A NEIGHBORHOOD FORESEEN: IDENTIFYING SOCIAL CAPITAL ON CONGO

STREET

by

D. DEIDRE HUMPHREY

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my mom, loving family, and friends for always motivating me to strive for my goals. Your unrelenting support has strengthened me to overcome obstacles and stoically journey on into my academic pursuits, telling the story all the way.

In addition, I give honorable appreciation to all of my professors past and present. Your guidance has helped me to become a more disciplined scholar. I extend the utmost gratitude to my thesis committee. Your patience and understanding empowered me to make every facet of my academic dream a reality. The thesis may not have sailed as gracefully without your academic acumen. Thank you for believing in me.

A special thanks to Dr. Maria Martinez-Cosio, whose willingness to share her knowledge and experience greatly helped and encouraged me in so many ways throughout this project. Her invaluable expertise opened my eyes to vital insights and perspectives I am sure to use throughout my life. Also, Dr. James Welch, who was a constant supporter of my ideas and encouraged me to remain consistent. Thanks to Dr. David Arditi, for his motivating me to think more critically about my ideas and rhythmically organize them.

Last but certainly not least, I greatly thank the residents of Congo Street, the Building Community Workshop and the staff at the Jubilee Park and Community Center. Thank you for granting me the opportunity to gain an understanding of your community. I pray that this small work helps in the progression of your outstanding community and neighborhood. Thank you.

May 1, 2013

ABSTRACT

A Neighborhood Foreseen: Identifying Social Capital on Congo Street

D. Deidre Humphrey

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2013

Supervising Professor: Dr. Maria Martinez- Cosio

The small Southeast Dallas community of Congo Street is not only unique because of its location within Jubilee Park neighborhood, but rather, it is a place where a group of five homeowners made history by cooperatively revitalizing their community with the assistance of the Building Community Workshop. Ongoing community redevelopment reveals that the homeowners are learning to use their social capital to mobilize within and throughout their community and neighborhood.

The initial focus of the study aimed to discover how Congo Street residents use social capital to accept or reject community revitalization goals set by the Building Community Workshop and the Jubilee Park and Community Center. To obtain evidence, stakeholders directly connected to the community were randomly selected, recruited, and interviewed. Qualitative research tools, included: face-to-face interviews, passive observations, and direct participation were then used to acquire data.

Results from the study suggest there are two very distinct social networks within the community. When the two networks amalgamate, a third network is created. The third network is important in that it illustrates residents' willingness to cooperate in civic engagement activities, which ultimately helps to buttress the social capital process within their community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

<u>1.1 Background of the study</u>

Social capital has become a fix-all for many underserved neighborhoods like Congo

Street. The inter- and multi-disciplinary use of the term has introduced a gamut of academic

discourse that attempt to understand social networks' role in remedying underserved

communities. Hanifan (1916) presented the notion that *capital* involves the social realm of

people and their relationships with one another. Today, social capital is used in an attempt to

identify those social networks that may excel or even limit a community. This qualitative

study examines how social capital within the recently revitalized Congo Street plays an

integral part to residents' continuation of their community.

1.1.1 Carroll Avenue and Congo Street

Congo Street's rich history dates back to the late 1800s. During this time the

Southeast Dallas neighborhood was part of the City of East Dallas. Congo Street, which was

then Carroll Avenue Congo Street, was referred to many as the "all-colored alley" (U.S.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010). The community was comprised of

low-income Black transient service workers and extremely poor families who could not

afford to relocate to other parts of the city.

In 1933, in a deliberate attempt to deter Whites, wayfarers and other Exposition Park

(Fair Park) visitors from the 'colored section' of East Dallas, led by an alliance between

businessmen and City of Dallas public officials, Carroll Avenue was renamed Congo Street.

Given the racial disharmony of the time, the renaming of the street was a tactful allusion to

1

the sub-Saharan country of Congo in Africa. Another point that must be made is that the city-manager form of government in place during this tumultuous period in history was overseen by elite businessmen. These elites were more interested in gaining outside investment to grow the city rather than improving the underserved minority neighborhoods (Elkin, 1987). As result, communities like that of Congo Street became victims of poverty by the very factions which attempted to bring wealth into the city.

1.1.2 East Dallas and Southeast Dallas

The more affluent White and Jewish neighborhood surrounding Congo Street was eventually affected by the growth politics of the city. In the late 1950s Interstate Highway (IH) 30 was constructed sectioning off the tranquil southernmost part of East Dallas (Theeastcorridor.org, 2007). The highway project spurred White flight whereby Whites relocated to suburban dwellings. Upwardly mobile Black families moved into the homes left by Whites, creating a neighborhood lush with the culture's flavor.

When the Ford Plant, the largest employer in the neighborhood closed many of the nearby residents were left unemployed (Hethcock, 2007). Crime, which had always been a problem in the community, began to worsen. The crime wave of the 1980s brought an onslaught of changes to social fabric of the Southeast Dallas neighborhood. Along with the heavily trafficked I30 that ultimately cut-through the neighborhood, came predatory businesses -- liquor stores, pawn shops, etc. Adding to the further disenfranchisement of the residents was their lack of financial capital and education attainment. Many of the Southeast Dallas residents became victims of drug use and other debilitating criminal activities.

Around the late 1980s, the eight single-members of the Dallas City Council began developing plans to combat the further destruction of the underserved neighborhoods within

2

the city (Appleton, 1989). For the Southeast Dallas neighborhood, the neighborhood cleanup strategy was the city's partnership with the private sector. Working closely with the city, , St. Michael All Angels Episcopal Church (SMAAEC) formed a second alliance with AmeriCorps, Habitat for Humanity, and the Greater Dallas Community of Churches. The church, though not located in the neighborhood sought to bring changes to the Southeast Dallas neighborhood. With the financial backing of benefactors like T. Boone Pickens and business acumen of Walt Humann, SMAAEC purchased 62 blocks of the Southeast Dallas neighborhood. Placing claim on the neighborhood, the powerful regime then renamed the area Jubilee Park.

Congo Street by virtue of its location is also part of the Jubilee Park redevelopment. Members from the small community played an integral part in early stages of the process. The unique history of the community of neighbors does not play into the mix of SMAEEC governance. However, with the fact that the community has undergone significant infrastructural advances the Jubilee Park neighborhood can revel in the successes of the five homeowners who were involved in a very different revitalization plan with the Building Community Workshop.

<u>1.2 Statement of the Problem</u>

To understand the role social capital plays in the redevelopment of Congo Street it is important to flesh out the theoretical arguments surrounding its formation. Social capital is prevalent in many community redevelopment projects, however it may not be used enough to engage all residents in the process whereby the community may civically govern themselves. Instead, some redevelopment projects choose to use the community's interpersonal relationships, which are central to the idea of social capital, only when it benefits the

community institution or agency. According to Kretzman and McKnight (1993), as result many underserved urban communities become client-based neighborhoods where deficiency-oriented policies and programs keep residents from solving their own problems. Warren, Thompson and Saegert (2001) agree adding to the assertion stating "the main problem for poor communities may not be a relative deficit in social capital, but that their social assets have greater obstacles to overcome, and are constantly under assault" (p. 4). Keeping these two claims in mind this study adds to the discourse surrounding the importance of social capital, by addressing the following research question:

> How do Congo Street residents use social capital to welcome or reject community revitalization efforts?

1.2.1 Congo Street

Since the early 1940s the small duplexes and "gun-shack" many of the homes on Congo Street were owned by the Topletz family. The Jewish landowners rented out the small domiciles to low-income and transient residents. After the death of one of the Topletz landlords, five renters were provided given the opportunity to buy their homes for a small fee. Overtime the homeowners shaped the community's identity around their collective experiences as residents of Congo Street. When SMAEEC came into the neighborhood to redevelop, collectively the homeowners welcomed the efforts. The small group of homeowners bridged their bonded social capital into that of the Jubilee Park neighborhood with intent of their community being redeveloped as well. They offered readily offered assistance in planning the community center and engaged in heavy discourse about what they believed their neighborhood needed to become a viable community. The regime however had different plans for Congo Street.

1.2.2 The Jubilee Park Celebration

Engaging with the neighborhood residents, including the homeowners of Congo Street, SMAAEC a predominately Anglo congregation, mapped out what they believed would enrich and renew the neighborhood. The organization envisioned a neighborhood with affordable housing for seniors, early education for the children of the community, a resource center to house police and other neighborhood governance, a community center, and a wrought iron fenced park to keep children safe as they played on the five acres of parkland supervised by surveillance cameras. Two of the most notable members of the city, T. Boone Pickens and Walt Humann, took interest in the Jubilee Park project and gratuitously offered to assist using their capital resources. Taking into account the many social difficulties within the neighborhood including: high unemployment, below poverty incomes and high crime the sponsors realized a large amount of capital would be needed to produce results. To assist in the venture Pickens provided $6 million toward the venture. Humann, a well-known businessman used his acumen to promote the neighborhood project. SMAEEC acquired about $5 million from church donations along with gifts from private foundations (Appleton, 2007).

To carry out the architectural and infrastructural improvements in Jubilee Park, SMAAEC hired the services of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) architect Brent Brown. Mr. Brown's responsibility was to design and construct the community center, resource center, early education center, and senior housing as suggested by the church. By happenstance, in 2008 after one of the neighborhood engagement meetings, Mr. Brown was approached by one of the Congo Street residents. The resident articulated the concerns of the small community along with the squalid living conditions the

homeowners were residing in to Mr. Brown. Not acting right away, Mr. Brown patiently observed how committed the Congo Street residents were in helping to improve the Jubilee Park neighborhood.

The Congo Street residents were not familiar with the process of formal community organizing or redevelopment, nonetheless they were eager to eliminate the parasitic social elements destroying their community and neighborhood. Not surprisingly, the group of homeowners was also concerned with what the regime had planned for Congo Street. In an interview with one of the homeowners, they explain how the collective bridged their social capital into that of the surrounding neighborhood and what they felt about the regime:

> Mrs. Walker and her daughter got out in the community in her car before they got a bus to ride around in the community to get volunteers to help out in the community. So as we go along we graduated and all that they stepped in... [Jubilee Park] they wanted to buy us out. But, we wasn't trying to have it. We been here too long to let somebody come in and try to buy us. So we kept going to the community neighborhood meetings.

After a few more of the neighborhood meetings, Mr. Brown decided to obtain a clearer understanding of the homeowner's situation. As Mr. Brown explains,

> I had driven down the street, talked to folks, but I had never been in a house. I could read it from the house as an architect, but I didn't understand it. So, one day I just randomly said ... can I see inside your house?

Interestingly, around the same time Mr. Brown was meeting the homeowners, he noticed that the Jubilee Park neighborhood development had a passive model of redevelopment planned where the private sector would decide how the Congo Street

6

community would be governed. The City of Dallas and other members of the regime assumed that it was not feasible to remodel the houses on Congo Street. The plots were considered too small and not worth the effort. Moreover, there was a robust homeowner presence on the small street. Without a strong voice to counter the regime, the homeowners would be left in unsafe housing conditions or even be relocated by the developers. Mr. Brown realized he needed to take a direct approach at redevelopment if he wanted to help the residents of Congo Street. He states,

> There was a tension with the Jubilee Center because they had a plan. They had not worked on that street [Congo Street] with the exception of doing some volunteer help, like to paint houses, there had been some sponsorship in that way, but if you looked at the trajectory, the street was going to disappear, or it was being ignored, or had been forgotten.

After observing the housing conditions and the homeowners up close, Mr. Brown ascertained with certainty that he had a moral obligation as an architect to assist the homeowners in bettering their situation.

1.2.3 The Congo Street Green Initiative

To begin the process Mr. Brown met with each of the homeowners to devise an approach to revitalize their homes without displacing any of them or jeopardizing their dense social network. Noticing the proposed plans for Congo Street by the Jubilee Park governing board and the SMAAEC, Brent Brown created the Congo Street Green Initiative. Mr. Brown kindled his idea through his social capital whereby he was able to obtain volunteers and sponsors to assist with the logistics of the Congo Street project. As an adjunct professor at the University of Texas at Arlington, School of Architecture, Mr. Brown even arranged for

two of his architectural studio classes to participate in the project. Funding for the project came from the City of Dallas, Real Estate Council Foundation, Central Dallas Ministries, AmericaCorp, and other philanthropic supporters.

Using the idea of reconstruction of place and citizen architecture — a form of civic engagement, Mr. Brown anticipated rebuilding one dilapidated home at a time for the Congo Street homeowners. The main purpose of the BCW revitalization approach was to allow the homeowners control of the redevelopment project. Regardless how much publicity the project received, the goal of the Congo Street Initiative was to remain consistent in its effort to ensure Congo Street homeowners were involved in each possible step of the revitalization process. The residents helped with sketches, participated in design charettes, and enthusiastically assisted with the construction of not only their own, but their neighbors' homes as well. The residents even went so far as to cooperatively decide the order in which each family would have their homes reconstructed.

Therefore, as not to displace any of the residents and keep the social fabric of the community intact, BCW constructed the Holding House, a domicile intended to lodge one family at a time as their homes were being reconstructed. The property for the Holding House was donated to the BCW by one of the longtime residents. The benevolent resident believed it was the least he could do for his community. The home enabled Congo homeowners to gradually adapt to the infrastructural changes and new amenities. The Holding House would go on to win *LEED for Homes Gold,* a prestigious recommendation honoring its conception, architectural design and approach. The first home to be built, owned by the homeowner who introduced the Congo Street network to Mr. Brown, also received an architectural award.

1.2.4 Congo Street at Present

Two years after the completion of the Congo Street Green Initiative, interviews with homeowners and residents suggests that the initiative has had a positive impact on the people and the place. What is more, the social capital of the homeowners can be observed and felt on a tangible level. The homeowner's have continued a healthy relationship with the BCW and the connection has broadened their social tools. The same story cannot be told about the homeowners' relationship with the Jubilee Park Community Center and SMAEEC. Though ongoing redevelopment is still occurring in the Jubilee Park neighborhood, many of the residents included in the five Congo Street homeowners choose not to participate in the neighborhood activities provided by the institution. There remains a bitter resentment toward the Jubilee staff because some of them feel the Jubilee Park and Community Center staff disregarded their needs as members of the neighborhood, and used them to get what they wanted. Many of the longtime residents had been very active in advocating for a community center in Jubilee Park. However, according to some residents at present the elderly are not treated respectfully. As one long-time resident of the Jubilee Park neighborhood explains:

> If it wasn't for the elderly folk [some of which resided on Congo Street] signing up
> for the Jubilee to be there, it wouldn't be there today.

1.2.5 Jubilee Park Community Center

The Jubilee Park Community Center is located one street over from Congo Street in the heart of the neighborhood. Corporations, foundations, other non-profits, and government agencies partner with the center to assist the neighborhood's residents. The community center is managed by the SMAAEC. The SMAAEC is responsible for the staffing of the Jubilee Center and ensuring that the mission of the agency is upheld. The community center is

staffed with thirteen well-rounded and ethnically diverse individuals, but only a few if any reside in the Jubilee Park neighborhood and none of them reside on Congo Street.

The community center's purpose is to serve as a hub for social capital. Programs and services such as: education enrichment, public health and wellness, public safety, and housing assistance, provide residents with resources otherwise not available. There are also numerous community events held throughout the year. The center offers after school childcare, computer and GED classes, along with an array of other social service programs to assist neighborhood residents.

The users (approximately 1100 residents) come from various areas of the Jubilee Park neighborhood. Many residents actively participate in neighborhood building activities such as, Crime Watch meetings, volunteering during special events, and even teaching the after school program. Conversely, according to some of the staff, none of the residents of Congo Street attends the neighborhood events nor do they volunteer. This raises the question whether the homeowners who participated in the Congo Street Green Initiative are rejecting community redevelopment or are they merely being selective toward a network for which they do not trust.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Traditional social capital theorists have approached social capital from two divergent

approaches, the normative (individual) and the resource-focused (structural) (Fulkerson &

Thompson, 2008). Other scholars have focused on the effects, the causes, or the features of

social capital (Putnam; 1995; Hyman 2002). Still others have chosen to emphasize how

internal and external linkages create, influence, or limit social capital (Granovetter, 1973;

Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Portes, 1998; Putnam, 1995, 2000). From the discourse, one is left

with the assumption that there is no right or wrong explanation about the process of social

capital, though many scholars would suggest that the over simplification of the term has

created a murkier definition (Portes & Landolt 1996). Nonetheless, to understand social

capital within the realm of community is to understand through the features that encompass it

during a collective process.

2.1. Bourdieuan Social Capital

Pierre Bourdieu, through his interest in determining the production of social

inequalities, set the framework for the individual theoretical underpinnings of social capital.

Through his framework, social capital occurs as an individual participates in a complex

system of various social relationships granting privileges to a set of diverse and rich

resources (Bourdieu, 1977, 1980; Burt, 1992; Lin, 2002). Bourdieu & Wacquant, conclude

that social capital is:

> ... the sum of resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by
>
> virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships
>
> of mutual acquaintance and recognition (1992, p.119)

11

Therefore, to Bourdieu, social capital is established by the intentional actions of individuals'

economic and cultural investment (Sobel, 2002). Some scholars argue against this

interpretation, emphasizing that social capital is an unintended consequence of particular

types of social networks (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 1995; 2000). Nonetheless, through the

lens of Bourdieu, the returns (resources otherwise not attainable) from the individual

investments are expected assets (interpersonal connections and other forms of capital)

accumulated from the connection of individuals to other individuals (Lin, 2002).

      The Bourdieuan perspective posits social capital as a pivotal element, which though

not solely by the participants' choice, can provide them with a source of capital maintained

and reinforced with repetitive investment into the group or social relationships (Stone, 2001).

In keeping with this view, individuals within their respective class system will attempt to

secure their position by manipulating their connections to buttress their own interests

(Bourdieu, 1984). Massey and Denton (1994) clarify this phenomenon in their work on the

creation of the underserved community. With federal and state policies aimed at bettering

upwardly mobile Whites' interests (assets) and socioeconomic class positions, many

impoverished Blacks were subjugated to the perils of underserved communities. Within this

example, capital sets up a stratified social structure. Those who do not have access to social

capital where resources and assets are abundant may also be limited in other forms of capital.

As followers of the Bourdieuan (1980; 1986) perspective would assert, all forms of capital

are convertible; even more so when they involve "durable obligations subjectively felt" (pp.

249-250). Thus, accessing social capital not common to the participant may help them

acquire other forms of capital.

2.2 Coleman and Social Capital

Scholars following in the tradition of Coleman (1988) assert that social capital is defined by its particular function. Social capital to them is dependent on the investment of individual members within the collective structure. Coleman's definition of social capital takes note that within a system there are various entities with two common characteristics: "... 1) They all consist of some aspect of the social structure, and 2) they facilitate certain actions between and among actors ... within the structure" (p. 98). Like the Bourdieuan perspective, individuals gain from participation and/ or membership in the group. Additionally, those gains would otherwise not be accessible but through the functional processes of social capital.

Coleman (1990) views social capital as a resource available to all individuals within a social network making it difficult to own by one individual. In this structural approach to understanding social capital, individual actors encapsulated in collectives inevitably strive to maintain their position within the whole by setting up and enforcing clear lines of demarcation and boundaries to protect against presumed negative externalities and/ or imposing individuals or groups (Arregle, Hitt, Sirmon & Very, 2007; Portes, 2000). From the stance of the community, a resident gains the capacity to take part in the maintenance of their collective group by embracing and promoting the rules or norms of the group. They then base their actions on the trust that everyone will follow the rules. Accordingly, all within the structure enhance their capacity to pursue the collective goals (Coleman, 1988; Stone, 2008). However, consequences from the social capital process at this level of collective engagement may result in benefits for some and exclusion for others (Bourdieu, 1980; Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998; McLean, Schultz & Steger, 2002; Newman & Wyly, 2006). Like other forms of

capital, social capital in this vein has the ability to create social imbalance (Bourdieu, 1977; Schulman & Anderson, 1999). As some scholars suggest, to resolve such collective action problems it may be necessary to identify the particular features that facilitate individuals to act together in the group or collective (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Putnam, 1995).

<center>2.3 Putnam and Social Capital</center>

Putnam (1993, 1995, 2000) in his examination of social capital expanded the outlook from the individual approach to that of the community. Unlike Bourdeiu and Coleman, Putnam takes the leap and looks into the intricate features of networks and communities to define social capital. Putnam chooses to explain his idea of social capital in the following way:

> Whereas physical capital refers to physical objects and human capital refers to properties of individuals, social capital refers to the connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. In this sense, social capital is closely related to...'civic virtue.' The difference is that social capital calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a sense of network of social relations (2009, p. 19)

Scholars following in the tradition of Putnam assert that collectively social capital provides the participants the necessary tools to make a community sustainable. But Sampson (1999) warns that social networks alone are not enough to understand communities. However, Putnam (1996) goes on to argue that social capital is a valuable "feature of social life—networks, norms, trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (p. 36). Shared objectives in this regard are achieved through the idea of civically participating in the functioning of the collective.

<center>14</center>

Putnam and his followers claim the above features of social capital are what allow collectivities to participate in civic activities thereby empowering citizens to be more cooperative and tolerant of one another. Social capital under the Putnam lens is derived from individuals actively participating in groups and those same groups interacting and engaging in a democratic fashion with other groups.

Research shows there is validity to Putnam's claim; however, he fails to address the impact structural forces have on underserved groups. He also fails to mention how the debilitating circumstances may impede member's participation in civic engagement activities which may help them to bridge their social capital between various groups (Mcclean, 2002.) McBride, Sherraden, & Pritzker (2006) make note of this claim demonstrating in their findings that there are hindrances to civic participation activities for some families in underserved communities that are much harder to overcome. As their study shows, *time, employment, family demands*, and *lack of organized community groups within the neighborhood* can prevent civic-minded individuals from participating in the improvement of their communities. Additionally, as Cosio (2006) determines through her research on the cultural aspects of social capital, dominant networks such as community institutions may place severe limitations on civic participation by marginalizing those groups whom are not socialized in the etiquette, verbiage, and other cultural capital relative to the dominant habitus. Hence, the community institutions intended to help citizens become more involved in civic engagement may negatively affect their ability to utilize social capital to better their situation (McBride, et. al., 2006). The inequalities that ensue from the exclusion of these individuals' and/ or groups' lack of civic participation thus may stem from the structural forces substantiated by the very community institutions in place to help them.

15

2.4 Social Capital and the Ties that Bind

Upon careful review of the Putnam interpretation of social capital, a generalization can be made that social capital is experienced through the social interactions of individuals within a collective who are linked to the communicative channels of other social networks by weak or strong ties (Granovetter, 1973, 1973; Henning & Lieberg, 1996). In much of the literature, social capital is purposeful and requires effort from actors in order to maintain the collective interests (Coleman, 1980; Putnam, 1995). Oh, Chung & Labianca (2004), makes note that social capital is significantly maximized by the diversity of the groups that participate in its creation. However one must understand, diversity can also constrain social capital if steps are not taken to improve collective social interactions and members' cooperation (Putnam, 2007).

Social interactions, especially face-to-face horizontal relations, play a significant role in creating dense networks of social capital. Horizontal relations are the network qualities of collective action, which are understood to facilitate the inclusion of ideas, diverse groups, and values in the public discourse within the community (Flora, 1998). Cooley (1924) in his assessment proposes that horizontal relations are *primary groups.* These primary social networks provide identity and a feeling of belonging to a specific community. According to supporters of Putnam, the civic sphere is dependent on such networks because they bring various actors together where they may cooperate and build trust amongst one another thus create social capital (Florida, 2002; Forrest & Kearns, 2001).

Social capital within a social network links various actors together through social ties. The social ties of networks, collectives, and/ or communities allow for a broader possibility of sharing between social clusters. Granovetter (1973) defines the strength of the social tie as,

16

"a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual trust), and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie" (p. 1361). As research indicates, these social ties have the ability to be 'weak' or 'strong' in their capacity (Lin & Dumin, 1986; Friedkin, 1982, 1990; Schweizer, Schnegg & Berzborn, 1998; Lin, 2000).

<div align="center">2.5 Weak ties</div>

Weak ties are the linkages outside of the immediate community or network -- acquaintances and or strangers -- that once bridged into can provide greater access to social capital between other social networks and systems (Kavanaugh, Reese & Carrol, 2005). Granovetter (1973), from his study on how often job seekers found new employment through social contacts, discovered that weak ties are "indispensible to individual's opportunities and to their integration into communities" (p. 1378). Granovetter considers the use of weak ties as an important role in spreading knowledge. Additionally, weak ties offer opportunities that encourage social progress for individuals while supporting the overall functioning of communities. Florida 2002) agrees with Granovetter, insisting that weak ties are imperative for the daily operations of a modern day community. Weak ties deliver the opportunity for people to engage in the exchange of novel ideas and mobilize other resources from outside of the community without compromising their strong-tie relationships.

Greenbaum (1982) somewhat disagrees with Granovetter's 'weak ties' argument, suggesting that 'weak ties' are not as valuable for underserved communities. She goes on to suggest that ties among residents on the same block are more likely to be weak. She found conversely that the ties which bridge to networks outside of the community are generally strong. To her these strong ties are composed of frequent informal face-to-face interactions,

<div align="center">17</div>

which deliver the necessary tools to mobilize the community. Despite this claim, Weimann (1983) theorized, weak ties are imperative for the transference of norms and viewpoints—the elements that make civil society possible, even within small collectives (Kleinhans, Priemus & Engbersen, 2005).

2.6 Strong Ties

Strong social ties, unlike weak ties involve close relationships such as those involving kin, neighbors, close friendships and/ or associations. Research conducted by Shemtov, (2003) notes that in the realm of community, strong social ties generate greater participation in collective goals and solidarity. Hansen, (1999) suggests that strong ties are better for transmission of multifaceted knowledge. Brown & Reingen (1987) confirm this assumption. They found at the macro level weak social ties were helpful in the movement of information, but at the micro level strong ties were more effective than weaker ties. As Levin & Cross (2004) illustrate in their study, strong ties are more dependent on a group that is bonded in trust with one another. In Uslaner's (1999) discovery, there is a moral obligation of trust among strong ties. He claims, "People who have faith in others and have strong ties to their communities will abjure self-interest and act for the common good, doing things such as joining civic associations, giving to charity, or simply telling the truth" (p.33). In other words, communities that are fused together based on trust may engage in behaviors of resource exchange that will benefit the collective for which they belong.

2.7 Bonding Social Capital

Bonding social capital occurs through the strong social ties of actors. The bonding of social capital is horizontal, among homophilic networks whereas bridging is vertical,

occurring between communities (Narayan and Pritchett, 1999). Bonded networks provide support to individuals through kinship, friendship, and other close associations (Riger & Laurakas, 1981). Woolcock, (2001) proposes that within the internal configuration of underserved communities, especially those of ethnic makeup, strong associations of 'bonded' social capital are prominent. Not denying this claim, some scholars suggest families, neighbors, and other close-knit groups within the community reflects a connectedness based on the daily situations that help them with survival (Anderson, 1999; Clark, 1965; Dubois, 1903; Small, 2004; Wacquant & Wilson, 1989; Wilson, 1978). Therefore, in some cases an underserved community's network of bonded social capital may have a more difficult time being converted into other forms of capital (Edin and Lein, 1997).

What has also been stated is that strongly bonded communities can produce ties so strong that they isolate and impair diversity between and across in- and out-networks (Durlauf, 1999; Portes, 1998). Putnam (2000) agrees asserting, "bonding social capital, by creating strong in-group loyalty, may also create strong out-group antagonism" (p. 23).

2.8 Bridging Social Capital

The 'bridging' of social capital is dependent on the collective actions of in-group and out-group members (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 1995; Ohmer & Beck, 2006). Bridging social capital is formulated generally by weak ties, and provides networks with access to resources and goods they may not already have in their possession (Granovetter, 1973; Bourdieu, 1980). Bridging social capital then is the bringing together of a variety of individuals and groups from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, lifestyles, occupations, preferences, and

19

experiences where they may make gains that help to improve social inequalities and other limitations (Paxton, 1999; Lockhart, 2005).

2.9 Decline in Participation

In understanding social connections, the concept paramount to the 'bridging' and 'bonding' of social capital, Putnam (1995) drew on the metaphor of the lone bowler without a bowling league to present his skills. Using hyperbole to make his point, Putnam (1995, 1996, 2000) claims that civic engagement and other associational activities are declining in the U.S. communities.

The discussion over the decline of civic engagement and participation presents an interesting case for social capital. If there is causality between civic engagement and the improvement of community, then social capital is likely a precursor to collective participation in the civic life of the community (Larsen, et al., 2004). Guiding the actions of the participants are collective norms set by the group with the most access to or actualized social capital. This group has an expectation that all will cooperate and adhere to their specific function in order to protect the collective (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995). From this assumption it becomes clear that communities with strong levels of bonded social capital may also have a strong core group which has influence over other group members' decision to actively participate in their collective (Larsen, et. al., 2004; Ulsaner, 2002). An interesting connection between the two arguments may indeed be that to initiate civic engagement, there is a need for the component of trust, which may catalytically set shared expectations into action (Putnam, 1995).

2.10 Trust and the Building of Community

Trust within the social capital framework, especially from the standpoint of community, enables participants to act together as a group. More readily observed by the bonds within the group, trust provides the foundation of collective actions that enhance civic engagement and mutual aid (Lelieveldt, 2004). Communities with high levels of trust may even obtain better governmental efficiency and effectiveness (Putnam, 1993). In essence, trust amongst, for example, informal institutions (residential networks) and formal institutions (nonprofit organizations, community organizations, and other neighborhood 'bridging' entities), aid in the democratic resolution of issues within the community (Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 1993; Forrest and Kearns, 2008).

Saegert (2006) using the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) identified cities where private and public sector actors collaborated with disadvantaged communities. What she discovered was that trust brought all of the entities together via collective community-building strategies aimed at increasing social capital. As various groups of residents and partners joined around specific agendas and expectations, trust in individual network's shared objectives became the spark for an array of dissimilar community expectations. From the varied expectations, conflict emerged. But as Seagart (2006) suggests, conflict is not a negative because it indicates not only that trust is effective in bringing people together to collaborate and form alliances, but also that the development of different relationships within and outside of the community may leverage assets to solve the community's problems.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Theoretical Perspective

The following theoretical perspectives are used to formulate a model that integrates the

insights from both the normative and resource social capital approaches.

Social Capital

For this study, the social capital lens is used to solidify the understanding of both the

relations actors maintain within their collectivity and how those relations are linked outside

of particular social networks. Upon discovery of these relations, the features of the networks

are examined to build on the idea that social capital must be achieved through civic

engagement in order for community revitalization to be an ongoing success.

Grounded Theory

Glaser and Strauss (1967) developed the concept of grounded theory while studying

the interactions of hospital employees who serviced dying patients. They believed that an

adequate theory could only materialize with rigorous immersion with the phenomenon of the

study. In this sense, the qualitative method is ideal for discriminating the features--

arrangements, norms, processes, and activities -- that develop the theory. As Creswell (2009)

asserts one way this can be accomplished is through questioning techniques that aim to

"address a description of the case and the themes that emerge from studying it" (2009: p.

130).

3.2 The Qualitative Method

Rooted in the Chicago School of the 1920s, the qualitative method examines the

behaviors of individuals and businesses within the social system based on their culture,

22

values, rituals, symbols, and emotions (Deegan, 2001). The qualitative research method was designed to collect the subjective perspectives of the residents of Congo Street, BC Workshop, and staff from the Jubilee Park Community Center. The study focused at the collective level where the features of the networks were readily identified and observed. The most applicable data collection tools for achieving the goals of this research were through interviews, observations, and participatory research. Secondary data was collected from archival documents retrieved online. The research subjects were not intentionally manipulated, thus the research is non-experimental. As with all qualitative methods the findings from the data collection emerged as the data was collected.

According to Bell (2009), many studies speak about a community's social capital, but too few of them use qualitative methods to gain insight from the notion. Using the grounded theoretical premise I took Bell's assumption and began building the theory of social capital. To identify the social capital within the community of Congo Street, it was imperative I become the data-gathering instrument. From this role, I was able to access and observe the social dynamics of the community.

Common among qualitative designs, the research questions, methods and theoretical framework kept shifting as the more data I collected (Jacob, 1988). The fluidity of the events made the data easier to obtain in many instances, yet it also made it difficult to remain centered on the research question. To aid in keeping the research grounded, I maintained copious field notes to record observations as it pertained to the setting, the participants, activities and interactions, and subtle issues (Merriam, 1988). Key words that stood out and patterns that could be made from previous visitations with research variables were also noted to help identify redundancies and formulate codes.

3.3 Convenience Sampling

Initially the goal was to recruit all five of the participant Congo Street Green Initiative homeowners for the sample. Once I became familiar with the social demographics of the small community, I realized a significant amount of residents did not participate in the initiative, yet were connected to the redevelopment project through familial ties. In addition, I discovered that there are renters on Congo Street that do not bridge into the social capital of the homeowners. To gather a large enough sample, I concentrated on recruiting as many Congo Street residents as possible. There were five families of Congo Street Green Initiative residents and I recruited three of them to participate in the interviews. From the five renters on the street three of them were interviewed.

To understand the roles they play in the social networks of Congo Street, data was also collected from the staff at BCW and the Jubilee Park Community Center. I actively sought out the Jubilee Park Community Center Community Outreach Director to provide information about the community institution's relationship about the Congo Street residents. I also utilized the neighborhood center to gather observational data, which provided information as to whether Congo Street residents participate in the formal civic engagement activities of their community and neighborhood.

There were a few experiences where snowballing techniques were used to gather participants. Throughout the study, the Jubilee Park Community Center staff and some of the BCW interviewees offered assistance in helping me recruit participants from which to garner information. In addition, early in the study some Congo Street residents were very active in helping me to recruit other residents for the study. Nonetheless, for most of the study, I chose to depend on random encounters with residents I met on the street or at the community

center.

3.4 Interviews

The use of interviews for this study proved to be a valuable tool in understanding the social dynamics between actors on Congo Street and other stakeholders. Because of the lack of empirical research data available specifically about the Congo Street residents, interviews afforded greater insight into the participants' lives. The three nonprofit personnel who agreed to participate in the face-to-face interviews reflect that they are willing to identify with the needs of the community for which they serve.

3.5 Recruitment

The initial goal of the study was to obtain at least twelve participants from Congo Street to volunteer for the study. To recruit interviewees, I created a script that announced to the prospective interviewee my role as a graduate researcher at the university. The script introduced the research topic, and informed subjects that their participation in the study was voluntary and would accrue no penalty even if they chose not to become involved. There were no incentives offered to any respondent. Respondents were only advised their participation would add to the scientific understanding of social relations.

Participants were selected based on four criteria:

- Current Congo Street residents who participated in the Congo Street Initiative,

- Congo street residents who did not participate, but currently resided on the street,

- Nonprofit personnel who serve Congo Street, and

- Individuals who are over the age of 21.

3.6 Cooperation of Interviewees

Upon the subjects' agreement to contribute to the study, they were provided an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved *Informed Consent Form* and advised that the anticipated hour-long interview would be recorded and later transcribed. The face-to-face interviews were conducted on the participant's turf -- homes, community center, office, etc. An interview instrument (See Appendix) with open-ended questions was used to guide and lead the interview, but was not utilized as strictly as a schedule or questionnaire (Lofland et al, 2006).

The questions sought to obtain specific details regarding the initial research question. The first set of open-ended questions collected personal information about the respondent. As the interview progressed more targeted questions were asked to grasp the respondents' thoughts and ideas about Congo Street as a community. Much effort was put into not compromising the interview or making the respondent feel uncomfortable (Charmaz, 2006). Probing questions were used throughout the interviews to stimulate the conversation, to obtain more information from participants, and to address any ambiguity of responses. Similarly, when negotiation was needed such as when respondents spoke about emotional situations from the past, probes were carefully employed to defuse the situation.

Nine Congo Street stakeholders agreed to participate in the face-to-face semi-structured interviews. Gaining the trust of the first few participants was somewhat easy, but as the study progressed, it became more difficult to obtain more participants. For example, three prospective participants were not willing to participate because they believed they had nothing to contribute to the study. Using ethical guidelines, these encounters were documented in the field notes and used during analysis to shed light on issues, which may

26

pertain to the initial research question. Interestingly, a few residents did not want to participate in the formal interview; instead, they opted to provide information through casual/informal conversation. The informal conversational data was treated just as the formal data, however to keep the anonymity of the residents the audio was not recorded.

The breakdown of the formal interviewees included:

- Three Congo Street residents who participated in the Congo Street Green Initiative;
- Three renters who did not participate in the Congo Street Green Initiative,
- Seven residents who are involved in the revitalization of Jubilee Park by virtue of residing in the Jubilee Park neighborhood
- Three nonprofit personnel (two participants from the BC Workshop- one of which is also a resident of Congo Street; and one participant from the Jubilee Park Community Center).

3.7 Participatory Research

Various community engagement activities sponsored and organized by the Jubilee Park Community Center, SMAAEC, and the BCW From the interviews, were extended to me. I attended two events held by the Jubilee Community Center, one event sponsored by SMAAEC, and one event sponsored by the BCW.

An abundance of information was garnered from visual assessment and observation of the Congo Street community, the residents, the Jubilee Community Center participants, and the wider neighborhood. Informal conversations with residents of Congo Street and Jubilee Park personnel afforded the opportunity to identify the social boundary between the social networks of Congo Street. If not for my direct participation with the neighborhood

27

institution staff and the Congo Street residents, the discovery may not have been as evident.

<div align="center">3.8 Study Limitations</div>

The limitations to this study do not compromise the findings. Instead, the findings serve as a

framework whereabouts further research can be used to uncover what has been left out of the

study. While collecting the data the as the instrument I had to remain consistently malleable.

The difficulty lied in the fact that human error occurs. To help lessen such occurrences, any

information I obtained was noted and tactfully not repeated in any other conversation. There

were tremendous inconsistencies in some of the participants' interview responses, which

made drawing conclusions from the data more complicated. To limit the internal noises and

find the voices of the community, the interview transcripts had to reevaluate multiple times.

3.8.1 Interviewer Bias

Though qualitative design is meant to document the descriptive data as respondents answer

to the questions posed, there remains the threat of biases. One such bias is interviewer bias.

Interviewer bias occurs when the information provided becomes misinterpreted and/ or the

interviewer allows certain factors to cloud the judgment of the data collection (Wynder,

1994). Because of the cultural differences and sometimes similarities, I had to make every

attempt to alleviate the possibility of any occurrence of interview bias. One such way was

after each interview each participant was asked, "Do you have any questions for me?" and

"Were you able to tell your story to me as you saw fit?" In addition, I tried not to rely too

heavily on any single interview account. Consciously, at every possible opportunity an

attempt was made to verify the data. Further, after each interview, I documented my musings

in a notebook where I could go back after the interviews and juxtapose what the interviewee

stated to my interpretation so as not to overgeneralize or oversimplify the responses.

3.8.2 Sample Size

There were not enough research participants recruited to participate resulting in a smaller than expected sample size. Additionally, the lack of diversity in interviewees makes the sample an unlikely representation of all Congo Street residents. The small data set does not limit or devalue the findings of social capital; however, it does prevent any measurement of social capital within or outside of the community. The limitation also makes it impossible to propose a new theory or argument against or for social capital.

3.8.3 Time

Time was a severe constraint to the study. Inclement weather, conflicting employment schedules, and other circumstances beyond both research subjects' and the researcher's control limited the amount of time needed to gather a deeper analysis of the social fabric of the community. More time or even immersion would have provided richer data about the social networks and other workings of the community.

3.8.4 Density of Bonds

After numerous visits to Congo Street, many of the residents, by word-of-mouth from other prospective and/ or participating interviewees, became familiar with the project. News of the study traveled especially quickly throughout the dense bonded network of homeowners. As result, previous research participants were able to influence their peers' decision to partake in the study. There was a downside to the dense bond relationship. As one prospective participant blatantly stated, "one voice speaks for all of the residents so there was no need to collect any more interviews from her or her family." This attitude was problematic to the study. In fact, the statement exemplifies how strong bonds of social capital can severely

hamper the movement of information throughout a social structure.

3.8.5 Rescheduling

Another issue in the study was the rescheduling of the interviews. One family rescheduled their interview three times. On the fourth attempt, I was told that neither family member was interested in providing their opinion to the study. Yet, through casual conversation one of the spousal members did provide valuable opinions.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS FROM CONGO STREET

Respondents shared their life-experiences and even presented other matters, which enhanced the research data. Their answers to the open-ended questions offered information about their personal experiences and their connection to the Congo Street community. The aim of questioning was geared toward gathering information about the features of social capital, such as networks, norms and trust. The overall flow of the questioning followed a preset arrangement of categories:

- Definition of community

- Stakeholder information

- Approaches employed to build Congo Street residential participation in community building

- Strategies used to provide continual community revitalization.

These predetermined themes specified direction and allowed for greater analysis and coding.

Upon completion of the interviews and participant observations, all of the data was transcribed and analyzed from which subthemes emerged. According to Creswell, (2009) this data emergence occurs after rereading the transcripts and identifying any recurrent ideas. The resulting themes were categorized and connected to other similar themes found in the findings. The themes that evolved from the interviews included the following categories:

1.   Social Elements of Community

2.   Expectations of the Community

3.   Trust

4.   Cooperation

Next, I combed through the transcripts, looking for each of the categorized themes. The data was then assigned associated codes. The codes were not used to reduce any of the interview responses nor were they intended to create different meanings from what was presented by the interviewee. Instead, the codes were used to summarize and interpret the respondents' opinions founded on the interview questions presented to them.

4.1 Social Features of the Community

Congo Street residents along with BCW and Jubilee Park Community Center staff were asked to describe their relationship with Congo Street. In understanding each participant's interaction with Congo Street residents, the idea of networks, norms, and trust became more salient. Each of the ideas is what Putnam (1995) describes as features of social capital. Moreover, the features elucidate how social capital connects the networks to the revitalization efforts of their community.

There are eight houses and ten duplex units on Congo Street. From the street's residents, six families participated in the Congo Street Green Initiative, and seven did not. The data reveals there are three social network groupings: the *Primary*, *Secondary and the "Family"* networks. These networks are clearly generated by the features of social capital.

1. *Primary Network*: The Primary network consists of the six homeowners who indirectly or directly participated in the Congo Street Green Initiative. This bonded group is strongly connected by kinship. Some of the members in this group have resided on Congo Street for more than 30 years. The idea of a "family-like" community takes shape within this group and resonates outward to those residents of the community who actively

participate in the maintenance of the goals of both revitalization initiatives. The members of the Primary network have weak ties to other social networks throughout the Jubilee Park neighborhood. However, collectively, this network does not participate in the formal neighborhood activities held at the Jubilee Center.

2. *Secondary Networ*k: This network consists of Congo Street residents who rent, landlords, and nonprofit personnel who are outside of the Primary network. For instance, some of the renters do not anticipate residing permanently on Congo Street. They like many residents before them use the duplex housing on Congo Street as temporary lodging. As result, they may not be connected to the street as residents in the Primary group.

None of the members of this group has resided on Congo Street for more than 5 years. The two landlords, Topletz and Camacho are in this group because though they own rental property on the street. What is more, they do not actively engage in the building of social capital or the governance of the community. One homeowner qualifies for the group because they do not adhere to the norms of the community. Specifically, this family is considered deviant by the primary group because they partake in criminal acts, which jeopardize rather than contribute to the revitalization efforts. Two of the families within this group do contribute in the activities at the Jubilee Park Community Center. For instance, one family uses the after-school program for her children. Ironically, the other homeowner participates in some of the senior activities along with the People and Nutrition Program, but does not engage in the upkeep of the community.

3. *The "Family" Network:* The "Family" is created through the combining of the Primary network, BCW staff and residents of the secondary network. The "family" willingly

volunteers to promote the progression of the community and maintains the idea of a revitalized Congo Street. There are four renters in this group. As long as they adhere to the norms of the community, they are recognized as "family." Of the nine interviewees, eight are members of the "Family" network. The other interviewee is not a considered part of the "Family" network because they are affiliated with the Jubilee Park Community Center.

4.2 Expectations of the Community

To protect the network, the primary group developed codes of conduct (norms) to create a boundary between themselves and those neighbors they considered undesirable. The norms entail no crime, no loitering, no violence, no drug dealing, no stealing, and respecting the neighbors. Before the BCW became involved in the community, the Primary group had fewer options at convincing their neighbors to enforce the rules of the community. As one respondent states,

> They did clean up a whole lot. I'm talking about a lot. It's a difference around here. Back in the day when we was coming up cause the police wouldn't get here until the next morning. Now when we call and say the Jubilee, they coming.

The above quote from the "Family" member serves as an indication that the Primary group has acquired more control over their community. It also shows how the City of Dallas may be putting pressure on the police to communicate with residents to improve their community. Nonetheless, all residents of Congo now have the ability to sanction the Secondary network's adherence to the 'rules of the community' and even force residents to be expelled from the community. One of the younger core members explains:

When any neighbor comes on this street, they are like family. Whether the first week

or two or not, if they do not fit, I guarantee they are out of here the next week or two.

It must be noted, the norms of the community do not seek to exclude any Secondary

members. The community norms are based solely on protecting the community and not

allowing their lived-space to revert to what it was before neighborhood revitalization. In a

heartfelt interview, one of the residents candidly spoke about the changes within the

community. As she explains:

 We had a wild life. We went through so much coming up. People breaking into our

house. You know those water fans in the windows? Somebody came through and put

ether through everybody fans. Some kind of thing that put you to sleep. They robbed

everybody on the whole street. When we woke up our purse, our clothes was in like a

big ole' field right here with trees behind our house. We was finding everybody stuff

in the bushes. They done cleaned our whole house up. Everybody was in the house

sleep. Whoever did it, did a good job. They cleaned us out; everybody on this street.

To prevent occasions such as the one stated above the Primary group members have more

recently formed a sort of eye on the street neighborhood watch system, which helps the

bolster the community policing model created by the Dallas Police Department.

According to the data, the Primary network is conscientious of their community

and they always have been. As Mr. Brown quite directly supports:

They maintained their community before we got there. Most people might

have seen it as poorly maintained or not maintained the way they would have

preferred, but that's an outward view.

As aforementioned, some of the residential members of the Secondary network may not

be as attached to the Congo Street. Nonetheless, whether they adhere to the norms of the community or not, the Secondary network residents are safeguarded by virtue of residing on the street. As one respondent states:

> You can be sitting right outside see your neighbor house broken into. I done call the police many times. If I see it, he going to jail because I wouldn't want nobody breaking in mine. If I'm at home and these my neighbors, I'm going make sure don't nobody go in my neighbor house. If my brother breaking in people house he going to jail, and that's just what that is.

4.3 Trust in whom they know

Trust amongst the Primary members of the community also emerged from the data. Trust between the residential networks could be observed through their interactions with one another. The close-fitting bond between members of the Primary network illustrates the level of trust they have for one another. The renters who civically engage in activities that provide them entree to the social capital resources are also bound to the Primary network by trust, hence the creation of the "Family."

Trust between those they know is also illustrated in the way they welcome outsiders into the community. Like other close-fitting groups, the "Family" is leery of outsiders. For instance, on several occasions while interviewing on Congo Street, the interview was interrupted by Primary network members who wanted to know about what other in-group members were conversing with me about.

Trust is also used to lessen in-group member's doubts of outsiders. An example of this type situation and how this conclusion was drawn was captured in an in-depth interview with one of the Primary network members. While we were interviewing

36

another resident walked up and began observing.

Interviewer: If you have the opportunity will you help preserve the historical context of Congo Street? What I mean by historical context is the history that is being made by all of the residents of Congo Street in making your community strong and better than before.

Respondent C: Yes.

Interviewer: What are some ways you intend to do this?

Respondent C: Break that down...

Interviewer: Well, you attend the crime meetings, correct? You stated earlier that you maintain the connection to the Jubilee Park neighborhood through your active participation the community meetings and working with the children. Is this something that you intend to continue and advocate for other residents in the community to do?

Bystander: What can you do now to make better for your kids. You can socialize with your kids and you can alert them and let them know...Like if we was at a crime watch meeting and they was telling you about an area that has a lot of crime, you could go home and alert your children is to the situations about what's going on. I don't want you all hang with that crew. When you see that crew, you separate yourself. If you see them doing anything, you alert someone in charge and tell them that they are doing it. That's something you would do. That's how you take charge in your children's life. So your children can say, "One day my dad did this and we are a part of the Jubilee," and it could actually turn into a legacy. Looking out for your family,

and your community, a better place and a better place for your children to grow up and live in ...

Respondent C: She is smart. Whatever she just said. Y'all will make a good interview.

The above scenario illustrates how the "Family" network sticks together. Their willingness to help their neighbor and even receive help is based on trust. The excerpt also shows how one interview respondent can influence other in-group members to participate or not participate in certain activities. After explaining the question to the interview participant, and the interview concludes, the bystander asked me to repeat some of the responses the participant provided. After explaining to them that the information was confidential and could not be shared, I immediately asked if she would be interested in participating in the interview. She eagerly accepted to be interviewed.

4.4 Selective Institutional Trust

The data also revealed the residents have preference in their use of the neighborhood institutions. The networks place trust in the formal civic institutions based primarily on their experiences with the staff. As mentioned earlier, the Primary group worked closely with both the Jubilee Community Center and the BCW to aid in the revitalization of their community and neighborhood. More recently, however, the six homeowners have chosen to only cooperate with the BCW. It can be assumed then that the Secondary network residents are more active with the Jubilee Community Center than the primary group and maybe even the "family." Some of the members from the "Family" mentioned in the interviews that they do not agree with the fairness of the rules, dislike the lack of ethnic diversity in community representation and some just have no interest in participating. They went on to indicate that the staff at the community center are not

38

racially inclusive and show preferential treatment to neighborhood Latinos. For this reason and possibly others, some members of the "Family" network tend to shun the programs and services offered by the center. Articulating this concern, one respondent affirms:

> The older folks the one made Jubilee. The reason I don't go there because, they got rid of Mrs. Walker. She made Jubilee happen. Made sure the senior citizens came first. Made sure the youth and teenagers and the kids safe in the neighborhood. They had trips and everything for the kids in the neighborhoods. If they needed something like in school paper, or clothes, shots or whatever, she was always helping the community out. It wasn't just for Blacks. It was for everybody. She wasn't out for just one certain person. Now as the Jubilee grow older it is all about Latinos. We was up there cleaning ... Whatever program they had, whatever activities they had outside. We even cooked at our house and took it around there. We was the only one to stay around and clean up our mess. The Latinos would eat and leave ... Now it's all about the Latinos.

Overlooking or possibly unaffected by the above claim, two families from the Secondary network actively engages in activities at the Jubilee Community Center and receives services from the organization when they are in need. A staff member at the community center comments on the issue:

> Oftentimes, the people who reside on Congo Street do not participate. I know who does is a senior. I see him pretty regularly. He comes to a lot of the senior events. But, many of the other Congo Street residents do not come to the meetings. If some of them do come by the center, they may be in need of financial assistance.

39

Careful not to misconstrue the above claim, in many ways the data provides insight into what services Congo Street residents may be lacking. Instead of the educational resources and/ or crime prevention meetings offered by the Jubilee Community Center, some residents of Congo may desire services tailored to their needs as a stakeholder of the neighborhood. As one of the newer residents of Congo states:

> I can't do the exercising classes cause I'm disabled. I don't go to any classes cause I got my GED. Cooking classes, I know how to cook; I'm an old cook. My grandchildren though, they be there every week. My son he goes over there. We active cause his four is over there. He is pretty much active with it. So I gets my information from him. You know we got turkeys from them. So that was something they brought by.

The findings suggest that the BCW staff is so well trusted by the Primary network that they welcome them without question into the "Family" network. This was not surprising since the BCW interacts more with the primary members than the other neighborhood institutions. BCW staff member and Congo Street resident Omar explains:

> I was more and more around the families and the rest of the residents there. Those with special needs and everything and I was done there building. I would work on Fridays and hang out afterwards. Then I needed a place to stay. I felt like I have a good rapport with everybody on the street. They were very welcoming. They were like, "Come on in."

> It's a very tight community, but there is some crime in the neighborhood.

> The immediate reaction was, "You know you helped us out. We got your back."

Moreover, the BCW offered direct assistance to the small network of homeowners when

the elite stakeholders at the Jubilee Park Community Center did not show much interest.

4.5 Cooperation

It could be determined from the data that the Primary network has influence over the norms of the Congo Street community. They do not readily extend membership into the "Family" network to Secondary network members unless they cooperatively adhere to the norms of a revitalized Congo Street community. Each of the nine interviewees agreed that in order to maintain the current revitalized state of the community, certain steps must be made where all residents cooperate with one another. A conversation with one of the renters recognizes this assumption and accepts her part in helping maintain the community:

Interviewer: Have any of the changes that have occurred sparked your interest in becoming involved in your community or maybe even volunteering at the Jubilee Center?

Respondent G: Yes, I would but I can't say how nobody else would feel. But, if there was somebody that would step out and say let's get it cleaned up a little bit better than what it was instead of me trying to force my own opinion, I would. See, I am disabled... But, if someone were to pull us together I would pull all the way with them. It needs to be something done.

In order to understand how cooperation occurs between all the residential networks on Congo Street, it was necessary to find a commonality that possibly linked them together to bring about the idea of 'family.' To do this, each interviewee was asked to define community. As expected, their responses were varied, but interestingly the idea of 'people interacting' together reoccurred in each response.

The nature of the Congo Street residential interaction is founded on the belief that both Primary and Secondary networks have the agency to cooperate with one another in order to maintain the idea of 'community.' However, it is difficult to assume that *all* Secondary group members will fit into the "Family" because not all of them have the same communal interests. As result, they do not readily cooperate with residents and/ or members that they do not trust. For example, one of the residents spoke informally about their lack of desire to participate with the neighbors. They mentioned that they had deep-rooted issues with some of their neighbors and saw no chance of resolve. The individual explained that they do not act in community activities with the neighbors because it is not necessary to reside on the street. Such a scenario may seem crass, but the resident may be correct. However, for the community revitalization goals set by residents of the community and their neighborhood institutions, all Congo Street residents must do their part. In fact, doing so makes them a more actualized community. A respondent supports this statement in the following quote:

Interviewer: What makes them 'family?'

Respondent A: They look out for one another.

The impression given from the above excerpt is that residents of Congo cooperate and share with one another making the community resilient because that is what "family" does. A Congo Street stakeholder explains in the following conversation about renters and homeowners:

Interviewer: Is there homeowner renter division on Congo Street?

Respondent A: Its not a homeowner/ renter issue. Its not a division of class based on asset. It's more of a personal. A 'crack head,' or 'mean old woman,' or 'she shot a bb at

my son.' It's like family. It's like the aunt that no one really likes. That's what's so fascinating about that place. The spatial structure forces that. When you sit on your porch and you're 19 or 24 ft. away from someone else sitting on the porch, its like sitting on two sides of this room.

Therefore, from the data, civic engagement between the Primary and Secondary network produces actions that strengthen the Congo Street community. By actively cooperating with one another, informally and/ or formally, the community is positioned to accept community revitalization interests, and act in ways which are conducive to their shared interest.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Social Capital and Community Redevelopment

As Schulman & Anderson (2009) noted, social capital is a form of power that can be created, accumulated, or destroyed. The dimensions of social capital--- networks, norms, and trust--- shown throughout the findings from Congo Street are congruent with the idea that social capital is an embedded resource accessible to those various network members which constantly invest in the social connections that aim to preserve the overall community.

5.1.1 Networks

Lin (2001) noted, access to better social capital generally happens for those who have better locational access to the bridge to the needed resources. For instance, the Primary network has an uninterrupted strong-tie to the B. C. Workshop. The small network of residents receives guidance to resolve community problems, obtains a steady flow of information, and is gradually being socialized in community organizing. The Secondary network does not directly bridge into this resource of social capital because they are renters. Instead, to obtain the some of the informational resources provided to members of the Primary network they must willingly cooperate with them and become a member of the "Family." Hence, networks are hierarchical within the community of Congo Street; thereby social capital is the stimulus for the community's sustenance. The social capital that arises from the Primary group's interaction with the B.C. Workshop spills over into the community and allows the willing members of the Secondary group to reap the certain communal benefits otherwise not obtainable had they not informally engaged. This social arrangement seems to be coordinated with the revitalization goals of the two nonprofit institutions that

serve the community. However, as Putnam (2007) warns, the ability to achieve community

goals do not imply that what is accomplished will be socially beneficial for *all* residents.

5.1.2 Norms

The maintenance of the community revitalization efforts is a multidimensional

process involving the support of all Congo residents. Bourdieu (1980) suggests that not only

must these residents maintain value in their network, but they must also exert energy into its

upkeep. The upholding of norms of Congo Street is one way the "Family" network preserves

the revitalization goals of their collective. Therefore, they have a certain amount of pride in

the improvements of their community. As Brent Brown explained earlier, the strong Primary

network already had the capacity to organize long before redevelopment occurred. They just

lacked some of the tools needed to further improve their community. The Primary group uses

the tools acquired by redevelopment efforts to nurture other residents into the "Family"

network. They exemplify this by protecting their neighbors and assisting them when they are

in need.

It is the desire of the "Family" network that each Congo Street resident will do what

is best for their community. When this is violated, the "Family" network creates sanctions in

order to bolster the interests of the community. One way this is performed by the residents is

with the use of the police. The police are trusted to regulate order when needed within the

community. Many members of the "Family" have a comfortable relationship with the police,

and can readily get assistance from them when they need to. A long-time Primary network

resident stresses this as they spoke about unwelcome Secondary network members who come

to informal community events and begin to get unruly:

I'm going to speed dial my police officer, and I ain't got to wait no two or three

hours. They going to be here in one minute.

As the data suggests, the low levels of cooperation between the "Family" and the Secondary network can hamper the advancement of the community. For instance, it is believed by many of the residents that the rental property owners are slumlords and do not properly manage their properties. As result, the small duplexes have remained dilapidated structures resembling the prior state of the five homes revitalized by the BCW. Further, one of the landlords rents to persons who may not be willing to adhere to the norms of the community, thus it becomes more difficult for revitalization efforts to be successful. The "Family" network constantly attempts to manage these negative externalities. One respondent explains:

> We had drug people coming in. You have to sit about two or three days...to see what's going on. We had breaking in other [peoples] houses from North Dallas. Every morning I get up, what I'm looking at? I'm looking at flat screens TVs, camcorders, wheels, everything from these people house. I was like. Gotcha.

> Then we had dope house here **pointing across the street**, got spotted out. My homegirl Misty (police officer) said, "We got a couple of people like drug dealers." I said, " Yeah ... but that house right there been breaking in. They come in and fight. They fight, argue, ride up and down the street. We got kids be outside playing. They be out there fighting (rowdy neighbors)

> Don't nobody want to hear that. Then they start like, the girls come ask my brother for a cigarette, or a Tylenol, or Hydrocodeine for they brains and stuff like that. They started cussing me out. I called [the police] to come around here. We having problems. They needed to go.

Unable to trust that some of the members of the Secondary network will share in the interests

of the community, the "Family" reinforces their revitalization energies through closure.

5.1.3 Closure

Communities like Congo Street are spaces where common values and social control are realized (Sampson, 2001). Many of the Congo Street residents desire to reside in a community that is aesthetically appealing and safe. The formulated rules create a periphery of protection around not only the "Family," but also other social networks on the street. Closure creates an obvious social capital disconnect between the "Family" and members of the Secondary network who have not gained the trust of the Primary network. Closure of the "Family" network is purposeful and determined. As Coleman (1988) suggests, closure is the "property of social relations on which effective norms depend" (S105). On Congo Street, the "Family" network is bonded in such a way that closure helps to prevent the negative externalities that hamper the revitalization goals of the community.

5.1.4 Trust

Trust between residents of Congo Street can be observed through the secondary networks being accepted into the "Family" network. This shows that trust and the adherence to the rules of the community are causally linked. Cooperation between the residents is based on their ability to trust one another and believe that each resident will protect the interests of the community (Fukuyama, 1995). A long-time resident of the street explains:

Together, we work as a whole. This is a drama-free street filled with family and love. That's what it is going to be...It is no longer the hang out street, the fight street, the come do your dirt street. This is now a normal positive regular street now... It's a family bond on this street. There is more family on this street than actual neighbors

47

and strangers. But anytime, neighbors of any kind come and sit in with us they know

this is going to be a great place to be when they meet the family and see how cool and

laid back we are.

It appears from the findings that at the heart of Congo Street revitalization, is the idea

that all residents will take ownership of the community and make it a safe neighborhood for

all to reside. This is achieved by Congo Street residents voluntarily engaging in civic

activities conducive to the enrichment of their community. The act of the two distinct

networks coalescing to form the "Family" network is in itself initiated by each resident

participant trusting the other. Trust then, is the foundation of civic participation on Congo

Street.

5.1.5 Civic Engagement

Civic engagement begets power for those who participate to help themselves

(DuBois, 1907). As such, by participating in formal civic engagement within the

neighborhood and community, the residents of Congo may have a better chance at

overcoming the structural boundaries that separate them from the governing functions of the

neighborhood. One way negotiation between the parties may occur is through all residents'

participation in formal civic engagement activities with the Jubilee Park and Community

Center and the Community Resource Center.

The City of Dallas plays an integral role in helping Congo Street residents in the

formal civic engagement process. Because of their enhanced community-policing model, the

Dallas Police Department and members of the "Family" have established a strong connection

with one another. The police work closely with certain residents from the network to combat

crime on their street. Many of the interviewees glorified the improvements initiated by the

City of Dallas, but can the city do more to progress the way of life of the Congo Street community? As seen in the research findings, beyond the community police officers, residents do not engage in dialogue with any other city officials. When some of the interviewees were asked what City Council person represented their district none of the respondents knew. This finding illustrates an obvious divide between the city government and the community.

CHAPTER 6

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from Congo Street elucidate how community revitalization is influenced by the networks engaging with one another. Upon deeper reflection, it becomes evident that the division between the networks of Congo Street may create a larger problem for community revitalization efforts in the long term if common ground is not realized by all stakeholders. For instance, the community center and SMAAEC, though it touts of the successes of Congo Street, its residents are separated collectively from the idea of a united Jubilee Park neighborhood. To mend the broken bridge, the Jubilee Park and Community Center along with SMAEEC must take the initiative to do what it takes to encourage these residents to become involved in the governance of not only their community but of their neighborhood as well.

As the results illustrate, all of the networks on Congo Street are resources of social capital, and the steps the residents collectively make to maintain their community is through informal and formal civic engagement. For civic engagement to transpire the Primary, Secondary, and "Family," networks must become more involved in the process. Examples of civic engagement includes volunteering, participating in neighborhood meetings, organizing the neighborhood around issues pertaining to its sustenance, etc. Civic engagement can be achieved first with the Primary and Secondary network engaging in informal civic participation whereby they help one another within the collective as a community. By collectively cooperating with one another the Congo Street community becomes more attractive to outsiders. Upon the Primary and Secondary network amalgamating into a

50

collective that includes all stakeholders on Congo Street rather than a select few, the fruits of civic engagement can be enjoyed and praised.

It is essential for landlords to realize that they are generating harm if they remain detached from the revitalization processes of Congo Street. In essence, their priority with financial capital, which may be creating the problem, must not run opposite to the overall revitalization of the community. Additionally, the neighborhood institutions must be malleable to the needs of Congo Street residents if there is to be mediation between them and Congo Street residents. They must replace their strong need for more clients with that of a residential self-sufficiency. There is one caveat to this claim. As with redevelopment in distressed communities, there usually remains the need for continual guidance once the community's redevelopment project is completed.

Both the BCW and the Jubilee Park Community Center agency missions are founded on encouraging Congo Street residents to civically engage in bettering their community. But many of the residents may not know how to interact with one another. As one of the participants stated about the issue:

> You can't put anyone at fault for what they don't know. A lot of people don't know.
> Just for the fact they don't know, no one told them that they didn't know, its ok for
> them not to know. So they have the 'I don't want to know' attitude. That's why our
> community sits to where it sits.

Congo Street landlords, the Jubilee Park and Community Center and SMEEAC, could possibly further their organizational goals if they were to willingly connect with the BCW. The BCW provides a working model of residential self-sufficiency that utilizes the social capital of the community without jeopardizing the long-term goals of their

revitalization mission. The BCW works closely with the Primary network to empower the residents with the skills they can use to navigate through the process of strengthening their community through civic engagement.

As community stewards, the neighborhood institutions and public officials must understand that the Congo Street networks may not have the communicative skills to engage in the governance of their community. Nonetheless, as a group they have the capacity to learn, organize and inform their peers of the needs and wants of their community. Ultimately, the residents of Congo Street and those of the Jubilee Park neighborhood must be socialized into the behaviors that promote their interaction with governmental officials, sitting on boards of the nonprofit agencies, and other progressive community-building activities. For example, the Community Resource Center in the neighborhood serves as the governmental hub -- houses the police department and the Community Prosecutor's Office. From the findings, the facility was not mentioned by any of the residents, nor was it stated by any of the nonprofit personnel to be an integral holding place for the residents' creation or continuation of social capital. If the residents do not use the structure for civic engagement what is its general purpose? The building could serve as a voting location for local, state, and national elections. The facility could also provide open-house activities to familiarize the community as to what role the City of Dallas plays in revitalizing Congo Street and the Jubilee Park neighborhood. Both suggestions would likely build trust between the residents, private and the governmental stakeholders, and as revealed throughout the study, trust produces cooperation.

CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY

The community is a complex system with many different social networks all functioning to achieve a certain level of individual or collective effectiveness. If social capital on Congo Street is treated as the necessary ingredient for community redevelopment set forth by the City of Dallas, BCW, and the SMAEEC, civic engagement between all stakeholders must be expected so as to produce results that are more productive. Further social capital research on Congo Street must remember that social networks are wavering structures that change, and are contingent. As the findings from this study recommend, to stabilize the networks within the communities like Congo Street, civic engagement with the intent of widening the scope of redevelopment must occur. In this way, a civic-minded Congo Street will be one that actively engages in high levels of cooperation with others.

To achieve additional civic engagement on Congo Street, the neighborhood institutions must ask themselves, "Are we providing the skills for *all* residents to civically engage in the process of building community." As Stoutland (1999) heralds, community institutions must be places where all networks unite and engage in civic activities thereby promoting change for their collectives. With assistance from the BCW, the "Family" network is progressively gaining the capacity to build their community from the inside out and take ownership for its upkeep. Interestingly, the residents are not being coerced or bribed into the revitalization process. Instead, they are empowered through the Primary network's constant interaction with the BCW. The nonprofit maintains an active role in the lives of the Primary group even though the Congo Street Green Initiative is complete.

All of the residents have a moral commitment to the preservation of their community. As one resident acknowledges:

> We take much pride in what people have come into our lives and we refuse for any
>
> other the negative forces come in and have a negative on something that has been
>
> developed in a positive way.

This statement confirms that some of the residents are willing and competent enough to guide their community into the next stages of redevelopment. But like any redeveloped community they must be provided the skills and opportunity to do so.

The "Family" on Congo Street, is where social capital is converted into a form of civic engagement. In this sense, civic engagement is not only produced by social capital, but it also protects it. It is advisable for both the BCW and the Jubilee Park Community Center to reinforce the "Family," but be cautious not create a client-based neighborhood that is solely dependent on nonprofit interference. By no means does this suggest that the underserved community in position to sustain itself independent of the more structured community institutions. Instead, residents should be provided the necessary skills, which make the community more welcoming to wider revitalization such as economic development.

Residents and landlords also have the responsibility of acknowledging that the whole Congo Street community's success rests in the opportunity for *all* of the stakeholders' to engage in the formal and informal civics of the neighborhood. This is the heart of the social capital process. Only through such choices and decisions can the rich social capital of Congo Street succeed in any redevelopment effort.

APPENDIX A

NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTION STAFF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What year(s) do/ did you work on Congo Street?

2. What was your role within [Agency]?

3. Tell me something about you...Where did you grow up?

----

1. What is the mission and vision of the agency?

2. So in keeping with the mission and vision, where do you see Congo Street in the next 10 years?

----

1. Is the project an ongoing project or is it short-term?

2. What were some of the partnering agencies involved in the Congo Street Initiative?

3. Is the community initiative similar in structure to that of any other in community redevelopment program that you are familiar with?

4. What do you believe makes the residents of the Congo Street unlike others across the metroplex?

5. As far as the wider Jubilee Park community, how did/ does the agency propose and/ or encourage Congo resident's involvement?

6. What were some of the challenges in obtaining and maintaining community involvement?

7. About how many Congo Street residents do/ did you observe participating in the community activities?

8. In your own words, how do you define community?

9. What are 3 strengths of the project pertaining to your definition of community?

10. What are 3 weaknesses of the project pertaining to your definition of community?

11. Did you observe any changes in the attitudes of the residents on Congo Street?

12. Did the resident participation increase or decrease while you were working with

   [agency]?

13. What does the agency expect of the residents of Congo Street?

----

1. Do you remain informed with the progress of the community?

2. Do you keep in contact with any of the previous residents?

3. What advice can you provide to present and future residents of Congo Street?

   Any advice for nonresidents?

4. If provided the opportunity would you take part in any volunteer efforts to

      help maintain the histories of Congo Street?

APPENDIX B

CONGO STREET RESIDENT INTERVIEW SCRIPT

1. Tell me something about you. Where were you born? Where did you grow up?

2. How long have you resided on Congo Street?

3. Do you have children? Were your children raised on Congo Street?

4. Do you attend church within the community? If no, have you ever? If so, where?

5. Tell me more about the history of how your family came to reside on Congo Street.

6. Are you familiar with the history of the renaming of Congo Street that occurred in the

    1934?

7. Are you involved in any social clubs within the community?

---

1. Describe some changes that you have seen in the past 10 years on Congo Street?

2. Were or are you involved in any of the redevelopment efforts of your

    neighborhood?

3. Do you participate in community activities? If so, what activities?

4. What do/ did you enjoy most about the program(s) you are/ were involved in?

5. Were you encouraged to become involved in the redevelopment of the

    community? If so, how?

6. What programs would you like to see offered for your community?

---

1. How often do you converse with other Congo Street residents?

2. Are you related to any of Congo Street neighbors?

3. How do you define community?

4. What makes the Congo Street community unlike other communities in the

    metroplex?

5. Is the history of Congo Street similar to that of Jubilee Park? If so, how? If not, tell me more.

_____

1. Has your community changed? In what way?

2. What do you like most about the way your community has changed?

3. What do you like least about the changes of your neighborhood?

4. Have any of the changes influenced your participation in community or neighborhood redevelopment?

5. In the next 10 years do you see your household residing on Congo Street? If so, what are some ways that you can promote community involvement?

_____

1. Do you keep up with the progress of the community?

2. Do you keep in touch with any of the previous residents?

3. What advice can you provide to the present and future residents of
        Congo Street? Any advice for nonresidents?

4. If provided the opportunity would you take part in any volunteer efforts to
        help preserve the unique history of Congo Street?

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Appleton, R. (2007, December 10). In Jubilee Park, $6M gift is reason for hope. *The Dallas Morning News*, from http://www.boonepickens.com/pdf/article11.pdf.

Arregle, J. L., Hitt, M., Sirmon, D., & Very, P. (2007). The Development of organizational social capital: Attributes of family firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(1): 73-95.

Bandura, A. J. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bell, S. E. (2009) There Ain't no bond in town like there used to be: The Destruction of social capital in the West Virginia coalfields. *Sociological Forum*, 24(3): 631-657.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, Loic J. D. (1992). *An Invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1983). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.

_____ (1984). *Distinction: A Social critique of the judgment of taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Brehm, J., & Rahn, W. (1997). Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3): 999-1023.

Brown, J. J., & Reingen, P. H. (1987). Social Ties and Word-of-Mouth Referral Behavior. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 14(3): 350-362.

Burt, R. S. (1992). *The social structure of competition. Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A Practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Clark, K. B. (1965). *Dark ghetto: Dilemmas of social power*. New York: Harper & Row.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: S95-S120.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Cooley, C. H. (1924). *Social organization: A study of the larger mind*. New York: Scribner's Son.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Deegan, M. J. (2001). The Chicago School of Ethnography, in *Handbook of Ethnography*, in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delemont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (eds.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1907). Economic Co-operation among Negro Americans (Atlanta University), from University of Massachusetts, Special Collection Web site: http://www.library.umass.edu/spcoll/digital/dubois/dubois12.pdf.

_____(1908). The Souls of Black folks. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.: [Cambridge]: University Press.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 1998. Brown kids in white suburbs: Housing mobility and the many faces of social capital. *Housing Policy Debate* 9(1): 177-221.

de Tocqueville, A. (1994). *Democracy in America*, London: Fontana Press.

Durlauf, S. N. (1999). The case against social capital. *Focus*, 20(3).

Edin, K. and Lein, L. (1997). *Making ends meet: How Single mothers survive welfare and low-wage work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Elkin, S. L. (1987). State and market in city politics: Or, the "Real" Dallas. In C. Stone and H. Sanders (eds.), *The Politics of Urban Development* (pp. 25-51). Lawrence, KS.: University Press of Kansas.

Flora, J. L. (1998). Social capital and communities of place. *Rural Sociology* 63(4): 481-506.

Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the creative class and how it is transforming work, leisure, community, and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

Forrest, R. & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12): 2125–2144.

Friedkin, N. (1982). Information flow through strong and weak ties in intraorganizational social networks. *Social Networks,* 3: 273-285.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). Social capital and the global economy. *Foreign Affairs*, 74 (HHHH): 89-103.

Fulkerson, G. & Thompson, G. H. (2008). The Evolution of a contested concept: A Meta-Analysis of social capital definitions and trends (1988-2006). *Sociological Inquiry*. 78(4): 536-557.

Gittell, R. & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967) The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology,* 78: 1360-
    1380.

Green, M. & Brock T. C. (1998). Trust, mood, and outcomes of friendship determine
    preferences for real versus ersatz social capital. *Political Psychology*, 19(3): 527-544.

Greenbaum SD. 1982. Bridging ties at the neighbourhood level. *Social Networks*, 4: 367-384.

Hanifan, L. J. (1916). The rural school community center. *Annals of the American Academy
    of Political and Social Science,* 67: 130-138.

Hansen MT. 1999. The search transfer problem: The role ofweak ties in sharing knowledge
    across organization subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(1): 82-84.

Henning, C. & Lieberg, M. (1996). Strong ties or weak ties? Neighbourhood networks in a
    new perspective. *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research* 13(1): 3-26.

Hethcock, B. (2007, November 11). Dallas developer buys old Ford assembly plant. *Dallas
    Business Journal*, from

    http://www.bizjournals.com/dallas/stories/2007/11/12/story7.html

Hornburg, S. P. & Lang, R. E. (1997). What Is Social Capital and Why Is
    It Important to Public Policy? Paper presented at the *Annual Housing Conference of
    the Fannie Mae Foundation*, April 30, Washington, DC.

Hyman, J. B. (2002). Exploring social capital and civic engagement to create a framework
    for community building. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4): 196-202.

Jacobs, D. (1988). Corporate Taxation and Corporate Economic Power. *American Journal of
    Sociology.* 93(6): 852-81.

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.

Kavanaugh, A., Reese, D., Carroll, J., & Rosson, M. (2005). Weak Ties in networked communities. *Information Society*, 21(2): 119-131.

Kleinhans, R., Priemus, H., & Engbersen, G. (2005). Understanding social capital in recently restructured urban neighbourhoods: Two Case studies in Rotterdam. *Urban Studies*, 5(6): 1069-1091.

Kretzman, J. P. & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A Path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets.* Evanston, IL: ACTA publications.

Levin, D. Z. and Cross, R. (2004). The strength of weak ties you can trust: The Mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science*, 50(11): 1477–1490.

Lin N & Dumin M. 1986. Access to occupations through social ties. *Social Networks*, 8: 365-385.

Lin, N. (1982). Social resources and instrumental action, in P. V. Marsden and N. Lin (eds.) *Social Structure and Network Analysis*, pp. 131-145. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A Theory of social structure and action*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lockhart, W. H. (2005). Building bridges and bonds: Generating social capital in secular and faith based poverty-to-work programs. *Sociology of Religion* 66(1): 45-60.

Martinez-Cosio, M. (2006). It is not just who you know: Dominant knowledge and civic participation. *Journal of Civil Society*, 2(2): 123-141.

Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). American apartheid: segregation and the making of the underclass. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press**.**

McBride, A.M., Sherraden, M.S., and Pritzker, S. (2006). Civic Engagement among low-
income and low-wealth families: In Their words." *Family Relations*, 55(2): 152-162.

Mcclean, S. L. (2002). Patriotism, generational change, and the politics of sacrifice, in S.
McLean, D. Schultz, and M. Steger (eds.), *Social capital: Critical perspectives on
community and "Bowling Alone."* New York: University Press.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Brashears, (2006). Social isolation in America: Changes
in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review*, 71(3):
353-375.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education:
Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco, CA:
Wiley & Sons.

Narayan, D. & Pritchett, L. (1999). Social capital: Evidence and implications. *Social Capital:
A Multifaceted perspective*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Newman, K. & Wyly, E. K. (2003). The Right to stay put revisited:

Gentrification and resistance to displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies*, 43(1): 23-
57.

Oh, H., Chung, M. & Labianca, G. (2004). Group social capital and group effectiveness: The
role of informal socializing ties. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6): 860-875.

Ohmer, M., & Beck, E. (2006). Citizen participation in neighborhood organizations in poor
communities and its relationship to neighborhood and organizational collective
efficacy. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, *33*(1), 179-202.

Onyx, J. & Bullen, P. (2000). Measuring social capital in five communities. *The Journal of
Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1): 23-42.

Paxton, P. 1999. Is social capital declining in the United States? A multiple indicator assessment. *American Journal of Sociology,* 105: 88-127.

Portes, A. and Landolt, P. (1996) The downside of social capital. *The American Prospect*, 26: 18–21.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its Origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 1- 24.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). The Prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, 13: 35-42.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1): 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. (2002). *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R. D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture, *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2): 137.

Riger, S., & Laurakas, P. J. (1981). Community ties: Patterns of attachment and social interaction in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 9(1): 55-66.

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2008). *Community organizing and development.* (Rev. ed.). Boston, Mass.: Pearson Education.

Saegert, S. (2006). Building civic capacity in urban neighborhoods: An Empirically grounded anatomy. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(3): 275-294.

Sampson, R. (1999). What community supplies, in R. Ferguson and W. Dickens (eds.), *Urban Problems and Community Development*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Schulman, M. & Anderson, C. (1999). The Dark side of the force: A Case study of restructuring and social capital. Rural Sociology, 64(3): 351-372.

Schweizer, T., Schnegg, M., & Berzborn, S. (1998). Personal networks and social support in a multi-ethnic community of Southern California. *Social Networks*, 20(1): 1-21.

Shemtov, R. (2003). Social networks and sustained activism in local NIMBY campaigns. *Sociological Forum*, 18(2): 215-244.

Small, M. L. (2004). *Villa Victoria: The Transformation of Social Capital in a Boston Barrio*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sobel, J. (2002). Can We Trust Social Capital? *Journal of Economic Literature,* 40: 139-154.

Stone, C. N. (2001). Civic capacity and urban education. *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(5): 595-619.

Stone, W. (2001). Measuring social capital: Towards a theoretically informed measurement framework for researching social capital in family and community life. *Family Matters* Autumn: 38.

Stoutland, S. E. (1999). Community development corporations: Mission, strategy and accomplishments, in R. F. Ferguson & W. T. Dickens (eds.), *Urban Problems and Community Development*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Texas Department of Transportation (2007). The East Corridor: An IH 30/ US 80 Design, from http.//: www.eastcorridor.org.

The Living Church Archive, 2010, from

archive.livingchurch.org/search?query=jubilee+park&x=-1107&y=-24

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2010, June). Four model affordable

housing developments earn prestigious HUD Secretary Design Award. (HUD No. 10-

120).

http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/press_releases_media_advisories/20

10/HUDNo.10-120

Uslaner, E. M. (1999). Trust but verify: Social capital and moral behavior. Social Science

Information, 38: 29-56.

Wacquant & Wilson, (1989). The Cost of racial and class exclusion in the inner-city. *Annals*

of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 501: 8–25.

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 S. Saegert, J. P. Thompson, & M. R. Warren (Eds.), *Social capital in poor*

communities (pp. 1-28). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Weimann, Gabriel (1983). The Strength of weak conversational ties in the flow of

information and influence. *Social Networks*, 5: 245-267.

Weissman, D. (2000). *A Social Ontology*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1978). *The Declining significance of race: Blacks and changing American*

institutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____(1987). *The Truly disadvantaged: The Inner city, the underclass and public*

policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____(2009). More than just race: Being Black and poor in the inner city. New York:

      W. W. Norton & Co.

Woolcock, M. (2001). The place of social capital in understanding social and economic

      outcomes. *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research* 2(1): 1-17.

Wynder, E. L. (1994). Investigator bias and interviewer bias: The Problem of reporting

      systemic error in epidemiology. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 47(8): 825-827

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

A 2010 recipient of the Benjamin Gilman International Scholarship, Deidre studied abroad at Thammasat University in Thailand. Introduced to the various cultures, ethnic groups and nationalities while abroad piqued Deidre's desire to study urban affairs from an interdisciplinary perspective. Upon arrival back to the states, Deidre graduated from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2011 with a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies. She then entered the School of Urban and Public Affairs where she later earned a Master of Arts in May 2013.