

**The Plan for Transformation and the
Residential Movements of Public Housing Residents**

by

Dan A. Lewis and Cheryl A. Ward

Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University
2040 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208

BACKGROUND

Chicago is well on its way to creating a new form of public housing. The Chicago Housing Authority's Plan for Transformation charts an optimistic course for the future, promising to remove the dilapidated buildings of the past and replace them with privately constructed, mixed-income developments that will provide multiple benefits for the poor. The plan's goals include providing quality housing opportunities to low-income households in mixed-income communities and contributing to the improvement of the neighborhoods and communities where public housing is located. One need not be a cynic to be concerned that the promise of this reform might not be realized. One can easily read the history of public housing reform as a series of failures. Over the last 50 years public housing advocates have trumpeted how public housing would improve the lives of the poor. Yet there has been little positive to show for those efforts. In the 1950s the original projects were supposed to bring decent housing and improved lives. The 1960s and 1970s saw more reforms and more promises, all of which cost a lot but came to very little. In the 1980s liberals and conservatives alike suggested that the concentration of the poor made real improvements impossible. A consensus formed that the only way the lives of the poor could improve was to "deconcentrate" them and have them live among other income groups. The question of what will make this reform work remains, as does the question of who wants the pattern changed and at what price. In Chicago, the answers to these questions have been shaped by two generations of lawsuits and consent decrees influencing a way of thinking about public housing issues that places the burden of responsibility on city and federal agencies to change the pattern of housing segregation that has existed for at least half a century. These lawsuits have forced concerns over housing issues and racial segregation to converge and subsequently shape the Plan for Transformation.

In the first Gautreaux court case decision (1969), the federal district court found that the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) had discriminated in selecting sites for public housing and assigning tenants on a racially segregated basis. The court ordered CHA to provide additional public housing, on a small-scale, "scattered-site" basis, primarily in predominantly white areas of the city. Under the agreement, no public housing could be

built in “limited areas” (areas where more than 30% of the occupants were people of color) unless it was matched by development in “general” or “revitalized areas”--those areas exhibiting signs of revitalization and therefore, not threatened by an increase in the number of low-income families moving to the area.

The second Gautreaux case (1976) was brought against HUD – the federal agency that funded CHA’s discriminatory program. The HUD remedy was a metropolitan-wide initiative that would use Section 8 vouchers (now Housing Choice Vouchers) to facilitate moving the plaintiff-class families into private rental housing throughout a six-county region. It emphasized relocating families in predominantly white areas of the suburbs. The agreement divided Cook County into “limited areas,” which are 30% or more black, and racially integrated “general areas.” Section 8 vouchers could only be used in “general areas.” The metropolitan-wide initiative was administered by the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities and is referred to as the Gautreaux program. Mobility counseling was offered to families selected for the Gautreaux program who had already expressed interest in opportunity moves. Advocates believe that with counseling intervention, traditional patterns of movement could be redirected for the betterment of public housing and Housing Choice Voucher families. If no counseling was offered to relocating families, advocates believe families would select more familiar neighborhoods equally as troubled as those they were already in. The Gautreaux program itself was modest in scale – assisting 4,500 public-housing eligible families, compared to the more than 40,000 plaintiff-class families entitled to relief in the case.

Many observers note that the current Mayor Daley has built his political empire on overturning the very foundations of his father’s political fortunes by supporting the deconcentration of the black poor despite massive resistance to residential racial and class mixing. To his credit, the current mayor recognizes the costs of maintaining the old public housing edifices and has proposed a new way of housing the poor using federal programs and subsidies as the main basis for change. Chicago, more than any other major U.S. city, has taken advantage of these federal dollars. The Plan for

Transformation is an ambitious attempt at socially engineered economic integration. Unfortunately, the plan does not address issues of racial segregation, and economic and racial resegregation. ■

Gautreaux has influenced the current reform in at least two key ways. First, the leverage created by the various consent decrees issued over the last generation places legal advocates in the unique position of influencing both directly and indirectly the focus and implementation of the current reform. The federal courts can shape the current efforts if the advocates use their standing to challenge what the CHA is doing. A second and more subtle influence is almost psychological. Thirty years of litigation have created a climate in which the public housing debate is about how well the city has attended to the issue of racial segregation. The advocates, in the name of public housing residents, work with public officials to fashion the reform. The result is a focus by many civic and media leaders on a narrow set of issues. This limits the range of questions being asked to those in the original litigation. What will be the mix of poor and not so poor in the new developments? Under what conditions will the residents of the old projects be allowed into the new ones? Who will make these decisions and under what kind of scrutiny?

These questions assume that the new mixed-income developments will be built and that the African American poor of the city have an interest that can be defended in that “right to return.” Let us assume for a moment that these privately managed mixed-income communities are as much of a chimera as those that were imagined for public housing in other historical periods (e.g., when the projects were first built). And let us imagine further, that the thousands of public housing residents that will have to find a place to live in the private housing market will, with their housing vouchers, be the more likely center of the story of public housing over the next generation. It then behooves scholars to focus their attention on what is happening to that group.

Our purpose in this paper is to look as carefully as we can at the reality of the lives of the poor who are affected by the Plan for Transformation. It might be possible that mixed income projects will blossom on the land that supported the separation of economic and

racial groups. It might be possible that the majority of public housing residents will return to these new developments. Public housing has historically been promoted as an improvement. The city is best served by looking beyond that rhetoric. The forces that limit the promise of public housing reform, both economic and political, are as strong today as they have been in the past. Those forces will limit the changes that can be made in how citizens are located in urban space. The power of the private housing market and the desire of citizens to protect the investments they have in their homes will limit (in a democracy) the kinds of reforms that are possible. The forces that make racial segregation a reality in this city are not much affected by the efforts reformers are making to move the poor into mixed-income communities. The past suggests that ambitious goals take a back seat to deep-seated interests when it comes to public housing.

Now that we are five years into implementing the Plan for Transformation, we can see the emerging results of this new public housing paradigm. We can identify where public housing residents are moving and compare their moves to like-situated families in the city. That is, if public housing residents that relocate themselves in the same poor African American communities as other very poor blacks who have also moved, then the Plan for Transformation has resulted in continued segregation. If the plan is succeeding, we would expect to see public housing residents moving from the projects to better communities at a different rate than their counterparts who reside outside the projects. The picture that emerges is one in which the economic status of public housing residents and the realities of racial segregation shape the options available to both public housing residents and the black poor in the city. The poorest of the poor are moving to African American communities, while there are almost no moves to white areas. This is true for public housing residents as well as other poor African Americans. We can see very little impact of the efforts to move public housing residents to so called “opportunity areas,” that is, those areas where less than 24% of the population’s income falls below the poverty line. Indeed, it would be difficult for these efforts to succeed. If we do not change the economic status of the person and we leave the decision to the mover as to where to go, most people are going to choose places they can afford that have the amenities they seek. Add in the inhospitable reaction of most communities (whether

black or white) to subsidized newcomers and the result is that poor black people stay in struggling black communities.

A series of programs has attempted to change the pattern of public housing segregation in the city by trying to move public housing residents into middle class communities. The foundation of this paradigm places the city and federal agencies in the position of remedying historical discrimination. But neither the courts nor the city have much authority to require communities to accept subsidized newcomers. The paradigm assumes “voluntary compliance,” that is, it takes action to stop segregation, but the community is not required to integrate. The city has few tools for changing the patterns it was held responsible by the courts and advocates for creating. The result is weak interventions and much resistance from communities to these interventions. The consequence over the last generation is what we call political displacement, a process in which citizens come to see the government’s efforts to remedy segregation as more problematic than the original discrimination. Factors contributing to the limited progress of government efforts include; little authority, the public’s tendency to displace the original problem, the desire of many landlords to avoid using housing vouchers, and hostile community activists. The city and the Gautreaux reformers are locked in a symbiotic dance that creates ineffective programs with limited results. The Plan for Transformation is shaped by this unfortunate paradigm. The legal history of the Gautreaux decisions and related cases has trapped current efforts for reform in a design straitjacket that ties racial integration to the improvement of public housing. The focus is on placing the black poor in mixed-income communities. This report describes the impact of that focus on people who lived in public housing.

RESEARCH METHODS

Our approach to analyzing current public housing reforms is to focus on the experiences of public housing residents who relocated as compared with poor black families outside the projects who also moved. We use a random sample of people living in Chicago who were receiving public aid in 1998. The data used in this study is taken from the first three waves of the Illinois Family Study (IFS), which began in 1999. The IFS is a six-year

panel study of approximately 1,360 families who are moving from welfare to work in nine Illinois counties. A stratified random sample of families was selected along two geographic regions: Cook County and eight counties in downstate Illinois. Only families living in Cook County were included in the analysis for this paper. The random sample of families living in Cook County included both families that lived in public housing developments and those that did not, allowing for comparisons to be made between each group. Both groups were studied at three points in time. Table 1 presents characteristics of the study populations for the variables used in the present analysis as measured in 1999, 2000 and 2001.

We are able to track changes in residence over two years and look for differences between public housing residents and non-public housing residents in where they move. If the metropolitan-wide mobility initiatives were having an effect, we would expect to see the public housing residents moving to different communities than the non-residents. Both groups have similar economic constraints, comparable family situations, live in the same city, and are about the same age.

Our results indicate the two groups are more alike than they are different. The focus on the metropolitan-wide mobility initiatives shifts our attention away from the experiences of the overwhelming majority of those public housing residents who are relocating, do not have the benefit of Gautreaux programs, and move to poor communities in Chicago.

RESIDENTIAL MOVEMENT PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING AND NON-PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES

Residential moves are fairly straightforward. There are supply issues (location, cost, amenities) and demand issues (available income, schools, neighborhood, family). People who are moving know what they need, can afford, and seek the best available rental at that price. Given their stage of life, what is best may vary some within identifiable parameters. The public housing resident uses the same set of parameters with one important constraint – the landlord has to want to take the housing voucher the resident holds.

Previous analyses of moves by public housing residents suggest that over 90% of public housing movers stayed in poor black urban communities (Fischer, 2002). For this study, we have used a random sample of welfare recipients (people who received TANF in 1998) in Chicago. We then identified those members of the sample who lived in public housing and those that did not. We tracked the changes of address for the entire sample and compared the neighborhoods that people moved to over a two-year period.

When examining the residential moves of both the public housing and non-public housing samples between 1999 and 2000, we find that public housing families are more likely than non-public housing families to be non-movers. As shown in Tables 2 and 3, 19% of public housing families and 36% of non-public housing families moved between 1999 and 2000, and 17% of public housing families and 28% of non-public housing families moved between 2000 and 2001.

Families residing in public housing exhibit similar moving patterns to those non-public housing families in terms of the destination of moves, most moves are made within communities – for example, Southside to Southside, Westside to Westside. None of the public housing families relocated to the Chicago’s Northside.

While few non-public housing families made moves from Chicago to suburban communities between 1999 and 2000, or between 2000 and 2001, even fewer public housing families made moves from Chicago to a suburban community (three families between 1999 and 2000, and no families between 2000 and 2001).

COMPARISON OF PUBLIC HOUSING AND NON-PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES

For those who do and do not move, we will describe how key variables (employment, TANF receipt, income, type of housing, housing subsidy receipt, feelings of neighborhood support and security, and child outcomes), are related to housing locations.

Chicago Welfare Families (CWF) and Public Housing Families (PHF) by 2000

When comparing CWF (IFS non-public housing residents) and PHF (IFS public housing residents) samples in 2000, we find that the groups are somewhat dissimilar. As shown in Table 4, more respondents in the CWF sample reported that they were currently working (54% versus 42%). Approximately one-third (32%) of the CWF sample reported TANF receipt, while 41% of the PHF sample reported the same. Both groups report similar median total annual household incomes.

In 2000, CWF families were significantly more likely than public housing families to feel satisfied that their neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children (75% versus 41%), and that their current neighborhood is safe at night (72% versus 50%). Those in the CWF sample were somewhat more likely than public housing families to feel that in their neighborhood, people help each other (49% versus 43%). Table 4 shows that significantly more public housing families than CWF families reported that their child had been suspended or expelled from school in the past 12 months (28% versus 10%), and that their child had repeated a grade in the past 12 months (19% versus 7%).

By 2000, 16% of non-public housing families reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt. Only 7% of families living in public housing in 1999 had relocated with a Housing Choice Voucher by that same year.

Non-Moving and Moving CWF Families in 2000

When comparing movers (individuals who reported a change of address between 1999 and 2000) and non-movers within the CWF sample in 2000, we find that both groups are similar in terms of employment status and TANF receipt. As shown in Table 5, 54% of both samples reported that they were currently working, and nearly one-third of the respondents in both samples reported TANF receipt. Movers report significantly higher median total annual household incomes than non-movers, \$11,250 versus \$8,750.

By 2000, 15% of non-moving CWF families, and 17% of movers reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt in that year.

Movers were slightly more likely than non-movers to feel satisfied that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children (79% versus 73%), and is safe at night (75% versus 71%), post-move. Non-movers were significantly more likely than movers to report that in their neighborhood, people help each other (55% versus 41%). Both groups were similar in terms of reports that their child had been suspended or expelled from school in the past 12 months (10% non-movers, 8% movers), and that their child had repeated a grade in the past 12 months (8% non-movers, 4% movers).

Non-Moving and Moving Public Housing Families in 2000

Similar to the CWF sample, when comparing movers and non-movers among the public housing sample in 2000 (N=74; 60 non-movers and 14 movers), we find that slightly more movers than non-movers had a job in 2000 – 50% versus 40% (Table 6). Both groups were nearly equal in terms of TANF receipt (43% movers, 40% non-movers). Movers report significantly higher incomes than non-movers, \$10,625 versus \$8,750. By 2000, five families living in public housing in 1999 (or 36%) reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt in 2000.

As shown in Table 6, both groups were equally as likely to report post-move, that in their current neighborhood, people help each other. However, movers were significantly more likely to feel satisfied that their neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children (71% movers, 33% non-movers), and slightly more likely to feel that their current neighborhood is safe at night (57% versus 48%). Both groups were equally likely to report that their child had been suspended or expelled from school in the past 12 months (28% non-movers, 29% movers); however, movers were less likely than non-movers to report and that their child had repeated a grade in the past 12 months (14% movers, 20% non-movers).

Summary of 1999-2000 Findings

Among the most noteworthy findings are that CWF families are somewhat more likely than public housing families to be working in 2000, and somewhat less likely to receive

TANF. While both CWF and PHF families report similar median total annual household incomes, movers among both groups report higher incomes than those that do not move. CWF families are significantly more likely than public housing families to report that they are satisfied that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children and is safe at night. Both groups are equally as likely to report that in their current neighborhood, people help each other.

CWF and PHF families that moved between 1999 and 2000 were more likely than those who did not move to report that they were satisfied following their move that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children and is safe at night. CWF families that moved between 1999 and 2000 were less likely to report that in their current neighborhood, people help each other. Both movers and non-movers in the PHF sample were equally likely to report that in their current neighborhood, people help each other.

In terms of child outcomes, public housing families are significantly more likely than non-public housing families to have a child who has been suspended/expelled from school or who has repeated a grade. CWF and PHF movers are somewhat less likely than non-movers to have a child who has been suspended/expelled from school or who has repeated a grade.

Public Housing and Non-Public Housing Families by 2001

CWF and PHF families in 2001 are similar in employment status: nearly one-half of each group had a job in 2001 (49% of non-public housing families and 46% of public housing families) (Table 7). Slightly more respondents in the public housing sample reported TANF receipt (29% versus 19%). Those in the CWF sample report significantly higher median total annual household incomes than those in the PHF sample, \$13,750 versus \$8,750.

Although those in the CWF sample were significantly more likely than those in the PHF sample to report being satisfied that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children (70% versus 48%), and is safe at night (79% versus 65%), public housing

families were somewhat more likely than those living outside of public housing to feel that in their neighborhood, people help each other (59% versus 50%).

Significantly more public housing families than non-public housing families reported that their child had been suspended or expelled from school in the past 12 months (24% versus 11%), and that their child had repeated a grade in the past 12 months (16% versus 6%).

In 2001, 17% of non-public housing families reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt. Eight percent of families living in public housing in 2000 reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt in 2001.

Moving and Non-Moving CWF Families in 2001

When comparing movers (individuals who reported a change of address between 2000 and 2001) and non-movers among the CWF sample in 2001, we find that slightly more non-movers than movers had a job in 2001 – 50% versus 42% (Table 8). Conversely, slightly fewer non-movers than movers reported TANF receipt (17% versus 25%). CWF movers report significantly higher median total annual household incomes than non-movers, \$15,625 versus \$13,750. In 2001, 17% of non-moving families, and 15% of movers reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt in 2000.

Both movers and non-movers were equally likely to report that they were satisfied that their neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children (70% non-movers, 71% movers), and is safe at night (79% non-movers, 81% movers). However, non-movers were significantly more likely to report that in their neighborhood, people help each other (54% versus 39%). Both groups were equally likely to report that their child had been suspended or expelled from school in the past 12 months (11% non-movers, 10% movers), and that their child had repeated a grade in the past 12 months (5% non-movers, 7% movers).

Moving and Non-Moving PHF Families in 2001

Similar to the CWF sample, when comparing movers and non-movers among the public housing sample in 2001 (N=63; 52 non-movers and 11 movers), we find that significantly more non-movers than movers had a job in 2000 – 50% versus 27% (Table 9).

Conversely, significantly more movers than non-movers reported TANF receipt (55% versus 23%). By 2001, five families living in public housing in 2000 reported Housing Choice Voucher receipt in 2001. Both PHF movers and non-movers report similar median total annual household incomes.

Both moving and non-moving PHF families were equally as likely to report that they were satisfied that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children (48% non-movers, 46% movers). However, non-movers were significantly more likely than movers to report that in their neighborhood, people help each other (63% versus 36%), and slightly more likely to feel that their current neighborhood is safe at night (67% versus 55%). Public housing non-movers were significantly more likely to report that their child had been suspended or expelled from school in the past 12 months (27% non-movers, 10% movers), and that their child had repeated a grade in the past 12 months (19% non-movers, 0% movers).

Summary of 2000-2001 Findings

Both the CWF and PHF samples are nearly equally likely to be employed in 2001. Non-movers between both groups are more likely than movers to be employed in 2001.

Respondents in the CWF sample reported only somewhat higher median total annual household incomes than those in the PHF sample.

CWF families are significantly more likely than public housing families to report being satisfied that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children and is safe at night. Public housing families are somewhat more likely to report that in their current neighborhood, people help each other.

CWF families and public housing families that have moved between 2000 and 2001 are somewhat more likely than those who did not move to report being satisfied that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children and is safe at night. Non-movers between both groups are more likely to report that their in their current neighborhood, people help each other.

In terms of child outcomes, once again, public housing families are significantly more likely to have a child that has been suspended/expelled from school or that has repeated a grade. Public housing movers are less likely than non-movers to have a child that has been suspended/expelled from school or that has repeated a grade.

PREDICTING WHO MOVES BETWEEN PUBLIC HOUSING AND NON-PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES

Using IFS data, logistic regression analyses were conducted among female respondents living in Cook County to predict who moves. Variables used in the analysis are ethnicity, age, teen parent, total number of children given birth to, education, employment, total household income, residence in a public housing development, TANF receipt, and Housing Choice Voucher receipt. The following neighborhood characteristics are measured: The neighborhood is “good place to live and raise children,” one in which “people help each other,” and “is safe at night.” A complete list of variables and codes appears in Table 10. [Note: Analyses were conducted using non-response weights.]

Why People Move

We are trying to predict who moves controlling for the variables listed in Table 11. Independent variables collected in 1999 were used to predict moving by 2000, and independent variables collected in 2000 were used to predict moving by 2001.

1999 and 2000 – Table 12 shows estimated odds ratios from a logistic regression predicting likelihood of moving between 1999 and 2000 among the study population. The estimated effect of each independent variable is expressed as the likelihood of moving among a particular group, controlling for other factors in the model. As shown in

Table 12, non-African Americans were 1.8 times more likely than African Americans to move between 1999 and 2000. Respondents who did not believe that their current neighborhood is a good place to live and raise children were 1.7 times more likely to move in that same time than those who were satisfied. The data indicates that TANF recipients were 1.5 times more likely than those who did not receive TANF to move. Also noted was a significant public housing effect. The relative odds of moving among respondents who lived in public housing in 1999 are .30. In other words, respondents who lived in public housing were about 70% (1.00-.30) less likely to have moved between 1999 and 2000 than their counterparts who do not live in public housing, controlling for other variables in the model.

2000 and 2001 – Table 13 shows estimated odds ratios from a logistic regression predicting likelihood of moving between 2000 and 2001 among the study population. According to the analysis, unemployed respondents were 1.5 times more likely than those who were working to move between 2000 and 2001. Housing Choice Voucher receipt is also a significant factor, where those who did have vouchers in 2000 were 79% less likely to make a move between 2000 and 2001.

CONCLUSION

Our research shows that lower-income families who are relocating typically select areas very similar to those areas they are leaving. The CHA offers mobility counseling to relocating families and encourages them to move to “opportunity areas.” The counseling programs are not universally available and people must seek them out. Most families end up on the south and west sides, perpetuating economic and racial segregation in the city and suburbs. We are concerned that if the new mixed-income housing developments falter that many public housing residents will find themselves in situations that are not different enough from the projects they left.

With so little movement to the Northside and suburbs, we doubt that people will make these “opportunity moves” even if they are offered mobility counseling. Mobility seems to be determined by forces beyond conventional counseling. Mobility initiatives are a

weak intervention for changing the patterns we report. If interventions can neither coerce movers to shift their preferences, nor force communities to be more receptive to low-income African Americans they will fail.

With very few resources, public housing residents have limited options. Unless income is significantly increased among poor public housing residents, and discriminatory practices are reduced, options will continue to be severely limited, and few will move outside of poor areas with high densities of African Americans.

Mobility counseling alone does not change the factors that systematically influence the moving decisions of the poor. Most families do not opt for less “impacted” areas under normal circumstances. The focus on moving families to Chicago’s Northside or to “unimpacted” suburbs has failed. Moving relatively few poor families out of poverty-stricken areas is a high-cost/low-benefit strategy. It shifts attention from the thousands of families living in the “Black Metropolis.” No matter where poor families are relocated, they must deal with the underlying issues of making ends meet, providing for their children, and finding and keeping jobs.

APPENDIX

Table 1 – Characteristics of Study Population	1999	2000	2001
	N	N	N
(Base: Cook County)	(671)	(538)	(474)
Gender			
Male	3%	3%	3%
Female	97%	97%	97%
Ethnicity			
African American	87%	89%	90%
Non-African American	13%	11%	10%
Age			
18-24	22%	22%	23%
25-34	43%	44%	43%
35-44	27%	25%	26%
45 and older	8%	7%	8%
Teen Parent (Age at First Child's Birth)			
Yes	63%	63%	64%
No	37%	37%	36%
Number of Children Given Birth To	3.1	3.4	3.6
Has High School Diploma or GED			
Yes	58%	70%	69%
No	42%	30%	31%
Employment Status			
Working	49%	53%	48%
Not working	51%	47%	52%
Median Total Annual Household Income	\$6,250	\$8,750	\$13,750
Receives TANF			
Yes	55%	33%	20%
No	45%	67%	80%
Residence in Public Housing Development			
Yes	13%	14%	16%
No	87%	86%	84%
Receives HCV			
Yes	15%	16%	17%
No	85%	84%	83%
Neighborhood is a Good Place to Live and Raise Children			
Satisfied	68%	71%	68%
Dissatisfied	32%	29%	32%
Neighborhood Networks			
Help each other	53%	53%	56%
Go their own way	47%	47%	44%
Neighborhood Safety at Night			
Safe	59%	70%	77%
Unsafe	41%	30%	23%
Child Suspended/Expelled from School			
Yes	14%	15%	16%
No	86%	85%	84%
Child Repeated a Grade			
Yes	13%	11%	9%
No	87%	89%	91%

Table 2 – Residential Movement Patterns of CWF Sample Versus PHF Sample When Comparing Place of Residence Between 1999 and 2000

	Non-Public Housing		Public Housing	
(Base: Cook County)	N	%	N	%
<u>Non-Movers</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>81</u>
Chicago	258	90	60	100
Northside	22	9	2	3
Southside	79	31	30	50
Westside	157	61	28	47
N. Suburb	2	1	-	-
S. Suburb	12	4	-	-
W. Suburb	16	5	-	-
<u>Movers</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>19</u>
Chicago - Chicago	121	76	10	71
Northside - Northside	12	10	-	-
Westside - Northside	1	1	-	-
Westside - Westside	28	23	1	10
Westside - Southside	6	5	1	10
Southside - Westside	2	2	1	10
Southside - Southside	77	64	7	70
Chicago – S. Suburb	5	3	1	7
Chicago – W. Suburb	1	1	2	14
Chicago - Other City	5	3	-	-
N. Suburb – N. Suburb	3	2	-	-
N. Suburb – W. Suburb	1	1	-	-
N. Suburb - Chicago	1	1	-	-
S. Suburb – S. Suburb	16	10	1	7
W. Suburb – W. Suburb	2	1	-	-
W. Suburb – N. Suburb	1	1	-	-
W. Suburb – S. Suburb	2	1	-	-
S. Suburb - Other City	1	1	-	-

Table 3 – Residential Movement Patterns of CWF Sample Versus PHF Sample When Comparing Place of Residence in 2000 and 2001				
	Non-Public Housing		Public Housing	
(Base: Cook County)	N	%	N	%
<u>Non-Movers</u>	<u>276</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>83</u>
Chicago	238	86	51	96
Northside	19	8	2	4
Southside	151	63	25	49
Westside	69	29	24	47
N. Suburb	4	1	-	-
S. Suburb	22	8	1	2
W. Suburb	12	4	1	2
<u>Movers</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>17</u>
Chicago - Chicago	82	77	11	100
Northside - Northside	5	6	-	-
Northside - Westside	1	1	-	-
Westside - Westside	17	20	2	18
Westside - Southside	1	1	-	-
Southside - Northside	1	1	-	-
Southside - Westside	1	1	2	18
Southside - Southside	54	66	7	63
Chicago – N. Suburb	1	1	-	-
Chicago – S. Suburb	4	4	-	-
Chicago – W. Suburb	3	3	-	-
Chicago - Other City	5	5	-	-
N. Suburb – N. Suburb	1	1	-	-
N. Suburb – Other City	1	1	-	-
S. Suburb – S. Suburb	4	4	-	-
W. Suburb – W. Suburb	2	2	-	-
S. Suburb - Other City	1	1	-	-
N. Suburb - Chicago	1	1	-	-
S. Suburb - Chicago	1	1	-	-

Variable	CWF Total		PHF Total	
	N	%	N	%
	(457)		(74)	
Currently working	247	54 ^c	31	42
TANF receipt	146	32	30	41
Median total annual household income in 2000	\$8,750		\$8,750	
Residence in a public housing development	-	-	74	100
HVC receipt	73	16 ^a	5	7
Current neighborhood...				
<i>Is a good place to live and raise children</i>	342	75 ^a	30	41
<i>Is one in which people help each other</i>	223	49	32	43
<i>Is safe at night</i>	328	72 ^a	37	50
Child suspended/expelled from school past 12 months	45	10	21	28 ^a
Child repeated a grade past 12 months	31	7	14	19 ^b

a Significant at .01

b Significant at .05

c Significant at .10

Variable	Non-Movers		Movers	
	N	%	N	%
	(288)		(160)	
Currently working	156	54	87	54
TANF receipt	92	32	50	31
Median total annual household income in 2000	\$8,750		\$11,250 ^a	
Residence in a public housing development	-	-	-	-
HVC receipt	43	15	27	17
Current neighborhood...				
<i>Is a good place to live and raise children</i>	210	73	126	79
<i>Is one in which people help each other</i>	157	55 ^a	65	41
<i>Is safe at night</i>	204	71	118	75
Child suspended/expelled from school past 12 months	30	10	13	8
Child repeated a grade past 12 months	23	8 ^c	7	4

a Significant at .01

c Significant at .10

Variable	Non-Movers		Movers	
	N	%	N	%
	(60)		(14)	
Currently working	24	40	7	50
TANF receipt	24	40	6	43
Median total annual household income in 2000	\$8,750		\$10,625 ^a	
Residence in a public housing development	60	100	14	100
HVC receipt	-	-	5	36 ^a
Current neighborhood...				
<i>Is a good place to live and raise children</i>	20	33	10	71 ^a
<i>Is one in which people help each other</i>	26	43	6	43
<i>Is safe at night</i>	29	48	8	57
Child suspended/expelled from school past 12 months	17	28	4	29
Child repeated a grade past 12 months	12	20	2	14

a Significant at .01

Variable	CWF Total		PHF Total	
	N	%	N	%
	(383)		(63)	
Currently working	186	49	29	46
TANF receipt	73	19	18	29 ^c
Median total annual household income in 2001	\$13,750		\$8,750 ^a	
Residence in a public housing development	-	-	63	100 ^a
HVC receipt	64	17 ^b	5	8
Current neighborhood...				
<i>Is a good place to live and raise children</i>	268	70 ^a	30	48
<i>Is one in which people help each other</i>	192	50	37	59
<i>Is safe at night</i>	303	79 ^b	41	65
Child suspended/expelled from school past 12 months	44	11	15	24 ^b
Child repeated a grade past 12 months	22	6	10	16 ^b

a Significant at .01

b Significant at .05

c Significant at .10

Variable	Non-Movers		Movers	
	N	%	N	%
	(276)		(106)	
Currently working	139	50	45	42
TANF receipt	46	17	26	25 ^c
Median total annual household income in 2001	\$13,750		\$15,625 ^a	
Residence in a public housing development	-	-	-	-
HVC receipt	48	17	16	15
Current neighborhood...				
<i>Is a good place to live and raise children</i>	193	70	73	71
<i>Is one in which people help each other</i>	150	54 ^a	41	39
<i>Is safe at night</i>	217	79	84	81
Child suspended/expelled from school past 12 months	31	11	11	10
Child repeated a grade past 12 months	14	5	7	7

a Significant at .01

c Significant at .10

Variable	Non-Movers		Movers	
	N	%	N	%
	(52)		(11)	
Currently working	26	50 ^a	3	27
TANF receipt	12	23	6	55 ^a
Median total annual household income in 2001	\$8,750		\$8,750	
Residence in a public housing development	52	100	11	100
HVC receipt	-	-	5	45 ^a
Current neighborhood...				
<i>Is a good place to live and raise children</i>	25	48	5	46
<i>Is one in which people help each other</i>	33	63 ^a	4	36
<i>Is safe at night</i>	35	67 ^b	6	55
Child suspended/expelled from school past 12 months	14	27 ^a	1	10
Child repeated a grade past 12 months	10	19 ^a	0	-

a Significant at .01

b Significant at .05

Table 10 – Variables Included in Logistic Regression Analyses
Ethnicity
African American
Non-African American
Age
18-24
25-34
35-44
45 and older
Teen Parent (Age at First Child's Birth \leq 19.99)
Yes
No
Number of Children Given Birth To (Range)
Has High School Diploma or GED
Yes
No
Employment Status
Working
Not working
Total Annual Household Income (Range)
Receives TANF
Yes
No
Residence in Public Housing Development
Yes
No
Receives HCV
Yes
No
Neighborhood is a Good Place to Live and Raise Children
Satisfied
Dissatisfied
Neighborhood Networks
People help each other
People go their own way
Neighborhood Safety at Night
Safe
Unsafe

Table 11 – Regression Models Predicting Moving	
<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>
Ethnicity, Age, Teen Parent, Number of Children, Education, Employment, Total Household Income, TANF Receipt, Residence in Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher Receipt, Neighborhood is Good Place to Live and Raise Children, in Neighborhood People Help Each Other, Neighborhood Safety	Moving by 2000 and Moving by 2001

Table 12 – Estimated Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Moving Between 1999 and 2000	
(Base: Cook County, N=409)	
Variable	Odds Ratio
Ethnicity	
Non-African American	1.81*
African American	1.00
Age	
18-24	1.32
25-34	1.30
35-44	1.00
45 and older	.69
Teen Parent (Age at First Child's Birth)	
Yes	1.42
No	1.00
Number of Children Given Birth To	
Has High School Diploma or GED	.92
No	1.15
Yes	1.00
Employment Status	
Not working	.78
Working	1.00
Total Household Income in 1998	
Receives TANF	1.05
Yes	1.45*
No	1.00
Residence in Public Housing Development	
Yes	.30***
No	1.00
Receives HCV	
Yes	.83
No	1.00
Neighborhood is a Place to Live and Raise Children	
Dissatisfied	1.73**
Satisfied	1.00
Neighborhood Networks	
Go their own way	1.02
Help each other	1.00
Neighborhood Safety at Night	
Unsafe	1.38
Safe	1.00

* significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level; *** significant at .001 level

Table 13 – Estimated Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Moving Between 2000 and 2001	
(Base: Cook County, N=380)	
Variable	Odds Ratio
Ethnicity	
Non-African American	1.01
African American	1.00
Age	
18-24	1.55
25-34	1.28
35-44	1.00
45 and older	1.40
Teen Parent (Age at First Child's Birth)	
Yes	1.33
No	1.00
Number of Children Given Birth To	
Has High School Diploma or GED	.99
No	1.12
Yes	1.00
Employment Status	
Not working	1.50*
Working	1.00
Total Household Income in 1998	
Receives TANF	.98
Yes	1.01
No	1.00
Residence in Public Housing Development	
Yes	.65
No	1.00
Receives HCV	
Yes	.21***
No	1.00
Neighborhood is a Place to Live and Raise Children	
Dissatisfied	1.17
Satisfied	1.00
Neighborhood Networks	
Go their own way	.80
Help each other	1.00
Neighborhood Safety at Night	
Unsafe	.66
Safe	1.00

* significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level; *** significant at .001 level

REFERENCES

Fischer, Paul. 2002. "Where are the Public Housing Families Going?: An Update."
National Center on Poverty Law.