found their way to the headlines in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and the unprecedented relocation it forced. In 1994, encouraging results from the Gautreaux housing desegregation program (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000) spurred the federal government to invest \$70 million in the randomized Moving to Opportunity experiment (MTO) in five metro areas: Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York.¹ MTO randomly assigned families living in high poverty public housing developments, who volunteered for the chance to relocate, to either a treatment group or one of two comparison groups (detailed below); the nearly two thousand households in the experimental group received rental housing vouchers and relocation assistance, with the requirement that they move to “low-poverty neighborhoods” (census tracts with a poverty rate below 10% as of the 1990 census). About half successfully “leased up” under these terms. At baseline, only about one-quarter of MTO adults were working; most were on welfare (Goering and Feins 2003).

Although MTO was not designed to directly address participants' employment status or employability—including the barriers to work that low-skill single mothers often face—the experiment had the research-based expectation that if families moved to low-poverty neighborhoods, adults could become employed or get better jobs by moving closer to

¹ MTO was authorized by Congress in 1992 and launched two years later with a special appropriation (U.S. HUD 1999).

employment centers, developing more useful job networks (as a form of social capital) with more advantaged neighbors, and/or gaining momentum from an environment with stronger work norms. Controversial or not, realistic or not, these expectations were real, *particularly in the minds of policymakers*. Indirect effects were hypothesized as well, such as the possibility that safer neighborhoods might reduce stress and anxiety, making adults more capable of pursuing jobs or training. On the other hand, families might lose access to social ties which are often sources of childcare, transportation, and other work supports, as well as pre-existing employment relationships.

Explaining treatment effects—and looking beyond them. Notwithstanding some encouraging evidence on early impacts of MTO on employment and welfare receipt at some sites, at the interim mark some four to seven years after random assignment, there were no generalized treatment effects on employment, earnings, or self-sufficiency (Orr et al 2003). Significantly, though, more than twice as many MTO adults were working *in all groups* (Orr et al 2003)—this over a period in which labor markets were tight and time limits on welfare assistance began to show effects—and many MTO families faced important barriers to work, in the form of chronic illnesses, lack of child care, and more (Popkin et al 2001). So the market and entitlement reform effects may have swamped any treatment effect of MTO, at least in the short run. Moreover, by the interim point, many experimental-group families had moved on to somewhat poorer neighborhoods, for a range of reasons. Yet additional analyses of the interim impacts survey suggest that the employment picture may be more complex and mixed than initially thought, with positive effects for subgroups of adults or particular sites, and that interference and other challenges limit the experiment as a source of unbiased estimates of neighborhood effects, which are notoriously difficult to attribute. In this paper, rather than estimate MTO treatment effects, we use qualitative and quantitative analyses to analyze how and why the mixed patterns obtain for employment. Our focus, therefore, is on non-experimental analyses of *causal mechanisms*, including social processes, that tie place of residence to economic opportunity. We employ a mixed-method approach that is particularly crucial for advancing our understanding of the role that structural factors as well as choice play in the lives of the poor in a changing society (Newman and Massengill 2006).

Research and policy background

The study of context effects, including effects of neighborhoods, has a long history in the social sciences and, in particular, in sociology (Briggs 1997; Ellen and Turner 2003; Jencks and Mayer 1990; Small and Newman 2001; Tienda 1991). Prior research suggests several ways that residing in a particular neighborhood might affect employment specifically, whether directly or indirectly: via a spatial mismatch between job locations and workers' housing locations; through social networks; and through shifts in normative climate.

Spatial mismatch: As economist John Kain's (1968) seminal work previewed, over the past generation, jobs have become increasingly decentralized in U.S. metropolitan areas—a pattern labeled “job sprawl”—while low-skill workers and low-cost housing has remained spatially concentrated in central-city communities (Fernandez and Su 2004). Research generally concludes that spatial mismatch makes low-skill and minority workers (who have more limited housing choices in outlying areas) less likely to learn about job openings, more likely to face high commuting costs, more likely to quit when job locations shift significantly, and more likely to be rejected by employers based on residence in a stigmatized ghetto (reviews in Fernandez

and Su 2004; Ihlanfeldt and Sjoquist 1998).² While black workers live closer to job concentrations in aggregate, for example, because job *density* is still highest in central cities, this also means living closer to a large number of *competing workers* (Raphael 1998). For example, Mouw (2000) found the labor force within 10 miles of blacks' homes to be 48% larger in Chicago and 76% larger in Detroit, than the labor force within that radial distance from whites' homes in those cities. Yet other researchers have argued that ease of travel is the missing link in much spatial mismatch research. Using an instrumental variables approach to control for the fact that employment and car ownership are correlated, Ong and Miller (2005) finds that car ownership is a much better predictor of employment, for men and women in Los Angeles, than is job proximity. Using a similar model, Ong (2002) also finds a significant "independent" of car ownership for welfare recipients seeking employment in L.A.

But since skill mismatches and other barriers also shape labor market outcomes, what might a *shift* in residence accomplish? In the nonexperimental Gautreaux desegregation program, which (in effect) assigned families to neighborhoods rather than to treatment groups, Popkin, Rosenbaum, and Meaden (1993) found that minority women who relocated from inner-city neighborhoods to suburbs 15-30 miles away were more likely to be employed, holding educational attainment and other factors equal, than counterparts who stayed within the city of Chicago, though not at higher wages. Addressing the potential selection biases in those findings, more recent research has incorporated long-run administrative data on employment and welfare receipt and tested a variety of neighborhood traits rather than urbanicity alone; Keels et al. (2005) find that mothers who relocated to more racially integrated, nonpoor neighborhoods spent 7% less time on welfare, were employed at a rate 6% higher, and earned \$2,200 more per year (on average) than women who relocated to poorer and more racially isolated areas. Mothers in the integrated group were more likely to report available jobs near their homes, as well as superior institutional resources, including training and educational opportunities. These results, while nonexperimental, strongly suggest that particular forms of relocation can positively affect the employment prospects of low-income, mostly low-skill mothers.

Nationally, spatial mismatch improved in the 1990s only for blacks, and this was because of residential mobility, i.e. blacks moving closer to jobs rather than the other way around (Raphael and Stoll 2002). Yet some observers of housing mobility policies for the inner-city poor have conjectured that uneven metropolitan restructuring could lead to a *loss* of access to proximate, skill-appropriate jobs, such as in rebounding downtowns, through moves toward lower poverty suburbs (Briggs 1997).

In the short to medium run, this causal mechanism hinges on an important, two-part condition: that relocation will (a) move the disadvantaged closer to jobs for which they are or can become qualified (b) in sectors that are hiring. This may be very context and business-cycle dependent. Also, the spatial mismatch literature has given little attention to the three-way match between place of residence, job locations, *and* the reliable sources of informal support, such as childcare at no or low cost, that are critical for disadvantaged parents in the labor force.

Social networks: Networks can mediate both spatial "matches" and mismatches by shaping access to information, endorsements, and support. Many jobs are found through informal networks rather than more formal means (Granovetter 1974; Lin 2001), but the

networks of the poor and disadvantaged tend to be more limited, strained, and insular than those of higher income people (review in Briggs 1998). For example, in a study of public housing residents living near the Brooklyn waterfront, Kasinitz and Rosenberg (1996) found that physical proximity to the large concentration of high-wage jobs did little for the mostly African-American poor in public housing who lacked social connections to the unions that brokered those jobs. Newman (1999) and Sullivan (1989) found similar patterns in neighborhood-based job networks and employer hiring, emphasizing how some employers use the referral networks of their current employees to favor nonlocal (outside-the-neighborhood) hires over local ones. O'Regan and Quigley (1993) likewise implicated weak or missing networks and the racial segregation of workers in minority youth unemployment. And Kleit (2001), in a study comparing clustered versus dispersed public housing residents, found that the latter were more likely to *have* diverse social networks but less likely to *ask* their neighbors for help when looking for a job. Having a tie is one thing, activating it quite another.

Relocation might enhance social resources, but for relocation to matter, one must be willing and able to make new contacts with usefully positioned individuals who are willing to provide aid (Briggs 1997; Smith 2005). One must also be willing to activate those ties to obtain such aid, yet there is some evidence that in the context of wary and often strained social relations, low-income blacks adopt an outlook of do-it-myself “defensive individualism,” at least with nonkin contacts, which undermines such activation (Smith forthcoming; and cf. Rainwater 1970). And movers might focus on their pre-existing networks of kin, close friends, or other strong ties, as Stack’s (1974) classic ethnography of mutually assistance networks among poor black mothers emphasized, rather than cast their social nets more widely in new neighborhoods.

Furthermore, given that race and class differences tend to inhibit neighboring and the creation of shared neighborhood institutions, poor and minority movers into low-poverty neighborhoods may face long odds as they seek to “convert” new locations into social capital (Briggs 1997, 1998; Kleit 2001). Here again, there is some encouraging evidence from Gautreaux mothers in white, middle-class suburbs, though the enabling conditions are not yet clear (Rosenbaum, DeLuca, and Tuck 2005): Is it only those families who are able to remain stably housed in a low-poverty neighborhood over long periods who see localized social capital gains? How important is individual agency relative to structural opportunities (such as the presence of strong community associations)?

Norms: Prior research suggests that high poverty, racially isolated neighborhoods, particularly where joblessness is chronic and pervasive, may lose a strong culture of work—in the form of role models who demonstrate that work is viable and leads to a better life (Wilson 1987). Low-income black parents in the Gautreaux program reported new norms and capabilities for themselves and their children, when they contrasted white, middle-income suburban neighborhoods with their former inner-city Chicago neighborhoods (Rosenbaum, DeLuca and Tuck 2005). Some researchers have also suggested that living in stigmatized, socially isolated ghettos undermines the norms of interaction and the “soft skills” needed to succeed in mixed-race, lower poverty employment contexts (Kirschenman and Neckerman 1991; Tilly et al. 2001)—i.e., the cultural “toolkit” (Swidler 1986) or repertoire important for economic and social success. But difficulties acculturating to new expectations, and resentment fueled by relative deprivation (Jencks and Mayer 1990), might thwart such gains. There is some evidence, from qualitative interviews in greater Baltimore, that teenage boys had greater difficulty than girls “fitting in” socially after relocating to low-poverty areas (Clampet-Lundquist et al. 2006). Net of

such adjustment challenges, if there are gains to be made through relocation, it is not clear what it would take for *role modeling* or *peer* effects (which hinge on social interaction with neighbors) or *demonstration effects* (which do not) to operate effectively across lines of race or class in mixed neighborhoods.

Potential losses and barriers. Research suggests other reasons for caution as well. Relocated adults might lose contact with valuable coping resources—informal caregiving, small emergency loans, and other aid from social ties—that are particularly crucial for low-income people. Housing mobility might force a trade-off between one set of (familiar) social resources and another valuable-to-have-but-hard-to-come-by set (Briggs 1998). Also, those MTO adults who were working when they entered the program might lose valuable employment relationships and struggle to replace them, adding to the employment instability that the most disadvantaged appear to face as they enter or re-enter the world of work (Herr and Wagner 2007). These risks, and the possible rewards of relocating as well, must be considered in the specific context in which low-skill, low-income single mothers look for work: safe, reliable and inexpensive childcare is hard to find; flexible transportation is critical and too often missing; and for many who live in public housing in high poverty areas, which has become a housing of last resort for the ill and disabled poor, chronic illnesses—whether afflicting the job seeker or a family member or other loved one—represent particularly high barriers to work and overall life functioning (Popkin, Cunningham and Burt 2005).

Exposure. One key necessary condition was taken for granted in launching MTO: that relocating to low poverty areas would give families sufficient exposure to the “treatment” for measurable effects to register. But this exposure assumption included relatively stable residence in better locations. About one-third of U.S. renters move each year, and mobility rates have increased among low-skill workers in recent decades even as mobility declined somewhat in the general population (Fischer 2002). Low-income people are also more likely than others to make what the Census Bureau terms involuntary moves, for example due to job loss or family emergency. Also, race, income, and life-cycle factors—but most of all race—shape the direction of these moves in important ways: blacks are far more likely than whites to fall back into a poor area after living in a nonpoor one (South and Crowder 1997). Over time, these differences add up to much longer spells of exposure to poor neighborhoods for blacks (Quillian 2003). This racialized dynamic appears to have persisted into the 1990s (Briggs and Keys 2005), in spite of the dramatic decline of extreme poverty concentration over the decade, suggesting that stable residence in low poverty areas cannot be taken for granted, least of all for low-income minority renters.

Why launch a social experiment? And what is MTO testing?

Researchers consider a randomized social experiment the best-available way to determine the impact of place—and, by extension, of particular kinds of residential mobility—independent of family-level influences and interactions between family traits and neighborhood conditions. Because participants in the MTO demonstration were randomly assigned to treatment groups, the effects of the treatment should be attributable to the experiment rather than to characteristics of the families, minimizing a common source of bias in most research on neighborhood effects, which methodologists have characterized as a “large and inconclusive literature” (Sobel

2003:2).³ But MTO randomly assigned willing families to treatment groups, not to neighborhood types, and the experiment has become a more complex object for causal inference than the basic rationale for randomization might suggest.

In MTO, local program managers invited very low-income residents of public housing, all in high-poverty neighborhoods of Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York to participate (Orr et al.2003). Over 5,300 families, most of them African American or Hispanic, applied, and just over 4,600 met basic eligibility requirements. These families were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups: a *control group* (families retained their public housing unit but received no new assistance), a *Section 8 comparison group* (families received the standard counseling and voucher subsidy, for use in the private market), or an *experimental group*. As Sobel (2003) notes, some of the treated and untreated, since they were neighbors in public housing, might have known each other, creating the risk of interference, through social interactions, across treatment groups. The experimental-group families received relocation counseling and search assistance (including rides with counselors) to help them move to low poverty areas. They also received a voucher useable only in a census tract that was less than 10 percent poor as of the 1990 census, with the requirement that the family live there for at least one year. Of the 1,820 families assigned to the experimental group, just under half (48 percent or 860) found a suitable apartment and relocated successfully (leased up, becoming “compliers”). Non-disabled adults, households with a car, and adults who expressed greater dissatisfaction with public housing and the desire to move a greater distance away were more likely to be successful, as were those in markets with a higher vacancy rate; number of children showed no significant association with success (Shroder 2003).

But what *is* the treatment, and what is MTO therefore testing? Like other social experiments, MTO has evolved in the real world and not under controlled laboratory conditions. First, about half of the experimental group did not successfully find and lease private apartments in low poverty areas, so discussions of the experiment’s results may confound the question of how effective the treatment is *for those who received it* (the treatment-on-treated or TOT effects) from that of *what shapes successful utilization* (which includes noncompliers, as reported in intent-to-treat or ITT effects). We report both TOT and ITT results in our quantitative component (and cf. Gennetian et al. 2005). Second, per Sobel, the conservative interpretation of MTO treatment effects, which employs ITT measures, is that they represent the difference between uneven treatment effects on the experimental group and *some* treatment effect, however modest, on the control group.⁴ While Sobel presents methods of statistical adjustment, for example for bounding potential biases from interference, and recommends designing studies to randomize treatment only within groups that are isolated from one another, we do not aim to present unbiased estimates of treatment effects but rather to examine the causal mechanisms that plausibly underlie such effects.

³ On the use of counterfactual models for estimating causal effects in observational data, see Winship and Morgan (1999). On application to neighborhood effects specifically, see Harding (2005).

⁴ Rubin (1978) shows that when the no-interference assumption does not hold, causal models require a different value of assignment realization for each potential value of the outcome variable, not just the *T* (number of discrete treatment group) assignment values. The number of aggregate outcomes becomes very large. On adjustments for interference, see Sobel (2003).

Third, some MTO families who did successfully move to a low poverty neighborhood moved on to poorer neighborhoods after the required year of residence, likely undermining many of the hoped-for social effects of “better” neighborhoods that depend on exposure over time. Fourth, and in a related vein, about 70 percent of the control group had also moved out of public housing when an interim evaluation was conducted (see below), meaning that MTO controls do not serve as a fixed point of comparison for families who moved to low poverty neighborhoods but rather as “cross-overs.” Fifth, the geography of risk and opportunity shifted as the experiment evolved. Census data show, for example, that the MTO experiment group-complier neighborhoods became poorer in the 1990s even as the inner-city origin neighborhoods became generally safer and less poor (Orr et al. 2003). For these reasons, the treatment does not strictly conform to the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) of experimental science: the treatment has neither been stable over time nor perfectly standardized across participants (Rubin 1978). Instead, the MTO treatment (experience) reflects broad differences in observed residential exposure to particular kinds of neighborhoods over time.

Social experiments are imperfect, expensive, and challenging to implement according to *any* strict design, but they represent uncommon learning opportunities for society and for researchers. Like more and more social experiments, MTO’s uneven participation rates, cross-overs, place-based and other interactions, and other limitations call for innovative approaches to data collection and analysis as well as inference. At the time of our fieldwork, and based on a wide range of measures, families in the MTO experimental group were still much more likely to be living in, and had lived for longer periods of time in, safer, lower poverty areas, which they also perceived to be less disorderly, than families in the other treatment groups. For example, at the interim point, experimental-group compliers were 30% more likely than members of the control group to report feeling safe in their neighborhoods at night, 25% less likely to report having seen illicit drug dealing recently, and 36% less likely to report public drinking (Orr et al. 2003). MTO is a valuable mechanism for analyzing two important experiences for low-income, mostly minority families who previously lived in high poverty public housing projects and who tend to be concentrated in poor and segregated places nationwide: (a) that of *living* in lower poverty neighborhoods for some period of time; and (b) that of *relocating*, after initial counseling and search assistance, to low poverty neighborhoods, and then to a range of neighborhood types, while raising children and handling other life challenges.

Next, we briefly outline MTO’s employment findings to date and describe how we designed our study to learn as much as possible from the experiment, taking into account its evolution and limitations.

MTO Employment Results So Far

Research on MTO has progressed over three distinct phases: site-specific, early-impact studies, conducted in the first few years after random assignment, using a variety of methodologies (cf. Goering and Feins 2003); an interim impacts evaluation, which included a large-scale qualitative interview study (cf. Popkin et al 2001) to prepare for a structured survey and achievement testing of the program population, and collect administrative data on them, at all five sites (cf. Orr et al 2003); and interim follow-on studies—quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method (our study and one other, focused on Baltimore and Chicago). In late 2006, HUD authorized a final impact evaluation, which will survey MTO participants in 2008-2009, about 10-12 years after random assignment.

Early evidence on the experiment's employment effects was encouraging, if mixed. Within two to four years of random assignment, experimental-group compliers in Baltimore were 15 percent less likely than control-group families to be receiving welfare; using the ITT measure, the experimental group as a whole was 5-7 percent less likely than controls to be on welfare (Ludwig, Duncan and Ladd 2003). However, comparable analysis for MTO families in Boston found no differences in either welfare reciprocity or employment (Katz et al 2001).

Later, the interim evaluation found no significant impacts on employment, earnings, or receipt of public assistance across the five demonstration sites (see Table 1; Orr et al 2003). Notably, about twice as many MTO adults were working in all three treatment groups. Researchers cautioned that market cycles and policy shifts—specifically, the strong job economy of the late 1990s and the shift from an entitlement-based welfare program to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—may have swamped any treatment effects of MTO at the interim mark.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Subsequent analyses have examined subgroup outcomes (by site, age, and other traits) and non-experimental effects, for example the association between months residing in low poverty areas (as a proxy for treatment intensity) and employment. When interim results are disaggregated by site, there are significant, if modest, effects on employment for experimental-group families in Los Angeles and earnings increases in New York (Kling 2006). Moreover, there are modest employment gains among younger adults (women under 33 years of age) in the experimental group, as well as earnings gains of about \$33 per week, four to five years after random assignment (Kling, Liebman, and Katz 2007). In addition, we find, net of conventional employment predictors, that MTO adults who moved to low-poverty *suburban* neighborhoods earned \$75 more per week than those in control neighborhoods. These nonexperimental analyses highlight key predictors of higher employment rates and earnings for MTO adults, including age (younger is better), education, employment status at program entry, disability status, and household composition (having teenagers in the household, who do not require adult supervision and who can provide it to younger siblings).

Using an alternative exposure-effects approach as well as a predicted-values simulation, Clampet-Lundquist and Massey (2006) present nonexperimental analyses of the association between MTO employment outcomes and residence in neighborhoods that are both low in poverty and racially integrated. Emphasizing prior evidence that “non-poor black areas are not comparable socially or economically to the non-poor neighborhoods inhabited by other groups” (p.8), the researchers note that while Gautreaux achieved both economic and racial desegregation, MTO achieved only the former—and only for a time. Clampet-Lundquist and Massey find that 85 percent of the program population spent no time in an integrated (less than 30 percent minority), low poverty census tract. They also find a significant association between duration-weighted exposure to racially integrated, low-poverty areas and employment fortunes over time, and they argue that this confirms the importance of neighborhood racial *and* socio-economic make-up for employment outcomes. We believe that a more cautious assessment is warranted, for while the researchers control for standard predictors of employment and location outcomes, there is no way to interpret their results as unbiased estimates of neighborhood effects. We do not know whether those who are more likely to be employed and off welfare are simply more likely to live in more integrated, low poverty areas or whether *something about these areas*

contributed to their encouraging economic outcomes.⁵ We strongly agree with these and other researchers, however, that the lack of strong *treatment* effects on employment in MTO cannot be reasonably interpreted as *disconfirming* neighborhood effects.

Finally, Turney et al (2006) use qualitative interviews with 67 Baltimore MTO families, plus spatial analyses, to examine the social processes that underlie MTO's employment effects. While experimentals and controls face the same barriers to work, the researchers find that unemployed experimental-group adults are "cycling in and out of jobs" whereas "more of the unemployed controls are permanently detached from the labor force" (p.36). Employed MTO participants in both groups were heavily concentrated in the healthcare and retail sectors, for which control-group adults' better access to public transit offered some advantage. In addition, while experimental-group adults were more likely to have employed neighbors, few neighbors were employed in the health and retail sectors, and experimentals were less likely to consult them about jobs. Yet experimental-group adults spoke about their employed neighbors as a source of pride and motivation.

These recent findings suggest (a) that the relationships between place of residence, job networks, and institutional resources, such as public transit, are more complex and location specific than the "strong" causal version of MTO expectations, i.e. with all structural advantages accruing to the treated group, and (b) that some place-based mechanisms of influence, such as normative climate or observation effects of higher local employment rates, might shape particular elements of employment (persistence in the labor force over time, for example) and not others (job holding at a given point in time, say).

Data and Methods

The Three-City Study of Moving to Opportunity was designed to examine key questions about causal mechanisms and uneven treatment effects that emerged from the survey-based and largely statistical Interim Impacts Evaluation. We conducted our study in three of the five MTO metro areas: Boston, Los Angeles, and New York. To better understand why participants in social programs make the choices they do, as well as to understand variation within treatment groups, we employed mostly qualitative methods to focus on "how" and "why" questions. But as outlined below, quantitative analyses were also an important part of our work.

Our family-level data were collected in 2004 and 2005, about six to ten years after families' initial placement through the MTO program. First, we conducted 278 semi-structured, in-depth qualitative interviews with a stratified random sample of parents, adolescents, and young adults in all three treatment groups, including compliers and noncompliers. We sampled randomly within the stratum of families who had an adolescent child resident in the home at the time of the interview. We interviewed 123 adults, 122 adolescents (ages 10-17), and 33 young adults (ages 18-23). We oversampled families in Los Angeles because it was the site with the highest lease-up rate for MTO experimental group families and because there were a large

⁵ Liebman et al (2004:24) compare experimental and non-experimental results from different survey populations, concluding that "estimates using non-experimental approaches are not at all consistent with those from the experimental approach, casting doubt on the validity of non-experimental estimates. Furthermore, the selection patterns necessary to reconcile the experimental and non-experimental results are complex and differ across subgroups, suggesting that it will not generally be possible to identify the direction of bias in non-experimental estimates."

number of families not included in the Interim Impacts Evaluation survey. Overall, we conducted 81 interviews in greater Boston, 120 in Los Angeles, and 77 in New York, with an overall compliance rate (adjusted for noneligible and attrited households) of 79%.

Next, we launched “family-focused” ethnographic fieldwork (Burton 1997), visiting a subset of 39 control-group and experimental-group complier families, who had already been interviewed, an average of 10-12 times over a period of six to eight months. In recruiting this subset, we over-sampled families who were still living in low poverty areas, including suburban school districts—considering these to be “locationally successful.” The adjusted cooperation rate for the ethnographic subsample was 70%.

Both qualitative samples are quite representative of the much larger population of MTO families surveyed at the interim mark, in terms of background traits, employment status, and a range of other social outcomes (Table 2). We modestly under-sampled Hispanics and over-sampled families on welfare. Based on refusal data for the ethnographic component, it appears likely that the latter were more available for repeat ethnographic visiting. They may also have been more motivated by the monetary incentives we offered for their participation. Consistent with our sampling strategy, the ethnographic sample over-represents families still residing in low poverty areas.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

The qualitative interviews, which were conducted in English, Spanish, and Cambodian, let us cover a wide range of social outcomes (from very successful to highly distressed) for all three treatment groups, which is crucial for generating representative results. Interviews with parents averaged one to two hours; interviews with adolescents and young adults averaged 45 minutes to an hour. To enhance data validity and to extend our data, the ethnographic fieldwork added direct observation to what subjects report about their attitudes, choices, and outcomes. The ethnographic fieldwork also enabled us to ask key questions informally, as we built relationships with family members over months, while focusing on: their daily routines to “get life accomplished”; key social relations (active exchanges and “logics of use,” not just reports of a tie; cf. Smith 2005); and engagement with the neighborhood of residence and other neighborhoods. This core-constructs approach, combining informal interviewing and participant observation, provides a robust source of inferences about social processes and other causal mechanisms to complement formal interviews that are focused heavily on the outcomes themselves. Unlike more established traditions in ethnography, such as community, in-school, or peer-group studies, family-focused ethnography centers on developing rich, valid accounts of family-level decisions and outcomes, including efforts to support or advance children, elders, or other family members (Burton 1997).

A team of trained coders coded the approximately 300 hours of interview transcripts for key themes and issues; the coding included checks for inter-rater reliability. The coded transcripts were loaded into QSR6 qualitative database software, which allows for cross-cutting analysis by codes and respondent characteristics (e.g., sorting by adolescent girls talking about safety and school). The ethnographic fieldnotes (totaling 430 visits) were linked to the interview transcripts and selected interim evaluation data, coded by fieldworkers (with reliability checks), and then analyzed using EthnoNotes, which facilitates multi-site team ethnography (Lieber, Weisner and Presley 2003). This included individual, family and group-level analyses in the form of memo-ing (Miles and Huberman 1994).

The third element of the study, which we term *scans*, uses census and administrative data to analyze the economic and social changes at the neighborhood, city, and metropolitan levels that are reshaping the geography of risks and resources for MTO families over time. To analyze spatial access to job growth and job creation, we integrated several datasets, following computational methods employed by Raphael (1998) and Mouw (2000). First, we estimated the number of new jobs paying less than \$20,000 per year (as a proxy for skill-appropriateness) within five, 10, and 20 miles of MTO families in all three treatment groups. We computed two measures: net job growth and new jobs created, as detailed below.

Data on business establishments come from Census Zip Business Patterns (BP), on earnings from the Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP), Part 2, by place of work and industry, on overall turnover in the job type from Local Employment Dynamics (LED) data, and on MTO residential locations from Abt Associates tracking data for the program population. The LED data were not available for metro Boston or New York, so we limited these analyses to metro Los Angeles and, for comparison, Chicago (though we did no qualitative fieldwork in the latter).

We conducted the analysis separately for four industries known to be major sources of entry-level jobs for low-skill workers (Newman 1999): retail trade, transportation and warehousing, healthcare and social assistance, and accommodation and food services, and then for the four industries combined. We calculated a low-wage net aggregate job growth indicator, by industry, for each MTO participant’s zip code at the time of the interim survey as follows:

$$J_{mk} = \sum_{Z=1}^N T_p e_c l_p g_c, \text{ if } d_{mp} < k,$$

where J_{mk} is the number of new, low-wage jobs within k distance of the MTO participant’s interim survey zip code m , T_p is the number of establishments in zip code p , N is the number of zip codes, e_c is the ratio of employees to establishments in county c , l_p is the ratio of workers earning more than zero but less than \$20,000 per year (about twice the minimum-wage rate) to all workers with earnings in zip code p , g_c is the ratio of the net number of jobs gained (or new jobs created) to the number of workers who were employed by the same employer in both the current and previous year in county c , zip code p is in county c , and d is distance from the centroid of zip code m to the centroid of job location zip code p . For counties more than 60 miles from MTO baseline zip codes, g_c is a proxy value calculated as the ratio of the median difference between the current and previous employment (or the median number of new jobs created) of the counties within 60 miles of MTO baseline zip codes, to the median number of workers who were employed by the same employer in both the current and previous year of the counties within 60 miles of MTO baseline zip codes.

To convert the tract-level CTPP data (used to calculate l_p) to the zip code level, we applied a transformation to estimate the portion of a tract that is within a zip code, then weighted the tract-level data accordingly. Therefore, the zip code level number of workers is equal to the sum of the number of workers in all overlapping tracts, weighted by the portions of the tracts that fall within the zip code. Next, we applied a distance equation to calculate the distance between the MTO residential zip code centroids and that of each job-location zip code, and then we summed the new, low-wage jobs in all zip codes within the specified distance to produce a single

low-wage job growth indicator for each MTO participant. We report single-site ITT and TOT results for Los Angeles and Chicago.⁶

The integration of distinct types of data is crucial for generating richer, more valid results and actionable specifics to guide decision-makers. Mixed-method approaches are also crucial for building better theory, over time, from a base of complex and mixed results (Rossman and Wilson 1994), including those that emerge in social experiments (Michalopoulos 2005). But we caution the reader about the need to appropriately interpret the different types of results. For example, the ethnographic field data, while drawn from a modified-random sample, follow a case study, not a sampling logic, allowing us to understand individual family circumstances as integrated constructs—families as cases that are revealing for the conditions that covary within them—without indicating how *common* those constructs are across the program population as a whole (Ragin 1987; Small 2005). Put differently, small-N results are often “big” (in importance) but this does not settle the issue of how *prevalent* they are in the program population. We use the interview data (from the larger and more representative sample) to indicate prevalence and explore broad patterns, referencing the full interim survey results where appropriate, and below, we outline the basis for selecting particular, revelatory cases for depth on key themes.

Results

Spatial mismatch

In the two study sites that were traditionally monocentric metro areas with dense central business districts, greater Boston and New York City, the assisted relocation made by experimental compliers was typically to a moderate income neighborhood in the outer ring of the central city (e.g., the Northeast Bronx) or an inner suburb proximate to the city (e.g., along Boston’s south and north shores, which include many working-class and lower middle-class neighborhoods), not to more distant or affluent suburbs. In sprawling and polycentric Los Angeles, patterns were more mixed: Compliers moved to moderate income neighborhoods in nearby southern suburbs, as well as the San Fernando Valley (to the north), Long Beach to the southwest, and more distant, rapidly expanding eastern suburbs and satellite cities, mainly in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, where racial diversity is growing rapidly. Relocating generally meant leaving behind a denser concentration of low-wage jobs—in Boston and New York, areas with strong transit access, too—for low job density, more car-reliant areas served by a few bus lines.

Consistent with Turney et al.’s (2006) findings for MTO families in Baltimore and Chicago, our interviews indicated that MTO families in all treatment groups and complier categories were heavily concentrated in healthcare, retail, and social services. They worked as home health aides, nurse’s assistants, childcare providers, janitors, security guards, office assistants, bill coders, and lower-level operators of social service programs. In Los Angeles and Boston, these jobs were highly dispersed, but in New York, many commuted to the dense retail and healthcare job center that is Manhattan.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

⁶ Per Orr et al. (2003:B8-9), the TOT estimate (or standard error) for a given site is the ITT measure divided by the site lease-up rate (Experimental group: 35% Chicago, 64% L.A.; Comparison group: 67% Chicago, 76% L.A.). Thus, the t-statistic is unchanged by this transformation.

Table 3 shows our results for Los Angeles and Chicago (the two sites with data available for this spatial analysis). The experimental group in L.A. lived in neighborhoods with fewer low-wage jobs, less net job growth, and less job creation within 5 and 10 miles of their housing locations than their control group counterparts. There was no significant difference in job concentrations within 1 mile in L.A., however, and no apparent impact at all in Chicago, where the volume of low-wage jobs and job growth are dramatically lower overall. Section 8 compliers moved to locations with essentially the same number of low-wage job opportunities as control-group counterparts. In Los Angeles, the average growth in low-wage jobs between 1998 and 2002 was 65 percent lower for experimental compliers than for control compliers (the group that hypothetically would have successfully leased up if offered the location-restricted voucher) within 5 miles of the most current address, and 16 percent lower within 10 miles.

As for spatial mismatch, these results confirm that relocating to a low poverty census tract outside the inner city through the MTO program did not, in fact, mean relocating to a job-rich zone, at least not on average, also that starting points and changes in the spatial organization of low-wage jobs are highly context (metro) specific. Additional analyses should examine changes in the competition for jobs by relocation group, yielding, in effect, a competition-adjusted view on spatial access to job opportunity in selected MTO metro areas. As prior research has emphasized, however, the geographic proximity of jobs is just a piece of the puzzle. To understand what shapes access, we must examine job seekers experiences and choices.

Interview findings on spatial mismatch. MTO mothers in the experimental group balanced competing concerns about safety, access to employment, and access to childcare in different ways, and each factor had important implications for the quality of their housing locations as platforms for employment success. In effect, the challenge for these low-income, low-skill parents, most of them single mothers, was lining up spatial matches that included jobs, housing and vital job *support*, especially reliable childcare that was generally obtained within networks of reciprocal, but often unstable, support (cf. Henly 2002).

About 1 in 7 mothers in the experimental group specifically identified the loss of convenient access to public transit as a “price” they paid to get out of the projects to safer neighborhoods. For example, when we asked Nicole, a mother in the Boston experimental complier group, how her current, low-poverty neighborhood compared to the one left behind in terms of worries and stress, she replied,

The stress here is more just transportation issues. How am I going to get from here to the doctor's today? ... I don't have money for a bus, which is an hour-and-a-half walk. And if it's pouring rain and cold, with two babies, you can't walk an hour to a bus stop anyway. In South Boston and Dorchester, I didn't have worries like that. Um, but it was just more concern for my kid's safety.

While most cited safety and security, not better job or school opportunities, as their top reasons for moving, a handful of MTO adults (about one in ten), when asked why they had chosen their current neighborhood, specifically mentioned relocating to be closer to jobs they already had. In New York, where participants in the experimental group did realize a significant gain in earnings over their control group counterparts, working participants had somewhat higher skill levels and more work experience. They held jobs that appear to offer more upward mobility as well. They are certified childcare providers, para-professionals, retail managers, teachers, and even graduate students; some have left housing assistance altogether. Rhadiya, for example, a

mother in the New York experimental group who used her voucher to reduce her commute time, found she could earn more:

Rhadiya: I started while I was in Manhattan and then I moved here where I was closer to work, which was a plus for me. Yeah, it's like now 10 minutes [away].

Interviewer: How far was it when you were in Manhattan? How long did it take you?

R: It took me like an hour and 15 minutes.

I: Oh, so it must be a big relief.

R: Yes, definitely. Yeah, and I also do a lot of overtime. Like my annual salary was like 24, 26, but that year I made close to 40,000.

Likewise, in Los Angeles, where experimental compliers were more likely to be employed, the successes combined new housing locations with access to job training and placement, sometimes through temp agencies.. Denise, a mother in this group, temped for four years for her current employer before they offered her a permanent position. But the neighborhood she found with her MTO housing voucher helped her keep commuting time well below the average for MTO adults in L.A. The evidence suggests that the MTO intervention, limited to relocation though it was, contributed to the economic prospects of low-income parents like Rhadiya and Denise. Although these women were indeed more likely than others in the program to succeed “on their own,” the assisted relocation accelerated their mobility prospects, helped them achieve work-related strategies in which place was one key element among several.

However, the balancing acts these women sustain are extraordinary, and progress is generally in stutter steps, as the innovative Project Match in Chicago has long found (Herr and Wagner 2007). For example, Sabrina, a mother of two in the Boston experimental complier group, left public housing in the inner-city neighborhood of Roxbury, moved to Quincy, an inner suburb to the south of Boston, moved back to the inner city near her old “project” neighborhood, and finally returned to Quincy where she has lived using a housing voucher ever since. She described the effect of the lower poverty Quincy environment on her life as a single mother: “It gives you a sense of confidence. It’s a better area and it’s up to you to decide what you want to change. I don’t feel like my life is in any danger, I never had that feeling here. Safety was a big worry there [in the projects].” Sabrina emphasized the importance of her living environment for setting out to work; her case emphasizes place as an enabler, though not a guarantor, of job prospects. Though Sabrina did spend a while on welfare when living in public housing, she began her career as an office assistant in a Boston hospital at age 16, so she had considerable work experience by the time she enrolled in MTO.

Anique, a mother in the L.A. experimental complier group who we introduced atop this paper, had more trouble aligning steady work, affordable housing, and childcare, though her rental voucher and relocations helped. Her pre-move employment as a telemarketer and bill collector helped her find better work as she moved, but in a turbulent labor market, she suffered repeated spells of unemployment and financial hardship, including the loss of her housing voucher (when her attempt to purchase a small home failed) and bankruptcy. After eventually landing a job in Riverside County, some 40 miles east of Compton, Anique moved to Perris, where she had an aunt and uncle to help look after her children. But when her relatives left the

state, Anique and her daughter Clara had to move to Long Beach to live with Anique's mother. Then Anique was laid off from her job, thanks to company relocation, and so they stayed put for almost two years. "It was hard to even get a place," she says. "Everything just went downhill, downhill ..." Other jobs ended because of downsizing. She changed jobs again during our fieldwork. Based on her work experience, she was hired as a child support investigator in Riverside County, but her daily commute from Long Beach was about 70 miles each way, which often meant leaving the house before 5AM and having very little time with her daughter each day. Anique gradually saved enough to rent an apartment in Riverside, right across the street from her job. However, because they were now far from the social support Anique's mother and sister provided, Clara, now 11, was home alone after school each day. Anique has found some support services nearby and feels her apartment complex is quiet and safe, but she also reports experiencing racial harassment in the neighborhood. When we asked in what ways she felt she had been successful in her life, she replied,

Maintaining employment through all the layoffs and downsizing, where I didn't have to end up goin' back on welfare. Getting my daughter out of the Jordan Downs [public housing projects]. And I'm still working on everything else. (Fieldnote April 2, 2005)

Anique is a revelatory case: a mother whose job, housing, and support locations remained unstable for a long period of time, challenging her to bring them into alignment, although she was an "instant success" at the narrow task of completing the program-assisted relocation.

Other MTO participants emphasized the risks associated with job changes, e.g. starting over "at the bottom"—an outlook at odds with the notion that wider housing choices will lead low-income people to pursue better jobs. Interviews with these participants highlight the real tradeoffs individuals face when switching jobs, such as losing their seniority within an organization, interrupting their job history, or losing benefits temporarily while they work through a trial period with a new employer.

Low-wage work is often particularly unstable as well as inflexible (Edin and Lein 1997; Newman 1999). Some employed MTO participants were clearly not mobile *enough* in the housing market to keep up with employer restructuring, as prior research on spatial mismatch has underscored. This suggests the need for a more dynamic view of housing-to-work connections, especially for the very low-income households that receive housing assistance. Assisting the *first* move, even if it is well targeted to the adults with the best odds of benefiting, represents a kind of bet that job locations will be in a stable relationship to the new housing location—or that harried, low-skill single parents will be able to quickly change jobs or change housing to re-establish a fit.

For example, a small subgroup of mothers who moved back to poorer areas (though not necessarily to the neighborhood of origin) cited access to job training and placement as a key factor in that choice—consistent with recent research findings that challenge the notion that higher neighborhood poverty is invariably associated with fewer organizational resources (Small and McDermott 2006)—along with access to informal childcare provided by relatives or close friends in those "move-back" areas. But these strategies, which also connect housing to work, did not always pan out. Kimberlyn, the second L.A. experimental complier we introduced early on, struggled in one way in her low poverty neighborhood in the San Fernando Valley: lacking credentials, work experience, and confidence in herself and feeling isolated and unwelcome. Moving back to the inner city led to a different set of struggles, as the childcare her sister

provided abruptly disappeared, and Kimberlyn could not manage to complete training and find steady work. She inquired widely about jobs and training opportunities, and she began, but never completed, training in cosmetology and other fields, as well as an associate's degree program. Constantly needy family members, now near at hand, and her son's dangerous school added to her stress and anxiety.

In general, this range of patterns underscores the role of neighborhood as *locations*, important sometimes for what they allow one to access *from* the neighborhood (including childcare and after-school programs, a reasonable commute to work or training, etc.), not as *social worlds* (significant as ecologies for human development through *social interaction* or influence through *observation*). In the range of balancing acts outlined above, while neighborhood locations were sometimes important, *neighbors* were not, at least for MTO adults—whether as working role models, sources of job referral, or providers of childcare or other supports for work. We turn to these and other functions of networks next.

Social networks

At the interim point, only 16% of experimental compliers reported that they got their current or most recent job through a referral provided by a friend, relative, or acquaintance in the current neighborhood. Networks are just one method of job search, of course. Like others in the market, MTO job seekers also used newspaper ads, the internet, and walk-in applications to find their jobs. But where networks did play a role, MTO adults in our qualitative samples were more likely to get useful referrals from job training program staff or fellow job seekers they met in those programs, and from friends or co-workers, than from neighbors. Here again, those who entered MTO with some work history, and the confidence and contacts that come with a history of job holding, were at an advantage. Some adults also got useful referrals from kin or from another trusted source, such as a pastor. The lack of neighbor-sourced job referrals in low poverty areas, meanwhile, reflected both a wariness about *forming* meaningful ties to neighbors, a lack of *structural* opportunities to form more ties, and a lack of willingness to *activate* ties to neighbors for help. As for hoped-for but largely unrealized *gains* in social capital, those who relocated rarely “converted” their lower poverty address, even if they managed to keep it for years, into significant new social resources.

Most experimental compliers who were living in low poverty or moderately poor (10-20% poor) neighborhoods at the time of our interviews had only casual contact with neighbors, greeting them or chatting briefly outside their homes but often not knowing their names, visiting them in their homes, or exchanging anything more. Like suburbanites across the country, MTO parents reported that their low poverty neighborhoods were quieter and safer than the inner city. The gains in safety and mental health cannot be overstated, as they contributed significantly to participants' life satisfaction. But without formal institutions to connect them to neighbors, and given ongoing mobility that undercuts the formation of relationships in new places, interactions were fleeting. A handful of MTO parents participated in secular associations, and a larger minority were churched, but these organizations tended to be outside the neighborhood. For some MTO women and their children, racial strains acted as barriers, too: a small number of cases reported active harassment, others a perception of strained interaction. In general, there was little to encourage neighboring. Mothers described neighbors left behind (in public housing) as social but often untrustworthy, whereas neighbors in low poverty areas were trustworthy but not social. MTO families attributed this to their new neighbors' busier, work-oriented lifestyles or their preferences for “keeping to themselves.”

Furthermore, pre-established networks, kin ties in particular, dominated the social lives of MTO adults and their children. These networks defined the most important socializing, social support exchanges, and sources of proximate influence from social contacts. And these were overwhelmingly disadvantaged networks, with adults that were often poorly educated, unstably employed, and, in the case of many male contacts, struggling to overcome the employment effects of a criminal record and incarceration. In a small number of cases, moves back to poorer neighborhoods specifically reflected the need for more social support, primarily from relatives, or the need to provide caregiving when kin became ill or disabled. But in other instances, parents moved to get *away* from relatives they saw as risky or burdensome.

Clearly, some movers did lose convenient access to useful social resources they had at baseline. But moves back to poorer neighborhoods were driven primarily by the need to find housing—and a landlord that would accept the rental voucher—quickly when escalating rents, the sale of a unit, or conflicts with the landlord caused MTO participants to lose their housing.

Norms

Wilson's (1987) influential hypotheses about social isolation and ghetto poverty emphasized the importance of normative attachment to the labor force and the habits of regular work. Other researchers have emphasized the importance of noncognitive skills and routines, which are often socially learned, i.e. cultural. Beyond gains in neighborhood safety and feelings of security and calm, a number of experimental compliers who made it to low poverty areas—like counterparts in the suburban Gautreaux group (Rosenbaum, DeLuca, and Tuck 2005)—took great pride in their neighbors' working. Parents in the ethnographic sample who stressed this specifically emphasized the importance of this climate of working people for their children's health development. A few explicitly complained about the lack of commitment to getting ahead among those able to work in the projects and about the discouragement. For example, when we asked Jackie, an experimental complier in L.A., whether she believed that most of her neighbors worked, she replied as follows, emphasizing the contrast with the social environment in which she had grown up in the Jordan Downs public housing projects,

Yeah. I see people leaving out, because I used to go to work, construction for security, at like five in the morning. And I see people leaving out 4:00, 4:30. And then you can hear the gates opening and close, the cars just going in and out, or walking through the hallways, the aisle-ways. I think mostly everybody get up and go to work. Except the older people ... [Whereas in the projects] I think that's what really made me get a job. Because I grew up seeing everybody that *don't* work. And all I used to say is, "I want a check with my name on it." And everybody used to say, "You want a check?" I say, "Watch. When I grow up, I'm going to get me a check with my name on it." Nobody believed me.

In this instance, the individual considered her prior neighbors' disbelief a motivator. That is, she wanted to prove them wrong. Like about one-quarter of movers, Jackie differentiated herself from those whom she perceived to lack the right values or get-ahead attitude and motivation—a logic that the ethnography of low-wage work and community life in poor neighborhoods has uncovered since the 1960s (Hannerz 1969; Newman 1999).

Not all MTO movers described their public housing neighborhoods as hostile to work. A handful of MTO parents specifically argued that, in the post-welfare reform era, everybody "has

to work” regardless of neighborhood environment. This underscores the notion that cultures are not static or monolithic—with regard to work or other life domains—in even the poorest neighborhoods (Small and Newman 2001). MTO families, who are overwhelmingly renters still (90% as of the interim survey), commonly move on within a few years or less. As we noted in the previous section, frequent moving is hardly a recipe for forming useful social ties in new neighborhoods. Demonstration effects alone may be a boon to the next generation, however. The interim survey found that adolescent girls in the experimental group were 22% more likely to be in school and 16% less likely to be idle than counterparts in the control group. When asked about the positive influences of their low poverty neighborhood on girls, some mothers in the ethnographic sample, which we visited repeatedly to understand attitudes toward childrearing and perceptions of neighborhood, specifically emphasized the climate of work. Jackie, for example, told us that

It gives the kids a different atmosphere, because it's a lot of working people out here. And everybody's always busy. If they're not in school [or] working, they're doing something. So you never really just see anybody just hanging around.

Brianna, also a mother in the L.A. experimental complier group, put it this way, emphasizing what she and her daughter notice about neighbors:

Well because she sees like our neighbors to go to work, come home. Just seeing, I think a lot of people [work] ... that's why you see the people leave and go to work, you know. I see a lot of that, and I think she look up to that. You know, she watch that. She's very observant.

Two young adults in the experimental complier group show how relocation *can* dramatically expand young people’s everyday experiences of cultural expectations and with them a cultural repertoire, including class manners and other “soft skills” to enhance employment prospects and upward mobility. These cases also reflect the strains of acculturating to new expectations. We cannot know how prevalent these patterns are in the MTO population, but we believe fine-grained data on social processes are important as researchers seek a better grasp of neighborhood effects, and relocation effects specifically, on young people.

Kaliyan is an 18 year-old freshman in the California State University system. Born to Cambodian refugee parents living in public housing, she has moved often since childhood, from the projects in South L.A. to Reseda (a middle-income, mostly white community in the San Fernando Valley) as a pre-teen, then to Van Nuys (a more ethnically and economically diverse Valley community), and on to Pasadena and Duarte (also diverse) in the San Gabriel Valley. In Pasadena, she lived with an African-American foster family because relationships within her birth family had disintegrated. Her peer relationships, formed mostly in school, ranged from middle and upper-income teens driven (in her view) by brand-name consumption to gangs of low-income Asian youth she turned to, in the poorer Valley communities, to help her fit in. Kaliyan has had to recognize and respond to varied social boundaries:

“Like at my high school, there were really rich people, so I didn’t fit in ... Actually, I realized it in elementary school. I remember thinking, “I just can’t afford to do that.”... I [the fieldworker] asked her, “What do you think was hardest for you growing up?” Kaliyan immediately replied, “Trying to fit in. Doing the popular thing. I remember when I first moved out here [to the San Fernando Valley], all the girls were doing ballet or

cheerleading or something. Then in middle school, everyone was a mall rat. In high school, it was racing. It was really hard for me because I wasn't allowed to go out. That's my 'minority' side," explained Kaliyan. She continued, "Then my white side was being forced to like things like Britney Spears, NSync. Everyone was into [brand names like] Hollister and Abercrombie [& Fitch]. People were driving Jettas and going to Tiffany's [jewelry store]. I was going to school with a bunch of MTV girls, all these white girls." "Why didn't you like the people you were hanging around with?" I asked. "Because I didn't always like what they did," replied Kaliyan. (Fieldnote)

Even though Kaliyan still struggles with being different, she has developed racially diverse friendships, skills at fitting in, and valuable knowledge about the power of attainment networks. She has held several jobs in retail, a sector she describes as color coded in terms of who can work where to serve what group of customers, and appears to confidently use her budding job networks to get better jobs. Kaliyan has even pledged a sorority, because she heard that "they're good for networks and life long connections. Like if you want to get a job here or there, your sorority might be able to help you out ... You know, you hear these stories of people getting jobs because they belong to the same sorority or fraternity. I've heard stories of people getting jobs in Congress and ... big corporations." Kaliyan, who now lives in the San Fernando Valley with her boyfriend and his parents, has come quite a social distance from the South L.A. projects.

Esperanza is a 23 year-old Latina whose family left the South L.A. projects for Canoga Park, a middle-income area in the San Fernando Valley. Though she often got into fights while in high school in the Valley, and although she had learned a relevant set of skills (how to defend herself) back in the projects, she remembers learning a different "way to be" in the Valley: how to be "proper" rather than "ghetto." There was "less drama" and less picking fights in the Valley, she recalls, teachers took more of an interest in her, and she learned how to behave around "people who are more upper class," including "sitting up straight." She believes that this helped her when she decided to enter the Marines and had to deal with its strict demands:

[fieldworker] asked about "ghetto style" and she explained, "leaning back, always being casual. Always have attitude when out, even in other neighborhoods." ... She said that she doesn't want to act like that anymore and her L.A friends make fun of her. They say to her, "You're so serious. The Military has you brain washed." But she said that they are not allowed to "act ghetto" in the military. If they are caught slouching or talking in a casual and off-handed way they will get yelled at, "You're not in the ghetto" ... She attributes so much of her "change" with both spending time in the Valley and the Military, I wanted to figure out which affected what. She speculates that moving to the Valley made her military experience easier: "If I hadn't moved to the Valley I would have been naïve to other races. The Valley taught me how to fit in." ... She explained that the Valley was a safer neighborhood so she had more friends and could leave the house more. So she had more opportunities to socialize. She had a diverse group of friends and was comfortable with diversity. (Fieldnote)

Esperanza now worries that her younger siblings, who live with her family now back in South L.A., are "becoming more ghetto." Yet Esperanza avoids spending time with her family except when she has to help out. When she completed her service in the Marines, she moved to a southern suburb about a half hour drive from her mother, stepfather, and younger siblings. She

marks her move there, initially to live with a boyfriend while she holds down several part-time jobs, as a step up from her family's life in L.A. "I'm not going backwards," she says.

Finally, the normative dimension of employment includes the "rightful" place of work in our lives. A small minority of the experimental compliers—about one in ten— who were not working at the time of our in-depth qualitative interviews emphasized this normative belief about work: their desire to focus on their children and the security of public assistance income compared to an insecure paycheck with no benefits. In this view, which other researchers have documented (Edin and Lein 1997), work is associated with insecurity and shortchanging one's children, not with advancement or self respect. And while discussions of pro-work norms generally assume *readiness* to work, as we show next, about a fifth of MTO families highlighted major barriers that made them, in effect, not ready at all.

Job Readiness and Barriers to Work

Many MTO adults face major barriers to work that were not directly addressed by the intervention. Beyond skill and credentials, transportation, and childcare, there were basic health and mental health barriers. It is not clear that changes in spatial access to jobs, jobs networks, or normative support for work *could* have significantly benefited those who were not job ready. Nor is it clear that changes experienced through a relocation-only intervention could make them more job ready.

Almost 40 percent of MTO participants were not in the labor force (neither working nor looking for work) at the time of the interim survey (Orr et al 2003). These patterns reflect the severe disadvantage that characterized families living in high poverty public housing—in some of the toughest neighborhoods of the target cities—by the early 1990s (Popkin, Cunningham, and Burt 2005). About 23 percent of MTO participants received SSI at the interim mark, a benefit primarily granted to individuals who are unable to work because of chronic health problems. Although experimental movers did experience reductions in depression and obesity over the study period, just under a fifth of these adults reported that problems such as depression, asthma, diabetes, heart problems, and obesity continued to interfere with their ability to look for work or keep a job after their initial move.

Yolanda, a mother in Boston describes how severe trauma that occurred more than five years ago continues to limit her ability to work:

My problem started in '97. I got depression and anxiety. I get panic attacks ... All of this is a result of a trauma I had at the projects...there was a fire and the smoke came in from the bottom of the door. The building did not burn because it was made of bricks, but it traumatized me so much ...when I saw the two-year-old baby burn in the crib ... My children were small ...The fireman tore down the door and grabbed the children. It was during wintertime, and they had to give them oxygen because they were asphyxiating.
Fieldworker: Did it affect you? Could you work during those years? I worked until this happened.

As we noted earlier, vital supports for work were also a consideration for many movers. Problems lining up childcare and transportation continued to undermine employment for many participants after moving. Said one mover in a low poverty neighborhood outside L.A.,

But since I've got here, the problems I had. Like I leave to go to work like four in the morning. Well, there's no childcare open. It's only like maybe four daycares in the whole

city ... And they all have limits on how many kids they could [take]. So that's the problem. I don't have, they don't have like the YMCA. They don't have things like that here [in this neighborhood]. *So do you have childcare?* I don't have nothing. I can't afford it on my own. So I been dealing with like certain family members. But now, next week, they're all moving to Arizona.

Discussion

Our findings document key mechanisms through which relocation from high to low poverty areas can contribute to economic advancement while challenging still-prevailing notions about neighborhood effects and segregation. These findings also underscore the range of challenges facing families at the bottom of two markets—housing and labor—in America, as well as how shifting place of residence fits into broader strategies to line up “matches” in both domains and to needed social supports as well. In part for this reason, low poverty areas, while less risky in a variety of ways, are not clearly advantageous for poor people across the board, as influential work on concentrated poverty has emphasized (Wilson 1987).

First, lining up viable jobs-housing matches was difficult for the mostly low-skill single mothers in the MTO experiment because basic *supports* for work, such as geographically accessible childcare at low or no cost, were often unstable and sometimes far flung, not just because both the low-wage job market and low-rent housing market were so bruising and so much in flux for those with few skills and other resources. Perhaps it is not surprising that prior research on the spatial mismatch hypothesis, dominated by a more static conception of housing location and generally ignoring the geography of informal social support for the poor altogether, has failed to uncover the importance of (a) the jobs-housing-support triangle and (b) the instability of each of its nodes. But in our view, this is a much more powerful way of conceptualizing spatial access to economic opportunity for low-skill single parents than the jobs-housing-referral networks links emphasized in prior research.

Second, assisted relocation actually led to significant loss as measured by the number of proximate entry-level jobs and net job growth in key employment sectors, at least in greater Los Angeles between 1998 and 2002, and Los Angeles much greater job growth than Chicago over that period probably factors into the treatment effects observed for the former. We cannot rule out the possibility that moving further away from large concentrations of low-skill competitors for those jobs had a countervailing effect. But our spatial results underscore how context-specific and cyclical spatial “matches” may be for those who move out of inner-city areas as entry-level job centers expand and contract around the metro area.

Third, we detected no social capital gains linked to moving outside the ghetto. Even where MTO movers were comparatively successful in the job market, a lack of joining (participation in area associations), along with very limited neighboring—both to be expected of very low-income renters who move about and express a general wariness about closer involvement with neighbors—truncated any social capital that might have been built through having more advantaged neighbors. Losses for some families, meanwhile, were in the form of lost or reduced childcare from kin, although kin remained at the center of most of these families' social lives. Those lives remained insular in large part because MTO families' most important pre-established contacts (their relatives) remained so disadvantaged and so often needy. The

persistence of these ties, the low rates of group joining, and the lack of “localism” (to the neighborhood of residence) in active ties dominated the picture.

Fourth, and conversely, there is some evidence that higher rates of employment and lower rates of idleness in low poverty neighborhoods could be a source of demonstration effects for MTO children and that some MTO youth who moved as teens or pre-teens developed broader social networks and cultural repertoires, with positive effects on their soft skills, through exposure to racial and economic diversity, along with new expectations, in new neighborhoods and schools. But acculturating to new expectations posed strains and dilemmas that remained with these young people into adulthood. These findings are consistent with interview evidence on Gautreaux parents’ perceptions of expectations in their advantaged neighborhoods (Rosenbaum, DeLuca, and Tuck 2005), adding young people’s perceptions about the informal rules for fitting in and how those rules have served them in the transition to college or the world of work. Our findings underline how a given location may be an effective economic platform for children but *not* their adult single parents. This specific distinction has not been examined in earlier research on the importance of life stage for neighborhood effects—research which tends to emphasize the resource richness of higher income areas across the board.

We see important lessons here for policy, beginning with *targeting* and extending to the *content* of interventions that include housing mobility. First, the evidence suggests that a family’s capacity to take advantage of opportunities that relocation offers depends on critical attributes and circumstances, some of which may require intensive assessment up front. For those who began with advantages, there is evidence of relocation accelerating a family’s exit from a more disadvantaged state. This underscores the value of strategies that help families move up a stepladder of successes and avoid the downward spirals caused by a single setback—the loss of free childcare, a spike in rent forcing an onerous commute or co-habiting with a burdensome relative, etc.

Second, relocation assistance *alone* is clearly insufficient to promote many disadvantaged families, particularly those headed by low-skill single mothers, forward toward greater economic security or self-sufficiency. In the future, assisted housing mobility programs could expand on MTO’s positive but limited employment effects by improving participants’ access to job-related resources, including job centers, training, and supports, including childcare and transportation. Interventions could also target job-growth zones, not to mention high-performing school districts, directly. The least job ready and the poised-for-upward-mobility clearly need quite different supports. The most severely disadvantaged of the roughly one million very low-income households in public housing may be ill served by relocation strategies, no matter what they include; that group may need service-rich supportive housing or similar in-place approaches.

Third, to help the “move-ready” participants stay in better neighborhoods once they get to them, mobility programs could extend counseling services beyond the first year and expand the supply of stable, affordable housing in strong locations, including areas where jobs are growing. The tight housing markets in which MTO unfolded have not offered most of the motivated low-income families the real prospect of long-run residence outside ghetto-poor neighborhoods. Fourth and finally, assisted housing mobility programs should offer participants active connections to institutions in their new neighborhoods that can link the movers to more and better jobs, whether directly (though job matching) or indirectly (by brokering ties to useful social contacts).

Some post-Katrina relocation brokered such connections, and we need more systematic evidence on these and other efforts to help poor people move *and* succeed. Assisted housing mobility is no cure-all for ghetto poverty, and it is not for everyone. But some gains were impressive, and research has now reality tested MTO's "great expectations." The limits of this particular relocation-only demonstration program for the inner-city poor should not dissuade policymakers and practitioners from building on the gains and making bolder, more savvy efforts in the future.□

References

- Abrams, Charles. 1955. *Forbidden Neighbors: A Study of Prejudice in Housing*. New York: Harper.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 1997 "Moving Up Versus Moving Out: Neighborhood Effects in Housing Mobility Programs." *Housing Policy Debate* 8(1):195-234.
- _____. 1998. "Brown Kids in White Suburbs." *Housing Policy Debate* 91(1):177-221.
- _____. 2004. "Traps and Stepping Stones: Neighborhood Dynamics and Family Well-being." Working paper RWP04-015, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- _____. 2005. "Policy and Politics: Changing the Geography of Opportunity." Pp.310-341 in *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*, edited by Xavier de Souza Briggs. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza and Benjamin Keys. 2005. "Did Exposure to Poor Neighborhoods Change in the 1990s?: Evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Washington, D.C., November.
- Burton, Linda. 1997. "Ethnography and the Meaning of Adolescence in High-Risk Neighborhoods." *Ethos* 25(2): 208-217.
- Clampet-Lundquist, Susan, Kathryn Edin, Jeffrey R. Kling, and Greg J. Duncan. 2006. "Moving At-Risk Teenagers Out of High-Risk Neighborhoods: Why Girls Fare Better than Boys." Working Paper #509, Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Clampet-Lundquist, Susan and Douglas Massey. 2006. "Neighborhood Effects on Economic Self-Sufficiency." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society, Boston, MA, February.
- DeLuca, Stefanie, Greg J. Duncan, Ruby Mendenhall, and Micere Keels. 2006. "Gautreaux Mothers and Their Children: An Update." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, Canada, August.
- Downs, Anthony. 1973. *Opening up the Suburbs: An Urban Strategy for America*. New Haven:

Yale University Press.

- Edin, Kathryn and Laura Lein. 1997. *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ellen, Ingrid Gould and Margery Austin Turner. 2003. "Do Neighborhoods Matter and Why." Pp.313-338 in *Choosing a Better Life?: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Social Experiment*, edited by John Goering and Judith Feins. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Feins, Judith D. 2003. "A Cross-Site Analysis of MTO's Locational Impacts." Pp.81-114 in *Choosing a Better Life?: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Experiment*, edited by John Goering and Judith D. Feins. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Fernandez, Roberto M. and Celina Su. 2004. "Space in the Study of Labor Markets." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:546-569.
- Fischer, Claude S. 2002. "Ever-More Rooted Americans." *City & Community* 1(2):175-193.
- Gennetian, Lisa A., Pamela A. Morris, Johannes M. Bos, and Howard S. Bloom. "Constructing Instrumental Variables from Experimental Data to Explore How Treatments Produce Effects." Pp.75-114 in *Learning More from Social Experiments*, edited by Howard S. Bloom. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Goering, John and Judith D. Feins, editors. 2003. *Choosing a Better Life?: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Experiment*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press
- Granovetter, Mark. 1974. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harding, David. 2005. "Counterfactual Models of Neighborhood Effects: The Effect of Neighborhood Poverty on Dropping Out and Teenage Pregnancy." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(3):676-719.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1969. *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Henly, Julia R. 2002. "Informal Support Networks and the Maintenance of Low-wage Jobs." Pp.179-203 in *Laboring Below the Line*, edited by Frank Munger. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Herr, Toby and Suzanne L. Wagner. 2007. *Beyond Barriers to Work*. Chicago: Project Match.
- Ihlanfeldt, Keith R., and David Sjoquist. 1998. "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: A Review of Recent Studies and Their Implications for Welfare Reform." *Housing Policy Debate* 9(4):849-92.

- Jencks, Christopher and Susan E. Mayer. 1990. "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood." Pp. 111-186 in *Inner-City Poverty in the United States*, edited by Lawrence E. Lynn and Michael G.H. McGeary. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Kain, John. 1968. "Housing Desegregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 32:175-97.
- Kasinitz, Phillip and Jan Rosenberg. 1996. "Missing the Connection: Social Isolation and Employment on the Brooklyn Waterfront." *Social Forces* 43:180-195.
- Keels, Micere, Greg J. Duncan, Stefanie DeLuca, James Rosenbaum, and Ruby Mendenhall. 2005. "Fifteen Years Later: Can Residential Mobility Programs Provide a Permanent Escape from Neighborhood Crime and Poverty?" *Demography* 42(1):51-73.
- Kirschenman, Joleen and Kathryn Neckerman. 1991. "'We'd Love to Hire Them, But...': The Meaning of Race for Employers." Pp.203-232 in *The Urban Underclass*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kleit, Rachel Garshick. 2001. "The Role of Neighborhood Social Networks in Scattered-Site Public Housing Residents' Search for Jobs." *Housing Policy Debate* 12(3):514-573.
- Kling, Jeffrey R. 2006. "Moving to Opportunity." Unpublished slide presentation, Conference on Causal Inference in Neighborhood-Based Research, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, December 1.
- Kling, Jeffrey R., Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Lawrence F. Katz. 2007. "Experimental Analysis of Neighborhood Effects." *Econometrica* 75(1):83-119.
- Leventhal, Tama and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2000. "The Neighborhoods They Live In: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes." *Psychological Bulletin* 126(2):309-337.
- Lieber, Eli, Thomas S. Weisner, and Matthew Presley. EthnoNotes: An Internet-Based Field Note Management Tool. *Field Methods* 15(4):405-425.
- Liebman, Jeffrey B., Lawrence Katz, and Jeffrey Kling. 2004. "Beyond Treatment Effects: Estimating the Relationship Between Neighborhood Poverty and Individual Outcomes in the MTO Experiment." IRS Working Paper 493, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, August.
- Lin, Nan. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ludwig, Jens, Greg J. Duncan, and Helen Ladd. 2003. "The Effects of MTO on Children and Parents in Baltimore." Pp.153-175 in *Choosing a Better Life?: Evaluating the Moving to Opportunity Experiment*, edited by John Goering and Judith D. Feins. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

- Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Michalopoulos, Charles. 2005. "Precedents and Prospects for Randomized Experiments." Pp.1-36 in *Learning More from Social Experiments*, edited by Howard S. Bloom. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mouw, Ted. 2000. "Job Relocation and the Racial Gap in Unemployment in Detroit and Chicago, 1980 to 1990." *American Sociological Review* 65:730-753.
- Newman, Katherine S. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Knopf and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Newman, Katherine S. and Rebekah Peoples Massengill. 2006. "The Texture of Hardship: Qualitative Sociology of Poverty, 1995-2005." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32:423-446.
- Ong, Paul M. 2002. Car Ownership and Welfare-to-Work. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21(2):239-252.
- Ong, Paul M. and Douglas Miller. 2005. Spatial and Transportation Mismatch in Los Angeles. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25:43-56.
- O'Regan, Katherine and John Quigley. 1993. "The Effect of Social Networks and Concentrated Poverty on Black and Hispanic Youth Employment." *Annals of Regional Science* 27:327-342.
- Orr, Larry, Judith D. Feins, Robin Jacob, Erik Beecroft, Lisa Sanbonmatsu, Lawrence F. Katz, Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Jeffrey R. Kling. 2003. *Moving to Opportunity: Interim Impacts Evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Pendall, Rolf. 2000. "Why Voucher and Certificate Holders Live in Distressed Neighborhoods." *Housing Policy Debate* 11(4):881-910.
- Popkin, Susan J., Mary K. Cunningham, and Martha R. Burt. 2005. Public Housing Transformation and the "Hard to House." *Housing Policy Debate* 16(1):1-24.
- Popkin, Susan J., Victoria Gwiasda, Lynn Olson, Dennis Rosenbaum, Larry Buron. 2000. *The Hidden War: Crime and the Tragedy of Public Housing in Chicago*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Popkin, Susan J., Laura E. Harris and Mary K. Cunningham. 2001. *Families in Transition: A Qualitative Analysis of the MTO Experience*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Popkin, Susan J., James E. Rosenbaum, and Patricia M. Meaden. 1993. Labor Market Experiences of Low-Income Black Women in Middle-Class Suburbs: Evidence from a

- Survey of Gautreaux Program Participants. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 12(3):556-573.
- Quillian, Lincoln. 2003. "How Long Are Exposures to Poor Neighborhoods? The Long-Term Dynamics of Entry and Exit from Poor Neighborhoods." *Population Research and Policy Review* 22:221-49.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rainwater, Lee. 1970. *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Raphael, Steven. 1998. "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis and Black Youth Joblessness: Evidence from the San Francisco Bay Area." *Journal of Urban Economics* 43:79-111.
- Raphael, Steven and Michael A. Stoll. 2002. "Modest Progress: The Narrowing Spatial Mismatch between Blacks and Jobs in the 1990s." Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution, December.
- Rosenbaum, James, Stefanie DeLuca, and Tammy Tuck. 2005. "New Capabilities in New Places: Low-Income Black Families in Suburbia." Pp.150-175 in *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*, edited by Xavier de Souza Briggs. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Rossmann, Gretchen B. and Bruce L. Wilson. 1994. "Numbers and Words: Being 'Shamelessly Eclectic.'" *Quality and Quantity* 28:315-327.
- Rubin, Donald. 1978. "Bayesian Inference for Causal Effects: The Role of Randomization." *The Annals of Statistics* 6(1): 34-58.
- Rubinowitz, Leonard and James Rosenbaum. 2000. *Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing 'Neighborhood Effects': Social Processes and New Directions in Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443-478.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2004. *Villa Victoria: The Transformation of Social Capital in a Boston Barrio*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 2005. "Lost in Translation: How Not to Make Qualitative Research More Scientific." Paper presented the Workshop on Qualitative Methods in Social Science, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., May.
- Small, Mario Luis and Katherine Newman. 2001. "Urban Poverty after *The Truly Disadvantaged*: The Rediscovery of the Family, the Neighborhood, and Culture." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:23-45.

- Small, Mario Luis and Monica McDermott. 2006. The Presence of Organizational Resources in Poor Urban Neighborhoods. *Social Forces* 84(3):1697-1724.
- Smith, Sandra Susan. 2005. "Don't Put My Name on It': Social Capital Activation and Job-Finding Assistance among the Black Urban Poor." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(1):1-57.
- _____. Forthcoming. *Lone Pursuit*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sobel, Michael S. 2003. "What Do Randomized Studies of Housing Mobility Demonstrate?: Causal Inference in the Face of Interference." Unpublished paper, Columbia University, New York, NY, July.
- South, Scott J. and Kyle Crowder. 1997. "Escaping Distressed Neighborhoods: Individual, Community, and Metropolitan Influences." *American Journal of Sociology* 102(4):1040-1084.
- Sullivan, Mercer. 1989. *Getting Paid: Youth Crime and Work in the Inner City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51:273-286.
- Tienda, Marta. 1991. "Poor People and Poor Places: Deciphering Neighborhood Effects on Poverty Outcomes." Pp.244-262 in *Macro-micro Linkages in Sociology*, edited by Joan Huber. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tilly, Chris, Phillip Moss, Joleen Kirschenman, and Ivy Kennelly. 2001. "Space as a Signal: How Employers Perceive Neighborhoods in Four Metropolitan Labor Markets." Pp.304-339 in *Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities*, edited by Alice O'Connor, Chris Tilly, and Lawrence Bobo. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Turney, Kristin, Susan Clampet-Lundquist, Kathryn Edin, Jeffrey R. Kling, and Greg J. Duncan. 2006. "Neighborhood Effects on Barriers to Employment: Results from a Randomized Housing Mobility Experiment in Baltimore." IRS Working Paper 511, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, April.
- Turner, Margery Austin. 1998. "Moving Out of Poverty: Expanding Mobility and Choice through Tenant-Based Housing Assistance." *Housing Policy Debate* 9(2):373-394.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Winship, Christopher and Stephen L. Morgan. 1999. "The Estimation of Causal Effects from Observational Data." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:659-706.