

Running Head: Pathways to Trust

**Pathways to Trust:
Bonding Social Capital Across Race in an Urban Neighborhood**

**Mark G. Chupp
Visiting Assistant Professor
Mandel Center for Nonprofit Organizations
Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences
Case Western Reserve University**

**Presented at the 37th Annual Conference of
The Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Associations**

Leading in Building Civil Society

Philadelphia, November 19-22, 2008

**Do not cite or circulate without written consent of the author.
To contact the author, email mark.chupp@case.edu**

Abstract

Increasingly, revitalization strategies focus on building community social capital that can be harnessed to address community needs and priorities and for neighborhood revitalization. Bonding social capital, or the internal networks in the neighborhood, is measured by social cohesion and trust and functions in low-income neighborhoods as social support, social location, and collective efficacy, while bridging social capital connects residents to external resources and networks. A qualitative study examined the ways in which social capital forms between African American and white residents in a historic Eastern European American neighborhood in Cleveland, Ohio, undergoing significant racial transition. The purpose of this study was to further explore how bonding social capital, specifically interpersonal trust, forms and functions across race within the same low-income neighborhood. Using the constant comparative method, the result was a grounded theory of interracial social capital formation. The field research paralleled an action research project using appreciative inquiry. The grounded theory includes seven pathways to trust, obstacles to building inter-ethnic trust, essential building blocks common to all trust-building paths in the neighborhood, and finally, a summary of what trust looks like. .

Despite increased mobility and globalization, neighborhoods continue to be vital to human organization and are the center of urban residents' lived experience (Smock, 2004). In low-income neighborhoods, residents face the double threat of a lack of economic resources within the household and a scarcity of resources within the neighborhood. In fact, numerous studies and comprehensive reviews of empirical research indicate that the issues facing children, youth and adults living in poverty are not just associated with individual characteristics but also with low socioeconomic neighborhoods (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, & Aber, 1997; Coulton & Pandey, 1992; Leventhal, 2000).

Neighborhood revitalization, therefore, requires a people-based strategy to improve the lives of residents and a place-based strategy to transform the negative affects of living in a poor neighborhood. Building community capacity embraces this dual focus. (Chaskin, Brown, Venkatesh, & Vidal, 2001) define community capacity as “the interaction of human capital, organizational resources, and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the well-being of that community” (p. 7). In general, social capital refers to “social networks, the reciprocities that arise from them, and the value of these for achieving mutual goals” (Schuller, Baron, & Field, 2000 p. 1). Community capacity functions among individuals, organizations, and social networks through informal processes and organized efforts in the community and with larger community systems (Chaskin, et al., 2001).

Given years of government disinvestment in central cities, investing in social capital can facilitate mobilizing residents of low-income neighborhoods to gain power and negotiate with those with the political control over development resources. (Lamore, Link, & Blackmond, 2006, p. 430) declare a “direct positive relationship with the creation of social capital, the redevelopment of the built environment utilizing sustainable development practices (approaches and methods), and community-based organizations in distressed neighborhoods.” Empirical evidence increasingly

points to the significance of social capital in the health of a neighborhood and its residents (Briggs, 1998; Forrest & Kearns, 2001; Miller, 1997).

Putnam (1993, 2000), who defines social capital as the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness, builds on the work of Coleman (1990) to argue that social capital improves the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated action. (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000) delineate four views of social capital, among which is a network view that is most relevant for low-income neighborhoods in that it compares intra-community and extra-community relationships. Bridging social capital refers to the extra-community networks while bonding social capital, the focus of this study, refers to the intra-community ties within the neighborhood. (Briggs, 1997; Gittel & Vidal, 1998) identify bonding capital that brings people who know each other closer together (dense ties), and bridging capital that brings together people who previously did not know each other (weak ties). Said another way, bonding capital is to “get by,” or cope with everyday life challenges while bridging capital is to “get ahead,” used for social leverage to improve one’s life circumstances (Briggs, 1997). Economic development, then occurs according to (Granovetter, 1995), through a mechanism that begins as individuals draw on the benefits of close community ties and then use and build upon them to acquire the skills (Granovetter, 1995) and resources to participate in networks beyond their community, thereby eventually joining the economic mainstream (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000).

In racially diverse neighborhoods, there is an additional challenge to building community capacity for revitalization as social interaction often takes place within a racial group at the exclusion of those from other races (Oliver & Wong, 2003; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). This can lead to separate and competing networks in which one group’s collective narrative about the culture and identity of the neighborhood comes in conflict with that of the other.

While building trust across ethnic or racial groups is difficult and can prevent neighborhood residents from uniting together for positive change, it is not an insurmountable challenge. Social

capital networks across race are crucial to healthy communities (Orr, 1999). Intergroup social capital itself can be a resource for negotiating conflicts that are rooted in divisions in race and class (Warren, 2001, Warren, Thompson & Saegart, 2001).

Recent findings from cross-sectional research in 10 cities participating in the Making Connections Initiative of the Annie E. Casey Foundation points to differences across race in how bonding social capital affects conditions in low-income neighborhoods (Brisson & Usher, 2005; Brisson & Usher, 2007). They tested five broadly used items of social cohesion and trust that were originally developed by the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). Specific to this study, the research found that neighborhood bonding social capital apart from neighborhood context is associated with homeownership and that, in comparison to blacks, being white is associated with a 200 percent increase in the odds of owning a home. Brisson and Usher (2007) confirm earlier research that trust among neighbors plays a significant role in low-income neighborhoods but they do not illuminate how trust functions across race in diverse neighborhoods nor how interracial trust forms.

The purpose of this study was to further explore how bonding social capital, specifically interpersonal trust, forms and functions across race within the same low-income neighborhood. This article reports on an action research effort, set in a central city distressed neighborhood undergoing racial transition, that focused on increasing trust across race within a low-income neighborhood. A parallel grounded theory study set out to discover, document, and analyze neighborhood stories to identify pathways for building interracial trust. Through observation, interviews, and focus groups, seven pathways emerged in which African American and white residents from the same disadvantaged neighborhood came together to form trusting relationships and cooperate for improvements in the lives of residents and the neighborhood.

The findings have implications for community development corporations and other neighborhood based nonprofit organizations that use community organizing and other methods to build community capacity in the form of resident involvement and social networks within a neighborhood.

Bonding Social Capital

Neighborhoods are consistently defined as a contiguous geographic space, but beyond physical dimensions, neighborhoods are defined as “a series of overlapping social networks” in the same spatial territory (Forrest and Kearns, 2001, p. 2130). Networks are often framed as social capital (Putnam, 1996, 2000).

Many studies point to a relationship between aspects of social capital and healthy communities, such as lower neighborhood crime (Bursik and Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls,., 1997) and social cohesion (Fukuyama, 1999; Guest & Wierzbicki, 1999; Forrest & Kearns, 2001). Sampson’s (1999) research on social capital as a mediating force for neighborhood violence found that social cohesion and trust led to increased informal social control. While Middleton, Murie and Groves (2005) compared adjacent neighborhoods with differing income levels and found no evidence that bonding and bridging capital was associated with higher economic status of low-income people, there was evidence that low-income residents lacked access to many voluntary associations, due to financial and time constraints.

Increasingly, revitalization strategies focus on building community social capital that can be harnessed to address community needs and priorities (Gitell & Vidal, 1998; Saegert, Warren & Thompson, 2001; Warren, 2001) and for neighborhood revitalization (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). The social capital of a household's community is as significant in shaping a household's income as many of the characteristics of the household (Narayan & Pritchett, 1999). Investing in social capital

incorporates a people through place strategy in contrast to investment in human capital that often facilitates exodus by those who gain education or skills (Chupp, 1999).

Bonding social capital, or the internal networks in the neighborhood, is measured by social cohesion and trust (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997) and functions in low-income neighborhoods as social support, social location, and collective efficacy. Together, these factors foster a greater sense of community, neighborhood identity, and the collective capacity to face adversity. Social support refers to the strong ties for getting by held between people connected to one another through family, common ethnicity, and the small circles they were born into (Gitell & Vidal, 1998; Stack, 1974). Social location combines the interaction that occurs at a neighborhood level and the sense of community that results, the degree to which people see the neighborhood as distinct, interact with one another, and use neighborhood facilities (Temkin and Rohe, 1998). Social location and local interaction are important, especially for the poor and elderly; neighbors and neighborhood organizations or institutions become important resources (Guest & Wierzbicki, 1999). Even for those whose primary close ties lie outside the neighborhood, informal social ties in the neighborhood increase a psychological sense of community and involvement in collective activities (Briggs and Mueller, 1997). This is similar to social integration that includes both the perceived availability of social organizations and activities in the neighborhood and the level of interaction with neighbors (Elliot, et. al., 1996).

Collective efficacy is the trust and cohesion among neighbors linked to a willingness to intervene for the common good. Collective efficacy refers to the level of trust, common values, and social cohesion that makes informal social control and problem solving possible (Sampson, et al., 1997). In essence, collective efficacy reflects the neighborhood residents' confidence in their own community problem-solving capacity. Moore (1996) describes this quality of community that functions amidst diversity: "when people who are interdependent struggle with the traditions that

bind them and the interests that separate them so that they can realize a future that is an improvement on the present” (p. 30).

Investing in the formation of bonding social capital for neighborhood revitalization is, therefore, a logical strategy but far more complicated in diverse neighborhoods where social capital, in the form of social networks, often functions along ethnic or racial lines. In an extensive qualitative study of an ethnically diverse urban neighborhood, Merry (1981) found some ethnic groups are encapsulated in their own networks at the exclusion of others. When this occurs, neighbors perceive the other encapsulated ethnic group as alien, unfamiliar, and unpredictable. Social networks are thus a source of power within an ethnic or racial population but one that can be detrimental to intergroup relations. Networks can create norms of exclusion and encourage intergroup conflict (Hardin, 1995). When different racial groups share the same neighborhood, intergroup differences impede developing a shared identity, common needs, and collective action for the neighborhood as a whole.

There remains, however, a void in the research: the existence and nature of trust and social cohesion across race and understanding the process in which this bonding social capital forms across race in diverse neighborhoods. This gap exists in spite of extensive research on race at a neighborhood level. Studies on racial segregation (Krysan, 2002; Borjas, 1998; Crowder, 2000) do not focus on the constructive process of building networks across ethnic lines. The studies that identify positive dynamics, such as stable integration (Ellen, 1997, 1998), resident participation (Brisson and Usher, 2005), and community capacity (Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999) also do not focus on social capital formation.

The process of social capital formation across ethnic lines is not understood in the neighborhood literature. Past research typically focused on measuring effects of social capital on one or more indicators—not how networks of trust and cooperation form. Bursik and Grasmick

(1993) identified a positive effect of primary and secondary relational networks on social control and crime in racial/ethnic heterogeneous neighborhoods. The existence of an effect does not, however, indicate the conditions and process by which those networks form and whether they occur along or across ethnic lines.

Sampson et al. (1997) found that collective efficacy had a moderating effect on neighborhood crime, but did not clarify whether mutual trust and willingness to act collectively crossed ethnic lines or existed within ethnic networks, possibly even in tension with one another. Other studies examined social capital in terms of the role of social cohesion at the neighborhood level (Forrest & Kearns, 2001; Fukuyama, 1999; Guest & Wierzbicki, 1999). These studies also did not address interracial or inter-ethnic social capital dynamics or only mentioned them tangentially.

Some neighborhood research focused specifically on race relations. Social contact studies (Ellen, 1998; Ellison & Powers, 1994; Ihlanfeldt & Scafidi, 2002) supported the theory that interracial neighborhood contact acts to break down prejudice. Significant quantitative studies with multi-city data sets, these studies identified an effect but did not offer an explanation of the process in which social contact effects prejudice. Studies on racial segregation and integration examined persistent segregation (Krysan, 2002), the choice to remain in an ethnically segregated neighborhood (Borjas, 1998), the nature of stable integration (Ellen, 1997), and the racial context of white mobility (Crowder, 2000). While significant, these studies also did not focus on the constructive process in which trust was built, cooperation fostered and community created across ethnic lines.

Although high levels of intra-group bonding social capital is generally considered positive, if combined with low intergroup (which Putnam refers to as bridging social capital) it will likely have adverse effects on equality, development and public support (Schiff, 1992; Putnam, 1996). Networks and narratives can compete and create conflict over neighborhood identity and use of resources. Conflicting networks are associated with lower levels of trust across races and that hinder collective

action for community improvement (Marschall & Stolle, 2004; Rothman, 1997). Some studies suggest that low-income, racially or ethnically heterogeneous communities with high mobility have less social cohesion, are less able to sustain social ties, and have lower levels of social control (Greenberg, Rohe, & Williams, 1985; Rose & Clear, 1998), and less neighborhood capacity to come together to solve problems held in common (Letki, 2008). Collier (1998) found that when social capital was high among existing residents it could result in exclusion of new entrants into the community. Analyzing social networks in both violent and peaceful towns in India, Varshney (2001) found that when inter-ethnic networks were stronger, conflict was more likely to be expressed peacefully. In communities where intra-ethnic networks were strong but inter-ethnic networks were weak, ethnic violence was more likely to occur.

Relevant to interracial networks and relationships, intergroup contact and intergroup threat studies have found somewhat contradictory results. The intergroup threat hypothesis purports that whites become more racially hostile as the proximate subordinate group increases (Oliver & Wong, 2003). In other words, white racial antagonism increases as black populations increase (Fossett & Kiecolt, 1989; Glaser, 1994; Quillian, 1996; Taylor, 1998). A common weakness of these studies is that they use large areas, such as metropolitan areas and counties, which do not ensure that the study actually includes direct intergroup contact (Oliver & Wong, 2003). In contrast, intergroup contact theory holds that increased interracial experience corrects negative stereotypes. According to Oliver and Wong (2003, p. 569), recent studies find strong correlations between direct racial contact and positive out-group sentiments (Ellison, 1994; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Sigelman & Welch, 1993; Stein, Post, & Rinden, 2000). Of particular relevance, (Welch, Sigelman, Bledsoe, & Combs, 2001) conducted a long-term study in Detroit and found that racial integration promotes interracial contact, lessens racial antagonism, and promotes interracial understanding.

A logical application of these recent studies might be to initiate strategies to promote racial integration. Deliberate racial integration, however, can be seen as efforts to destroy exclusive ties along ethnic lines (Putnam, 2000). Encapsulated ethnic groups often resist forming networks with other ethnic groups, dismissing the notion that their combined social capital would strengthen their capacity to promote economic development for the entire neighborhood (Merry, 1990). Integration or community building across racial or ethnic groups, even if successful, might also preclude working at the root causes of poverty and neighborhood disadvantage. It can be a tactic that uses neighborhood relations, self-help and community spirit as a panacea for social problems and “an attractive (and cheaper?) alternative for tackling social exclusion and regeneration” (Forrest and Kearns, 2001, p. 2139).

Nevertheless, racially diverse neighborhoods face internal obstacles to acquiring resources and the power for revitalization if networks and organizing occur within one race. Bonding and bridging social capital are both essential. Bonding social capital across race, the focus of this study, not only facilitates the expansion of social support within a setting of limited resources but also increases the collective efficacy so that together the neighborhood can more effectively use bridging social capital to attract outside resources and change policies. In this way, the entire neighborhood benefits from the distinct networks of each racial group as well as from their shared interracial network.

In the current study, I sought to understand the process in which a dimension of bonding social capital—trust—formed between African American and European American residents that honored each other’s cultural identity while working toward shared interests in the neighborhood. A guiding premise was that increasing bonding social capital across race promotes greater collective efficacy while decreasing the potential of competing networks. As a result, low-income residents are better positioned to confront systemic forces of discrimination and exploitation that contribute to

the disadvantaged status of the neighborhood and to secure external resources through bridging capital with outside institutions and funders (Kubisch et al., (2002).

Neighborhood Context

The study neighborhood of approximately 30,000 people, located on the southeast side of an urban northern city, was historically comprised of Polish, Slovenian, Bohemian and Czech populations, which blended together in the 1970s around a single Eastern European identity referred to as Slavic. Still home to numerous Polish restaurants, Catholic parishes, and ornate Slavic community centers, many social events still closely follow ethnic lines. The neighborhood is surrounded by African American neighborhoods on three sides and a nonresidential industrial area..

African Americans make up the other major ethnic group in the neighborhood, having moved into the study neighborhood over the past two decades. In 1990, whites made up 95 percent of the entire neighborhood. Through a dramatic shift, African Americans went from 3 percent in 1990 to 26 percent by 2000 (Center on Urban Poverty and Social Change, 1980, 1990, 2000). These demographic changes brought with them racial tensions.¹

Both groups share working class status as the last two decades witnessed economic decline, unrelated to the ethnic transition as historic manufacturing employment in nearby woolen and steel mills all but vanished. During this time, owner occupied housing rates declined moderately from 46 percent in 1980 to 38 percent in 2000. Contrary to the stereotypes, home ownership in majority black census tracts was 43 percent in 2000—above the neighborhood average.

While notable class differences along racial lines did not exist, many white residents perceived that African Americans introduced not only their own culture and identity but also declining norms to a stable ethnic neighborhood. Neighborhood narratives held by both African American and

¹ There is a small but growing number of Hispanic residents in some areas of the neighborhood. Since they represented less than 3 percent of all residents and were not yet a recognized ethnic identity in the neighborhood, they were not included in the study.

Eastern European Americans framed their relationship as one of racial tension or conflict. Neighborhood narrative (Small, 2002, 2004) is the framing process residents use to shape and filter perceptions of tangible and intangible neighborhood features, often consistent with cultural categories and a worldview. “Perceptions of neighborhoods are filtered through cultural categories that highlight some aspects of the neighborhood experience and ignore others. These selective perceptions then become part of a narrative about the neighborhood’s role and significance in residents’ lives” (Small, 2004, p. 70). These neighborhood narrative frames then affect how residents act in and toward the neighborhood (Small, 2002; Snow & Benford, 1992). Residents reflected competing narratives in describing current race relations and in referring to the future identity of the neighborhood.

This study paralleled a Valuing Diversity Project conducted by the community development corporation (CDC) in the study neighborhood, which sought to diversify local block clubs that often did not reflect the changing racial makeup of their streets.² Rather than focus on the presenting racial stereotypes and tensions, the project chose an approach known as Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider and Sirvastva, 1987). As an asset-based approach, the engagement and planning process sought to inquire into existing “comfortable diverse relationships” to develop guiding principles and an action plan. I served as a consultant in designing the Appreciative Inquiry process and training staff and resident leaders. Having a prior history in the neighborhood as a consultant and trainer provided familiarity and trust on which to build, an important factor in light of all-too-common troubled interaction between researchers and communities (Chaskin, et al., 2006).

Appreciative Inquiry assumes a social constructionist approach to change in which individuals and groups co-construct their perceived reality. Social constructionism holds that “reality” is a meaning making process that is dynamic and continuously negotiated (Berger &

² The Project was a funded initiative from the Association for the Study and Development of Community.

Luckmann, 1966; Gergen, 1999). Barrett and Cooperrider (1990) cite the work on social cognition and selective perception (Hill, Lewicki, Czyzewka, & Boss, 1989) to describe how the traditional ways for resolving conflict often actually heighten the very problems they attempt to solve. Once judgments about others have formed they tend to be preserved, even in the face of totally discrediting information (Anderson, Lepper, and Ross, 1980). Appreciative Inquiry begins by defining the topic of inquiry, framed as a desired end (e.g. comfortable diverse relations). The second phase engages stakeholders in an investigative process into existing and past positive experiences to construct a new narrative of the group. Breaking from typical interaction that reinforce differing or negative narratives, participants engage in dialogue to socially construct a new social theory of their community and relationships. As they identify the qualities and characteristics they value, they engage in the third phase to envision a new future not based on the old schemas of one another but on the new emerging narrative. The fourth phase involves designing structural changes and an action plan to realize the newly envisioned future. The fifth phase is one of innovating, working together to empower, learn, and adjust to deliver the new narrative and vision of their community so that it becomes a sustainable reality (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2001).

Research Methodology

The research for this study occurred simultaneously as the Appreciative Inquiry process and employed a grounded theory approach to develop an inductively derived theory about interracial trust formation (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). I did not begin with a predetermined bound sample but used purposeful or theoretical sampling, a type of nonrandomized sampling driven by purposefully selecting information-rich cases (Patton, 2002). I used the constant comparative method and the emerging theory to inform what new samples needed to be added to fill in any gaps (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Selection was driven by the need for representation and variation in concepts, not in people.

I began my fieldwork by conducting ten in-depth, open-ended audio-taped interviews. Data collection also included seven open-ended interviews with leaders in neighborhood-based organizations and block clubs conducted by participants in the diversity project. Based on preliminary data analysis of responses from these interviews with African Americans and white residents, I set up seven focus groups. I recruited focus-group participants through flyers, public announcements, door-to-door recruitment, and by direct appeal to members of specific targeted groups. Given residents' reluctance to talk about race relations in the neighborhood, all focus groups were held in closed meeting rooms at public locations, such as libraries, in the neighborhood.

There were four homogenous focus groups—two of these groups were all African American groups, facilitated by an African American doctoral student. Being Caucasian, I facilitated the two all white focus groups as well as three additional typical case, mixed-race focus groups. One mixed-race group included black and white residents of the same senior high rise apartment building; another group consisted of black and white members of a diverse church in the neighborhood. The final mixed-race focus group was with a diverse youth group that met regularly to organize social and improvement activities. A total of 43 residents participated in the focus groups, approximately one half white (the majority being of Eastern European ethnicity) and the other half African American residents.

I conducted eight additional audio-taped individual interviews following the focus groups. These included confirming and disconfirming cases, selected to build the necessary continua of categories. University students transcribed audiotapes of the interviews and focus groups, which I then reviewed. I also transcribed several tapes. I listened to all tapes at least once and usually several times—once to follow the transcript line by line, a second time to listen for overall themes and meaning, and a third time to review specific data-rich sections.³

³ Two participants requested not to be audio-taped. Interview notes served as the data.

I incorporated data from multiple written sources to increase the trustworthiness of the data—historical, news, administrative, and the neighborhood weekly newspaper. I also visited the neighborhood on average one to three times per week during the 15 month study period. Another source of data came from the Appreciative Inquiry process that included monthly meetings where participants engaged in one-on-one guided interviews about comfortable diverse relationships. Fifty participant summaries of these interviews served as data for my research. As part of the Appreciative Inquiry, the steering committee analyzed these interviews to develop a series of provocative propositions or promising themes, which I used as data. The Appreciative Inquiry extended as steering committee members went to block clubs and convened encounters between two dissimilar homogenous groups.

Data analysis occurred throughout the study period. I analyzed transcripts, steering committee interview notes, and field observation notes for open coding, the “process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 61). I then used my initial categories, properties and dimensions to move to axial coding, where I explored relationships between categories. Finally, I moved to integration of categories, concepts and relationships at a more abstract level in selective coding to develop several emerging propositions that became the basis of a more complete grounded theory on how networks of trust and cooperation form between Eastern European Americans and African Americans in the neighborhood.

In order to arrive at the grounded theory, I constructed a paradigm, where each category’s conditions, context, strategies, and consequences were connected together and to the core category. Two main paradigms emerged: a typology of views of neighborhood perceptions of race relations, and a set of pathways to interracial trust. I tested these with all data sources to modify and confirm the findings and to fill in any gaps in the theory. All categories were confirmed by several cases.

Findings: Pathways to Trust, a Grounded Theory

Both black and white residents considered the neighborhood to be an ethnic white neighborhood, often using the term “ethnic” or simply using Slavic or Polish to describe the dominant ethnic identity of the area, which actually includes three other major groups—Slovenians, Slovaks, and Bohemian/Czechs. Black and white residents expressed many differing views of the neighborhood, ranging from extremely negative to positive. The first phase of analysis, therefore, included classifying all residents into four general views of the neighborhood. Since there was not one dominant narrative on race relations in the neighborhood, I then developed a continuum of six distinct African American perspectives on race relations and a parallel continuum of six European American perspectives on race relations in the neighborhood. All residents in the study fit on one or the other continuum, each of which ranged from no trust to high trust perspectives on race relations. Due to space limitations, these findings (see Chupp, 2003) are not reported in detail here but summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Seven primary trust-building pathways emerged from the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The pathways fall into two categories—four pathways at the group level and three paths at the individual level, which are summarized in Table 2. All but one of these trust-building paths are primarily informal and voluntary; all but two are initiated by residents and not by professionals or neighborhood organizations. The residents that initiated trust forming action all fell within the middle to high levels of trust in terms of perspectives on race relations. Each pathway is defined below, using language of residents, followed by an analytic description and due to space limitations one example to ground the pathway. See Table 2 for a summary.

1. A crisis moves us from strangers to friends—coming together around a perceived crisis creates the space for building personal relationships that transform the neighborhood.

The crises in this path ranged from confronting crime to the closing of the only hospital in the neighborhood. One example illustrates how a crisis led to ongoing relationships within smaller areas of the neighborhood. Residents from the several adjoining streets came together to confront increased drug dealing. An African American resident providing daycare out of her home became angry and decided to take a leadership role, and subsequently learned that she was already acquainted with many residents. With the support of a community organizer, they forced the drug dealers out and built stronger relationships through a new block club. The resident who initiated the process said:

They trust me, they do. It surprises me sometimes. I guess when I had the meeting I was angry...I think at that point the older people wanted to do something about it—they just didn't know what to do. I am going to be very frank about it; it is a lot of black boys selling the drugs. Most of the people who live on my street are white, and you think twice before you do anything. I didn't think twice I just knew I didn't like it. If you understand what I'm saying, I had to do something. I don't know if the situation had been changed I would have thought twice, but...I kept thinking about [how] I pay taxes. Once I started it, they then know we were all in the same boat.

It became known as one of the most diverse and successful block clubs in the neighborhood. The trusting relationships formed through a crisis took a generally welcoming atmosphere to become an area with frequent cooperative interaction.

2. The only way to get a change is to make a change—one individual serves as a proactive catalyst to break stereotypes and move diverse residents beyond cordial greeting to sharing experiences in community.

Cases in this pathway point toward trusting relationships forming through one person by initiating positive engagement that broke stereotypes held about them. The initiators in this path were residents who took proactive steps to build community.

One story involved a white Polish woman who moved into an area next to a small corner park and simply started watching kids from her front porch. Soon children were asking to use her bathroom, drinking her Kool-Aid, and sitting to talk about their problems. She got to know the parents as well. Beyond hanging out, Big Momma, as she is called, set norms for the street and park, resolved conflicts, and helped kids get off drugs. She offered the kids incentives to clean up the park. Her efforts were contagious, evident when the kids worked together to raise enough money to buy a wheelchair so a neighbor boy could sit outside in the summer. Big Mama's husband organized football games in the street. Children and adults around the park reported a sense of belonging. Big Momma also served as the hub of a number of activities among the women on the street—sharing food and taking each other to the doctor. Ethnic white residents, African Americans and a Korean family regularly interacted together, often combining their cooking efforts to share a Sunday meal together. The result of this trust building process was a connectedness and sense of belonging. Big Momma described the neighborhood as family, adding, "I think we love each other and that's what we really do right here."

Insert Table 2 about here

3. Convened groups force us to really get to know people different from us. When diverse neighbors come together repeatedly—breaking bread, learning from one another, and walking in someone else’s shoes—stereotypes are broken and relationships are built.

This pathway begins with the initiative of an organization. More than just convening a meeting, they created gatherings characterized by a safe and comfortable space that usually included a meal together. Participants stressed the importance of someone making them get to know someone different from them, often through guided exercises or one-on-one conversations. In the process, participants learned personal things about each other and realized they had more in common than they previously thought. They then set goals and worked together on their shared interests in neighborhood improvement. Participants also noted that the process often involved more than a one time event as trust grew through multiple experiences with the same group.

A training program for active residents illustrates this path. The CDC convened 15 to 25 residents in Neighborhood Leadership Training, an annual program held over 13 weeks. One cohort described the convened group trust-building path in their last session. They identified nine factors that made it possible for them to come together as a diverse group: having a set time and place to engage, repeating encounters with one another to become more comfortable, talking one-on-one, taking a risk or initiative followed by small action steps, helping each other to get personal needs met, sharing experiences together, uniting around a common goal to improve the neighborhood, getting beyond race to know people as human beings, and getting beyond stereotypes and preconceptions through personal connection. As evidence of how walls came down in this convened space, one black resident recognized in front of the whole group how his view of a middle class white couple in the class had changed:

I was a bigot when it came to Mill Creek [a new middle class housing development in the neighborhood where the white couple lived], but having them reach out to the

neighborhood has made a difference. I realize they don't want to be a city on a hill, a gated community.

4. The natural path—children and youth get it, naturally embracing the beauty of each culture and modeling how to live together in a multicultural world.

Many residents spoke of uninhibited black and white children who played together throughout the neighborhood, not needing a leader or someone to structure their time together. They were spontaneous and free, playing regardless of what was going on around them. Especially younger children were seen as oblivious to differences; if they recognized them it seemed unimportant, not something to separate one from another. Residents commented that when disagreements naturally occurred, the children moved beyond any conflicts in a short order. Adults commented throughout the study that the children “get it” and everyone could learn from them.

One poignant example of this path came from a report on a block club party. In an area that had experienced tensions around race, leaders were able to successfully bring together a diverse group of residents for a summer party. One of them commented that while the parents were nervously trying to figure out how to relate to one another, their children were off playing with one another with what seemed to be the greatest of ease.

The remaining three paths are at the individual level, where one person acts, creating an opportunity for a new trusting relationship to form.

5. Helping another leads to friendship. People helping people build strong personal relationships.

An elderly Polish woman who had lived many years in the neighborhood recounted the impact help from her neighbor had on her. The neighbor, a young African American man, initially made her anxious. However, when her lawn grew long after her mower broke, this neighbor simply began mowing her lawn. He never asked to do it, never expected any payment—not even a thank

you. She was pleased and grateful. When weather turned cold he began to shovel the snow on her sidewalk and driveway. She politely thanked him for his generous help and gradually, they struck up conversation from time to time. The neighbor learned that she liked jazz music and one day he showed up at her door with several jazz CDs he had burned for her. In reporting the story, she acknowledged that not only had she gained a friend, she had a new view of the neighborhood. She said, "It's just like the neighborhood used to be, only multicolored." Helping a neighbor facilitated the development of new friendships. Similar stories surfaced repeatedly about neighbors helping neighbors through which strangers became friends.

6. The teacher never gives up—consistently being there leads to learning and a new friend.

While many older white residents felt they wanted to "teach young black youth a thing or two," the attempts often failed and led to alienation. One example demonstrates how trust building came about as someone persistently made himself available and consistently tried to be himself in front of the youth. Over many months, this long-term resident was able to teach many skills and impart knowledge in areas that a particular young black youth needed. Through informal interaction, he reported that he saw the best in the young man who in turn, responded with respect and friendship. Ironically, this young African American youth always feared this man who was the director of a neighborhood recreation center. He and other children had been intimidated by the man, largely due to the position he held, the stereotypes they had of his Polish ethnicity, and the significant difference in age.

We always thought he was the meanest old man. We were scared to death of him. When we was younger we would just go peak around the corner to make sure the scary monster was still there and then run away.

The director, who grew up in the neighborhood, stated his motivation and philosophy.

What keeps me going is the positive things I can give to kids—that’s the biggest reward.

When you have that care it works off on everyone in the neighborhood...It’s about accepting things, accepting goes both ways. The biggest thing I’ve learned is to give the person a chance, to sit down and at least listen.

The boy continued to go to the recreation center and eventually the director’s philosophy broke through. Neighborhood youth wanted to play in the game room and knew the director was the master at some of the games. The boy began to accept the director’s invitation to play and even teach him how to play. It was not a dramatic moment but the 15 year old recognized that it was a process over time that led to a new connectedness with the director, “Now I think he is the greatest guy. He taught me that I can impact other kids and he always checks up on me to see how I am doing.” The director likewise acknowledged the connectedness.

He knows what I know—even though we’re 40 years apart in age, we’ve been in the same ocean—just at different times.

7. Sharing your pain leads to empathy and support from the most unexpected people, forming a bond that keeps on giving.

People often seek emotional support from trusted friends or family, but this pathway illustrates that such support can come from the least expected place, even when two people have little in common. In one case, a 15 year old white girl participated in the diversity project meetings and came to a meeting once during a particularly difficult struggle at home. Approached by a long-term resident, a retired steel worker from Appalachian background, she reluctantly began to talk. Through his encouragement, she became more vulnerable, eventually admitting that her conflict was with her father. She was dating an African American boy and upon finding out, her father refused to celebrate her upcoming sixteenth birthday. She was heartbroken but refused to give up her boyfriend just because her father did not like it that he was black.

Ironically, this retired white man was more like her father than she cared to imagine. While listening and not putting her down, he admitted to her that he was similar to her father's age and could understand his point of view. In recounting the story, the older man admitted telling her, "Mixed races—I don't care what they want to say, you can do it but your children are going to pay the price for it. Your children are going to be mixed and it's not really very nice of you to put this on your children." At the same time, he empathized with her and offered her support, especially moved by her having to be alone on her sixteenth birthday. During an interview he discussed what moved him:

I can see both sides. Her daddy says if you want to do that get out of the house or I don't want you in the house, I don't want him in the house—I can live with that. This is the way I was brought up, you don't mix but I could see where she is and why she wants to run off because it is like her 16th birthday. She's got enough problems with her weight and everything else that if she gets a boyfriend. I've went through this—I've been heavy all my life. You're always on the edges, looking into the center at the other people, the young people... Now if she's got somebody who is interested in her even though he's black. He might be a nice kid—he might be an asshole—but her daddy evidently didn't even want to consider him. To me, even though I wouldn't want to hear it from a child of mine, I would maybe listen or look, observe and see how she acted or he treated her.

Her story had clearly moved him, and although he agreed in principle with her father, he saw himself in her. He identified with being overweight and on the side line, something he did not want her to go through, especially on an important birthday. Out of compassion he arranged to have the diversity group celebrate her birthday. He even knew what kind of music she liked. At the next month's meeting, he presented her with a birthday cake and made a speech. As someone who hated to speak in front of a group, he moved out of his comfort zone to reach out to her. As she came up

in front of the group of 25 diverse residents he was moved to tears and gave her a hug. He had become vulnerable, forming a bond with her that continued for months after that. He reflected, “When you get touched, you want to touch back.”

In sharing her pain she touched a chord in someone who had to wrestle with his own acceptance issues and perspectives on race. By listening and staying engaged in dialogue, she gained recognition and support from an unexpected source. What began as an individual path led to a group process where the entire steering committee felt a connection to the individuals involved.

These seven trust-building paths emerged from qualitative grounded theory research in one neighborhood and are therefore not generalizable to other communities. They do, however, provide insights into the trust-building process that can inform and help focus future research and community development practice. While the trust formation process across race was the primary focus of this research, the study also revealed a set of obstacles that kept people from increasing their trust in and cooperation with residents of another race. Six obstacles emerged that pertained to history, cultural narratives, barriers to communication and the role of high profile crime (Chupp, 2003). As grounded theory, these obstacles reflect the language of residents and are summarized as follows:

1. *You don't talk openly about race in this neighborhood.* (This prevents honest dialogue and leads to suspicion and greater social distance.)
2. *It takes time, especially given everyone's busy schedule and the way people were raised* (with stereotypes and social distance from each other).
3. *Black youth on the street and high profile racial incidents or crimes* (reinforce fear and stereotypes).
4. *The approach to issue organizing in the neighborhood focuses too little on community building* (and sometimes creates or reinforces differences across race.)

5. *Other barriers, in particular, age and (perceived) class differences get in the way of forming trust with someone of a different race.*
6. *Polish culture might create a barrier.* (Polish American residents reported that aspects of their own culture, such as a more reserved communication style and tendency to not express emotions, might inhibit interaction with African Americans who have a more expressive culture. They also wondered whether they carried a sense of resignation as a result of a history of victimization in Poland.)

In contrast to barriers, five essential building blocks emerged from the research that facilitated interracial trust formation across all pathways to trust. While at a higher level of abstraction than generally articulated by the residents, each building block can be found in the stories and reflections by residents, from which each path was derived.

1. Create a safe and comfortable space
2. Be positive and work toward a common goal or cause
3. Talking creates relationships and meaning
4. The inner shift created through relationships
5. Leaders invite people onto the trust-building path

All paths described in this grounded theory led to a shift in interracial trust in a group or among individuals. Residents sometimes referred to this as an increase in trust; most often they chose to use other terms to describe a positive shift within themselves and the relationship. Most of the shift occurred among residents in the mid-range of trust. Naturally, those who were no trusters did not choose to participate in these voluntary and diverse activities or groups. Using the constant comparative method the following continuum of outcomes (from moderate to high interracial trust) emerged from the data and field work (Chupp, 2003).

1. We committed to work together

2. We connected and realized we are the same or want the same thing
3. We became comfortable and relaxed with one another
4. We gained a new sense of belonging
5. We watch out for one another
6. We became friends

These outcomes ranged from increased levels of cooperation to increased vulnerability and intimacy and apply equally to the group and individual paths. They reflect the interplay between individual and group relationships and the impact they have on residents' views of the neighborhood. Indeed, residents reported that the shift in one's view of the group often occurred as a result of shift that had taken place in a relationship with an individual group member. This occurred repeatedly in the appreciative inquiry process as individuals paired up with someone for an interview and in that encounter gained a new respect for the other ethnic group. Sometimes the shift occurred among members of the same ethnic group, between people who considered themselves different from each other in some other aspect, such as age, education, or personality.

Discussion

The research focused on understanding the process in which bonding social capital, specifically trust, forms across race in a transitioning neighborhood. The grounded theory that emerged from the study delineated clear group and individual trust-building pathways. In comparing the results of the research to the conceptual frameworks in the literature, there is evidence of trusting interracial relationships that represent all three aspects of bonding capital found in the literature—increases in social support, social location and collective efficacy.

Social support (Gitell & Vidal, 1998; Stack, 1974) across ethnic lines included giving a ride to someone, taking care of someone's children, cooking and eating together, loaning money and

helping out with home repairs, or calling someone when upset. Residents referred to these relationships as friendships or even in some cases, being family to one another.

Social location combines the interaction that occurs and the sense of community that results (Temkin & Rohe, 1998; Guest & Wierzbicki, 1999; Briggs & Mueller, 1997) and occurred on those streets where social support was high among neighbors. Residents spoke with a special pride and identified with their part of the neighborhood, referring to it as the best neighborhood or as a community that had everything you needed.

Collective efficacy refers to the ability of citizens of a neighborhood to join together to face and resolve common problems or challenges that arise (Sampson et al., 1997). For those who responded to a crisis, the joint problem solving process led to increased trust and an increased capacity that could then be applied to other problems. For those who participated in other trust-building paths, the capacity for problem solving was an outgrowth of forming trusting relationships. They joined together to work on abandoned properties, street clean-ups and getting a new public circulator bus for the neighborhood.

There are clear limitations to this study. As a grounded theory of one neighborhood, the pathways to trust cannot be generalized to other communities. This study focused on the nature of trust formation between African Americans and eastern European American residents in a traditionally white ethnic neighborhood. The dynamics between other ethnic groups or in neighborhoods with different demographic transitions would likely be different. Nor did the study measure neighborhood narratives within racial groups or prejudice levels held by residents and whether they had changed as trust increased. A major limitation to the Appreciative Inquiry process was that the participants did not represent a large enough portion of the neighborhood to shift the collective narratives of the entire area. There were elements where the process began to get to scale through newspaper articles and a large mural on the main street in the neighborhood. The most

significant shift in the overall dialogue was that it became commonplace to have open discussions about race in mixed groups—a subject that previously would end conversation.

Future research could use these findings to conduct quantitative studies to further discover the interplay of dynamics such as neighborhood narratives, prejudice levels and accrued histories of intergroup interactions. In the future, researchers could also examine the factors that enable ethnic and racial groups to maintain their cultural identity while embracing a broader more inclusive neighborhood narrative.

One of the challenges, then, is for racial and ethnic groups to maintain their cultural and ethnic identity while embracing a larger heterogeneous narrative and identity. Ethnicity, according to Horowitz (1985), meets the needs for family-like ties, emotional support and reciprocal help, and for mediation and dispute resolution, previously met by kinship—much like bonding social capital. Culture can be revived to preserve ethnic mutual support and group boundaries, but the risk is that it will be at the exclusion of other affiliations and will create divisions. Paradoxically, what is needed to transform ethnic or race relations is to simultaneously work at amalgamation and division—two processes Horowitz (1985) declares to be in opposition to one another. Lederach (1995) suggests from a conflict transformation perspective that the energy of ideas is enhanced if disparate views are held together. This involves discovering the energy that arises from empowering each group while simultaneously nurturing mutuality and community across the groups. This process has not been studied in ethnically diverse neighborhoods.

Among prejudiced white residents internal bonding capital was high but these individuals and families were the least likely to participate in public meetings, voluntary associations, or informal interaction in the neighborhood, whether in an all white or mixed group. Nor did the process explicitly confront white privilege and racism but rather sought to build connections through which empathy and awareness would transform attitudes.

Trust is a significant aspect of social capital and citizen participation. By investing in the development of interethnic trusting relationships, residents will be able to move forward with a common identity, shared values, and a sense of collective efficacy. These become the building blocks for leveraging outside resources (bridging capital), as well as affecting political change and creating public-private synergy. Letki (2008, p. 122) states, “inequality and deprivation individually offers an important explanation as to why poverty destroys social cohesion and solidarity, but in real life they tend to coexist and their effects accumulate. At the same time, each of them can be alleviated, but that requires government intervention and cannot be achieved solely by reverting to ‘community relations’.”

An increase in bonding social capital within the neighborhood can facilitate an increase in bridging social capital to access resources outside the neighborhood. Organizations facilitate and support the development of interethnic social capital through trust-building activities. In this study, the community development corporation was instrumental in the development of diverse block clubs and in training resident leaders. The CDC also increased its role in facilitating bridging capital with outside resources as staff linked residents and voluntary associations with extra-local institutions, such as city departments, foundations, and other resource-rich organizations.

Political power of a neighborhood aids community and economic development, often via its neighborhood organizations, to negotiate, set the terms of that negotiation, define what the neighborhood will look like, and control resources that affect the ability to become a productive economic and social location. .

Social capital becomes meaningful when it leads to positive community and economic change. Interracial bonding social capital facilitates speaking with one collective voice and uniting for action This study suggests that local interethnic bonding and bridging social capital leads to action and improved quality of life. Residents in both the group and individual pathways used new

trusting relationships to cope with everyday struggles, confront serious problems on the street, and develop new efforts to strengthen the physical and economic infrastructure of the neighborhood. (Krumholz, et al., 2006) analyzed the long-term impact of the CDC's impact on the neighborhood and found that the CDC facilitated processes through which residents spoke and acted with one voice, which positively affected the narrative and identity of the neighborhood. While there is no direct correlation, there was significant investment of public and private economic capital in the physical revitalization of the neighborhood at a time when the racial transition might have included a disinvestment of capital.

Neighborhood revitalization, in the context of overall government disinvestment, can be advanced through social capital investment process in which one or more organizations serve as a catalyst to invest in inter-ethnic community building that would recognize and appreciate residents' diverse cultures. If successful, the increased bonding social capital could serve as the foundation for developing leaders, leveraging outside resources (bridging social capital), negotiating political support and creating new public-private partnerships for the neighborhood. Voluntary associations, organizations and institutions can facilitate the relationship building process to build power, connect residents to resource-rich networks, and mobilize, advocate for and legitimize the needs of the diverse neighborhood.

Table 1: Typology of Neighborhood Views and Trust Levels

Interpersonal Trust Level	Overall Trust	Communication	Emotional State	Spectrum of Black Perspectives Case Examples	Spectrum of White Perspectives Case Examples
No Trusters	Low	Minimal Guarded Unclear	Angry Afraid	Separate, reactive and confrontational	Threatening, fighters, and blaming
Marginal Trusters			Threatened Suspicious	Inconsistent, involved and withdrawn	Pretenders, against blacks in private, but confrontational on occasion
Low Trusters			Frustrated Anxious Perplexed	Don't get involved—withdrawn and avoid	Careful, keep to themselves, talk about class not race
Mid-Level Trusters			Cautious Reserved Curious	Stay to yourself, keep the peace but distant, lend a hand if necessary	I'm not prejudiced, but..., paternalistic
Moderate Trusters			Hopeful Giving Excited	Be a good neighbor, do the right thing and it will come back to you	"Colorblind" and engaged, overlook problems to get along
High Trusters	High	Open Clear Regular	Relaxed Proud Loved/ Loving	Accept others, don't try to change them but disagree as friends	Learn and grow by reaching out and stretching yourself

Table 2: Group and Individual Pathways to Interracial Trust

Group Level of Involvement					
Path	Agents	Agent's Perspective	Prior Relationship	Key Elements of Path	Reported Outcomes
Crisis	Residents with organizers	Variety	Some known, some unknown	Neighborhood-wide gatherings, committee emerged to develop strategy, daily marches, many public strategy sessions, attend court, celebrate victory	Care for one another Watch out for each other
	Black female resident	Treat people nice	Knows neighbors somewhat	Get angry, call neighbors together, form block club, work with authorities, celebrate victory, continue to meet	We know each other Committed to work together
	Black female resident	Stay to yourself	Does not know neighbors	Identify common goal, come together, form block club, develop strategy, work/talk together, celebrate victory, take advantage of informal opportunities	Vulnerability New view of neighborhood Sense of community
Proactive Catalyst	Black female resident	Treat people nice	New to neighborhood	Reach out before patterns set in, look for good in other, provide services to others, receive help, organize block club, have fun	Communicate regularly
	White female resident	Treat people nice	Knows neighbors well	Hanging out, offers kids help, engages parents, set norms, kids help each other, father and others reach out, act like family to each other	Trust each other Accept each other
Convened Group	Organizers with residents	Variety of high trust perspectives	Working relationships, some unknown	Bring diverse group together, share meal together, invite people to share one-on-one, find common ground, work on common goal, repeat experience	Friendship Sense of belonging
Natural	Children and youth	Not defined	Known and unknown	Uninhibited children play together, oblivious to differences, spontaneous and free, conflicts quickly forgotten	Connectedness
Individual Level of Involvement					
Path	Agent and Receiver	Agent's Perspective	Prior Relationship	Key Elements of Path	Reported Outcomes
Helping/Receiving	Young black male resident/senior Polish woman	Treat people nice/Be careful	Unknown next door neighbors	Be neighborly, offer unsolicited help, small talk, repeat doing favors, discover other's interests, give meaningful gifts	Friendship Mutuality
Teaching/Learning	Polish center director/black male teen	Colorblind/Stay to yourself	Known but distant	Persistently make yourself available, be consistent with who you are, offer skill/knowledge the other needs/wants, interact informally, see the best in learner	We care for each other New relationship
Share Pain/Support	White female teen/Appalachian retired white male	Colorblind/I'm not prejudiced	Acquaintances	Talk, become vulnerable, share painful situation, dialogue about both sides of situation, accept support and empathy, receive recognition	Connectedness Accept each other

References

- Anderson, C. A., Lepper, M., & Ross, L. (1980). Perseverance of social theories: The role of explanation in persistence of discredited information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 1037-1049.
- Barrett, F. J., & Cooperrider, D. L. (1990). Generative metaphor intervention: A new approach for working with systems divided by conflict and caught in defensive perception. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 26(2), 219-239.
- Berger, P. & Luckman, T. (1966) *The social construction of knowledge*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Borjas, G. J. (1998). To ghetto or not to ghetto: Ethnicity and residential segregation. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 44, 228-254.
- Briggs, X. de S. (1997). Social capital and the cities: Advice to change agents. *National Civic Review*, 86(2), 111-118.
- Briggs, X. de S. (1998). Brown kids in white suburbs: Housing mobility and the many faces of social capital. *Housing Policy Debate*, 9, 1, pp. 177-221.
- Briggs, X. de S. & Mueller, E. R. (1997). *From neighborhood to community: Evidence on the social effects of community development*. New York: Community Development Research Center, New School for Social Research.
- Brisson, D. & Usher, C. L. (2005). Bonding social capital in low-income neighborhoods. *Family Relations*, 54(5), 644.
- Brisson, D. & Usher, C. L. (2007). Conceptualizing and measuring bonding social capital in low-income neighborhoods. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 34(1), 1.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., & Aber, J. L. (Eds.). (1997). *Neighborhood poverty, context and consequences for children. volume I*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

- Bursik, R. J., Jr., and Grasmick, H. G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime: The dimensions of effective community control*. New York: Lexington.
- Center on Urban Poverty and Social Change (1980, 1990, 2000). Northeast Ohio Community and Neighborhood Data for Organizing [Poverty, income, and race data for Cleveland neighborhoods]. Available from Case Western Reserve University Web site: <http://neocando.case.edu>; (From U.S. Census Bureau; Census of Population and Housing).
- Chaskin, R. J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S., & Vidal, A. (2001). *Building community capacity*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Chaskin, R. J., Goerge, R. M., Skyles, A. & Gultinan, S. (2006). Measuring social capital: An exploration in community–research partnership. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34/4, 489–514.
- Chupp, M.G. (1999). Investing in people through place: The role of social capital in transforming neighborhoods. Unpublished manuscript prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
- Chupp, M. G. (2003). *Pathways to trust: Interethnic social capital formation in a disadvantaged neighborhood*. Cleveland: Doctoral Dissertation, Case Western Reserve University.
- Collier, P. (1998). *Social capital and poverty*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Cooperrider, D. L. & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1, 129-169.
- Coulton, C. J., & Pandey, S. (1992). Geographic concentration of poverty and risk to children in urban neighborhoods. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 35(3), 238-257.
- Crowder, K. (2000). The racial context of white mobility: An individual-level assessment of the white flight hypothesis. *Social Science Research*, 29, 223-257.
- Ellen, I. G. (1997). Welcome neighbors? *The Brookings Review*, Winter, 18-21.

- Ellen, I. G. (1998). Stable racial integration in the contemporary United States: An empirical overview. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 20, 27-42
- Elliott, D. S., Wilson, W. J., Huizinga, D., Sampson, R. J., Elliott, A.M. & Rankin, B. (1996). The effects of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent development. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 33: 389-426.
- Ellison, C. G. Powers, D. A. (1994). The contact hypothesis and racial attitudes among black Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 75(2), 385-400.
- Forrest, R & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighborhood. *Urban Studies*, 83, 2125-2143.
- Fossett, M. A., & Kiecolt, K. J. (1989). The relative size of minority populations and white racial attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly (University of Texas Press)*, 70(4), 820-835.
- Fukuyama, F. (1999). *The great disruption: Human nature and the reconstitution of social order*. New York: Free Press.
- Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gittell, R., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glaser, J. M. (1994). Back to the black belt: Racial environment and white racial attitudes in the south. *The Journal of Politics*, 56(1), 21-41.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Granovetter, M. (1995). The economic sociology of firms and entrepreneurs. In A. Portes (Ed.), *The economic sociology of immigration: Essays on networks, ethnicity, and entrepreneurship* (pp. 128-165). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

- Greenberg, S. W., Rohe, W. M., & Williams, J. R. (1985). *Informal citizen action and crime prevention at the neighborhood level: Synthesis and assessment of the research*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Guest, A. & Wierzbicki, S. (1999). Social ties at the neighborhood level: Two decades of GSS evidence. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35, 92-111.
- Hardin, R. (1995). *One for all: The logic of intergroup conflict*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Hill, T., Lewicki, P., Czyzewka, M., & Boss, A. (1989). Self-perpetuating development of encoding biases in person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 373-387.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Ihlanfeldt, K. R. & Scafidi, B. P. (2002). The neighbourhood contact hypothesis: Evidence from the multicity study of urban inequality. *Urban Studies*, 39, 619-641.
- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University.
- Krumholz, N., Keating, D. Star, P.D., & Chupp, M. G. (2006). The long-term impact of CDCs on urban neighborhoods: Case studies of Cleveland's Broadway-Slavic village and Tremont neighborhoods. *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 37(4), 33-52.
- Krysan, M. (2002) The residential preferences of blacks: Do they explain persistent segregation. *Social Forces*, 80, 937-980.
- Kubisch, A. C., Auspos, P., Brown, P., Chaskin, R., Fulbright-Anderson, K., & Hamilton, R. (2002). *Voices from the field II: Reflections on comprehensive community change*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Lamore, R. L., Link, T., & Blackmond, T. (2006). Renewing people and places: Institutional investment policies that enhance social capital and improve the built environment of distressed communities. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(5), 429-442.

- Letki, N. (2008). Does diversity erode social cohesion? Social capital and race in British neighbourhoods. *Political Studies*, 56, 99–126
- Leventhal. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(2), 309.
- Marschall, M. J., & Stolle, D. (2004). Race and the city: Neighborhood context and the development of generalized trust. *Political Behavior*, 26(2), 125-153.
- Merry, S.E. (1981). *Urban Danger: Life in a Neighborhood of Strangers*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Merry, S.E. (1990). *Getting Justice and Getting Even: Legal Consciousness Among Working-Class Americans*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Middleton, A., Murie, A. & Groves, R. (2005). Social capital and neighbourhoods that work. *Urban Studies*, 42; 1711-1738.
- Miller, R. (1997). Healthy Boston and social capital: Application, dynamics and limitations. *National Civic Review*, 86, 157-166.
- Moore, C. (1996). What is community? *Chronicle of Community*, 1, 1, pp. 28-32.
- Narayan, L. (2000). Freire and Gandhi: Their relevance for social work education. *International Social Work*, 43(2), 193.
- Narayan, D. & Pritchett, L. (1999). Cents and sociability: Household income and social capital in rural Tanzania. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 47, 871-897.
- Oliver, J. E., & Wong, J. (2003). Intergroup prejudice in multiethnic settings. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(4), 567-582.
- Orr, M. (1999). *Black social capital: The politics of school reform in Baltimore, 1986-1998*. *Studies in Government and Public Policy*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *American Prospect*, 13, 35-42.
- Putnam, R. D. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *The American Prospect*, 24, 34-48.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Touchstone.
- Quillian, L. (1996). Group threat and regional change in attitudes toward African Americans. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(3), 816-860.
- Rose, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (1998). Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 36(3), 441-479.
- Rothman, J. (1997). *Resolving identity-based conflict in nations, organizations, and communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Saegert, S.; Thompson, J. P.; & Warren, M. R. (Eds.) (2001). *Social capital and poor communities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sampson, R. J. (1999). What "community" supplies. In R. F. Ferguson & W. T. Dickens (Eds.), *Urban problems and community development*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 633-660.
- Sampson, R., Raudenbush, S., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *American Association for the Advancement of Science. Science*, 277(5328), 918.
- Schiff, M. (1992). Social capital, labor mobility, and welfare. *Rational Sociology*, 4:157-75

- Schuller, T., Baron, S., & Field, J. (2000). Social capital: A review and critique. In S. Baron, J. Field & T. Schuller (Eds.), *Social capital: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-38). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Sigelman, L., & Welch, S. (1993). The contact hypothesis revisited: Interracial contact and positive racial attitudes. *Social Forces*, 71(3), 781-795.
- Small, M. L. (2004). *Villa Victoria: The transformation of social capital in a Boston barrio*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Small, M. L. (2002). Culture, cohorts, and social organization theory: Understanding local participation in a Latino housing project. *American Journal of Sociology* 108(1): 1-54.
- Small, M. L. & Newman, K. S. (2001). Urban poverty after the truly disadvantaged: The rediscovery of the family, the neighborhood, and culture. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:23-45.
- Smock, K. (2004). *Democracy in action: Community organizing and urban change*. New York: Columbia University.
- Snow, D. & Benford, R. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In Morris, A. & Muelle, C., *Frontiers in social movement theory*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 133-55.
- Stack, C. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Stein, R. M., Post, S. S., & Rinden, A. L. (2000). Reconciling context and contact effects on racial attitudes. *Political Research Quarterly*, 53(2), 285-303.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, M. C. (1998). How white attitudes vary with the racial composition of local populations: Numbers count. *American Sociological Review*, 63(4), 512-535.
- Temkin, K. & Rohe, W. (1998). Social capital and neighborhood stability: An empirical investigation. *Housing Policy Debate*, 9, 61-88.
- Varshney, A. (2001). Ethnic conflict and civil society: India and beyond. *World Politics*, 362-398.

- Warren, M. R. (2001). *Dry bones rattling: Community building to revitalize American democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Warren, M. R., Thompson, J. P. & Saegert, S. (2001). The role of social capital in combating poverty. In Saegert, S.; Thompson, J. P.; & Warren, M. R. (Eds.), *Social capital and poor communities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Welch, S., Sigelman, L., Bledsoe, T., & Combs, M. (2001). *Race and place: Residence and relations in an American city*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University.
- Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 15(2), 225.