

**University of San Francisco**

---

**From the Selected Works of Tim Iglesias**

---

2017

# Two Competing Concepts of Residential Integration

Tim Iglesias



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/tim\\_iglesias/33/](https://works.bepress.com/tim_iglesias/33/)

- Quad Council of Public Health Nursing Organizations & American Nurses Association. (1999). *Scope and standards of public health nursing practice*. Washington, DC: American Nurses Publishing.
- Sanders, B., Schneiderman, J. U., Loken, A., Lankenau, S. E., & Bloom, J. J. (2009). Gang youth as a vulnerable population for nursing intervention. *Public Health Nursing, 26*, 346–352. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1446.2009.00789.x
- Schlapman, N., & Cass, P. S. (2000). Project: HIV prevention for incarcerated youth in Indiana. *Journal of Community Health Nursing, 17*, 151–158.
- Sickmund, M. & Puzanchera, C. (2014, December). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2014 national report*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatb/nr2014/downloads/NR2014.pdf>
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006, March). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. Retrieved from <http://www.ojdp.gov/ojstatb/nr2006/downloads/NR2006.pdf>
- Tolou-Shams, M., Stewart, A., Fasciano, J., & Brown, L. K. (2010). A review of HIV prevention interventions for juvenile offenders. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 35*(3), 250–261. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsp069
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Human Administration. (2010). *The registered nurse population. Initial findings from the 2008 national sample survey of registered nurses*. Retrieved from <http://bnp.hrsa.gov/healthworkforce/rsurvey/rsurveyinitial2008.pdf>
- Wilson, A. (2007). Planning primary health-care services for South Australian young offenders: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Nursing Practice, 13*, 296–303. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-172X.2007.00641.x

## Two Competing Concepts of Residential Integration

Tim Iglesias

### Introduction

A surge of contemporary social science research demonstrates the centrality of housing to one's quality of life and access to critical social goods. For example, an online resource called "How Housing Matters" sponsored by the Urban Institute and the MacArthur Foundation posts research and practical information demonstrating the importance of housing in the lives of individuals, families and communities in terms of income, health, education and more. (How Housing Matters, 2016). So, while "social equity" is a contested concept, evoking multiple definitions, housing is central to social equity in any definition.

There are seven distinct housing problems: lack of supply, poor physical condition, unaffordability, discrimination, problematic location, vulnerable tenure and cultural inadequacy. (Iglesias, forthcoming). Residential segregation, a particular locational problem, is the focus of this chapter.

Residential segregation causes a wide variety of negative impacts on people living in segregated neighborhoods. In response, U.S. national housing policy has embraced racial integration as a goal since at least 1968 with the passage of the federal Fair Housing Act (FHA) in the wake of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (Schwemm, 2016). Senator Mondale, one of the cosponsors of the bill that became the FHA explained in



his comments supporting the bill that it was intended to prohibit housing discrimination and to promote “truly integrated and balanced living patterns.” (Mondale, 2016). A 2014 U.S. Supreme Court decision named *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs et al. v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. et al.*, (ICP), reaffirmed the national commitment to residential integration (U.S. Supreme Court, 2014).

There are many obstacles toward achieving residential integration, including continued discrimination and so-called “not-in-my-back-yard” resistance to the siting of affordable housing in privileged cities and neighborhoods. However, a critical but overlooked obstacle is even more fundamental. While there are many concepts of integration in academic literature, there are only two popular concepts of residential integration; they conflict, and so which definition is used has important practical consequences. This chapter contends that the progressive community needs to have frank conversations about which conception of residential integration it wants to work towards. This clarity of purpose is necessary both to select, design and implement policies that will be effective in attaining the desired goal and to engage in the inevitable public and political debates about integration and whether and how to pursue it.

After briefly summarizing the problem of residential segregation in the U.S., this chapter will explore the two conflicting popular conceptions of residential integration and then explain the practical consequences of these different conceptions for policies intended to address residential segregation. It concludes with a call for a frank conversation about the conceptions of integration by progressive advocates.

### Overview of the Problem of Residential Segregation

Residential segregation is generally defined objectively as residential patterns in which certain groups categorized by race or income live clustered together and separated from other groups. (Massey & Denton, 1993). (In this chapter, when I discuss “race,” I am considering it as a social construction. (Haney-Lopez, 1994).) Such patterns have existed in many metropolitan areas for many decades. In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, commissioned by President Johnson in response to widespread race riots in American cities, issued its final report (popularly referred to as “The Kerner Report”).

The Kerner Report documented the extent of racial residential segregation and famously warned: “Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.” (U.S. Department of Justice, 1968).

The problem of residential segregation has spawned a truly vast scholarly literature. There is little dispute over the array of causes of initial racial segregation, including action by federal, state and local governments as well as organized private action and housing market dynamics, even though researchers dispute the relative contributions from each cause. (Baar, 1992; Farrell, 2002; Harvard Univ., The Civil Rights Project, 2001; Kushner, 1979; Power, 1983; Roisman, 1995; Shulman, Menendian, & Costa, 2014). While rates of racial segregation have declined, many areas are still quite segregated and some are hyper-segregated. (Glaeser & Vigdor, 2001; Frey, 2001). Substantial disagreement exists over how and why residential segregation persists in some communities. (Bell & Parchomovsky, 2000; Bell, 2000; Been, 1996; Boudreaux, 1999; Ellen, 2000; Galster, 1990; Muth, 1969; Rossein, Steil & White, 2016; Schelling, 1978; Seitles, 1998; Shapiro, 2005; Ware, 2002).

There is a broad consensus that residential segregation causes a wide variety of negative impacts on people living in segregated neighborhoods, including low quality housing, inadequate public safety, poor education, limited access to jobs, and restricted recreational and shopping opportunities (Carr & Kutty, 2008; Harvard University, The Civil Rights Project, 2001; Iglesias, 2014; Institute on Race and Poverty, 1997; Seitles, 1998). The combination of racial segregation and high poverty in some communities has been the focus of a great deal of attention by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development because the combination intensifies the negative impacts on people living in those neighborhoods. (Brookings Institution, 2008).

### The Coming Debate about “Forced Integration”

Residential integration advocates are encouraged and motivated by recent events. Since around 2010, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has more vigorously enforced fair housing law and its integration goal, including by enforcing a long-dormant “duty to affirmatively further fair housing” (which requires cities receiving federal funding to not only avoid discriminating but also to take affirmative steps to





eliminate housing discrimination in their communities) and in HUD's commitment to adopt a regulation to specify the requirements of the "duty to affirmatively further fair housing." (Allen, 2010; Gurian & Allen, 2010; King, 2013; Schwemm, 2011–2012; Smyth, Allen & Schnaith, 2015). Moreover, the 2014 U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the ICP case affirmed that even a usually conservative Court acknowledged and supported the policy supporting residential integration. "Much progress remains to be made in our Nation's continuing struggle against racial isolation. In striving to achieve our historic commitment to creating an integrated society,... The Court acknowledges the Fair Housing Act's continuing role in moving the Nation toward a more integrated society." (ICP, 2014).

In the coming years, this increased interest will motivate substantial advocacy for "residential integration" by progressives in many cities all over the U.S. However, race, income, and integration are still difficult and volatile topics among elected officials, opinion leaders, and among the general public. In my view, we are not a "post-racial society" in any meaningful sense. Importantly, debates about residential integration are deeply fraught precisely because of the very importance of housing and its location (How Housing Matters, 2016).

Therefore, I anticipate that progressive advocacy in favor of residential integration will incite a series of controversial public debates. Such public conflict is predictable based upon the volatile conflicts that have emerged over four recent events: the "Black Lives Matter" movement, the 2016 Presidential race, the public storm that erupted over the Westchester County (N.Y.) consent decree in which the wealthy, predominately white county agreed to take some steps towards racial integration, and popular reactions to HUD's proposed affirmatively furthering fair housing regulation. (Jonsson, 2013; Applebome, 2013).

Those opposing integration typically frame their arguments as resisting "forced integration," arguing that policies aimed at residential integration "force communities to diversify in ways that may hurt local property values, their tax bases, and their overall economies." (Jonsson, 2013) Westchester County Executive Robert Astorino, complained: "Washington bureaucrats, who you will never see or meet, want the power to determine who will live where and how each neighborhood will look... What's at

stake is the fundamental right of our cities, towns, and villages to plan and zone for themselves." (Applebome, 2013).

If progressives are not ready for this debate about integration, it could doom their attempts to promote residential integration as well as hurt other efforts to develop affordable housing and to enforce fair housing law. In my view, unclear and conflicting popular models of "residential integration" create a great risk for progressive policies in this context.

### Scholarly Controversies Over Residential Integration

While the existence of stable racially integrated communities has been documented, (Nyden, Maly & Lukehart, 1997), there is a wide range of opinion among scholars and commentators concerning whether some form of "residential integration" is a useful and viable solution. Some argue that we should abandon the ideal of integration as a public policy goal (Boudreaux, 2004; Cashin, 2001; Gilmore, 2010; Ho, 2002), while others continue to support some version of it (Anderson, 2010; Aoki, 1997; Days, 2002; Hartman & Squires, 2010; Harvard Law Review, 2001; Roisman, 1995; Schuck, 2002; Seitles, 1998; Young, 2000).

Among those who promote some version of "residential integration" as a goal, there are substantial differences among their conceptions of what would constitute integration. One conflict concerns whether integration is consistent with continued "clustering" by existing communities of color, on the assumption that such clustering can be and is freely chosen. And, of course, there is substantial disagreement about the means through which any particular vision of integration should be pursued. (Briggs, 2002; Carey, 1997; Payne, 1998; Potter, 1990; Roisman, 2001; Schuck, 2002; Wiggins, 2002; Young, 2000).

### Conflicting popular conceptions of residential integration

Despite a great deal of agreement among progressive advocates on the value of "integration" as a stated goal in the abstract, there is insufficient agreement on what integration actually means. Scholarly literature includes multiple treatments of integration—many of which are intellectually complex. Those debates are probably unresolvable, and are not likely to be the focus for practical integration efforts. Rather, I would argue that there are only two well-recognized popular concepts of residen-



tial integration, and these are the critical ones that progressive advocates need to wrestle with.

The two competing popular conceptions are: the *traditional integration model* and the *individual access to the opportunity structure model*. And, as will be argued below, these conceptions have very different implications for progressive policies.

First, there is the traditional integration model which concerns the nature or quality of a community. It focuses on the complexion of a community as a geographical unit and the social relationships among members of different income groups or races within it. This concept asks: Who lives there and how do they relate to each other? It usually begins with a statistical analysis of relative spatial location and concentration of Caucasians and people of color within a defined geographical unit. (Massey, 2000). It defines integration statistically by the relative spatial location of households by race within a specified geographical unit. However, this vision looks beyond simply improving the statistics. It seeks actual, authentic human interaction between people of different races and economic classes and overcoming what scholars have called *social distance*. (Bogardus, 1947; Karakayali, 2009). This model focuses on racial and ethnic integration without any reference to the opportunity structure. The concept is well-expressed in the following quote by New York City Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer in reference to a new integrated residential development, "I'm hoping that as time goes on, people will share play dates and I hope they'll do BBQs together." (Kusisto, 2014).

The second model is the *individual access to the opportunity structure model*. This model focuses on how the location of a household relates to the opportunity structure of a community (e.g. good schools, good jobs, decent shopping, healthy neighborhoods). This model comes from the writings of John A. Powell and the work of the Kirwan Institute (and more recently the Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society at the University of California at Berkeley) as well as the "geography of opportunity" scholarship (Briggs & Wilson, 2005; Powell, 2002). This model does not inquire into the relationships among the members of the households who live in a neighborhood. Its primary focus is maximizing the access of the new residents to the structure of opportunity available in the new neighborhood so that they can improve their lives through participating in the better opportu-

nities enabled by the location of their housing. While not reducible to seeking "economic integration," this model does place a premium on the economic and social success of individuals and families.

### **The Poor Door Controversy Demonstrates the Conflict Between the Conceptions**

The recent poor door controversy provides a vehicle to explore the two conceptions and their potential conflicts. (Briquelet, 2013). In 2013, a developer was using New York City's 421-A tax exemption voluntary inclusionary zoning ordinance to develop market-rate condos and affordable rental units. (Jacobs, 2014). The proposal envisioned two separate entrances: one for residents of the market-rate condos and another for residents of the affordable rental units. A reporter's story of the plan, along with a dramatic graphic, stirred a national furor. The controversy led to revision in the design. (Badami, Sept. 2014). Later, the City of West Hollywood voted against another poor door proposal. (Branson-Potts, 2014). Others opined that poor doors were not the issue or even that poor doors are not a problem at all. (Jacobs, 2014; Navarro, 2014).

If we hold to the traditional integration model, the poor door is significant because it seems to reinforce separation of people based upon income (and possibly race) and is likely to lead to stigma and to the experience of affordable housing residents being perceived as second class citizens. (Badami, Sept. 2014). We would not allow separate entrances to apartments based upon race, gender or religion. At the very least, a poor door violates the spirit of the traditional model of integration.

In contrast, if we employ the individual access to the opportunity structure model, the poor door probably should not matter because living in that same great neighborhood provides the affordable housing residents essentially equal access to the opportunities for schools, jobs, health and safety, etc. (Navarro, 2014).

### **Clarifying our Model of Integration**

Exploring the poor door controversy forces us to clarify our model of integration. While scholars have and continue to engage in sophisticated and meaningful debates about concepts of integration, this is not by any means a merely an academic question. Rather, it is also a profoundly practical and political question:







Presumably, the necessary and sufficient conditions will vary based upon each element of opportunity. For example, regarding schools, if the jurisdiction has neighborhood-based schools, then location matters by neighborhood; if the jurisdiction has magnet schools or another system to allocate students to particular schools, the neighborhood may not matter for that element of opportunity. For employment, it will depend upon the mechanism by which residents are expected to access better job opportunities. Will an address alone matter or one's social network of contacts?

Moreover, there are likely both objective and subjective aspects of opportunity. In other words, being objectively aware of an opportunity is different from subjectively believing you have a reasonable chance at actually accessing it so that you are motivated to seek it. Thus, objective opportunity alone may be insufficient to meet the model's objectives. Location near or within a high opportunity neighborhood may need to be supplemented with other interventions to create sufficient subjective opportunity as well.

Perhaps most importantly, discrimination may limit the access of the residents living in high opportunity neighborhoods to the opportunities that now are closer to them. Recent studies reveal that employment discrimination by race is still prevalent. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2013). A national study showed that employers reviewing candidates' resumes with equal qualifications regularly disfavor those with names that sound like minority communities or foreign. (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2003). And, apart from intentional discrimination, a large body of evidence now demonstrates that unconscious or implicit bias, including based upon race, has widespread effects on social interactions and decisions. (Greenwald, 1998; Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2009).

Given the strong statistical linkages between race and income, it is possible that if we dig deeper into the assumptions and mechanisms of the two models that they are not so different and perhaps they even merge at points. Perhaps the traditional model also seeks economic and social opportunity for the individuals in the households and expects that these will follow (possibly even naturally flow from) enhanced interpersonal relationships. If so, we need to be clear about how improved economic

and social opportunity are likely to occur, because these results assume an additional step beyond improved interpersonal relationships.

And, perhaps the opportunity model assumes that meaningful personal relationships across race and income will develop among the residents by virtue of the new neighbors in the high opportunity neighborhoods taking up the newly available opportunities. If so, we need to think through how this is likely to occur. As Marion Young reflects:

Racial segregation is an overlapping, but separate problem [to lack of equal opportunity] that deserves the attention of policy makers. Granted, policies that break down economic segregation might also help break down racial segregation. Minorities are disproportionately poor in this country, so any policy that benefits the poor should disproportionately benefit minorities. Because racial segregation is so severe and harmful in this country, however, policies designed to help the poor should include mechanisms to maximize the chance that poor minorities will benefit from the policy. (Young, 2000).

And perhaps the opportunity model assumes that over time the benefits that individuals and families accrue from economic integration will redound to the entire community of which those individuals and families are members, so that the broader patterns of discrimination will be relieved and historical inequities will be resolved.

### **What Difference Does the Integration Model Make for Policy Choices?**

If every policy would not serve both concepts equally, which concept of integration one is pursuing will affect which policies one pursues to achieve the goal. Some policies may serve both models equally well. But perhaps some policies will only serve one model, or will serve one model better than the other. If so, then choosing the appropriate policies will be an important consequence of which model of integration is selected.

Traditionally, policies aimed at solving the residential segregation problem are separated into those that would revitalize the communities in which there is a high concentration of people of color now (e.g. redevelopment programs) and those that would



enable members of those disadvantaged communities to move to more advantaged communities (e.g. policies aimed at siting affordable housing in privileged white suburbs and mobility programs, such as HUD's Moving to Opportunity program).

Ideally, we could implement both types of programs in order to maximize the scope of choice that all members of the community would have to decide where they would want to live. However, since most of these programs require substantial government subsidies, which are increasingly limited, often choices must be made between them. In this context, promoters of the traditional model of integration tend to push and try to hold out for a "both/and" solution, i.e. pursuing both kinds of programs in concert, in part because this model particularly values the sense of community and place in which interpersonal relationships are fostered. In contrast, those who support the opportunity model tend to favor mobility programs.

Perhaps more interesting is how the choice of models makes a difference for inclusionary zoning, a policy that could potentially serve both models equally and does not require government subsidies. Upon analysis, we will find that even in this context the choice of integration model significantly affects how one would design and implement this policy.

Inclusionary zoning (or inclusionary housing) policies incentivize or require market-rate housing developers to include a certain percentage of affordable housing units in their developments (Iglesias, 2015). Usually, the ordinance will provide numerous benefits to developers (e.g. a density bonus, fee waivers, fast-track permitting and others) to reduce or eliminate the economic impact of the policy (Iglesias, 2015). Inclusionary zoning ordinances are very flexible, enabling a city to adapt this strategy to its housing market, current settlement patterns and other dimensions. The model of integration we support makes a difference for how inclusionary zoning ordinances ought to be designed, implemented, and evaluated. One important design decision is whether to require developers to locate the affordable housing units on the same location as the market-rate units (called on-site development), or to offer the developer alternative compliance options, such as, off-site development of affordable units, dedicating other land to the jurisdiction for its development of affordable units or paying money instead of developing units, viz. *in lieu fees* (Iglesias, 2015). If we promote the tradi-

tional integration model, then there should be a strong emphasis on on-site development of affordable housing units with market-rate units (avoiding the poor door problem). If we follow the individual access to the opportunity structure model, then we could put less emphasis on on-site development and we can be more open to other locations within a jurisdiction and their tradeoffs as long as they meet that model's criteria.

Of course, the selection of appropriate policies will be largely influenced by a particular community's actual situation as regards segregation, its history, leadership and many other factors. No matter which model of integration we promote, we will probably need to include program features such as counseling of potential residents and support programs to maximize the chance that the program will increase meaningful racial integration under either model. (HUD, 2011).

## Conclusion

As the 2016 Presidential race has demonstrated, race is still a very difficult and often polarizing issue to in American politics. The opportunity structure model is probably more palatable to the American public, but risks underestimating the effects of existing racism/implicit bias and the legacy of racism. But many believe integration *means* the traditional integration model... and this scares some other people.

Advocates need to decide on a good analysis and help decision-makers, opinion leaders (including the media), and the general public understand it so that they can talk about it with others. If we do not successfully engage this public debate, there will be more local opposition to affordable housing, fewer and weaker progressive policies and more opposition to their implementation.

Of course, the conversations I am proposing are complex, sensitive, and require mature, thoughtful engagement. There are profound language issues underlying the substantive topics. For example, one might try to frame the conversation as being about "strengthening communities" or "promoting diversity" to avoid potentially problematic integration. Politically, individual access to the opportunity structure model appears to be the less controversial of the two models because it is somewhat less threatening to local leaders and the general public because it is based on the bipartisan notion of America being a nation of



equal opportunity. But it would be naive to assume that even this model is widely accepted outside of the progressive community because of different models of meritocracy and economic-social mobility.

## Note

A version of this argument was presented at the 2016 University of San Francisco Social Equity Leadership Conference on June 1, 2016 in San Francisco. My thanks to Dr. Richard Gregory III for inviting me to present at the conference and to contribute this chapter to the book.

## References

- Allen, M. (2010, April 5). No certification, no money: The revival of civil rights obligations in HUD funding programs, *Planning Commissioners Journal*. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://plannersweb.com/2010/04/no-certification-no-money-the-revival-of-civil-rights-obligations-in-hud-funding-programs/>.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Perseus Books Publishing.
- Anderson, E. (2010). *The imperative of integration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Aoki, K. (1997). Direct democracy, racial group agency, local government law, and residential racial segregation: Some reflections on radical and plural democracy, *California Western Law Review*, 33(2) 185–205.
- Applebome, P. (2013, Apr. 23). Showdown for Westchester and U.S. over desegregation agreement. *The New York Times*, A18. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/24/nyregion/us-gives-westchester-deadline-to-comply-with-housing-pact.html>.
- Baar, K. (1992). The national movement to halt the spread of multifamily housing, 1890 – 1926. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58(1), Winter 1992.
- Badami, S. M. (2014, August 3). *A poor door—and the fair housing risks involved*. [Web blog post]. Retrieved from <https://fairhousing.foxrothschild.com/2014/08/articles/discrimination/a-poor-door-and-the-fair-housing-risks-involved/>.
- Badami, S. M. (2014, Sept. 3). Is the “Poor Door” closed? Not yet. But the proposal is Changing. And will likely change some more. [Web blog post]. Retrieved from [http://fairhousing.foxrothschild.com/2014/09/articles/discrimination/is-the-poor-door-closed-not-yet-but-the-proposal-is-changing-and-will-likely-change-some-more/?utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+FairHousingDefense+%28Fair+Housing+Defense%29](http://fairhousing.foxrothschild.com/2014/09/articles/discrimination/is-the-poor-door-closed-not-yet-but-the-proposal-is-changing-and-will-likely-change-some-more/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+FairHousingDefense+%28Fair+Housing+Defense%29).
- Been, V. (1996). Comment on Professor Jerry Frug’s The geography of community. *Stanford Law Review*, 48(5), 1109–1113.
- Bell, A. & Parchomovsky, G. (2000). The integration game. *Columbia Law Review*, 100(8), 1965–2030.
- Bell, D. (2000). *Race, Racism and American Law*. Aspen Publishers.
- Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2003). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w9873.pdf>. Washington, DC: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1947). Measurement of personal-group relations, *Sociometry*, 10(4), 306–11.
- Boudreaux, P. (1999). An individual preference approach to suburban racial desegregation. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 27(2) 533–562.
- Boudreaux, P. (2004). Vouchers, buses, and flats: The persistence of social segregation. *Villanova Law Review*, 49(1), 55–78.
- Branson-Potts, H. (2014, Aug. 9). West Hollywood commission votes against “poor door” housing development. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-west-hollywood-8899-beverly-20140808-story.html>.
- Briggs, X. (2002). Social capital and segregation: Race, connections, and inequality in America. KSG Working Paper No. RWP02-011. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=320243>. Boston: Kennedy School of Government.
- Briggs, X. & Wilson, W. J. (Eds.) (2005). *The geography of opportunity: Race and housing choice in metropolitan America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Briquelet, K. (2013, Aug. 1). Upper West Side condo has separate entrances for rich and poor. *The New York Post*. Retrieved from <http://nypost.com/2013/08/18/upper-west-side-condo-has-separate-entrances-for-rich-and-poor/>.
- Brookings Institution. (2008). *Concentrated poverty in America: An overview*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Carey, C. A. (1997). The need for community-based housing development in integration efforts, *Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Development Law*, 7(1), 85–122.
- Carr, J. H., & Kutty, N. K. (Eds.) (2008). *Segregation: The rising costs for America*. New York: Routledge.



- Cashin, S. D. (2001). Middle-class black suburbs and the state of integration: A post-integrationist vision for metropolitan America. *Cornell Law Review*, 86(4) 729-776.
- Days, D. S. III, (2002). Rethinking the integrative ideal: Housing, *McGeorge Law Review*, 33(3), 459-472.
- Ellen, I. G. (2000). *Sharing America's neighborhoods: The prospects for stable racial integration*. Boston: Harvard College.
- Farrell, J. L. (2002). The FHA's origins: How its valuation method fostered racial segregation and suburban sprawl. *Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Development Law*, 11(4), 374-389.
- Frey, W. H. (2001). Melting pot suburbs: A census 2000 study of suburban diversity. Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu/dydocroot/urban/census/frey.pdf> Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Gilmore, B. (2010). Home is where the hatred is: A proposal for a federal housing administration truth and reconciliation commission. *University of Maryland Legal Journal of Race, Religion, Gender & Class* 10(2), 249-288.
- Glaeser, E. L. & Vigdor, J. L. (2001). *Racial segregation in the 2000 census: Promising news*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Greenwald, A.G., McGhee, D.E., & Schwartz, J.L.K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464-1480.
- Greenwald, A., Pehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L. & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the implicit association test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(1), 17-41. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015575>.
- Gurian, G. & Allen, M. (2010). Making real the desegregating promise of the fair housing act: "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" comes of age. *Clearinghouse Review*, 43(6), 560-569.
- Haney-Lopez, I. (1994). The social construction of race: Some observations on illusion, fabrication and choice. *Harvard Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Review*, 29(1), 1-62.
- Hartman, C. W. & Squires, G. D. (Eds.) (2010). *The integration debate: Competing futures for American cities*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvard Law Review (2001). Note: Making mixed-income communities possible: Tax base sharing and class desegregation. *Harvard Law Review* 114(5), 1575-1598.
- Harvard University, The Civil Rights Project, (2001). *Housing segregation: Causes, effects, possible cures*. Boston: Harvard University Civil Rights Project.
- Ho, C. (2002). Backfiring in race relations and markets. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*, 13(2), 323-345.
- How Housing Matters. [Web blog] Retrieved from <http://howhousingmatters.org/>. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- Iglesias, T. (2015). Maximizing inclusionary zoning's contributions to both affordable housing and residential integration, *Washington Law Journal*, 54(3), 585-612.
- Iglesias, T., (forthcoming). *Clarifying housing problems and problematizing housing opportunity*. unpublished manuscript in author's files.
- Iglesias, T. (2014). Amici Curiae Brief of Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the common good and forty-five housing scholars in support of defendant and respondent city of San Jose, No. S212072. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/iglesias/Downloads/SSRN-id2468324.pdf](http://C:/Users/iglesias/Downloads/SSRN-id2468324.pdf)
- Institute on Race and Poverty (1997). Examining the relationship between housing, education, and persistent segregation. Retrieved from <http://www1.umn.edu/irp/publications/contents.htm>. St. Paul: Institute on Race and Poverty.
- Jacobs, K. (2014, Aug. 8). *The real scandal in NYC real estate? Not enough poor doors*. Fast Co. & Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.fastcodesign.com/3034027/slicker-city/the-real-scandal-in-nyc-real-estate-not-enough-poor-doors>.
- Jonsson, P. (2013, Aug. 9). "Fair" housing or "social engineering"? HUD proposal stirs controversy, *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2013/0809/Fair-housing-or-social-engineering-HUD-proposal-stirs-controversy>.
- Kang, J. (2014). Implicit bias and segregation: Facing the enemy. Retrieved from <http://furancenter.org/research/ir/essay/implicit-bias-and-segregation-facing-the-enemy> [Web blog post]. New York: Furman Center.
- Karakayali, N. (2009). Social distance and affective orientations. *Sociological Forum*, 24(3), 538-562.
- King, A. W. (2013). Affirmatively further: Reviving the Fair Housing Act's integrationist purpose. *New York University Law Review*, 88(6), 2182-2219.
- Kirwan Institute (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/>.
- Kirwan Institute (n.d.). Opportunity mapping initiative and project listing. [Web blog post]. Retrieved from <http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/opportunity-communities/mapping>.
- Kusisto, L. (2014, Aug. 28). A "poor door" on a planned New York apartment tower with affordable housing gets a makeover. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/a-poor-door-on-a-planned-new-york-apartment-tower-with-affordable-housing-gets-a-make-over-1409276266>.
- Kushner, J. (1979). Apartheid in America: An historical and legal analysis of contemporary residential segregation in the United States. *Howard Law Journal*, 22(4), 547-686.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A., (1993). *American apartheid: Racial segregation and the making of the underclass*. Boston: Harvard University Press.



- Masey, D. S. (2000). The Residential segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, 1970-1990. In G. D. Jaynes (Ed.) *Immigration and race: New challenges for American democracy* (pp. 44-61). New Haven: Yale University.
- Mondale, Senator (1968, Feb. 20). Congressional Record, 114, S3422 (daily ed.).
- Muth, R. F. (1969). Racial segregation and discrimination. In Ellicksen, R. C., Rose, C. M. & Ackerman, B. A. (Eds.) *Perspectives on Property Law* (pp. 47-76). Aspen Publishers.
- Navarro, M. (2014, Aug. 26). "Poor door" in a New York tower opens a fight over affordable housing. *The New York Times*, A1. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/27/nyregion/separate-entryways-for-new-york-con-do-buyers-and-renters-create-an-affordable-housing-dilemma.html>.
- Nyden, P., Maly, M. & Lukehart, J. (1997). The Emergence of Stable Racially and Ethnically Diverse Urban Communities: A Case Study of Nine U.S. Cities. *Housing Policy Debate*, 8(2), 491-498.
- Payne, J. M. (1998). Lawyers, judges, and the public interest. *Michigan Law Review*, 96(6), 1685-1714.
- Potter, M. F. (1990). Racial diversity in residential communities: Societal housing patterns and a proposal for a "racial inclusionary ordinance." *Southern California Law Review*, 63(4), 1151-1235.
- Powell, J. a. (2002). Opportunity-based housing. *Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Development Law*, 12(2), 188-228.
- Power, G. (1983). Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913. *Maryland Law Review*, 42(2), 289-328.
- Roisman, F. W. (1995). Symposium: Shaping American communities: Segregation, housing & the urban poor: Intentional racial discrimination and segregation by the Federal Government as a principal cause of concentrated poverty: A response to Schill and Wachter. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 143(5), 1351-1378.
- Roisman, F. W. (2001). Opening the suburbs to racial integration: Lessons for the 21st century. *Western New England Law Review*, 23(1), 65-114.
- Rossein, M., Steil, J. & White, A. (2016). Brief of housing scholars as amici curiae supporting Respondent in Bank of America v. City of Miami and Wells Fargo & Co. et. al. v. City of Miami, Nos. 15-1111 and 13-1112.
- Schelling, T. C. (1978). Micromotives and macrobehavior. In Ellicksen, R. C., Rose, C. M. & Ackerman, B. A. (Eds.) *Perspectives on Property Law* (pp. 478-86). Aspen Publishers.
- Schuck, P. H. (2002). Judging remedies: Judicial approaches to housing segregation. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 37(2), 289-368.
- Schwemm, R. G. (2011-2012). Overcoming structural barriers to integrated housing: A back-to-the-future reflection on the Fair Housing Act's "affirmatively further" mandate. *Kentucky Law Journal*, 100(1), 125-176.

- Schwemm, R. G. (2016). Integration as a goal of Title VIII. In *Housing Discrimination Law & Litigation*, § 2.3 West Publishing.
- Seitles, M. (1998). The perpetuation of residential racial segregation in America: Historical discrimination, modern forms of exclusion, and inclusionary remedies. *Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law*, 14(1), 89-124.
- Shapiro, T. (2005). *The hidden cost of being African American: How wealth perpetuates inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shulman, D.R., Menendian, S. & Costa, D. (2014). Brief of housing scholars as amici curiae supporting respondent, submitted in Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs et al. v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. et al., respondent, No. 13-1371. Retrieved from <http://haasinsti-tute.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/Amicus%20Brief%20EPI%20and%20Haas%20Institute%20Texas%20Housing%20Dec%202014.pdf>.
- Smyth, T. M., Allen, M. & Schnaith, M. (2015). The Fair Housing Act: The evolving regulatory landscape for federal grant recipients and sub-recipients. *Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Development Law*, 23(2), 231-258.
- Stanley, S. (forthcoming March 2017) *An impossible dream? Racial integration in the United States*. Oxford University Press.
- U.S. Congress (1968). Title VIII, Federal Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2011). Moving to opportunity for fair housing demonstration program final impacts evaluation. Retrieved at [https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/mtofd\\_full-report\\_v2.pdf](https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/mtofd_full-report_v2.pdf). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2013). Turner, M.A., Levy, D.K., Wissoker, D., Aranda, C.L., Pitingolo, R. & Santos, R. Housing discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities 2012. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2016) Affirmatively furthering fair housing tool. Retrieved from <https://egis.hud.gov/affht/#>. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (n.d.). AFFH fact sheet. Retrieved from <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/AFFH-Fact-Sheet.pdf>. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- U.S. Department of Justice, (1968). Report of the National Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Report). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/8073NCJRS.pdf>. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- U.S. Supreme Court (2015). Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs et al. v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. et al., No. 13-1371. 135 Supreme Court 2507 (2015).



- Ware, L. (2002). Race and urban space: Hypersegregated housing patterns and the failure of school desegregation. *Widener Law Symposium Journal*, 9(1), 55–72.
- Wiggins, M. J. (2002). Race, class, and suburbia: The modern black suburb as a "race-making situation." *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 35(4), 749–808.
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## Promoting Social Equity to Achieve the Dream at Minority Serving Institutions

Susan T. Gooden, Kasey J. Martin, Lindsey L. Evans, and  
Kashea N. Pegram

### Introduction

A focus on closing the college education gap and achieving equitable outcomes for historically under-represented students is an increasingly important part of the national and state higher education agenda (Carnevale & Rose, 2011). Achieving the Dream is a multi-year national initiative launched by the Lumina Foundation for Education in 2003 to improve student success. The initiative is particularly concerned about student groups that have traditionally faced significant barriers to success, including students of color and low-income students. Achieving the Dream works across multiple fronts, including changes in the institutional practices and policies at participating colleges; research into effective practices at community colleges; public policy work; and outreach to communities, businesses, and the public. It emphasizes the use of data to drive change. The initiative promotes "ground-level strategies to accomplish big-picture outcomes" (Achieving the Dream, 2009, p. 3). The initiative is also particularly concerned with promoting an equity-based agenda and including institutions with high concentrations of low-income students, students of color, and nontraditional students (Rutschow et al., 2011).