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ABSTRACT
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INTRODUCTION

There are many people in the United States who are currently living in substandard housing. The reasons people live under these conditions vary, but the most predominant factor is the lack of ability to pay for adequate housing.

Attempts have been made to alleviate this situation. Various programs designed to house low income people and to provide assistance to moderate income people have been tried. Public housing, rent supplement, and leased housing programs have been aimed at the poorest people. Subsidized interest rates on mortgages for single and multiple unit dwellings have helped hold down costs of housing for moderate income families, and FHA and VA insured mortgages have helped those with higher incomes to purchase homes. In general, although the current housing shortage the nation is experiencing affects nearly everyone, the above programs have helped ease the strain on many families. For a large minority of the population, however, the country's poor, the problem of substandard housing is still severe, and has not been solved by existing forms of assistance. Low income people have been isolated and segregated in low income housing projects; this generally has not solved the housing problems of the poor, only relocated existing problems.

One of the most promising strategies proposed to possibly offer a solution to this housing problem is the concept of mixed income housing.
development. It has been theorized that by combining low income residents with higher income residents in a single development, a more suitable living environment will be achieved for the low income people, eliminating many of the social problems normally associated with low income housing. Theoretically, a mixed income project would provide a means for integrating low income people into the mainstream of American life.

A number of these projects have been started. The question that needs to be asked is that of the effects of projects like these on their residents, and the possible implications for the behavior and attitudes of their residents. The issue of whether or not projects of this kind achieve their goals is still uncertain.

Literature on this subject is decidedly negative. Several studies have concluded that the sociological disadvantages inherent in neighborhoods where different economic groups of people are thrown together outweigh any possible benefit that could be gained by having families of different income levels line side by side.

During the course of this study, examination was made of one particular mixed income project in depth. Financed by the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency, this development contains 25% low income families, receiving rent subsidies, 20% moderate income families, receiving rent subsidies, and 55% families with incomes high enough to enable them to pay market rates for their apartments. Different kinds of tenants are totally mixed together throughout the project, totalling 141 occupied units.
In general, the pessimism shown by authors about the prospects of mixed income housing seems to be justified. Several specific predictions that came out of the literature were confirmed by observations and interviews at the project. The main finding was that social contact and interaction between tenants is minimal.

Why then, should this approach to the housing problem be pursued? The answer to this question lies in one's own system of values and priorities regarding the needs of upper and lower income residents. The project tends to inhibit social relationships, and some discontent was found on the part of higher income residents. But the project does succeed in housing low income people comfortably, with the help of government subsidies, in an atmosphere devoid of many of the social problems existing in most low income housing. Considering the fact that upper income apartment dwellers are for the most part a transient group, it is possible that a high turnover rate of upper income residents will minimize any detrimental effect on them of the project's lack of social relationships. If this is the case, mixed income developments may very well be a partial solution to the problem of housing low and moderate income people.
SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND HOUSING

One often encounters the claim that American society today is a democracy, the land of the free, with equal opportunity for all. Idealists swear that success and prosperity await any American who is motivated and will work hard, overcoming any obstacles in his way. The claim is quickly refuted, of course, after the most cursory glance at current literature describing the class structure in our society, or by taking a realistic, objective look at contemporary America. There exists a definite system of social stratification, with somewhat precise measures and classifications. More often than not, external factors such as birth, family life, and living environment determine into which of the social strata an individual will fall, and external factors tend to hold individuals at a particular level. Robin Williams, in his American Society, states the following:

> It takes no great acumen to see that actual equality of opportunity does not exist for a great many individuals; nor is it difficult to show that inherited position, social connections, and a variety of circumstances essentially irrelevant to strictly personal qualities and achievements help place individuals in the stratification order.

There are several systems of class categories, but most vary only slightly. Occupation, education, and income are common measures of social class. Education and income are valuable measures because they provide metric data for analysis, but occupation is generally used because clear boundary separations are inherent in its nature. William Michelson has created a reasonably typical stratification classification system, based on occupation:
a. Lower Class: Low income, often no steady job or one subject to the whims of the employer; little education.

b. Working Class: Regular blue-collar employment.

c. Lower Middle Class: Regular white-collar employment, usually for others; moderate salary at most.

d. Upper Middle Class: High amount of education; comfortable salary or fees; sometimes self-employed, but skills are transferable regardless.

e. Upper Class: Great personal wealth either at present or within the family at some past date; at least moderate education; occupation, if any, is respectable.  

Michelson's system, as others, can precisely classify people and order their classifications, with one exception. On the borders of working class and middle class lie skilled blue-collar workers and white-collar clerical workers. Skilled blue-collar workers have a substantially higher income but lower educational level than do clerical workers. This results in an ambiguity of status in these occupations. Under an educational or occupational classification system, white collar clerical workers are ranked higher; on an income scale, skilled workers are higher. This status ambiguity will become important later in a discussion of observed residential patterns.

This stratification system has many implications for the behavior, attitudes, and environments of people, particularly as it relates to the sociological problems involved with housing low and moderate income people. Great variances in income between individuals has left a considerable number of families at the bottom of the income scale, and families in this position are frequently unable to afford decent housing. The U. S. President's Commission on Urban Housing has found that one American family in eight is now "house-poor," where a
"house-poor" family is defined as one that would have to pay more than 25% of its income on housing. There were 7.8 million house-poor families in the United States in 1968, 4.4 million of those in urban areas. And, in contrast to the concept of an ever-rising gross national product, the situation in not improving at all. The Commission states that "over the next ten years, assuming that current economic trends and national policies continue without marked change, the number of American households unable to afford decent housing will remain almost constant." 6

Yet as important as economic considerations are in looking at housing, it must be realized that they are not the only differences separating people in different stratification levels. Life styles vary greatly between social classes. Several significant housing variables are related to social class, specifically housing quality and the level of environment emphasized. The quality of people's dwellings is directly proportional to social class. 7 On the surface, this seems to be merely a function of financial constraints; yet the relationship holds even among the ambiguous status groups discussed above. Skilled blue-collar workers in general have a higher income than white-collar clerical workers, but the clerical workers are better housed than the blue-collar workers. The implication of this (assuming equal housing opportunities for white-collar and blue-collar workers) is that the two groups have different values and different priorities that affect their housing preferences. Clerical workers must spend a greater proportion of their income on housing than do
blue-collar workers who spend more of their income on consumption items. It seems that quality of housing is more important to white-collar people in this ambiguous status group.

Social class is related to the level of home environment stressed by a particular group. Among the lower class, a safe home is often an ultimate end. Lee Rainwater wrote about the specialized needs of lower-class people. Citing safety and security as the chief demands of these people in wanting better housing, Rainwater discussed the human and non-human threats that these people face in their environment, or are afraid of facing (such as vermin, fire, faulty construction, trash accumulation, violence, assault, robbery, neighbors, verbal hostility, etc.). Upper middle and upper class groups tend to be more concerned, when selecting a new residence, with the community that will surround them. Unlike lower class families, they probably live in a safe home, and are concerned with the services that can be provided by a community. S. D. Clark terms these orientations "house-centered" and "community centered." Thus the housing preferences between social class groups will vary, as a function of differing housing demands, differing abilities to pay for housing, and differing degrees of willingness to pay for housing.

An individual's social class then, may have an effect on the type of environment in which he lives. Does the type of environment in which he lives have an effect on an individual's social class? The reason that the above discussion on the relationships between social class and housing is important and relevant, I think, is because
physical surroundings do play a major role in determining what happens to people. Alvin Schorr has expressed some very strong feelings on this matter. In his study for the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Schorr discusses the effects of housing, stating that the type of housing occupied by an individual influences his health, behavior, and attitude, particularly if the housing is inadequate (inadequate meaning that the house is dilapidated or lacks a major facility such as running water.)

Schorr cites specific effects that may spring from poor housing:

1. A perception of one's self that leads to pessimism and passivity.
2. Stress to which the individual cannot adapt.
3. Poor health.
4. A state of Dissatisfaction.
5. Pleasure in company but not in solitude.
6. Cynicism about people and organizations.
7. High degree of sexual stimulation without legitimate outlet.
8. Difficulty in household management and childrearing.
9. Relationships that tend to spread out in the neighborhood rather than deeply into the family.

Most of these effects, in turn, place obstacles in the path of improving one's financial circumstances. The point of Schorr's study is emphasized in his conclusion:

It would be difficult to find some aspect of housing that does not play a role in the way people live and, more precisely, in their ability to learn and relax, their specific pattern of functioning with each other, and their view of the world.
This kind of reasoning has led to a debate about which are more important in planning housing: physical considerations or social considerations. Nathan Glazer, among others, asserts that social surroundings are more important in determining what happens to people than are physical surroundings. He writes, "we must root out of our thinking ... the assumption that the physical form of our communities has social consequences." But Rainwater claims that many non-human dangers can be controlled by adequate housing; and a lower class person will evaluate his home in terms of the housing unit itself.

During the 1950's, great emphasis was placed on the physical aspects of the housing environment, applying theories similar to the arguments made by Schorr, above. Under the banner of Urban Renewal, physically run down structures were torn down, often destroying viable neighborhoods. (The most celebrated of these being Boston's West End in Gans' Urban Villagers). Poor people's residences were torn down to eliminate bad housing stock, and low income high rise apartment buildings began to be built (not necessarily in the same place). The results were disastrous. There are numerous examples of low-rent high rise projects that have failed. Two projects of this type that have encountered many problems are the Pruitt Igoe project in St. Louis and the Cabrini Green project in Chicago. Despite shortages of low-rent units in these areas, these projects are afflicted with high vacancy rates. Pruitt Igoe cannot attract residents even by lowering its rental levels to twenty dollars per month. What happened, in effect, was the concentration of all the social problems of a low income area into one building, what Newsweek calls a "high rise slum."
rendering projects like these almost unliveable. This has happened in spite of the existence originally of sound, physically adequate units.

It has thus become clear that social factors must be considered when searching for means to provide adequate housing for people of all income levels. The special financial problems of people in the lower levels of the social stratification system have been recognized, and legislative action by the federal government has made available subsidy programs to help these people. But uncertainty exists concerning the best system in which to use subsidies, the best strategy for achieving the goal of adequate housing opportunities. One theory currently being considered as a possible source of solutions to this problem is the concept of mixing different income groups into housing developments, to have people of different social classes live in close proximity, in the same housing project. There is reason to believe that such a structure would have desirable effects. In a social psychological study, Festinger, Shachter, and Back looked at the pattern of social relationships that developed between residents of a college housing project for married students where residents were assigned individually and randomly (first come, first served) to rooms in the project. The researchers found a strong inverse relationship between amount of social contact between residents, and physical distance between doors leading to apartments. There was a very great tendency for residents to mix socially with their closest neighbors. Geographic influences on social interaction were also found in a study by Leo Kuper of social relationships in an English suburb. He found
that, on a neighborhood level, situating factors favor the establishment of "cordial relations" with side neighbors.\(^{23}\) It is possible, therefore, that a mixed-income project would foster social contact between income groups and encourage inter-group social relationships. This type of contact and interaction could, in turn, have positive implications; hopefully, a "shedding of undesirable traits"\(^ {24}\) on the part of lower class residents would occur, along with the social acceptance of lower classes by higher classes.\(^ {25}\) There is some support of this theory in the literature. In a study done by Collins and Deutsch dealing with people of the same social class but who differed in race, positive effects of integration were found; as a result of living in close proximity to black people, white people were found to be more tolerant and more willing to accept black people as human beings.\(^ {26}\) A study by J. Musil of Prague's ecological structure found indications of positive effects of social mixing on a city-wide scale; neighborhoods seemed to be viable and there was an almost complete breakdown of the status connotations of various parts of the city.\(^ {27}\)

The majority of the evidence, however, is decidedly negative. In general, the mixing of social classes seems to be an unpopular idea with undesirable results. In his study of a mixed class New Jersey suburb, Gutman found that working class wives had trouble forming relationships; they hadn't the necessary social skills to interact with other wives on a free and easy basis.\(^ {28}\) Gans has much to say on the subject in his *Levittowners*. He found, contrary to contact theories set forth above, that economic integration was not necessarily conducive to increased social interaction between economic groups; people
have their own social spheres and exclude dissimilar others. He found that working class residents tended to go their own way most of the time. Middle class residents looked beyond immediate neighbors to find friends with similar interests; working class residents withdrew, because they generally lacked ability for this type of social behavior.29 Looking at a mixed neighborhood in England, Wilmott and Young found that working class residents who had the strongest complaints about snobbishness in their neighborhood were those most fully integrated.30 The conclusion of a study by Keller stated that both middle and working class people have a fuller social life when "among their own."31 Gans discovered that mixed income neighborhoods may be economically unsound. He found that when the differences in cost of adjacent homes in a neighborhood goes above 20%, developers are often left with unsaleable homes.32 Gans concludes that in order to obtain the fullest and most rewarding social interaction, a certain amount of neighborhood homogeneity must be preserved. He proposes that the block (two rows of houses facing each other) is the basic unit that must be kept homogeneous.33

Mixed income developments may quite possibly, then, produce undesirable results. They do not seem to be popular with residents as a type of neighborhood. Another study from Britain examined new towns (which were originally intended to be and were economically mixed) several years after they were occupied. The finding was that local neighborhoods became progressively less integrated through time; individual sub-areas began to take on coloration of one kind or another.34
Morris and Mogey found that neighborhoods are "expected to be a haven from a hostile world - where a family seeks refuge and strength among its own kind." This implies that similarity between neighbors is of crucial importance, where relationships are unavoidable and face to face (although the authors admit the possibility that a general impression of similarity may perform the same function as actual similarity.). Morris and Mogey conclude that class differences are unpopular, particularly between side neighbors, and that the most influential aspects of class are occupation and economic status.

On the basis of these studies, one can predict that there would be significant social problems in a mixed income neighborhood. One would expect to find conflicts between income groups created by differences in housing preferences. As mentioned earlier, Lee Rainwater has found that lower class residents generally evaluate their home environment on the basis of the housing unit itself. Middle and upper residents can assume that the quality of housing they live in will be good. As a result, the latter group tends to look at the choice of a place of residence as purchasing a package of services. Lower income people in adequate housing are likely to be straining their budgets to meet housing costs, and are most concerned with their immediate physical surroundings. Higher income residents demand non-necessary amenities. Value differences of this kind can lead to conflicts in a mixed community. Upper income residents, for example, may favor increased taxes for a community center or a new school curriculum, while lower income residents would oppose an additional financial burden of this nature.
Additional problems may be encountered directly related to social stratification levels. There is a relationship between the extent to which formal class barriers exist, and residential segregation. When social barriers between classes are formal and visible, members of each social strata do not feel threatened by classes below them. For example, there has generally been a large amount of racial residential integration in the South (relative to Northern states), where strong social barriers existed between races. But once ideology supporting class barriers breaks down, then class differences are supported by other means, one of which is residential segregation. It has been mentioned here how social stratification classifications are clearly defined; but the formal barriers between classes, which bar interaction and limit contacts, are not great, and are lessening. Using the above argument, this would imply that it will become increasingly more difficult to integrate social classes; higher classes will feel their superior position threatened by lower classes, and will tend to be uncooperative. An example would be the laborer who sees a welfare family getting almost two-thirds of the income he is getting, and is then faced with the prospect of the welfare family living next door to him in similar accommodations. James Beshers talks about housing as the universal indicator of status, cutting across all social classes. Automobiles may be important status symbols to lower class people, and upper class people may have their own set of status symbols that are not even visible (e.g., a child doing well at college). But housing means something to everyone. Perhaps this is one of the reasons
housing is such an important issue, as well as one of the reasons it is a most difficult issue to handle.

The pessimism expressed by these authors regarding the possibilities of mixed-income neighborhoods is especially relevant in the discussion of current developments in this area. A great deal of money is currently being committed to the construction of mixed-income housing projects. If it is true that economic integration will tend to produce undesirable effects, serious problems can be anticipated regarding the future of these developments. If the conclusions reached in the literature are valid and applicable, we should expect to find some of these undesirable effects upon examination of projects of this kind. In particular, it should be expected that social contact between residents will be minimal, that working class people will experience snobbishness and have trouble interacting, that the social lines of everyone will be restricted, and that middle class residents will feel their status threatened. In the following sections, the brief history of mixed income housing in this country will be traced, and one such project examined in detail to determine whether or not these negative predictions are credible.
HISTORY OF MIXED-INCOME HOUSING

In order to understand how the concept of mixed-income housing developed, it is necessary to look back at unsuccessful attempts that have been made in the past to achieve the goal of decent housing for all American families. It is through examination of past failures that corrective measures can be contemplated, and plans made for future developments.

Efforts to achieve this goal of decent housing for all, particularly efforts to provide adequate housing for those families of low and moderate incomes, have seen little success in the past. Public housing, traditionally one of the main mechanisms for housing low income families, is now a recognized failure. Not only are there widely publicized mistakes, such as Pruitt Igoe; but public housing projects in general, while usually functional, produce many undesirable effects. Perhaps the main detrimental quality associated with low-income housing in the past has been the institutionalized segregation of lower economic classes. Life in the usual public housing project is not the way most American families want to live. It does not reflect American values as to the way people should live. Project designs often set off low-income housing from the rest of the community, reinforcing visually the fact that its residents belong to the "lowest income group." One of the consequences of this system is reduced contact between economic groups of people. Thus it seems that physical isolation of low income people in public housing projects results in rigid social segregation, barring low income families from entering
the mainstream of American life. These conditions seriously constrain the social mobility of low income families and limit any possibility of economic self-betterment on the part of these individuals. The lesson to be learned from the experience of public housing programs, then, is that of the disadvantages inherent in any housing plan that isolates low income families.

The ordeal of public housing corroborated the developing theory that economic segregation was not an effective strategy for dealing with the housing problem, that perhaps economic integration offered the basis for a solution. The idea began to evolve of combining families from different economic groups into new housing developments. Increased contact between classes, social mixing, and removal of the stigmatization associated with low income housing were considered to be desirable characteristics that could be achieved in low rent housing by combining it with housing designed for middle and upper class residents. As a result of this new planning, several mixed-income developments have been built in the last few years.

The Farm Urban Renewal Project in Brookline, Massachusetts, was one of the first housing projects to be built that combined units for several economic classes. Although not originally planned to be a mixed-income development, this project represents one possible form that mixed-income housing can take. Identification of the advantages and disadvantages resulting from this environment can be compared to the observations of a newer project in order to speculate about the future of economically integrated housing.
The site of the Farm Project was originally occupied by Irish immigrant field hands and their descendants, and became the target of an urban renewal program in 1952. Initial plans called for clearance of the neighborhood and construction of high rent apartment units to provide upper middle class housing. \(^{42}\) Urban renewal regulations, however, required the town to provide relocation housing for displaced residents. Since there was reluctance on the part of most Brookline residents to have low income housing built in otherwise affluent neighborhoods, plans for the development were changed to include provisions for low and moderate income households. The end result was a project consisting of eleven buildings, divided into three areas. The decision was made to group the population into three distinct sections, the physical standards of the three groups of buildings varying widely. The upper income section consists of four buildings, "stylishly modern and deliberately individualized," \(^{43}\) with rents ranging from $170 to $900 per month. This section is separated by a six-foot high brick wall from the three buildings that constitute the moderate income section. \(^{44}\) Designed by the same architect who designed the upper income section, these three buildings are more restrained with less variety. \(^{45}\) Rents range from $92 to $125 per month. A road separates this section from the four buildings that make up the public housing section for low income families. The design of the public housing is described as "austere ally functional." \(^{46}\) There are many other physical differences between the three sections. The bricks of the buildings are color coded (upper income housing is a light buff, middle income housing orange, and low income housing a darker red). Differentially
allocated services include outdoor courts, views from commons rooms, access to shops, a park, and parking accommodations.

As can be expected, little adult interaction was found between classes. The upper class residents keep almost completely to themselves, and there are slight evidences of social contact between low and middle income groups. Children do interact freely, meeting in the public school and on the one playground in the project. Animosity, aggravated relations, and conflicts exist between groups, and there seems to be a good deal of mistrust between groups.

There are advantages to be gained from mixed housing, however, that have appeared in the project. Theoretically, such an organization provides a structure for families to move up the socio-economic scale without changing neighborhoods; in the Farm project a move of this kind would be a formalized shift from one section to another. There are three families who accomplished this, moving from the low income buildings to the middle income buildings. A mixed project also provides the opportunity for sharing facilities to which one group might not normally have access. This occurred to some extent in the Farm project, in that the low and moderate income families were allowed limited use of the upper income residents' swimming pool and stores. Another possible advantage of economically integrated housing is the potential opportunity to gain some insight into the life styles of economic classes different from one's own. There was some evidence that in the Farm project, low income mothers looked to the middle and upper income sections as representing aspirations for their children.48
The Farm project was not planned to be economically integrated, and is not an ideal form of mixed income housing; but it does exhibit some of the potential advantages and disadvantages of this type of development. Exposure of an individual to others in different social classes can be achieved, if only in a limited manner. Facilities that are not normally available to low income people can be provided for use in such a system. Upward social mobility does seem to be possible. However, the physical dissimilarities and separateness that are present in this project significantly inhibit inter-group contact. This limited contact, in conjunction with physical proximity and differences in life styles and available amenities, breeds inter-group conflict. It seems possible, after examination of this project, that a development could be designed which would incorporate the advantages of a mixed-income project while avoiding the disadvantages found in the Farm Project.

In recent years, a more deliberate, coherent, and formalized plan for the construction of mixed-income housing projects has begun to emerge. The states of Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and New York have established agencies whose purpose is to finance housing projects that integrate different economic classes of people. Hundreds of millions of dollars are currently being committed to the development of projects based on this theory. Policies at the different agencies vary, of course, in the degree to which they require economic integration in the projects they finance. Some of these agencies combine only middle and upper income classes, while others attempt to
provide also for low income persons. Of these states, Massachusetts
has gone the farthest in trying to achieve integration of families with
significantly different income levels.

The Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) was created in
1966 by an act of the Massachusetts state legislature as an indepen-
dent organization placed in the Department of Community Affairs. Its
creation was brought about by the recognition of a shortage of decent,
safe, and sanitary housing available at low rentals in the Commonwealth.
It was assumed that private enterprise alone could not provide decent,
safe, and sanitary housing at rentals which families of low income
could afford. It was also recognized that past housing programs had
not been effective in dealing with this problem. In the "Declaration
of Public Necessity" section of the legislation creating the MHFA, it
is stated that "... experience has demonstrated that concentration of
low income persons and families even in standard structures built with
public subside does not eliminate undesirable social conditions and
does not permanently eliminate slum conditions." The purpose, then,
of the MHFA was to financially encourage private enterprise to provide
housing for low income families which would prevent recurrence of slum
conditions by housing people of varied economic means in the same pro-
jects and neighborhoods. There was no evidence at the time the legis-
lation was written that indicated that mixed housing would prevent
slum conditions from occurring in a project, nor was it known what
the long-range consequences would be. But it seemed logical that the
presence of middle class families in a project would insure against
this possibility.
The MHFA is governed by a seven-member board, consisting of public and private professionals in fields relating to housing. The function of the agency is to make construction and permanent loans at below conventional market rates. It raises money through the sale of tax-exempt boards to private investors. This money is then made available to make low interest loans to limited dividend and nonprofit housing sponsors. The agency requires sponsors to allocate 25% of the planned units to persons and families of low income, where low income refers to those persons who are eligible for admittance to public housing projects. The remaining 75% of the units are to be made available to persons of mixed income levels. The exact percentage of units that are allocated to other income groups varies from project to project, depending on locations of the projects and the state of the housing market in that location. All projects include provisions for moderate income families (generally, those with incomes between $4,000 and $8,000). In a low income area, as in Roxbury, for example, a project will allocate all 75% of the remaining units to moderate income families. In an MHFA project in Lowell, however, where the market includes more higher income people, only 20% of the units are reserved for moderate income families, and 50% are rented at market rates to higher income families (those with incomes between $8,000 and $16,000). In general, the MHFA wishes to finance projects that are responsive to the most critical housing needs of the housing market areas the projects will serve.

Mixed income projects have been under construction for several years, largely based on the intuitive notion that combining people of
different income levels into a single project will have beneficial effects. There is little concrete evidence, however, which supports this belief. This raises the question of whether or not this type of development is viable and/or accomplishes the goals for which it is designed. An examination of the operations of a specific mixed-income project might yield some general conclusions about the condition of that project, and also furnish a basis for speculation about the effectiveness of this type of housing. An opportunity to examine one of these projects closely was provided by the MHFA, which is interested in procuring information on the current chances of successful application of mixed income housing theory. Unfortunately, no MHFA sponsored development has been occupied for more than a year and a half, due to the recency of the agency's establishment, but observations at this point could begin to yield some preliminary conclusions about the functioning and consequences of the program. A study was made of Westminster Village Arms, an apartment complex of 141 units in Lowell, Massachusetts.
Westminster Village Arms is located along the Merrimack River on the outskirts of Lowell, Massachusetts, a city of 100,000 people. Westminster Village is an excellent example of planned economic integration, and provides an opportunity to examine the success and effects of this type of development, at least to the extent that they have appeared in the nine months of the projects occupancy.

The complex was planned in three phases, the first of which is completed and has been occupied since August, 1971. Phase I consists of twelve 2 1/2 story buildings of twelve units each, and is fully occupied. Phase II, which is scheduled to be completed late in the summer of 1972, with approximately the same number of units as Phase I, is almost completely rented up. Construction has begun on Phase III. Phase I is made up entirely of one and two bedroom apartments of high quality. Amenities that go along with each unit include electric heat and air-conditioning, dishwashers, garbage disposals, sunken living rooms with wall to wall carpeting, balconies, and television antenna systems. The complex provides communal facilities of security systems, a community center, two swimming pools, a tennis court, winter ice skating, children's playground, a basketball court, a picnic area, and facilities for boating on the Merrimac River, all of which will be completed this summer. The project itself is set into a hill with landscaping and a fountain. The site is on the outskirts of Lowell and is well away from the city proper. The complex is flanked on two
sides by wooded areas. Access to shopping and downtown Lowell is poor, with limited bus service (although increased service is planned to coincide with the project's completion).

In order to achieve the goal of economic integration in this project, three government subsidy programs are used to lower rents for lower income people, while charging market rent levels to higher income people. Market rents have been set at $173 per month for one bedroom units, and $223 per month for two bedroom units. Families whose income would not allow them to pay those rents in many cases qualify for one or more of the three subsidy programs. The federal government's 236 program provides interest subsidies to sponsors of low income rental housing, reducing their debt payments on mortgages to as low as those which would prevail at a 1% interest rate. The interest on the mortgage for the whole project cannot be subsidized, however, since 50% of the project's residents have incomes too high to qualify them for 236 subsidies. Rents are calculated for the families who qualify for this program, assuming that the interest rate on the mortgage for the project is 1%. The difference then, between this calculated rent and the market rental values for these units is paid to the mortgagee of the project (MHFA) from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Tenants with incomes less than $8,000 (for a family of three or four) can qualify for the 236 program. Rents for tenants in this program are $123 per month for a one bedroom apartment ($50 subsidy), and $158 per month for a two bedroom unit ($65 subsidy). These figures can be seen in Table 1.
The second subsidy program is designed to assist low income persons with special needs. The federal governments' rent supplement program provides payments directly to the sponsors of low-income housing, making up the difference between one-fourth of the tenant's income and 236 rentals. In this project, tenants are eligible to live in WVA under this subsidy program if their income is below $4,930 (for a family of four) and if the tenants fall into one of the following six categories: 1) Physically handicapped, 2) Age 62 or over, 3) Displaced by government action, 4) Presently living in substandard housing, 5) Disaster victim, or 6) Military on active duty. Rents charged under this program are 25% of the tenant's income, with the difference between that figure and 236 rental levels being covered in a direct payment from HUD to the owner of the project.

The third subsidy program also originates from the federal government and is designed to assist low income persons, but works through the local Lowell Housing Authority. This is the leased housing program, which consists of annual federal contributions to local authorities, covering the difference between public housing rents and the rates paid to private owners from whom dwelling units are leased. Thus families in this program, having been placed in Westminster Village by the Lowell Housing Authority, pay one fourth of their income as rent to Westminster Village. The difference then, between this figure and market rental levels is paid to the project owners by the Lowell Housing Authority, which is leasing the units. The flow of money in these subsidy programs is outlined in Table 1.
The residents of the project are thus comprised of three economic groups; those financially able to pay market rates (incomes generally greater than $5,000), those of moderate incomes (generally between $4,000 and $8,000), and those of low income (generally under $4,000). Figure 1 in the Appendix illustrates the composition of the project's residents by income level. Fifty-five percent of the units are occupied by market tenants, 20% by moderate income tenants, and 25% by low income tenants. Figure 1 shows that there is a definite economic difference, a gap, between low income families and the rest of the residents in the project. There is an overlap of income levels between 236 and market tenants. Aside from the gap at the $4,000 - $5,000 income level, the distribution of residents by income level is fairly continuous. Further data on tenants, broken down by groups, appears in Table 2.

The economic groups are completely mixed within the project, and within each of the twelve buildings of the project. All units are of the same quality with the same amenities. Each of the three floors in each building has at least one subsidized family and one market family. No formal information is disclosed as to which tenants pay market rates and which are subsidized. The present management has adopted a policy of trying to be as careful as possible not to treat tenants differentially in either a positive or negative direction, or to accentuate differences in tenants. If two families are moving out of the project, one subsidized and one paying market rates, the manager will switch the units so that a market rate tenant will move into the
previously subsidized unit and vice versa. This action is taken to presumably avoid any possibility of a stigma being attached to a particular apartment. Informal contact often reveals the economic means of tenants to each other, but no official confirmation of subsidized units is ever available to residents.

In order to draw some conclusions about the operation of Westminster Village, four sources of information were drawn upon. Aggregate demographic data on the residents of Westminster Village were obtained to give a general economic profile of the project's tenants. Tables containing this data appear in the appendix. Personal observations of the physical surroundings of the project have provided a general background on which to evaluate other information. The last two sources of information involved personal interviews. An interview with the manager of the project revealed his perceptions of the project, its purpose, and its success. Lastly, and perhaps most important, interviews were conducted with residents.

From a developer's point of view, WVA has been successful to date. Phase I is completely occupied, and Phase II is nearly full even before completion. There seems to be no problem attracting tenants. The rent delinquency rate is effectively zero. There has been almost no vandalism, only isolated incidents of littering. Visually, the project is very attractive. And lastly, and probably most relevant to the project owner, it is economically sound and will be a profitable development, based on its current rent levels and occupancy. The manager of the project speaks optimistically about it. The project is in excellent shape, physically, the level of maintenance is high,
and few problems have arisen. It has been necessary in several cases to instruct lower income families as to the use of the modern facilities such as the garbage disposal and dishwasher, and in other cases to teach proper use of even basic facilities (such as instructions not to barbecue in the bathtub). But there have been few instances of undesirable behavior. The management is hopeful that the majority of the residents, the 55% who have incomes high enough to pay the standard market rents, will be the norm setters regarding behavior, and will be a strong enough force to positively influence the behavior of others.

A high degree of visual attractiveness along with a minimum of 50% market-rate tenants are considered by the management to be essential qualities in a mixed income project if it is to be successful. Their assumption is that undesirable behavioral characteristics tend to be associated with low-income groups, and that a majority of subsidized units in a project would mean the disadvantage of having these tenants be norm-setters. Visual attractiveness is important, along with a high level of maintenance, because this creates a situation where any objectionable behavior or infraction of rules is extremely visible in contrast to the rest of the residents. Things are going well thus far, says the management; residents are satisfied and happy, and it is pleased with overall success of the project.

In order to get a sense of the degree to which tenants reflect the attitudes of the management, interviews were conducted with fifteen residents: eight market tenants, three 236 tenants, two leased housing
tenants, and two rent supplement tenants. The questions asked of the tenants and a summary of their answers appears in the Appendix. In general, interviews with the residents show a picture of Westminster Village that is slightly less optimistic than that presented by the management, but still favorable. Residents like the project. All people in every income group were pleased with the exterior design and appearance of the project, with the quality of the individual units themselves, and with the functioning of the current management. (Residents who had lived in the project in its beginning told some bad stories about the previous managers, but it was universally agreed that the present management corporation is doing an excellent job). All agreed that it is a comfortable place in which to live. All but one of the fifteen residents interviewed termed Westminster Village an improvement over their last place of residence. (All but three lived in apartments before coming to WVA). Yet there was dissatisfaction expressed over some specific aspects of the project. All but two respondents were of the opinion that the project in its present state is not suitable for children; insufficient and even dangerous play areas are a problem. There was some enthusiasm expressed regarding play areas to be built in the future, but presently the situation is undesirable. Other dislikes about the project were more commentaries on apartment living in general, e.g., thin walls, many rules, and scarcity of parking space, which seem to be common to apartment complexes of any form.

There were several topics that elicited mixed responses. Market tenants claimed both that rents were too high and that rents were
reasonable. (Subsidized tenants rarely mentioned rents). The number of children in the project also drew ambivalent reactions. There was satisfaction expressed about the way the management "allocated" units to families with children, as well as fear that when summer arrived the disturbances caused by the many children would be intolerable. The differing reactions of residents on these issues came from all different income groups and did not fit into any pattern according to income level.

One aspect of the project that did seem to bring income oriented responses was the location of the project. All of the market tenants interviewed were pleased with the location of Westminster Village for a variety of reasons, ranging from "you can't get too far away from downtown Lowell," to satisfaction with the accessibility of both Boston and New Hampshire. Four of the seven subsidized respondents, however, were displeased with the location. It was too far away from schools and shopping, and transportation was often hard to come by. These opposite responses seem to be directly related to the degree of physical mobility that is enjoyed by different income groups, and there are indications of conflicting interests between groups.

One of the crucial questions of the interview was designed to ascertain the extent to which residents were aware of the operation of subsidy programs at WVA, their conceptions of the subsidy programs, and their feelings about the subsidies. Responses indicated that all market know that some units are receiving government subsidy, although some of those who moved in under the old management were not told about
these subsidies until after they had moved in. Most market residents were uninformed or misinformed, however, about the details of the project's composition and the purpose of the income mix. Several respondents thought that there were few subsidies, and that those were given to welfare mothers only. Another misconception was that the complex was not being filled, so the developer went to the government, and the government supplied residents and paid part of their rent. A clear majority of the market rate tenants think that the presence of low income families is either a present or a future problem. Several respondents expressed dissatisfaction over the fact that they thought many of the subsidized persons were "taking advantage of" the system, accepting government aid when it was not really needed. Another theme that was mentioned several times was that of why others should get for nothing what one had worked hard for. There were definite tones of resentment directed at the subsidized groups. No direct social conflicts between economic groups precipitated by their closeness was reported, partly explained by the lack of social relationships in general in the project. Some concern was expressed that future problems might arise when the completion of the community center and swimming pools force a certain amount of social contact. In general, the economic mixing of residents is an issue, but not a problem of any magnitude at the present time.

Another topic relevant to the operation of Westminster Village is that of the plans of residents for the immediate future. Subsidized
families invariably planned on staying in Westminster Village Arms indefinitely. No plans to move were revealed. On the other side, almost all market rate respondents expressed a desire to move out of WVA within a few years, not planning to make it a permanent residence. Most of those desiring to move eventually also expressed a preference for a house rather than an apartment as the next place in which they would like to live.

The following general picture of the project emerges. Residents are in general pleased with and enthusiastic about the project, some as temporary residents, some as long-term residents. There are reservations, however, concerning the possibility of future problems resulting from the combination of different economic groups in this fashion. From the tenants point of view, the project seems to be a qualified success.

It is now possible to review once more the theories of economically integrated housing, and to speculate as to which are applicable to Westminster Village Arms, and what implications they hold for the project's future.
APPLICATIONS OF MIXED INCOME THEORY

Westminster Village Arms (WVA) represents the most highly integrated form of mixed income housing on the American housing scene. Like the Farm Urban Renewal Project, WVA provides housing for three economic groups of people; but it differs from the Farm Project in several fundamental areas. First, and perhaps most important, residents of Westminster Village of all socio-economic classes live together in the same buildings. At the Farm Project there is a distinct, physical separation between economic classes; at WVA no such segregation exists and people of varying income levels line side by side. A second major difference lies in the fact that residents at Westminster Village enjoy the same facilities and amenities regardless of the economic group to which they belong. This policy more fully achieves one of the goals of mixed income housing: to provide a system in which facilities which are not normally available to low income families can be provided for their use. There is no evidence that residents of different economic classes are treated differentially at WVA. The third difference between the two projects is a result of the first: residents at the Farm Project are labeled and identified with a particular economic group by the location of their apartment in the project. At WVA there is no formal distinction between units and no formal method for determining the economic status of a particular resident. There is a conscious effort on the part of management not to let differences between residents show.
Many of the advantages to be gained from mixed income housing that were found in the Farm Project exist in the Westminster Village project. A framework exists within which a family may move up the socio-economic scale without changing neighborhoods; economic self-betterment does not necessarily force a change in environment. Low income families have access to amenities they might not otherwise enjoy, such as air conditioning, dishwashers, garbage disposals, a swimming pool, etc. To an extent greater than in the Farm Project, opportunities exist to gain insight into the life styles of economic classes different from one's own. None of the mixed income advantages of the Farm Project have been lost in WVA, and many of the disadvantages have been reduced. The animosity, aggravated relations, and conflicts that exist between groups in the Farm Project do not seem to be apparent in Westminster Village. Segregation of economic classes in the Farm Project has produced three distinct groups with which residents identify themselves. When issues arise that involve conflicting interests between groups (such as the allocation of parking space to one group or another), the result is inter-group tension and conflict. At WVA, the combining of different kinds of residents together, sharing the same amenities, has reduced the tendency to identify with one economic group. Residents share all facilities equally, and thus a potential problem is eliminated. There are interpersonal conflicts at WVA, of course, but not the kind of distrust of one social group for another that is found at the Farm Project. Westminster Village is an advanced form of mixed income housing, and it should be
expected to be an improvement over a development like the Farm Project. WVA is economic integration by design, not by afterthought.

The studies regarding economically integrated housing that have been cited, however, suggest several disadvantages that may be inherent in a project that combines people of several economic classes. Some of the conclusions that have been reached are validated upon observation of life at Westminster Village Arms.

For example, one conclusion drawn from the literature is that socio-economic heterogeneity of residents in a neighborhood creates conditions unfavorable to social contact between residents of different social classes. Support for this conviction seems to be found at WVA. Little social interaction occurs. In several instances residents were acquainted with many of their neighbors, but intra-project relationships were infrequent. This condition may be a function of apartment living in general, merely showing itself in Westminster Village as it would in any other apartment complex; but it is present, in any case, and concurs with predictions that social interaction in a mixed income project will be minimal.

This is a significant finding. If it is true that in projects of this kind there will be little social interaction, then the goal of building developments that foster inter-group social contact will not be achieved in this manner. It may be that if the setting for economic integration is an apartment complex, then the positive effects anticipated, the "shedding of undesirable traits" by lower classes and the "acceptance of lower classes by higher classes," may not be brought about by increased geographic propinquity, as was hoped. Two forces seem to be at work in the project. First are the forces described by
contact theory. Festinger, Shachter, and Back, Collins and Deutsch, and others have shown that physical proximity tends to promote social contact, increased interactions, and reduction of conflict between groups. Superimposed on the contact theory model in a project such as Westminster Village are two components of a force which work in an opposite direction, limiting interaction: 1) conclusions by Gans and others that persons tend to seek out others of their own kind, excluding dissimilar others from their social spheres, and 2) tendencies toward reduced interaction in apartment living. Given these assumptions, then, observations at Westminster Village suggest that the latter force is stronger, resulting in little interaction between residents.

If the other conclusions about mixed housing that are reached in the literature are valid and applicable to WVA, we would expect to find several other negative effects of the project on its residents. On the basis of the literature, it can be predicted that:

1) Working class people will experience snobbishness.
2) Working class wives will have trouble mixing.
3) Social lines will be restricted.
4) People will feel their status threatened.

The project has not been in occupancy long enough to say anything definitive about whether or not these predictions will be substantiated, but there is basis for speculation. The fact that social interaction between residents has been so minimal up to this time indicates that the third prediction may be borne out. Residents tend to keep to them-
selves, social contact are limited, and social lives outside one's immediate family are somewhat restricted. This lack of interaction was evidenced throughout the project, across all classes. There is some evidence that suggests that the fourth prediction may be materializing in the Westminster Village Project. No respondents reported directly that they felt their status threatened, but uneasiness and anger were expressed by some of the upper income residents. One might argue that resentment toward lower income tenants and feelings of inequitable treatment due to rent subsidies may represent fears of possible status loss. This may not necessarily be true, but it does offer a possible explanation of why a middle class tenant might be distressed by the fact that his low income neighbor enjoys accommodations comparable to his own.

There was no visible evidence of the first and second predictions. However, if it is true that social interaction between residents in general will remain minimal, the second prediction will follow (everyone will have trouble mixing) and the first will become meaningless. It appears then, that socially, the project will prove to be unsuccessful. It seems unlikely that social interaction between economic groups will occur to any great extent, and likely that social relationships in general will be limited. It must be made clear, however, that there is a difference between lack of interaction among residents at Westminster Village, and conflict caused by separation of residents in the Farm Urban Renewal Project. The lack of interaction between
people in general at IVA does not seem to be class-oriented, with no formal barriers between economic groups. The lack of contact is very neutral, and does not involve any of the inter-group tensions that exist at the Farm Project.
CONCLUSION

In attempting to assess the value of mixed income theory as a viable alternative for residential developments, the advantages and disadvantages to the people involved must be weighed.

Low income people benefit the most from a project such as Westminster Village. This is very clear from an economic point of view. For example, tenants in the rent supplement program paid an average of 37% of their income for housing before moving to WVA. At WVA, they pay an average of 26% of their income for rent. Also responses in interviews indicated that the quality of the units at Westminster Village is higher than previous residences for all respondents but one. Low income residents are also better off socially in a mixed income project than in traditional low income housing. Some of the history of low income housing has been traced here, and one of the conclusions from these experiences is that the social problems associated with low income neighborhoods are not eliminated by concentrating low income families in adequate housing. Thus low income tenants are living in better housing than they had been before moving to the project, and paying less rent. These persons benefit from the absence of the problems that normally go along with low income housing. Moreover, low income tenants benefit from an amenity-filled development in a favorable geographic setting. These tenants are not isolated and concentrated in one place, as was the case in many previous low income developments.
The residents of Westminster Village who benefit least from the fact that the project is mixed income are the higher income tenants. Two out of three of these tenants who pay market level rents are paying more for rent now than they were at their previous residence (excluding those who did not pay rent before moving into WVA; young people, students, etc.) While nearly all interviewed tenants reported that Westminster Village is of higher quality than their last residence, it is not clear that this group is enjoying any special benefit; they are getting what they pay for. (A similar apartment complex a mile away from Westminster Village, with no subsidy programs, rents comparable units with the same amenities for $3 - $10 more per month than rents at WVA). It is unlikely that any advantage for these people will result from their living in the vicinity of low income people. Yet there has been no trouble in attracting market tenants to the complex. There are two reasons for this.

The first is that Westminster Village offers a comfortable, attractive place to live. The convenience, the luxury, and the beauty of the units were often cited by market residents as reasons for moving into the project. Apparently, the housing market in Lowell is such that luxury apartments of this kind are in demand, and it is an incidental fact that some of the people in the project are receiving government subsidies to help pay their rent.

The second reason has to do with the nature of middle class apartment dwellers. All but one of the market residents interviewed made reference to the fact that they did not intend to make Westminster
Village a permanent home. Although most were satisfied with the project, only one planned to stay indefinitely. Reasons given for the temporary nature of the tenancy were generally either desire to purchase a house or uncertainty as to plans for "settling down". The one respondent who planned to stay had just retired and moved out of a house.

The middle class residents do not seem to be necessarily hurt by the presence of lower class persons and families in the same project with them, although social interaction in the complex is limited, and some resentment of subsidized households was expressed; but neither do they benefit from the income mix. The project adequately serves them as a luxury apartment complex. Lower class families, however, realize many advantages as a result of living in a project like Westminster Village. While social interaction with higher income persons might be desirable, it is not a necessary element of the benefits described above. Just the presence of higher income residents mixed in with lower income households will serve many useful purposes. The issue of interaction may be much less important than just the ability of people of different income groups to live side by side without major conflicts.

Projects like Westminster Village, then, will serve a useful and unique purpose if they can attract middle class residents in large enough numbers to achieve a 50% middle class tenancy. This means that the locations of projects of this are an important issue. Local markets must be similar to the situation in Lowell, where there is a
demand for and absence of luxury apartment units. It appears, then, that a crucial issue is the availability of amenities and luxuries which will attract higher income people.

One must view this type of residential development through his own system of values and priorities. The greatest benefit from this form of housing clearly goes to the low income tenant. If the purpose for constructing developments of this kind is to provide housing opportunities for low income persons to achieve social objectives, mixed income housing could be a great success. Considering the needs of both lower and middle class persons, considering the fact that apartment complexes tend to be a somewhat temporary residence for middle class tenants, and considering the minimal detrimental effects of economic integration on middle class residents, I feel that placing the housing needs of low income people as the main priority of a financing agency such as the MHFA is fully justified.

The examination of Westminster Village indicates that several factors are of crucial importance in determining the chances of success for a mixed income housing project: A strong local market capable of supporting luxury apartments, a project physically attractive enough to draw middle class residents, and a management policy which strives to minimize the presence of visible, formal differences between residents of different economic groups.
INTERVIEWS WITH RESIDENTS

Fifteen residents of Westminster Village were interviewed, eight market rate tenants, three 236 tenants, two rent supplement tenants, and two leased housing tenants. Residents within each group were chosen without pattern by ringing doorbells until a contact was made. Once contact was made, the following statement was read:

Hi. My name is Roger Waldon, and I'm a student at M.I.T. I'm doing a study of rental housing in the Lowell area, and I'd like to ask you to spend about ten or fifteen minutes talking with me, if you would.

If questioned further about the purpose of the study, it was stated that the interviews were being conducted to try to determine why people have moved into the housing they presently occupy. Once in a resident's apartment the following questions were asked:

1) Why did you move to Westminster Village?
2) Do you like it?
3) What type of residence did you live in before Westminster Village?
4) What specifically do you like or dislike about Westminster Village?
5) How many members in your family?
6) How is Westminster Village for children?
7) I've heard that people pay different levels of rent at Westminster Village. Is that true? Is that an issue? (if further prompting is needed). Is that a problem? (if further prompting is needed).
8) How does Westminster Village compare to the last place you lived?
9) Do you plan to stay here for a long time?
10) Would you encourage friends of yours to live here?
A summary of the answers received appears below. In some instances a respondent made several answers to a single question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mkt.</th>
<th>236</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>LH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a) Convenience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Shortage of housing opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Physical units, buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Amenities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a) Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Yes, as an apartment, but dislike apartment living</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a) House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Apartment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a) Like layout</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Like units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Like freedom from maintenance responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Like present management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Like location</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Dislike location</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Not enough luxuries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Too many children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rents are too high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mkt.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a) Have children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) No children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. a) Good for children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Bad for children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Bad now, expect improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. a) Knows that some units are subsidized</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Accurately informed of programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Income mix a present problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Income mix a future problem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Resentment shown toward other economic groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. a) WVA better</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Last residence better</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. a) Plan to stay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. a) Would recommend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Would not recommend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Would recommend with qualifications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Rent Supplement</td>
<td>Leased Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Project</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>$ 5,000 - $16,000</td>
<td>$4,000 - $8,000</td>
<td>less than $4,000</td>
<td>less than $4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent paid by tenant for a 1 BR apt./month</td>
<td>$173</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>1/4 of income</td>
<td>1/4 of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Subsidy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>difference between tenant's share and 236 rent level</td>
<td>difference between tenant's share and market rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Subsidy</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>HUD to MHFA</td>
<td>HUD to Project Owner</td>
<td>HUD to LHA to Project Owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Statistics on Residents of Westminster Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>236</th>
<th>Rent Supplement</th>
<th>Leased Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age Of Head</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Children</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number in Household</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of Income for Housing</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No information available
Figure 1

Number of Households by Gross Income Level

- □ = Market
- □ = 236 subsidy
- □ = Rent Supplement
- □ = Leased Housing (LHA)

TOTAL GROSS INCOME ($)
FOOTNOTES

1. U.S. President's Committee on Urban Housing, A Decent Home, p. 40.


5. U.S. President's Committee on Urban Housing, p. 40.


7. Ibid., p. 114.

8. Ibid., p. 114.

9. Ibid., p. 115.

10. Ibid., p. 115.


14. Ibid., p. 32.

15. Ibid., p. 96.


17. Michelson, p. 117.


24. Michelson, p. 121.

25. Ibid., p. 121.


33. Ibid., p. 172.


35. Ibid., p. 123.

36. Michelson, p. 119.

37. Ibid., p. 119.


Catherine Wurster, "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing," in Urban Housing, p. 245.

Ibid., p. 245.


Ibid., p. 315.

Built under the federal government's 221(d)(3) program, accepting residents with incomes between $6,700 and $12,000.

Boeschenstein, p. 315.

Ibid., p. 315.

Ibid., p. 315.

Ibid., p. 315.

Ibid., p. 317.


Ibid., p. 2.

Market rents are comparable to rents of similar accommodations in the area.

Added as section 236 to the Housing Act in 1968.

Exception when 25% of a residents income exceeds the 25% rent level.
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