[105] Fla. Stat. 163.3177(6)(f).

[106] Fla .Stat. 163.3177.

[107] Fla. Stat. 163.3177(6)(f).

[108] Fla. Stat. 163.3177(6)(f).

[109] Fla. Stat. 380.06(12)(a)(3) (1993).

Chapter Fifteen

Social Isolation in a Southern City: Social Dislocation and Community in Jacksonville

Jeffry A. Will and Henry Camp

MACRO CHANGE, SOCIAL DISLOCATION, AND THE UNDERCLASS

In this paper, we examine the impact of social and economic changes on residents in Jacksonville's poor, and predominately racial minority, neighborhoods. Melding macro-level, micro-level, and organizational data, we outline how structural changes, creating what William Julius Wilson (1987) has described as Social Isolation and Dislocation, have not been met by adequate response on the part of service providers from private, city, and state government sources.

In his landmark examination of Chicago, William J. Wilson (1987) examined how neighborhoods in Chicago were transformed from "normal" (albeit segregated) neighborhoods to ones in which large concentrations of the poor, criminals, female headed households, and the homeless became isolated from the economic gains of their former neighbors who were middle class and working. The toll this transformation takes is examined in light of research on Jacksonville, Florida. In this study, we utilize multiple methodological approaches to better understand how Wilson's model can be applied to Jacksonville, and, when moved to a micro-level of analysis, a better understanding of how we can approach these problems can be designed.

To this end, the following paper attempts to 1) examine Jacksonville from macro-level social and economic indicators and apply Wilson's model of social change; 2) examine one neighborhood in Jacksonville which most closely resembles these changes as predicted by Wilson; and 3) examine the micro-level impact these changes have had on the people of this neighborhood, and of Jacksonville in general.

Defining the Underclass

The debate over the precise definition of class is extensive and can hardly be decided in these few pages. However, some understanding of the usage of the term underclass and the implications such usage has in American society is important. As defined, underclass is a direct reference to a society with a general set of classes, including, perhaps, a working class and a land owning class. In their 1987 discussion of various approaches to defining the underclass, Cook and Curtin (1987) attempt to lay out the general outlines of various approaches for defining the underclass.

The most straightforward discussions of the underclass center on describing them as the extremely poor, such as homeless members of the population. By this definition, the underclass are those members of the population whose incomes, by official designation, fall below the poverty line and who are thus eligible for various, and varying, forms of governmental assistance. Defining these conditions of poverty is, however, not as straight forward as would be expected. In general, poverty as defined by the government is used as a definitive indicator of the underclass. Conservative and liberal debate over exactly what should be included as income in order to qualify for inclusion in the ranks of the poor, however, tends to cloud this indicator. For some, income should include "in kind" benefits received from the government, such as food stamps, housing subsidies, and medical assistance (e.g., Murray, 1984).

Others believe that official definitions of poverty highly underestimate the effect of income deprivation, and that the minimum required income levels for poverty association are too low (Bergmann, 1986; Rossi, 1989; 1987; Shapiro and Greenstein, 1986). Finally, some commentators see the definitional problems as less important than specifying the length of time people are poor or destitute (c.f., Duncan and Hoffman, 1985).

Cook and Curtin cite more straightforward sociological discussions (Cook et al, 1986; Wilson, 1989) of the underclass as ones that examine material well-being rather than just income levels. In one of the more visible discussions of the underclass, William J. Wilson (1989) defines the underclass as:

> . . . the most disadvantaged segments of the black urban community, that heterogeneous grouping of families and individuals who are outside the mainstream of the American Occupational System. Included in this group are individuals who lack training and skills and either experience long term spells of unemployment or are not members of the labor force, individuals who are engaged in crime and other forms of aberrant behavior, and families that experience long spells of poverty and or welfare dependence. These are the populations to which we refer when we speak of the *underclass* (emphasis Wilson's).

From a sociological view, inclusion of demographic and quality of life characteristics, as well as general lack of income, is important for understanding the makeup of the underclass.

A number of researchers examining the underclass have focused on the presence of extreme poverty among black Americans and, particularly, the inner city black poor. These studies suggest that "First, they are predominately unemployed and underemployed . . . they are predominately black . . . they are essentially an urban population . . . and, most importantly, they lack prospects for social mobility" (Rolison, 1991:288).

In addition, Massey (1990) argues that the indicators of membership in the underclass should also include segregation (in particular racial segregation) of the population from the economic and social resources that would allow for full participation in society. In particular, Massey argues that without racial segregation "the economic dislocations of the 1970's would not have produced...a socially and spatially isolated underclass" (Massey, 1990:330).

Finally, a number of researchers have focused on the extent to which this underclass represents a distinct "cultural" phenomenon, examining sexual behavior and family disruptions among the underclass (Anderson, 1989; Wilson, 1987), criminal and anti-social behavior among members of the underclass (particularly young males) (Jenks, 1991; Murray, 1984; Wilson, 1987), and the increase in unwed mothers dependent on welfare (McLanaghan and Garfinkel, 1991; Wilson, 1987). Whether explicitly stated as being a culturally (and morally) degenerate segment of the population (c.f., Murray, 1984) or seen as products of the effects of, and responses to, structural conditions (Jenks, 1991; Wilson, 1987), some commentators are concerned that this line of research is tantamount to "blaming the victim" for ills that are for the most part beyond the immediate remedial control of those persons most affected and is simplistic public policy implications (Jenks, 1991; Greenstone, 1991).

Although this discussion of the various approaches examining the characteristics of the underclass is only skeletal, the influence of some of these positions on the overall debate has caused some concern (Rolison, 1991). These various theoretical positions are open for (and are engaged in) extensive debate. For the purposes of this study, we are most concerned with how the structural processes of social and economic change have "set the stage" for the development of an isolated "underclass" within Jacksonville and how responses to this development have failed to prove effective as social policy.

FOCUS OF THIS STUDY

The primary focus of the macro-level examination of this project is to examine William Julius Wilson's process of the development of the Urban Underclass in light of changes in Jacksonville. In his landmark study of the development of the urban underclass, The Truly Disadvantaged, William J. Wilson (1987) examined how the rise of female headed households, welfare dependency, and economic isolation occurred in predominately black areas of Chicago between the 1950's and the 1980's. In particular, Wilson examined the city during the period most associated with Civil Rights gains made by African-Americans at large.

In this study, Wilson's model on change and development is applied to the City of Jacksonville between 1970 and 1990. We examine a number of socio-economic indicators for census tracts within Jacksonville to determine the extent of social isolation of the residents remaining in those neighborhoods and the exodus of black residents of the central city. Has the social isolation and the "*tangle of pathology*" discussed by Wilson (1987, 1994) also blighted this Southern city?

DATA AND MEASURES

Data used to examine the social isolation processes in Jacksonville are taken from the 1970, 1980, and 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing. Upon release of the next census in 2001, we can easily update the portrait of Jacksonville that follows. Use of census data allows us to compare both the overall picture of change in Jacksonville as well as local area neighborhood change as presented in census tracts.

All areas of the city were assigned census tracts beginning with the 1970 Census. Census tracts are "designed to be homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions."[2] In the following discussion, census tracts are therefore frequently discussed in terms of neighborhood composition. Indeed, an examination of the census map of Jacksonville supports this use in many situations.

For this analysis, we present data from the four (4) primary social indicators utilized in Wilson (1987) to better understand how Jacksonville's experience compares to that study. First, we examine overall population change in Jacksonville to better understand how population growth has been distributed within the city. Second, we examine changes in a number of social and economic measures, including income levels, employment, and poverty for the 1970 - 1990 period. Note that it is important to keep in mind that the data presented here represents snapshots of 1970, 1980, and 1990. Variations in social and economic conditions within the middle years have profound effects on quality of life, and thus limit some of the scope of this analysis. In the final section of this paper, we examine micro-level issues for one neighborhood using data from a small scale survey of residents, information from social service providers, and Jacksonville City records.

In his analysis, Wilson (1987) argues that a considerable force in the isolation of the underclass is the exodus of major segments of the population in "poor" neighborhoods, particularly those residents with the financial means to move. Out-migration of professionals, middle class, and many working class residents of previously segregated neighborhoods left neighborhoods with little or no economic and social solidarity. By examining population change, in conjunction with other socio-economic factors, underclass enclaves as described by Wilson (1987) will surface in Jacksonville much as they did in Northern "rust belt" cities.

Socio-Economic Indicators and Change

The Jacksonville MSA

In order to understand social and economic change, we first need to examine overall population changes in Jacksonville (Duval County). Since the Jacksonville/Duval County consolidation in 1968, Jacksonville has grown considerably. As can be seen in Chart 1, in 1970 the overall population of Jacksonville was slightly less than 530,000. By 1980, Jacksonville had increased in population to more than 571,000. This represents an increase of greater than 8 percent in the decade of the 1970s. Jacksonville had grown to more than 672,000, an increase of more than 27 percent since 1970, and almost an 18 percent growth during the 1980s. Census Bureau estimates for Jacksonville's population as of July 1, 1997 indicate that Jacksonville has approximately 732,600 residents.

Note that this represents growth only within the Jacksonville/Duval County borders. By 1990, the Jacksonville metropolitan area (MSA), which includes parts of the surrounding counties of St. Johns, Clay, Nassau and Baker, had grown to more than 906,000. In early 1996, the Jacksonville MSA topped the one million mark. In all, between 1970 and 1990, the greater Jacksonville area population had grown by more than 71 percent.

Population growth within the county varied significantly across racial groups. As can be seen in Chart 2, while population increased for all groups, minority race groups increased at a much faster pace than whites. The black population in Jacksonville increased by almost 39 percent between 1970 and 1990, while non-black minority groups increased almost 550 percent. The white population increased slightly more than 20 percent during this same period.

During this period, in addition to increasing in overall numbers, minority residents also increased their overall share of the population. In all, whites dropped from 77 percent of the population in 1970 to about 73 percent in 1990. The proportion of blacks increased from 22 percent of the population in 1970 to 24 percent in 1990. Non-black minority residents increased from less than one percent to approximately 3 percent during this period.

Economic Change

In addition to population growth, Jacksonville as a whole was also seeing an improvement economically. In Chart 3, we present the median family income for the Jacksonville MSA for the period from 1970 through 1990. Note that we have presented this measure in both the current dollar value as well as income adjusted according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI).[3]

In Chart 3, we can see that, overall, median income levels in Jacksonville have improved over the past 10 years, although the income increases for the 20-year period is less positive. When we examine current income levels, we see a remarkable jump for all years. When we adjust for the CPI, a significant improvement in median family income can be seen between 1980 and 1990. Indeed, average household income increased more than 20 percent during the decade of the 1980s. In all, when adjusting for the CPI, the median income for families in Jacksonville increased from slightly less than $23,700 to more than $28,500. However, when we adjust 1970 income levels for the CPI, Jacksonville residents are less well off overall than primary figures would appear. Jacksonville's median household income dropped, in "real" terms, more than 23 percent during the decade of the seventies.

While gains were made during the 1980s, Jacksonville residents saw a net decrease in income between 1970 and 1990 of more than $600. An important point of consideration here, also, is how Jacksonville fared with regard to the rest of the country. For each of the years in question, Jacksonville was significantly below the overall U.S. median income. Indeed, in 1989 (our 1990 Census information) Jacksonville's median family income was more than $5,500 less than the national median household income of approximately $34,000.

When we compare median household incomes for different races, we find a marked disparity between whites and blacks. Little change in that disparity is evident across the census years. In 1970, adjusted household income for blacks was $17,211, almost $15,000 behind white household income of $32,100. By 1990, adjusted median household income for blacks was $17,795, still only 56.5 percent of the median income earned by white residents. Note that while everyone experienced income decline by the 1980 Census, black households gained ground on white households slightly during the 1980s. The available Census Bureau data from 1970 does not allow for us to accurately compare income levels with non-black minorities and whites.

Additional economic measures again show overall improvement for the Jacksonville MSA. In Chart 5, we present the poverty levels and unemployment levels for Jacksonville between 1970 and 1990. As can be seen in this data, Jacksonville, overall, has seen some significant improvements in the poverty levels as measured in these decennial census periods. Between 1970 and 1990, Jacksonville experienced a reduction of more than 27 percent in the poverty level, from 17.6 percent of all families below the poverty line in 1970 to less than 13 percent by 1990. During that same period, the U.S. as a whole saw virtually no change in poverty rates among families (Statistical Abstracts, 1991, p. 465).

Overall unemployment figures for the city, while mixed, also point to some success for Jacksonville. As we can see in Chart 5, the unemployment rate for Jacksonville more than doubled between 1970 and 1980, from 2.7 to 5.8 percent. Yet, we see a slight drop between 1980 and 1990 from 5.8 to 5.6 percent. In all, however, these figures fare well when we examine the U.S. as a whole; corresponding national figures for unemployment ranged from 4.9 in 1970 to 7.1 in 1980 and 5.5 in 1990 (Statistical Abstracts, 1991, data not shown).

When we compare poverty and unemployment for various racial groups, we find that all groups have shown reductions in these problems over the past 20 years. However, we again find marked differences in these measures when comparing different groups. As we can see in Chart 6, in 1970, the black family poverty rate was 35 percent, almost four times the rate for whites. Although each group improved over the two decades, by 1990 the overall gap had widened. Black poverty was more than five times as high as white poverty levels in 1990, despite having dropped by almost 27 percent during that period. By 1990, one in four black families were poor, while only one in 20 white families were poor. Non-black minority families experienced poverty levels at more than twice the rate of whites and at approximately half the rate for blacks in both 1980 and 1990 (1970 data did not include this group).

A similar gap exists between whites and blacks with regard to unemployment rates. For all census years, blacks had unemployment rates more than twice that of whites. In 1980, both groups experienced a doubling of unemployment, with non-black minority unemployment rates slightly higher than those for whites, and just above half the rate for blacks. By 1990, white unemployment levels had begun to decline slightly. Note, however, that unemployment for blacks continued to increase, albeit only slightly, while unemployment rates for non-black minorities almost doubled. As with income, we find a wide gap between whites and blacks on both poverty levels and unemployment over the past three decades.

Census Tract Details of Jacksonville

To understand how these changes vary across our community, it is important to juxtapose the overall changes in Jacksonville with a more detailed understanding of how sections of Jacksonville have fared. To this end, in this section, we examine changes in census tracts for the greater Jacksonville area. In order to facilitate this, we present census tract maps depicting changes on key measures over the past three census enumerations. Note that Jacksonville has changed significantly over the past 30 years. Prior to consolidation in 1968, Jacksonville was primarily concentrated in census tracts 1-29. For this analysis, we have included all of the city and county areas in these maps to better illustrate the structural makeup of Jacksonville and the changes the city has experienced over the past few decades. Much of the population growth over the past decades has come in areas that, prior to consolidation, were basically rural suburban areas.

Population

As we noted earlier, Jacksonville has seen tremendous growth in the overall MSA since 1970. Yet, despite overall population growth for the city, we find several of areas where the number of residents has declined, frequently by large proportions. Indeed, for all of the inner city areas (tracts 1-29)--as is true for many cities in the Northern U.S.--we find declines in population throughout the entire period. As we can see in Map 1, some census tracts in parts of the original city experienced population loss of more than 2000 residents. In some instances, specifically in tract 17 and tract 18, we find a loss of more than two-thirds of the number of residents between 1970 and 1990. In these areas, population was decreased by more than 72 percent and 67 percent, respectively, during this period.

As Jacksonville expanded between 1970 and 1990, residential patterns for residents shifted to the "newer" sections of the city. Indeed, areas to the West, East, toward the Intracoastal Waterway, and South, along the river, experienced tremendous growth during the last several decades. The late 1960s and early 1970s, by virtue of favorable Civil Rights litigation, also opened doors for residents to broaden their option of neighborhoods in which to live. In Maps 1a through 1c, we present the proportion of black residents in Jacksonville census tracts.

As can be seen in these maps, blacks are not equally represented in all areas of town. Indeed, as we can see in Map 1a, significant numbers of blacks were found in only a few census tracts in 1970, with the majority of blacks residing in tracts comprising the original city limits. By 1990, we find blacks living in most census tracts in the city, although there are several areas that remain almost entirely inhabited by whites. Perhaps most noticeable is the increase in black residents in the areas east of the St. Johns River from Downtown and the increased proportion of blacks living Southwest of Downtown.

In Map 2, we replicated our earlier picture of population change in the city, superimposing small dots indicating the percentage of the black population in each census tract (one dot = 2 percent). As we found in the previous discussion, black residential patterns are much broader in 1990 than in 1970. By 1990, blacks could be found living in many areas of town, albeit usually a small proportion of the tract population. In 1990, however, we still find that black residential patterns still tend to be concentrated in the Northwest portion of the city, as well as within areas that experienced population loss between 1970 and 1990.

For example, as discussed above, the *proportion* of blacks living in tracts Southwest of downtown increased, however the overall *number* of residents in many of those areas decreased. We find a similar pattern when we examine those census tracts East of Downtown with a significant proportion of black residents in 1990. Again, as with Wilson's (1987) model, these areas suffered from concentration of poverty, unemployment, and low incomes, which appears exacerbated by the loss of large numbers of residents through out-migration, residents, Wilson (1987) argued, that come from the most "successful" of the members of these neighborhoods. This "exodus of middle and working class families from ghetto neighborhoods removes an important 'social buffer'" from these hardest hit neighborhoods (Wilson, 1987, p. 56).

Area Differences in Social Indicators and Racial Composition

As discussed in the first part of this report, changes in social and economic indicators over the past three decennial census enumerations have not been consistent across racial lines. Indeed, while some improvements have been made over the past year, black residents continue to trail whites on most indicators. In the following section, we examine several of these measures to understand the extent to which some areas of the community have not experienced the economic growth of the city at large and how racial composition of these areas exacerbates these differences.[4]

Family Income

The first area we examine is Median Family Income. For this analysis, we have adjusted median income for each census tract according to the CPI as represented in the 1991 Statistical Abstracts of the United States. In Maps 3a and through 3c, we map the changes in median family income for all census tracts in Jacksonville, as adjusted by the CPI. As can be seen in Map 3A, the median family income in all but one tract within Jacksonville was above $10,000, with 10 of the downtown tracts averaging within this range. Only the census tract with Mayport and the Naval Station fell below this figure. All other tracts had median income levels above $20,000, with a large number (72 tracts) having adjusted incomes above $30,000.

By 1980, however, we find that this picture had changed dramatically for a vast majority of Jacksonville census tracts. As discussed above, overall, Jacksonville did not fare well during the 1970's, experiencing a drop in median income of almost $5,500. When we examine different areas of town, we see that this phenomenon was widespread. Indeed, by 1980, when adjusting for the CPI, only 33 of the census tracts in Jacksonville had adjusted median family incomes above $30,000 (Map 3b). In addition, we find that six tracts had seen the median family income drop to less than $10,000, with the largest number of tracts having median family incomes between $20,000 and $30,000 per year.

By 1990 (Map 3c), we find some areas of Jacksonville "turning the corner," with several tracts improving the median income to more than $30,000. Note, however, that within the inner-city areas one census tract (#17) had a median family income of less than $5,000 for 1989—a figure that is at the poverty line for a family of two for 1990 and 40 percent of the level for a family of three. Note also that this is *family* income; when we adjust for single individuals, as well, the median income for 1989 drops to less than $2,500. Again, this should be juxtaposed against the fact that the overall median family income for Jacksonville *increased* by more than $5,000 (when adjusted by the CPI) between 1980 and 1990.

Recall that overall adjusted income levels for the city as a whole dropped slightly between 1970 and 1990. As we see in Map 4, however, not all areas of the city experienced this stagnated economy in the same fashion. One in four census tracts in the city experienced increases in income of more than $10,000 between 1970 and 1990 when adjusting for inflation, while more than half experienced decreases in median income of more than $7,500. As we found in our earlier analysis, examining the Downtown and Northwest areas of the city indicates that census tracts that fared the worst economically also had a large proportion of residents who were black.

However, we also find high levels of income loss in several areas that have high residents in numbers higher than expected, given the population distribution. Again, areas that showed the most improvement are those that were less developed prior to consolidation.

Poverty Levels

One of the better "success stories" shown in the first section of this report concerned the reduction in overall rates of poverty for Jacksonville. In all, poverty levels dropped in Jacksonville from slightly less than 10 percent to less than 6 percent between 1970 and 1990. In Maps 5a through 5c, we outline how different census areas of the city have fared with regard to poverty rates. As can be seen in Map 5a, while a number of areas experienced poverty rates between 10 and 20 percent (twice the city rate), extremely high poverty among families in Jacksonville in 1970 was concentrated primarily in census tracts from the original portion of the city and in Mayport. Indeed, 11 tracts had levels of family poverty in the 20 to 29 percent range.

Another eight census tracts in the downtown area had levels of family poverty from 30 to 40 percent, with six tracts experiencing more than 40 percent poverty rate among families. One area, tract 17, had a family poverty rate greater than 50 percent.

By the beginning of this decade, family poverty rates for the majority of census tracts had dropped to less than 10 percent, with only 21 tracts experiencing family poverty rates in excess of 20 percent. Despite this overall *decrease* in the levels of family poverty in Jacksonville between 1970 and 1990, several census tracts saw poverty rates balloon past the 50 percent mark (more than 10 times the city wide level). Another 11 downtown tracts had poverty rates from 30 to 49 percent (6 to 8 times the overall rate for Jacksonville).

As we can see in Map 5c, by 1990, poverty within the downtown tracts had reached the 30 to 39 percent mark in 15 census tracts. In tract 17, the poverty rate among families had exceeded 70 percent. Note, however, that this concentration of the highest poverty areas is occurring during the period where poverty among families in Jacksonville overall had reached its lowest point in more than 20 years. Indeed, as can be seen in these maps, low poverty rate areas can also be seen "concentrating" in areas of the city farther removed from downtown.

Unemployment

When we examine unemployment rates, we again find the concentration of joblessness in areas that are predominately downtown and with a high proportion of black residents. As discussed above, whereas Jacksonville saw a doubling of unemployment between 1970 and 1980 and a subsequent slight reduction by 1990, these rates fared quite favorably to the related U.S. numbers. When we examine Maps 6a through 6c, however, we again see that not all areas of Jacksonville experienced the same success. In 1970, only a handful of areas of Jacksonville experienced rates of unemployment rates greater than six percent (double the citywide average). All of these, however, were located in or adjacent to downtown, and most were in tracts that had predominately black residents. In addition, 16 tracts, including several areas where residents were overwhelmingly white did experience unemployment rates of 4 to 6 percent. Even so, only one area, Tract 9,[5] had more than 10 percent unemployment.

By 1990, we find that a number of areas with extremely high levels of unemployment can be found in downtown, and such areas are becoming more concentrated with the ranks of the blacks as they were with the ranks of the poor. In those areas of the city that joined with consolidation, we find relatively low levels of unemployment for the most part, with a large number of areas indicating unemployment rates significantly below the city average. As Wilson (1987; 1994) discussed, in historically black neighborhoods, residents were working, albeit in low wage jobs. He argues that with changes in legislation, as well as movement of low wage labor from the city, we find unemployed (and arguable unemployable) persons concentrated within these old neighborhoods. These findings indicate support for Wilson's model in this area.

Transformation of a Neighborhood: The Decline of LaVilla (Census Tracts 17 and 18)

In the preceding discussion, we have mapped out in Jacksonville what we believe is support for William Wilson's (1987) model of how underclass neighborhoods develop. It is essential, therefore, to better understand how one such neighborhood has fared over the period discussed above. To that end, we will examine more closely the neighborhood of LaVilla, located near downtown Jacksonville (census tracts 17 and 18[6]). As is evident from the discussion above, for most of our indicators, social and economic change is pronounced in these two areas, and thus allows for more in-depth analysis.

Before discussing findings of this neighborhood, however, a brief discussion of the LaVilla area is important.[7] Throughout the mid-1800s, LaVilla was an independent city on the outskirts of Jacksonville. Annexed in the late 1880s, LaVilla was an early settlement for freed slaves as well as whites. Although most of Jacksonville was destroyed by fire in 1904, much of LaVilla was spared, and a number of buildings from that era still stand.

As with many such areas in other large cities, LaVilla was historically a neighborhood where many blacks lived because of segregation. Historical accounts of the LaVilla district are filled with discussion of the life and livelihood found in LaVilla. Older residents, in discussions with our research team, reminisce about the days when LaVilla was an exciting, vibrant area where black-owned businesses thrived, middle-

class and professional blacks lived, and where entertainment was a major draw for all races. On a number of occasions, we were reminded that Ray Charles got his start on Ashley Street in the heart of LaVilla.

Today, LaVilla remains only a shell of its old self. It is considered one of the most violent areas of the city. In this section, we outline the decline of LaVilla between 1970 and 1990 in order to better understand the mechanisms behind this decline.

Poverty Levels

As we saw in the mapping of poverty throughout the city, the LaVilla census tracts represent some of the highest levels of poverty in the city. In Chart 8 we present the poverty levels for LaVilla by tracts 17 and 18. As can be seen in this chart, tract 17 has seen continued increase in family poverty rates between 1970 and 1990, while tract 18 has held somewhat stable (albeit at a high rate) with regard to family poverty. One important note here is that in tract 17, just north of the designated LaVilla area is the Blodgett Homes complex, a public housing facility, which accounts for much, although not all, of the family poverty in this area.

In Chart 9, however, we see that, in addition to high rates of *family* poverty, high rates of individuals in poverty are also prevalent. In all periods discussed, we find more than 50 percent of the people in these districts falling below the poverty line, with from 2/3 to 3/4 of the residents in tract 17 poor. Thus, we find high concentrations (i.e., high rates) of poverty among both families as well as unattached individuals, with these rates being more than five times the rate of Jacksonville as a whole.

Unemployment

In addition to high rates of poverty, when we mapped out the overall rates of unemployment, we also saw marked differences between our LaVilla tracts and Jacksonville overall. As we see in Chart 10, unemployment rates have increased more than 2.2 times in tract 17 between 1970 and 1990 and by more than 50 percent in tract 18. Tract 18 remained somewhat stable in official unemployment between 1980 and 1990.

Again, however, we see a somewhat different picture when we examine male labor force participation. In Chart 11 we present the labor force non-participation rates (i.e., males not in labor force) for the LaVilla area. As can be seen in this graph, whereas 41 percent and 32 percent of the males over age 16 in tracts 17 and 18 (respectively) were not in the labor force in 1970, more than half of all males in tract 18 and almost 2/3 in tract 17 were not involved in the labor force by 1990. Coupled with unemployment rates, we find that a vast majority of the males in LaVilla were not working in 1990, a phenomenon Wilson described as a "low male-marriageability pool." That is, these are males that, given a lack of labor force participation or a job, represent the potential problems with regard to fathering out of wedlock children as well as crime (Wilson, 1987, p. 81-92).

Female Headed Households

It is toward the concern over this "male marriageable pool" that Wilson (1987) directs his discussion of female headed households as one of the "pathologies" facing underclass neighborhoods. In order to examine this issue, Chart 12 presents changes in female headed households between 1970 and 1990. As is seen in Chart 12, Tract 17 has a very large percentage of female headed families. Indeed, by 1990 almost 3/4 of all families were headed by females, up from slightly above 50 percent in 1970. Remember, however, that the Blodgett Homes addition, which houses predominately female headed families, is located in this district and somewhat skews this data. For tract 18, however, we see a somewhat different pattern. Although we see an increase in female headed households (from almost 40 percent to less than 48 percent), these numbers remain below those of tract 17 and comparable to the national average (43 percent for black families in 1989).

Population Change

Finally, we would like to discuss several population change indicators of the LaVilla area. As discussed earlier in Chart 1, we saw that, while the overall population of Jacksonville increased dramatically between 1970 and 1990, the census tracts in LaVilla saw dramatic *decreases* in population. As can be seen in Chart 13, the total population of this area went from (combined) more than 10,400 persons to only slightly over 3,000 between the 1970 and 1990 Decennial Census, a loss in excess of 70 percent.

In Charts 14 and 15, we examine some age characteristics to better understand this loss of population. As can be seen in Chart 11, in both tracts 17 and 18, we see a significant increase in the proportion of persons living in LaVilla who are over age 65. This is particularly striking for tract 17, where we see a 70 percent increase in the proportion of elderly. In tract 18, we see an increase of slightly less than 1/3. At the same time, in Chart 15 we see a reduction of the proportion of the population who are young children for the LaVilla neighborhood. This represents a reduction of approximately 25 percent in tract 17 and about 40 percent in tract 18. This is significant in that, despite having a "dependent population" of proportionately the same size over time, a dramatic change in the composition can be seen. As the next section of this report reveals, this finding has significant implications for public policy approaches to LaVilla.

The Truly Disadvantaged: Community Responses To Residents in Need

As we have seen in the previous discussion, in a period where the city of Jacksonville, as a whole, prospered, one neighborhood in particular appears to have been left isolated from these gains. By 1990, concentration of a number of "pathologies" left the LaVilla neighborhood, in particular, filled with extreme poverty, joblessness, and with what Peter Rossi described as the "Precariously Housed" (Rossi, 1989). In this section, we examine how responses to the needs of the truly disadvantaged in Jacksonville, and LaVilla in particular, exacerbate the problems of social and economic isolation among underclass neighborhoods and the people who live there.

More than two decades ago, Herbert Gans (1971) wrote an intriguing article about the functions of poverty. Taking a functionalist perspective, Gans argued that since poverty existed, it must serve some positive societal functions and proceeded to outline a number of such functions. A cursory examination of the literature on homelessness (perhaps the poorest of the poor) quickly confirms some of Gans' contentions, the least of which, are the numerous academic professionals (including this sociologist) who have earned at least part of their academic stature by studying and writing about the poor and the homeless. In mid 1990, a volume of *Contemporary Sociology*, reviewed seven books published by sociologists in 1992 or 1993 that focused on various aspects of homelessness. A 1990 American Psychological Association bibliography (Shinn, Burke and Bedford, 1990) cited 488 abstracts and citations to the serial and dissertation literature on homelessness between 1967 and 1990, with most dated 1980 or later. In addition, the *American Behavioral Scientist* published two full journals in January 1994 and February 1994 on homelessness. Academicians are not the only professionals finding career opportunities in the homeless game (Long, 1958). Indeed, most American communities (cities and towns) have developed a variety of activities and programs designed to address the needs of their homeless population. What is unclear in all this is the question posed in the title of this presentation, "Whose interests are being served?"

In many ways, LaVilla's plight in the 1990s is that of the homeless in Jacksonville. Many of the services for this population are centered in or near LaVilla, and redevelopment efforts since this project began have displaced a number of persons who used to live in the neighborhood. As part of this project, we examined four main issues surrounding the responses to the problem of homelessness. First is the exploration of what academics tend to focus on in their research on homelessness, suggesting that at least one area of research on homelessness is largely ignored or overlooked. Second is the effort to raise questions about the types of community responses to homelessness and to explore questions about whose interests are being served as result of these responses. A couple of short case studies will be highlighted to demonstrate the type of research that is currently being pursued to examine the interest question. Third, connections between Wilson's argument about the social isolation of the inner city as tested in Jacksonville are presented here, and the politics of the community's response to homelessness and urban decay are presented. Lastly, a discussion of the gaps in servicing the needs of the homeless and the LaVilla neighborhood are presented.

Homelessness Literature

Shinn, et al (1990) organized abstracts of research dealing with homelessness around five major headings: Characteristics, Mental Disorders, Substance Abuse including Deinstutionalization (158 entries); Intervention

with Adults (127 entries); Children and Youth (54 entries); and Societal Issues (83 entries); the remainder were citations to books on homeless. These works, along with those reviewed in *Contemporary Sociology* and the *American Behavioral Scientist* in the mid-1990s, describe characteristics of the poor and causes of homelessness or focus on a particular type of service to meet identified needs as spelled out by providers. What seems to be missing from this rather extensive literature on homelessness is community-based research examining how communities, as such, respond to homelessness. That is, we have much less literature on how community-based action may impact the magnitude of homelessness or how communities organize resources intended to address the needs of the homeless over the short or long-term. Part of the ongoing work of the Center For Community Initiatives is to better understand what this community is doing that is likely to increase the level of homelessness as well as address the needs of the homeless. Concerning services, the focus is not on a particular agency, rather it is upon how or whether a community coordinates its short-term and long-term efforts in responding to homelessness. Questions center on what a community is doing to not only provide emergency services but to stabilize and ultimately integrate or re-integrate formerly homeless into its non-homeless environment. Currently, research efforts have not been directed toward this type of analysis. Before discussing how a community responds, it is necessary to provide some background on homelessness in the local community in which this research is undertaken.

Homelessness in Jacksonville

Each year the Emergency Services and Homeless Coalition of Jacksonville conducts a count of its homeless population and interviews a sample of the homeless so counted. This is done in late February. Research team members of the Center For Community Initiatives have supervised and coordinated this project each year since 1993. In all, the number of homeless persons counted in Jacksonville has increased since 1993 (Figure 16). In 1993, more than 2,180 homeless persons were counted, including persons on the street, in emergency shelters, and in other situations designated by the federal government as constituting "homelessness." The number of homeless persons identified in subsequent years fluctuated, but the general trend was an increase over the past seven years. By 1998, more than 3,100 homeless persons were counted in Jacksonville. Although counting homeless persons is problematic, the annual count and interviews undertaken by the Emergency Services and Homeless Coalition of Jacksonville have provided an opportunity to learn important socio-demographic characteristics of the community's homeless population. Some of the more important findings from the 1998 Census and survey of 326 homeless include:

- 72% were males.
- 57% were black, 41% were white, 2% other.
- 5% were 55 or older, the average age was 35-38.
- 61% of those interviewed were homeless for the first time.
- More than 70% of those interviewed were homeless less than one year.
- 73% of those interviewed had called Jacksonville home.
- Many had less than a high school level of education.
- 71% worked, 74% worked out of labor pools.
- High levels of social isolation-approximately 75% reported no family or friends they could call upon for assistance, many reported no family ties at all.
- 40% reported being in jail within the previous 12 months.
- More than half had serious medical needs at the time of the interview.

In addition, in order to better understand the needs of people who are homeless, both homeless adults and agency staff were asked in a 1995 survey to rate the importance of a number of homeless needs and services. Respondents were asked to indicate on a scale of 10 (least important) to 50 (most important) services and needs such as job training, meals, and others. Homeless persons responded to the survey as part of the annual Homeless Census Project. Nineteen agency staff persons responded to the survey on needs for the homeless. The following table summarizes the importance of these services.

Services	Homeless	Providers
Jobs/Job Training	76.5%	88.2%
Affordable Housing	74.5%	88.2%
Medical Care	70.7%	58.8%
Education	68.8%	35.3%
Food/Meals	68.4%	47.1%
Safety/Security	65.3%	35.3%
Alcohol/Drug Treatment	58.7%	52.9%

While both homeless persons and providers agreed on the rank ordering of Jobs/Job Training and Affordable Housing, discrepancies appeared in the rank ordering of other services. Most notable are differences in Education and Safety/Security. These were viewed as major needs by homeless persons (68.8 percent) but were viewed as less important by service providers (35.3 percent). Medical and dental care needs (70.7 percent) were perceived as high priority for homeless persons. A significant number of all homeless adults (61 percent) indicated that they had health and/or dental care needs. Twenty-one percent reported they had not had any health or dental care for more than three years (data not shown).

The conclusions drawn from these interviews regarding the needs of the homeless focus on both short-term and long-term responses. The short-term seems to call for a comprehensive, agency integrated approach, an approach having both horizontal and vertical integration or linkages (Warren, 1970) to providing emergency and supportive services, such as shelter, counseling, child care, and case management. Longer term responses would include the development of a stock of affordable housing, job training and job placement, expanding employment opportunities and family and community social integration. The examination of the level of such types of integration is one of the primary objectives of the agency field research conducted as part of this project.

As one examines more closely the characteristics of homeless people and their needs, it becomes clear that a wide array of community-based services are needed to significantly increase opportunities for moving beyond servicing the homeless on just an emergency basis. With this background information, we can now turn to the community responses and address the question, "Whose interests are being served?"

Community Responses

Jacksonville, similar to other urban communities, has developed a number of programs addressing the needs of homeless persons. Some of these have been in existence for years, others are more recent. These services include emergency shelters, transitional housing, on-site soup kitchens, walk-in health clinics, and a regional coalition composed of many agencies that are part of the community's response to homelessness. Jacksonville recently opened a 24-hour shelter that offers emergency shelter and substantial social services, including case management. On the surface, it would appear that the needs of the homeless are being met throughout the region. However, a closer examination of what is provided and how it is provided raises substantial questions. An argument can be made that homelessness has become another game in town and that while services are provided to assist meeting SOME of the needs of the homeless, the community has not provided the type of long-term assistance required to facilitate the upward mobility of the homeless. Rather, most services respond to emergency needs only, such as food and shelter, with limited longer term assistance.

Emergency housing is one such emergency service. Within the community, seven different organizations provide 936 shelter beds. There are 649 beds for men and 287 beds for women, couples, and families. These shelters have rules and regulations limiting access to the shelter and limiting activities while in a shelter. For example, most shelters limit the number of "free" days a person may stay at the shelter, the most common is a three-day limit. Some shelters labeled family shelters will not allow "older" male children to remain with their mother while the family is being sheltered. In one agency, the definition of an older child is age eight or above. Shelters require occupants to leave as early as 5:00 a.m. and do not allow persons to remain in the shelter throughout the day. Do these types of policies adequately respond to the true needs of homeless persons?

There are also a number of kitchens serving meals at various times of the day. Some have noon meals, others provide only morning and evening meals. Some serve their meals seven days a week, others less frequently. For example, one serves a noon meal on Tuesdays and Thursdays, another serves meals on Wednesdays and still another on Saturday and all legal holidays. These meal sites are scattered throughout the community. One would need a day planner to keep up with where a meal is being served on a particular day or time.

There are a number of agencies providing transitional housing. One of the largest houses 214 men and 29 women. This agency is a private, for profit, owned operation funded by federal and local funds totaling in excess of 8 million dollars over the past six years. This transitional housing operation provides small private rooms at the rate of $343.00 per month and meals at the rate of $3.00 per meal. Substantial restrictions are enforced, perhaps most notably the policy of no alcohol on the "campus." This particular rule has created problems for some of the residents. For example, individuals wanting to have a drink(s) are required to do so off campus. With no nearby bars, residents purchase package liquor and then find public places to consume their purchase. From time to time, police will patrol the area and arrest individuals for consuming in public. In short, this transitional housing facility is providing longer term housing, but it is expensive and greatly restricts the freedom of its residents. Further, a non-profit arm of the privately owned unit was established to provide social services to assist residents in becoming more self-sufficient and to begin the process of stabilizing their personal and economic life so that residents could move into more traditional housing and living environments. However, few such services are provided because of limited funding for such services by the facilities management.

Its is interesting to speculate how other community development activities affect the ability of limited income people to maintain their independent housing environments. In 1996, Jacksonville began "redeveloping" the LaVilla area near the downtown core of the city. As discussed above, this area was the lowest income area of the city and contained numerous SRO's and boarding houses. Its population is predominately male, with a high proportion in the age bracket found to be the mean for homeless men. Most of the housing is substandard and privately owned (absentee landlords predominate). Most units were rented prior to renovation, with rents averaging in the $140.00-180.00 per month range. In 1996 the Jacksonville Downtown Development Authority began demolition of large sections of LaVilla, converting much of the land to parks and other non-residential uses in preparation for anticipated business relocation to the neighborhood. What is curious about this is the plight of residents in LaVilla and the comparison of their living arrangements with those living in the transitional housing unit described above. The neighborhood targeted for razing offered affordable but largely substandard housing in which individuals had considerable freedom to organize (or as seen by some, disorganize) their lives. For example, prior to the beginning of the LaVilla redevelopment program, during a block by block survey of the neighborhood conducted by *CCI* research team members, groups of men, young and old, were sitting on their front stoops, talking and having a beer or two, facing no threat from the local police regarding public consumption. A mile or so away, residents lived in more standard housing, paid significantly higher rents, but had considerably less personal freedom.

What happens when neighborhoods like this are ultimately bulldozed? Comments made by local officials at community meetings informing the residents of the upcoming changes concerning the affected neighborhood indicated that transitional housing and the 24-hour shelter are viewed by planners as housing alternatives, replacing the privately owned SROs. Again, the question is "Whose interests are being served?"

In examining the complete picture of homelessness, it is clear that the community is meeting some of the needs of the homeless population, yet many needs go unmet. Perhaps it is a matter of funding. More funding could mean a more complete package of services. Or, perhaps it is more than a matter of funding. What may be occurring is best captured with the statement "this is how we have always done it." Current responses are in the form of what agencies typically and historically have provided in the past and that these services will continue to be provided in the future. Such a response leaves gaps in meeting the needs of contemporary homeless persons and families. As funds come into the community (federal, state, and local), one game seems to be to get more dollars to do what an agency has always done. The impact of recent "WAGES" legislation, however, adds new dilemmas to the provision of services, forcing additional families and individuals into "competition" for the scarce resources and services available for the most disadvantaged segment of our population.

Communities need to carefully examine their array of services and fully understand the needs of the disadvantaged and homeless as viewed by those persons, as well as service providers, and then develop

coordinated service packages meeting the needs of the disadvantaged rather than meeting the needs of agencies serving them. This project is an effort to develop baseline data to better understand the needs of the poor and homeless and to better understand how the community is responding, not agency by agency, but rather as an entire community.