

**HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE CHICAGO REGION:  
Report of a 2010 Regional Survey**

**James H. Lewis, Ph.D.**

**2017**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The following report was prepared from a 3,000-plus households survey fielded in the Chicago area by the Metro Chicago Information Center in 2010. The data was shared with the author at that time and I began working with MCIC on a report of the findings but due to delays, and then because of MCIC's retrenchment and then closing, the report was not completed at that time. More pressing professional responsibilities drew the author away from the project in the intervening years. During the past year changes in my professional life afforded me the opportunity to return to the work. The survey contained a wealth of information about the Chicago region at that time, and many of the findings remain relevant today. I have, therefore, now completed the following report begun many years ago.

### ***How did the Chicago area compare with the rest of the nation on human relations and subjective well-being?***

A major national study conducted by Harvard University 10 years ago placed Chicago in the lower-middle nationally on quality of social capital. The data collected in the Trust/MCIC survey in 2010 suggest that it probably occupied a similar place at that time. Decades of racial tension and segregation, economic transition, high residential mobility and stress of urban life have no-doubt taken a toll. Chicago city residents continued to report low social trust, and in Chicago in particular, low trust of the police. Chicago area residents volunteered less in secular settings than people appeared to in other places. They also reported fewer social connections than did people in other places.

Chicago area residents did report better health, wider diversity of friendships, and higher levels of volunteering through religious institutions than did people in other parts of the nation.

### ***What made Chicago area residents happy?***

A person's race/ethnicity and related experiences were the largest determinants of happiness and satisfaction captured by the survey. Also important is whether one experienced discrimination. While the absence of discrimination did not necessarily lead to happiness, the presence of discrimination was the single largest correlate with unhappiness. Other important predictors of overall happiness were being Latino or Asian, having good health, liking your neighborhood, satisfaction with your relationship with a spouse or partner, and job satisfaction. This is broadly consistent with the academic literature on what makes people happy.

Of particular concern should be the 13% or so of area residents who reported no close friends or confidants.

### ***How welcoming of diversity was the Chicago region?***

The survey suggested that the Chicago area was making progress on becoming a more welcoming place for everyone, but it still had a distance to go. While most respondents, and African Americans, in particular, reported having been discriminated against at some point in their lives, a much smaller percentage reported that it occurred within the past year. The vast majority of respondents supported open housing. Area residents were about evenly split on their support for same-sex marriage, and

whether they believed the region should welcome undocumented immigrants. Most residents acknowledged that members of various minority groups within the region are hurt by discrimination to some degree.

Chicago area responses to questions regarding social capital – the value we accrue from relationships - suggest that in the early 2000s it had probably not moved very far from its lower mid-range position nationally as expressed in the Harvard social capital survey. Volunteering remained average and measures of neighborhood efficacy remained low to moderate. Residents of the region did not, on average, express strong trust in one another and mistrust of the police was high.

### ***Was quality of life different in city and suburbs?***

The survey pointed out many differences between city and suburbs. Chicago may pride itself in being a “city of neighborhoods”, but across nearly every variable measuring social connectedness and assessment of neighborhood quality, Collar County residents reported the most connectedness and Chicago residents reported the least. Suburban residents reported knowing more of their neighbors, trusted them more, anticipated greater neighborhood responses to local problems and considered their neighbors more closely connected and sharing their values.

### ***How accepted were gays?***

LGBs (Lesbian, Gay and Bi-Sexual persons) reported substantially more discrimination than did Straights, said they knew fewer of their neighbors, and lived in neighborhoods that in their assessment were less cohesive and of lower overall quality. The Chicago region was roughly split on support of same-sex marriage, as was the nation.

LGBs tended to report about the same amount of overall happiness and life satisfaction as did Straights, but they were substantially less trusting of neighbors and of the police. They were, however, more optimistic about the future than was the general population.

### ***Blacks and Latinos are segregated residentially across the region, but did that extend to social relations?***

Across most survey measures, Whites indicated knowing more people, and being relationally closer to those people, than did Blacks, Latinos or Asians. Whites also reported living in neighborhoods where people shared more common values.

African Americans were the most insular of the 4 major groups in terms of having friends who were of a different racial or religious group and were also the least trusting. African Americans, and to a lesser extent Latinos, were also distinct in their mistrust of the police.

### ***Did the poor have the personal connections they needed to escape poverty?***

The most common way of finding jobs is through word-of-mouth and so the survey suggests that social isolation may hinder the efforts of many low-income people to find work. In the Chicago area, low income people experienced social isolation, had fewer close friends or confidants, and were more likely to know little about their neighbors. They were less trusting of others and less likely to know someone

who owned a business. The multi-variate analysis indicated that the main driver of whether a person trusted others was whether they were white, Asian, middle or upper income, or college-educated.

***Did men and women see and experience community life the same way?***

Men and women as a whole tended to answer most questions on the survey similarly. Women tended to be a little happier, to be more likely to volunteer, were a little more trusting and were more likely to consider their neighborhood to be “close-knit”. They also tended to be somewhat more progressive on issues such as same-sex marriage, welcoming the undocumented, acknowledging discrimination, and open housing.

***What drives the experience of discrimination?***

Controlling for a variety of possible causes, the biggest statistical driver in the 2010 survey of having experienced discrimination is being black, which made one 257% more likely than a white to report lifetime discrimination. Being Latino was second at 91% more likelihood. Being gay or bisexual increased likelihood by 63% compared to heterosexuals.

Being male, healthy, Protestant or older made it less likely that one reported having been discriminated against.

Being black, Latino or living in Chicago were independent predictors of having little confidence in the police to do a good job enforcing the law.

***What predicted whether a person will have diverse relationships?***

Strong independent predictors of diverse social connectedness were being better educated, Latino, speaking English well, volunteering (although this could flow from social connections) and being younger. Gays and bisexuals also reported strong diversity of relationships net of other possible causes.

***Were seniors isolated?***

Seniors captured in the survey were somewhat less likely to have the religious and racial diversity of friendships that typified younger people, but on most measures they appeared about as connected as younger people were. They actually reported having greater numbers of friends than young people. Perhaps in part as a result, they also reported being happier. To some degree this is typical of national age cohort studies, which consistently have shown older age cohorts to experience less stress and more happiness. Seniors were less likely to say they had been discriminated against, and perhaps because of this, and their generation, which came of age before the social revolution of the Sixties, they also were significantly more trusting.

## **CONTENTS**

**Introduction**

**The 7-County Region**

**Chicago Area Sub-Regions**

**Race/Ethnicity**

**Sex**

**Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual**

**Low Income**

**Seniors**

**What Drives Differences in Attitudes**

**How Does the Chicago Area Compare Nationally, and are we Improving?**

**Methodology & Notes**

## INTRODUCTION

Human relations is a term that means different things to different people and potentially encompasses much pertaining to how people in a place interact and the quality of those interactions. While aspects of human relations such as voting patterns, who lives where, or crime are relatively easy to observe and measure, other important elements of human relations such as how we regard one another, who we trust, or who we interact with socially are harder to measure, or to observe systematically across a society.

We can infer things about human relations from indices of segregation constructed from Census data. We can count numbers of hate crimes, or crime statistics in general, but this is only one form of human relations, and a form of failure at that. We lack public data sets relating to discrimination or other forms of conflict. These types of data also tend to measure the more public manifestation of the underlying quality of human relations, rather than the individual experiences persons have. And we lack data indicating the extent and variety of people's personal connections.

Much research now shows that the quality of human relationships contributes significantly to the success of job searches, effectiveness of political decision-making, neighborhood safety, education, and to a great degree, the overall happiness of most people (Holzer 1987, Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997, Putnam 2000, Lane 2001, Bok 2010). It is, therefore, essential to develop periodic reports on the quality of human relations in the Chicago region if we are to understand the reasons that some problems persist, and create the most effective approaches to helping people achieve happiness and well-being. Quality of human relations should inform decisions such as how public space is used, neighborhood development, zoning decisions, initiatives aimed at raising civic participation, educational curriculum, housing policies, policing strategies, and any number of other critical policies.

In the absence of existing data sets on the subject, in 2010 the Metro Chicago Information Center conducted a 3,000 household survey across the seven-county region. The resulting survey provided data on three crucial domains in human relations:

*Social Capital* – The value people derive from personal relationships. (Coleman 1988, Portes 1998, Putnam 2001) This includes number of personal friends and confidants; religious, racial and vocational diversity of friendships; volunteering; and assessment of the extent to which neighbors take responsibility for one another and trust one another (neighborhood efficacy).

*Discrimination* – The extent to which a person has in the past or currently experiences discrimination, and whether a person supports policies that tend to include or exclude people.

*Quality of Life* – How one rates one's overall quality of life, health, job and relationships; and how one rates one's community. (Putnam 2001, Diener and Biswas-Diener 2008)

Probably because of the availability of data, the quality of places has commonly been assessed in terms of levels of income, percentages of people in poverty, average years of schooling and in like ways where Census data and/or data from other administrative sources are available. These are important measures of the quality of life for individuals and the health of a place, but sociologists and economists are finding that survey measures of quality of life define a domain correlated with, yet different from,

domains defined by the Census statistics (Lane 2001). And both subjective and objective quality of life is determined in large measure by quality of social capital and the absence of discrimination (Lane 2001, Putnam 2000, Bok, 2010).

This study begins by reporting regional levels on survey-derived indicators in each of the three domains: Social Capital, Discrimination and Quality of Life. It then asks how those indicators varied across key demographic categories that are often of interest in public policy discussions. These include:

Race – What was the experience of discrimination? Did experiences of Whites, Blacks, Latinos and Asian-Americans differ in significant ways?

Regional Subsectors - Did quality of life and social capital vary between city and suburbs?

Age – Did seniors experience life differently from younger people, and did they have constricted human relations?

Sex and Gender – Did men and women have common life experiences? Did the gay experience differ in significant ways from that of heterosexuals?

Income – Did persons with low income have the social resources that would facilitate their obtaining jobs or better employment? Did their social life differ in significant ways from that of persons with more financial resources?

These are important questions to answer in part because growing bodies of work in economics, sociology and psychology tell us that strong human relations are essential to both individual and community well-being. But also because of Chicago's history.

The most glaring social relations problem in the Chicago region remains the geographic and social separation of Whites from African Americans). For decades Blacks and Whites have been nearly totally separated residentially in the region with dissimilarity (separation) scores consistently over 90 (on a scale from 0 to 100) (Massey and Denton 1993). Latino to white segregation scores have been around 60. To varying degrees, this separation is a result of history, of cultural identity, of the association of housing markets with wealth, and ongoing discrimination. Results and causes of this separation include highly segregated religious institutions, racially-aligned business relationships, racially segregated schools, and other social divisions. The racially divisive history and present contribute to the poverty that facilitates crime.

Closely related to race relations is the integration of immigrants into the Chicago area. Challenges include overcoming differences in language, culture, and religion (Lewis and Paral 2003). These differences are often manifested in conflict over housing and how to deliver public education. Chicago will continue to be home to an extraordinarily wide array of people of different national origin and culture and how well its residents succeed in living together will in part determine our quality of life, strength of our economy, and public safety.

Like most large urban areas, Chicago exhibits problems with civic participation. This includes low election turnout, and smaller and less dense networks of personal relationships than those of smaller, more rural, and less mobile places (Saguaro Seminar, 2001). Individual philanthropy to federated giving

programs such as the United Way suffer from institutional change such as major corporations moving or restructuring and a more general loss of faith in civic institutions and skepticism about their functions.

Ultimately, crime is a failure of human relations. While crime rates in the Chicago area had declined substantially over the 15 years preceding the survey (Kneebone and Raphael 2011), as had those in most other American communities, they remained unacceptably high at the time. Crime is lower in places with higher levels of social trust, homogeneity, where poverty is lower, where people observe and are accountable to one another, and where law enforcement is more closely connected and sensitive to residents (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997). While the reasons for gang and domestic violence are multi-faceted, to some degree they represent failings of people to resolve conflicts in a useful way or create supportive communities and families in the face of stress.

It seems likely that the Chicago area faces some of the same types of conflicts over LGBTQ acceptance as do other large urban regions. Because of its cosmopolitan culture and the high level of residential mobility of many neighborhoods, and tolerant, and sometimes even supportive, political leadership, many Chicago neighborhoods are relatively friendly places for LGBTQ people to live in. However, numerous gays remain closeted because of the stigma that attaches, or they fear would attach to them, were they to be more open.

These issues are also critical to investigate because there is evidence that the Chicago region struggles with them by national comparison. The 2000 Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, conducted in 42 different places across the nation, found Chicago somewhat below national averages on a number of key indicators, and far below on several critical ones. With a score of 100 representing the national mid-point on a measure, Chicago had the following scores:

<u>Very Low</u>	
Social Trust	81
Giving and Volunteering	85
Inter-Racial Trust	86
Conventional Politics	89
<u>Somewhat Low</u>	
Diversity of Friendships	90
Civic Leadership	92
Associational Involvement	93
Social Capital Equality	94
Informal Socializing	95
<u>Average</u>	
Faith-based Engagement	99
Protest Politics	100

The scores for social trust, inter-racial trust and giving and volunteering were in the bottom 17% nationally. Combined, all of this strongly suggests that to the extent possible, steps should be taken to improve the quality of human relations and social capital in the Chicago area.



How good is good enough?

In order to have meaning, data must be comparable to some standard. This is difficult to achieve in many areas of social research, and extremely difficult to do in the field of human relations. While any place might aspire to a day when no one is discriminated against, where no violent crimes take place, or no one is poor, it is hard to imagine a place of any size where that would occur. Life places stresses on rich and poor alike, and people are sufficiently different in their upbringing, desires, ethics and moral standards that some forms of conflict would appear almost inevitable anywhere. And while social connection is a good and useful thing within any community, people vary in their personal tastes for, and inclinations toward, numbers of friends, confidantes and interaction. Even the safest societies in the world have the occasional violent crime, and it is hard to think of a place where some form of discrimination against members of some social group does not exist. So absolute high standards for social connection, equity and well-being tend to be aspirational.

If absolute standards for social achievement in human relations are elusive, we still can interpret data in some relative ways. For example:

1. How does the Chicago region compare with other parts of the nation, or the nation as a whole? While we cannot be “perfect”, we might like to be at least better than average.
2. Are we improving on measures of human relations? While we may not be able to ever quite say what will be the best we can do, we can aspire to doing better over time.
3. Are there dysfunctional differences in experience between identifiable groups within our region? In a healthy society we might posit that opportunity would be spread equally and that one identifiable group or another would not have disproportionate access to it, or lack it. While different cultures might tend toward different constructions of human relationship, where those structures bear on well-being, we might wish those differences to be minimal. As pointed out above, social insularity can impact ability to find a job, participate in the political process, or be well educated.

This report attempts to contextualize data by providing abundant inter-group comparisons within the region, and a concluding chapter that compares the survey data to data that exists nationally across time and in national comparison.

The report begins with a review of measures of these three dimensions of human relations as measured by the survey comparing reports from Chicago, the Cook suburbs, and the collar counties in 2010. Following are sub-reports focusing on key demographic groups who may have unique experiences of human relations: race, gender, seniors, LGBs and low-income persons.

The report concludes with a multivariate analysis that points to which of the various demographic characteristics tended to be the strongest drivers of residents’ experiences of community, happiness, trust, and discrimination.

## THE 7-COUNTY REGION

### *Personal Relationships and Trust*

Studies of social networks indicate that the number and nature of personal relationships a person has can have a strong impact on one’s ability to find employment, how effectively communities participate in the political process and people’s mental health and happiness. (Granovetter 1983, Gans 1962, Quillian and Redd 2006, Klinenberg 2002, Diener and Biswas-Diener 2008) The Chicago region appeared to be around the mid-point nationally in the number and variety of friendships had by its residents – typical of many large urban areas, but weaker than many smaller and less urbanized regions.

Of particular concern are residents who said that they know none of their neighbors (4.8%), have no close friends (11.6%) or have no one in whom they can confide (14.8). These individuals were at heightened risk for being unable to find a job if unemployed and may have difficulty retaining healthy social life as they age. In the case of seniors, they may have no one looking out for them on very hot or cold days (Klinenberg 2000).

**Table 1.1 Number of close relationships by relationship type**

<b>Number you know personally:</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>One</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>5-9</b>	<b>10-14</b>	<b>15 or more</b>
Neighbors	4.8%	3.0%	17.6%	29.6%	22.0%	23.0%
Employees of neighborhood businesses	35.2%	9.4%	25.8%	29.5%		
Whose workplace you know	17.0%	9.0%	26.1%	29.9%	17.9%	
	<b>None</b>	<b>1 or 2</b>	<b>3 to 5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>MT 10</b>	
Number of close friends	11.6%	23.7%	34.3%	19.6%	10.8%	
	<b>None</b>	<b>One</b>	<b>Two</b>	<b>3 or more</b>		
Number of people to confide in	14.8%	5.9%	27.0%	52.4%		

In many spheres of life, it is important to know people who are unlike yourself. Success finding a job, organizing people for a political cause, selling raffle tickets or identifying interesting activities for a child often depend more on having a wide and diverse circle of acquaintances, than on knowing very well a few people who may be much like yourself.

As a whole, most Chicago-area residents reported knowing people who practice a different religion than they do, although the non-religious were much less likely to know someone who is religious. Area residents were less likely to know someone of a different race, with about 60% of respondents saying they did. This is problematic in that it results in part from the high levels of racial segregation across the region, and because it makes racially categorized divisions more likely to occur. Diversity of who one knows is important in part because of the value of social connection, but also because of the growing need for appreciation of diversity in our society.

**Table 1.2 Diversity of Personal Relationships by religion, race and type**

	<b>Yes</b>
If Protestant, have non-Protestant friend	75.0%
If Catholic, have non-Catholic friend	82.8%
If Jewish, have non-Jewish friend	86.7%
If other religion, have friend different religion	78.6%
If not religious, have very religious friend	56.7%
Have friend who is Latino	60.7%
Have friend who is Asian	62.1%
Have friend who is African American	62.7%
Have friend who is gay/lesbian	52.0%
Have friend who is a community leader	44.3%
Have personal friend who owns a business	52.5%
Have personal friend who is a manual worker	52.9%
Have friend who has been on welfare	29.3%
Have friend who owns a vacation home	50.8%

Volunteerism can be a challenge in large urban places with highly mobile populations. Neighborhood social services providers, arts organizations, children and youth organizations and other civic functions depend upon volunteers to operate effectively (Skocpol and Fiorina 1999). Chicago performed poorly on the 2000 Harvard survey with respect to volunteering in national comparison, and the current survey suggests it remains in a similar place. In the Chicago region, people were most likely to volunteer in some capacity at a place of worship, and were almost as likely to volunteer for a school or youth program.

**Table 1.3 Type of volunteering last year by type.**

	<b>Percent volunteering</b>
<b>Place of worship</b>	40.1%
<b>Health related</b>	22.8%
<b>School or youth program</b>	38.5%
<b>Help poor or elderly</b>	35.1%
<b>Arts or culture</b>	14.3%
<b>Neighborhood/civic group</b>	26.7%

Chicago also performed quite low in measures of trust in the 2001 Harvard social capital survey. The Chicago region was around the national average on trust measures in the 2010 survey, although the City of Chicago remained lower. About half of all 2010 respondents (47%) felt that in general people could be trusted. People were most likely to be highly trusting of people in their religious institutions, but even that came with qualifications for about half of Chicagoans. Nationally, surveys typically indicate

generalized trust at between 37% and 45% of the population. Trust has been declining nationally for 50 years with generalized trust at around 55% in the early 1960s.

The lack of trust in a place is costly when we try to do regional planning, raise and share tax revenues, share public spaces and institutions, and conduct politics. It makes law enforcement more difficult and ultimately less effective, and makes educating and raising children harder. (Fukuyama 1995, Bryk and Schneider 2005, Putnam 2000, Uslaner and Brown 2005; DiPrete et al 2011)

There are likely countless reasons for the lack of trust felt by about half of residents: history and tradition of ethnic, racial and neighborhood identity; a civic culture and tradition of conflict whether organized around labor/management, politics (Beirut by the Lake), the idea that Chicagoans are tough, rugged, individualists. The history of racial conflict and the immigration of hundreds of thousands of non-English speakers makes communication and common cause more challenging. Chicago has both an authentic history and notorious tradition of political corruption wherein it is popularly assumed that politicians are “on the take” and do not necessarily have the best interests of constituents and the common weal at heart. In large religious institutions, a member likely knows far fewer people than they don’t know, and religious institutions can engender a fear of judgment in some members, or be seen as judging others.

**Table 1.4 Trust by group**

	<b>People can be trusted</b>	<b>Depends</b>	<b>You can't be too careful</b>	
Trust	47.4%	2.8%	49.8%	
	<b>A lot</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Only a little</b>	<b>Not at all</b>
Trust people in neighborhood	32.7%	49.4%	13.8%	4.1%
Trust coworkers	41.3%	43.5%	10.4%	4.8%
Trust people at place of worship	52.9%	37.9%	7.0%	2.2%
Trust of people in stores where shop	22.1%	54.8%	16.2%	6.8%
Trust police in local community a lot	45.6%	40.0%	10.2%	4.3%
Trust of police in local community	45.6%	40.0%	10.2%	4.3%
Trust white people	25.1%	63.4%	9.0%	2.4%
Trust African American people	20.6%	65.5%	10.5%	3.4%
Trust Asian people	21.7%	65.1%	9.6%	3.6%
Trust Latino people	20.8%	65.7%	10.6%	2.9%
Trust Arab Americans	16.2%	60.8%	15.6%	7.3%

One of the most damaging casualties of Chicago’s history of racial conflict and public corruption is trust of the police. Trust of the police is essential for effective law enforcement because people need to report offenses, be willing to witness and testify, and ideally, view local police as partners rather than adversaries in maintaining safe and friendly communities. About 40% of respondents expressed “a great deal of confidence” in the police to do a good job, and only 30% had “a great deal of confidence” that racial/ethnic groups are treated fairly. In each case, another 40% of respondents expressed “a fair amount” of confidence in the police.

**Table 1.5 Confidence in police**

	<b>A great deal</b>	<b>A fair amount</b>	<b>Just some</b>	<b>Very little</b>
Confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law	40.1%	40.5%	13.3%	6.1%
Confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects	33.6%	38.2%	17.7%	10.6%
Confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally	30.9%	37.8%	19.9%	11.4%

**Neighborhood Strength**

Most law enforcement actually takes place informally through communication of expectations and modeling standards of good citizenship by everyday people in every walk of life. (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997, Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush 2001) No one would want, or ever be able to afford, the police having the lead role in maintaining safety and social order. It is, therefore, important that residents feel that their neighbors are willing to play a role in maintaining appropriate standards of conduct.

The survey indicated mixed results as to how responsive most people feel their neighbors would be to conventional threats to neighborhood social order or well-being. The survey suggested that most people felt that there was some likelihood that their neighbors would respond to various threats to community and well-being, but were less than certain of it. Respondents expressed general belief that people in their communities were joined together in some sense (around 60%), but only around 20% “strongly agree” that their neighborhood was “close knit”, neighbors helped one another, or could be trusted.

**Table 1.6 Neighborhood intervention**

Likelihood of neighborhood response:	<b>Very likely</b>	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Unlikely</b>	<b>Very unlikely</b>
Children skipping school	36.9%	33.6%	18.9%	10.0%
Graffiti	59.7%	28.7%	7.5%	3.9%
Scolding a disrespectful child	17.0%	40.4%	29.3%	12.8%
Breaking up a fight	42.8%	34.4%	15.9%	6.6%
Stop closing of a fire station	47.5%	34.6%	12.3%	5.3%

**Table 1.7 Neighborhood cohesion**

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
Close-knit neighborhood that pulls together	16.8%	54.2%	22.3%	5.2%
Neighbors help one another	27.7%	61.1%	8.9%	2.0%
People in neighborhood can be trusted	22.3%	62.5%	10.9%	3.7%
Neighbors DO NOT get along with one another	1.7%	8.7%	61.1%	28.1%
Neighbors DO NOT share the same values	5.7%	22.8%	54.2%	16.6%

## Well Being

Arguably, the most important function of society is to help people to be happy (Bok 2011). As entire fields of psychology attest and debate, there are limits to how much social policies, or even one’s closest family and friends, can help or enable a person to be happy. Scholars work to determine whether a person’s experience of happiness tends to be more absolute, or more relative, and therefore harder to change over the long term. Still, it would seem that the number of persons in the region who live happily should be at least one measure of how well our policy and social priorities are working, and this measure is becoming increasingly popular in national surveys and indicator systems of well-being. (Lane 2001)

The assessment of how well we are doing as a region depends on the standard that we set. To the extent that we would like everyone to report being very happy, very optimistic, or very satisfied with different domains of life, the region could be doing better. In 2010 only 19.7% of residents regionally reported on the survey that they felt “very happy” overall. However, another 59% indicated that they were at least “pretty happy”. These figures are a little lower, but generally typical of figures from national surveys. While perhaps not entirely happy, half of residents did express strong optimism about the future. About half were very satisfied with their current job, and nearly 60% with their closest personal relationship.

One-third considered their neighborhoods excellent places to live, while only about 3% considered them poor places to live. But ominously, about 20% thought their neighborhood had gotten worse over the past 5 years.

**Table 1.8 Subjective well-being**

	<b>Very happy</b>	<b>Pretty happy</b>	<b>Not too happy</b>	
<b>How happy do you feel</b>	19.7%	58.7%	21.5%	
<b>Happiness with marriage/relationship</b>	57.0%	39.1%	3.85	
<b>Optimism or pessimism about next few years</b>	<b>Very Optimistic</b>	<b>In between</b>	<b>Very pessimistic</b>	
	52.8%	37.3%	9.9%	
<b>Assessment of own health</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
	26.5%	52.5%	17.7%	3.3%
<b>Satisfaction with current job</b>	<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Moderately satisfied</b>	<b>Little dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
	48.3%	39.5%	7.3%	5.0%

**Table 1.9 Neighborhood quality**

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Rate your community as a place to live</b>	33.6%	48.9%	14.5%	2.9%
	<b>Better</b>	<b>About the same</b>	<b>Worse</b>	
<b>Neighborhood change over past five years</b>	23.6%	56.8%	19.6%	
<b>Likely neighborhood change over next five years</b>	27.1%	60.4%	12.5%	

**Discrimination**

Survey results in 2010 were consistent with a long-term trend toward less acceptance of racial discrimination across the American population, extending back approximately 50 years (Sniderman and Piazza 1995). Most Chicago-area survey respondents (82%) said they prefer some mix of groups, while about 72% said they favor integration, and that a homeowner should not be able to refuse to sell to someone of a particular race. While we can argue that people will say something on a survey that they may not in fact mean because of awareness of changing social norms and pressure to conform to them when talking to a survey interviewer, there was, in fact, a day when respondents did not answer so favorably. (Sniderman and Piazza 1995) For instance, Gallup surveys in 1967 reported about 75% of Whites saying they would move if “great numbers” of blacks moved into their neighborhood. By 1997, that figure had fallen to 20% (Leachman 1997). So at the very least, social norms are gradually moving toward greater cross-racial acceptance.

Levels of support for same-sex marriage and accepting undocumented immigrants are lower than cross-racial acceptance, but broadly consistent with other national surveys conducted around 2010, showing a fairly evenly divided population.

**Table 1.10 Policy preferences**

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Quality of race relations in your community is good or excellent</b>	17.2%	39.8%	34.2%	8.9%
	<b>Integration</b>	<b>Something between</b>	<b>Separation</b>	
<b>Favor racial →</b>	72.1%	25.5%	2.3%	
	<b>Mix of groups</b>	<b>Some other group</b>	<b>Same as respondent</b>	
<b>Preference for racial makeup of community mix of groups</b>	82.7%	2.3%	15.0%	
	<b>Homeowner cannot refuse</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Homeowner decide for self</b>	
<b>Support of laws where homeowner cannot</b>	73.2%	1.5%	25.3%	

<b>refuse race to sell to</b>			
	<b>Strongly Agree or agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Disagree or Strongly disagree</b>
<b>Undocumented immigrants should be welcome in Chicago area community</b>	45.9%	10.6%	43.5%
<b>Persons of same sex should be able to marry</b>	47.7%	10.7%	41.7%



## CHICAGO AREA SUB-REGIONS

### *Summary*

#### **Connectedness**

Across nearly every variable measuring social connectedness, Collar County residents reported the most connectedness and Chicago residents reported the least.

- Suburban residents reported:
  - Knowing more of their neighbors
  - Anticipating greater neighborhood responses to local problems
  - Consider their neighbors more closely connected and sharing their values
- Suburban residents reported having more friends and more people in whom they confide.
- Suburban residents were much less likely to say they had no friends or no one in whom they could confide.
- Suburban residents reported having greater diversity of personal relationships than did city residents among some religious groups and social class.
- City residents were more likely to volunteer in arts and culture settings, while Collar County residents reported greater help to seniors and the poor.
- Levels of trust reported in the suburbs were far higher than in the city, and far fewer suburbanites said they had little or no trust than did city residents. The Collar Counties reported far higher levels of trust than did the Cook suburbs.
- Suburban residents expressed far more confidence in the police than did city residents.

#### **Well Being**

Collar county residents reported the greatest overall happiness, job satisfaction, health, and happiness with their marriages or relationships with significant others.

- On optimism and health, city residents reported more favorably than did the Cook suburbs.
- Collar County residents were twice as likely as city residents to rate their community as an “excellent” place to live.
- City residents were most likely to say their community had changed for the better over the past five years, and that it would likely be better in the next five. However, city residents were also more likely to say their community would get worse over the next five years while few Collar County residents felt that way.

#### **Discrimination**

- Perceptions or experiences of discrimination were stronger in the City.
- Collar county residents expressed greater support for integration and assessed quality of race relations higher than did Chicago and Cook suburban respondents. It is important to note that less racial diversity exists in the Collar counties than in Cook.
- Significantly more Chicago residents reported having been a victim of discrimination at some time in their lives.

Multi-variate analysis indicated that many of these regional differences were driven by imbalances of differences among racial/ethnic groups, and disparate levels of income and education that also existed across the three regions.

## Findings

One of the persistent questions of urban development has been the impact of living conditions and geography on strength of ties between people, and whether those patterns are different in the city and suburbs. So-called “New Urbanists” have argued that personal connections are attenuated by suburban living where people reside further apart and may share fewer public institutions, services and facilities (Bressi 1994, Burchell et al 1998, Calthorpe 1993). In the Collar counties, populations are more racially homogenous, and consequently appear to be less diverse culturally as well.

On the other hand, cities tend to be populated by more mobile people, and the greater population diversity of cities does not necessarily translate into quality personal relationships and connection. Population heterogeneity can lead to conflict and separation more than to community if people separate themselves because of language differences, cultural identity, racial/ethnic differences, competition for resources or access to political influence. The very fact of mobility can make it harder to establish long-term or trusting relationships.

### Connectedness

Chicago has long prided itself on being a city of neighborhoods, with the implication that neighborhood life breeds close associations and high quality of life. But while Chicago may be neighborly, the data suggests the suburbs are even more so. The differences reported between Chicago and its suburbs in numbers of friends are not great, but that they exist at all, in the direction that they do, is noteworthy. The most common means of finding a job is through a personal connection (Holzer, 1987) and it would appear, therefore, that suburbanites are better positioned for job search: both because they know more people and because they know more people with connections to businesses.

A key element in crime prevention is neighborhood efficacy – the idea that people watch out for one another, share values, and are willing to intervene to prevent various forms of delinquency and disorder. The data from the survey suggests that these attributes were more commonly found in Cook suburbs than in Chicago, and were most common in the Collar counties. Suburbanites were far more likely to report that they thought their neighbors would intervene in various forms of disorder, and they were also much more likely than city residents to feel that their neighborhoods had strong networks of relationships and that their neighbors shared the same values. As would be predicted, this pattern correlates with crime rates, which were generally lower in suburban communities than in the city.

**Table 2.1 Neighborhood connectedness, intervention and cohesion by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
Know 10 or more neighbors personally	42.8%	44.6%	47.5%	45.0%**
Know 5 or more employees of neighborhood businesses personally	25.3%	29.9%	33.4%	29.5%**
Know the workplace of 5 or more neighbors	45.8%	45.2%	52.0%	47.8%**
Have friend or neighbor who works for neighborhood business	34.0%	37.8%	46.3%	39.6%**
Very likely neighborhood response to child skipping	29.8%	38.1%	42.7%	36.9%**

school				
Very likely neighborhood response to graffiti	48.8%	60.9%	69.1%	59.7%**
Very likely that neighbors would scold a disrespectful child	12.6%	17.8%	20.7%	17.0%**
Very likely that neighbors would break up a fight	34.1%	41.7%	51.9%	42.8%**
Very likely neighbors organize to stop closing of a fire station	43.4%	48.4%	50.8%	47.5%**
Strongly agree close-knit neighborhood that pulls together	12.4%	16.9%	20.8%	16.8%**
Strongly agree neighbors help one another	18.8%	29.1%	35.0%	27.7%**
Strongly disagree neighbors do not get along with one another	23.9%	26.7%	33.1%	28.1%**
Strongly disagree neighbors do not share the same values	11.6%	16.5%	21.6%	16.6%**
Strongly agree people in neighborhood can be trusted	13.1%	21.6%	31.2%	22.3%**
Difference between groups significant * = p < .05 ** = p < .01				

Research shows that networks of friends and acquaintances are useful for finding employment, developing business opportunities, obtaining reliable child-care, and generally having a high quality of life (Duncan and Raudenbush 1999, Granovetter 1995, Woolcock 1998, Wuthnow, 1998). About 30% of persons across the region reported having at least 6 close friends, and again we can observe the differences across Chicago, suburban Cook County and the Collar counties. Collar county respondents were 50% more likely to report many close friends and confidantes. However, more problematic is the number of persons who claim to have no close friends or confidants. This appears to be more of a problem in Chicago, where 20% of survey respondents said they had no one in whom they could confide, while only 10% of suburbanites said this.

**Table 2.2 Personal Relationships by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
Six or more close friends	24.3%	30.8%	36.1%	30.4%**
No close friends	14.1%	10.4%	10.0%	11.6%**
Three or more people to confide in	42.7%	50.3%	63.4%	52.4%**
No people to confide in	20.6%	12.9%	10.7%	14.8%**
Have personal friend who owns a business	51.2%	49.3%	56.4%	52.5%**
Have personal friend who is a manual worker	50.8%	49.7%	57.6%	52.9%**
Have friend who has been on welfare	37.2%	24.7%	25.3%	29.3%**
Have friend who owns a vacation home	45.4%	48.1%	58.1%	50.8%**
Difference between groups significant * = p < .05 ** = p < .01				

While a large number of friends who are similar may contribute to good quality of social life, diversity of friendships contributes to strong race relations and acceptance of social diversity, and it is well-established that these so-called “weak ties” or “bridging ties” are essential for political mobilization and finding employment (Granovetter 1983). Here the pattern was mixed. Protestants and “other” religious

persons were more likely to have more non-Protestant friends in the Collar suburbs, but there was little regional difference with respect to other religious groups. Conversely, in Chicago, non-religious persons were more likely to have a religious friend.

**Table 2.3 Diversity of personal relationships by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
If Protestant, have non-Protestant friend	70.9%	73.7%	79.2%	75.0%
If Catholic, have non-Catholic friend	86.7%	75.1%	86.2%	82.8%**
If Jewish, have non-Jewish friend	88.9%	84.0%	88.9%	86.7%
If other religion, have friend different religion	76.1%	69.5%	88.2%	78.6%**
If not religious, have very religious friend	63.1%	52.7%	50.4%	56.7%*
Have friend who is Latino	64.3%	59.5%	58.1%	60.7%**
Have friend who is Asian	40.6%	33.9%	38.5%	37.9%**
Have friend who is African American	74.6%	57.7%	55.1%	62.7%**
Have friend who is gay/lesbian	57.1%	41.8%	44.5%	48.1%**
Have friend who is a community leader	43.3%	41.3%	47.6%	44.3%*

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01

Collar county residents expressed somewhat more likelihood of volunteering in various settings than did Chicago or suburban Cook residents, although differences were small. The exception was arts and culture, where almost twice as many Chicago residents indicated that they volunteered.

**Table 2.4 Type of volunteering last year by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
Volunteered somewhere **	66.4%	68.0%	72.2%	31.1%
Place of worship	39.7%	37.8%	42.2%	40.1%
Health related	20.8%	22.7%	24.8%	22.8%
School or youth program	37.3%	37.1%	40.7%	38.5%
Help poor or elderly **	33.5%	31.4%	39.7%	35.1%**
Arts or culture **	18.7%	13.1%	10.8%	14.3%**
Neighborhood/civic group	27.3%	23.6%	28.6%	26.7%*

Difference between groups significant \*= p <.05 \*\*= p <.01

The capacity to trust is essential to the well-being of communities. It correlates with support for policies that accept diverse people. It is essential for security from crime, and for people feeling comfortable in their communities. People benefit both from trusting, and from feeling, and being, trusted.

The survey revealed significant differences between levels of trust in Chicago and the suburbs with trust lowest in the city and highest in the Collar Counties. For many factors, differences were extreme. Any number of explanations could account for the lack of trust in Chicago: the history of contentious race relations, the mobility of people that can lead to instability of relationships, the relatively high

crime rates, history of police corruption, and the presence of large numbers of people who may speak different languages or be culturally different. Multi-variate analysis indicated that many of these regional differences were, in fact, driven by imbalances of differences among racial/ethnic groups, and disparate levels of income and education that also exist across the three regions. But whatever the reason, suburbanites were better positioned to utilize the huge value of trust than were city residents.

**Table 2.5 Trust by type and sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>	<b>Total</b>
People can be trusted	42.8%	45.7%	53.3%	47.4%**
Trust people in neighborhood a lot	19.7%	32.4%	45.7%	32.7%**
Trust people in neighborhood only a little or not at all	26.0%	19.6%	8.5%	17.9%**
Trust coworkers a lot	36.1%	42.3%	45.8%	41.3%**
Trust of coworkers only a little or not at all	16.9%	17.5%	11.7%	15.2%**
Trust people at place of worship a lot	45.7%	51.5%	60.8%	52.9%**
Trust people at place of worship only a little or not at all	11.9%	11.2%	5.8%	9.2%**
Trust of people in stores where shop a lot	20.7%	20.4%	24.9%	22.1%**
Trust of people in stores where you shop only a little or not at all	27.7%	25.4%	16.7%	23.0%**
Trust police in local community a lot	32.1%	47.2%	57.4%	45.6%**
Trust police in local community only a little or not at all	20.4%	14.9%	8.5%	14.5%**
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01				

Huge distinctions existed across sub-regions of the Chicago area with respect to confidence in the police. The survey indicated fairly strong confidence in the Collar counties, a little less in the Cook suburbs, and serious confidence problems in the City. About 30% to 40% of respondents reported “a fair amount “ of confidence on each question.

**Table 2.6 Confidence in the police by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>	<b>Total</b>
A great deal of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law	22.8%	44.9%	53.0%	40.1%**
A great deal of confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects	19.1%	35.6%	46.4%	33.6%**
A great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally	18.7%	34.1%	40.4%	30.9%**
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01				

Very few members of any racial/ethnic group were highly trusting of the members of others. The strong distrust levels were consistently around 20%. Arab Americans appeared to be the least trusted of the groups considered in the survey, suggesting that perceptions of international events contribute to local attitudes.

**Table 2.7 Demographic group trust by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
Trust white people a lot	18.5%	26.1%	30.9%	25.0%**
Trust white people only a little or not at all	17.3%	10.8%	6.1%	11.4%**
Trust African American people a lot	15.0%	19.8%	26.7%	20.6%**
Trust African American people a little or not at all	19.8%	14.5%	7.8%	13.9%**
Trust Asian people a lot	16.1%	21.6%	27.5%	21.7%**
Trust Asian people a little or not at all	18.2%	14.5%	7.2%	13.5%**
Trust Latino people a lot	14.9%	21.2%	26.5%	20.8%**
Trust Latino people a little or not at all	17.8%	15.1%	8.0%	13.5%**
Trust Arab Americans a lot	12.5%	15.2%	21.0%	16.2%**
Trust Arab Americans a little or not at all	26.6%	26.4%	16.3%	22.9%**

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01

## Well-Being

Respondents in Collar county suburbs reported more positive subjective well-being than did residents of Cook County. The differences were statistically significant owing to the large sample size, although not large. The largest differences were in satisfaction with marriage or significant other relationship, with job, and with overall happiness – about 7% or 8% differences between city and collar counties.

**Table 2.8 Measures of well-being by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
Feel very happy overall	16.5%	19.7%	22.8%	19.7%**
Very optimistic about next few years	54.2%	51.5%	52.4%	52.8%
Own health excellent	26.6%	21.2%	30.5%	26.5%**
Very satisfied with current job	45.3%	46.5%	52.6%	48.3%*
Very happy with marriage/relationship	53.7%	54.4%	61.3%	57.0%*

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01

Suburbanites were much happier with their communities than were city residents, 45% compared to 20% considering it an “excellent” place to live. The wide diversity of quality of Chicago communities was evident in the findings: Chicagoans were more likely to say that their community had gotten better, but were also far more likely to say it had gotten worse. This likely owed to the deterioration of some of Chicago’s lowest income and highest crime neighborhoods, particularly in the wake of the mortgage crisis, while other neighborhoods remained stable or improved.

**Table 2.9 Neighborhood quality by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties	Total
Rated community as an excellent place to live	20.8%	35.0%	44.9%	33.6% **
Outsiders rate your neighborhood as an excellent place to	16.0%	24.6%	29.7%	23.4%**

live				
Neighborhood change better over the past five years	26.7%	20.3%	23.1%	23.6%**
Neighborhood change worse over the past five years	23.2%	21.7%	14.3%	19.6%**
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better	29.3%	25.7%	26.0%	27.1%**

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01



## Discrimination

The survey indicated that suburban residents had a better assessment of race relations, and were actually more in favor of racial integration, than were Chicago residents. While that may have been true, we must contextualize the data with the possibility that the surfeit of racial minorities living in the outer suburbs creates the illusion that racial integration is proceeding better than it sometimes does, and it is easier to be in favor of it when the group migrating in does so in very small numbers (Farley, Reynolds and Krysan 1997). It is note-worthy that the responses of suburban Cook residents were similar to those of Chicago – with northwest Cook County experiencing enormous in-migration of Latinos while south Cook had become increasingly black. Collar county residents indicated less feeling that members of various groups were hurt often by discrimination, and indicated less personal experience with discrimination, which is in keeping with the perception that race relations in general are of high quality.

Sometimes it may be easier to be accepting of diversity when one actually encounters less of it, than when one must contend with the challenges entailed in actually making social diversity work. For instance, hate crimes occur less in settings where members of contending groups rarely, if ever, come into contact with one another, than in the areas where they do. (Taylor, 1992) In this sense, then, perhaps it is less surprising that Collar county residents were more positive about the quality of race relations than were Chicago residents, and by a significant margin.

Suburban respondents were less liberal in their support of the undocumented, while they expressed greater support of same-sex marriage, which has not always been supported by many African Americans and Catholic Latinos, who comprise so much of the city’s population.

**Table 2.10 Policy preferences by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>	<b>Total</b>
Quality of race relations in your community is good or excellent	51.1%	54.6%	64.5%	57.0%**
Favor racial integration	69.1%	70.2%	76.7%	72.1%**
Preference for racial makeup of community mix of groups	82.1%	83.2%	82.9%	82.7%
Support laws where homeowner cannot refuse race to sell to	72.5%	74.6%	72.8%	73.2%
Agree or strongly agree undocumented immigrants should be welcome in Chicago area community	48.3%	52.2%	38.7%	45.9%**
Agree or strongly agree persons of same sex should be able to marry	43.1%	47.8%	52.0%	47.7%

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01

In general, there was greater consciousness of discrimination in Chicago than in the suburbs. This was true regarding African Americans, LGBs, immigrants and seniors. Chicago residents were also much more likely to report that they had been discriminated against personally. The perception of discrimination likely contributed to undermining of trust and assessment of quality of life of City neighborhoods.

**Table 2.11 Discrimination by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>	<b>Total</b>
Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently	25.5%	30.7%	22.1%	25.8%**
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently	44.0%	34.1%	28.1%	35.5%**
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently	9.7%	10.3%	8.2%	9.3%
White people are hurt by discrimination frequently	4.7%	6.8%	6.9%	6.1%
LGBs/lesbians are hurt by discrimination frequently	35.8%	31.9%	29.0%	32.2%**
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently	46.4%	40.3%	37.2%	41.4%**
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently	22.1%	23.6%	19.0%	21.4%**
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently	37.0%	32.1%	28.8%	32.6%**
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01				

**Table 2.12 Personal discrimination by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>	<b>Total</b>
Have been a victim of discrimination	47.7%	39.2%	36.1%	41.1%**
Related to jobs (26.2% in past year)	31.0%	25.8%	24.8%	27.6%
Related to education (14% in past year)	15.7%	15.7%	16.2%	15.9%
Related to housing (16.7% in past year)	25.3%	18.4%	11.6%	19.1%**
Related to something else (30.5% in past year)	32.0%	23.7%	22.7%	26.8%**
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01				

## **RACE/ETHNICITY**

### ***Summary***

#### **Connectedness**

- Evidence across most of the survey domains indicated that persons of different races, and African Americans in particular, experienced social life in the region differently.
- Across most survey measures, whites indicated knowing more people, and being relationally closer to those people, than did members of other groups. Asians were most likely to report that they had no close friends or persons in whom they felt they could confide.
- Whites reported living in neighborhoods where people share more common values.
- African Americans were the most insular of the 4 major groups in terms of having fewer friends who were of a different racial or religious group.
- Whites were most likely to have Asian friends, and Latinos were most likely to have African American or gay friends. Latinos were most likely to say someone in their family had brought home a member of another racial group.
- African Americans were most likely to volunteer.
- White respondents were far more likely to indicate that they trusted neighbors, co-workers, and members of other racial groups, and African Americans were the least trusting.
- African Americans and Latinos had far less confidence in the police than did Whites or Asians.

#### **Well-Being**

- Latinos and Asians expressed greater overall happiness than did Whites or Blacks.
- Latinos were most optimistic about the future, were most satisfied with their current job, and were most optimistic about their neighborhood.
- Whites were happiest with their marriage or relationship with a significant other.
- Whites were far more likely than members of the other groups to feel their neighborhood was an excellent place to live.

#### **Discrimination**

- Over half of Blacks and almost half of Latinos reported having been a victim of racial discrimination.

- Blacks were most likely to say that discrimination had taken place in education or housing.
- Blacks were by far the most sensitive to the possibility that other groups are discriminated against, perceiving discrimination against other racial groups, women, LGBs and seniors. Latinos were most likely to think immigrants were discriminated against.
- Whites and Asians were far more likely to report the quality of race relations in their communities as good or excellent than were Blacks or Latinos.
- Blacks expressed the strongest preference for racially mixed communities and for open housing laws. Latinos were most welcoming of undocumented immigrants, and Whites most supportive of same-sex marriage.

## Findings

An extensive research literature exists documenting the segregation of Americans along racial lines. Blacks and whites, in particular, are measurably highly segregated in where they live (Massey and Denton 1993), work (Tomaskovic-Devey et al 2006), worship (Vischer 2001) and go to school (Moody 2001). Because of the potentially damaging effects of racial separation, and the large average racial differences in unemployment, income, and wealth, it remains important to continue to understand how life in the Chicago region is experienced by members of different racial/ethnic groups (Massey and Denton 2001 and Wilson 1987).

### Connectedness

Analyzing connection is important because where differences in the number or quality of connections exist, group members derive significant advantages in many life domains. In the Chicago region, Whites appeared to be most closely connected to other members of their neighborhoods, while Latinos were the least. Whites were most likely to say that they lived in a close-knit neighborhood, that neighbors helped one another, shared values, and could be trusted. Since Latinos were the most likely of the three large groups to live in racially mixed neighborhoods, for many, language differences may impede relationships within the neighborhood. Latinos were more likely to be new arrivals in a neighborhood, which could have militated against having denser, longer-standing relationships.

**Table 3.1 Neighborhood connectedness by race**

	White	Black	Latino	Asian
Know 10 or more neighbors personally **	49.3%	41.6%	35.1%	40.0%
Know 5 or more employees of neighborhood businesses personally **	31.4%	27.9%	25.0%	23.2%
Know the workplace of 5 or more neighbors **	51.2%	37.3%	46.0%	44.5%
Friend or neighbor who works for neighborhood business **	42.3%	36.5%	32.5%	41.5%
Very likely neighborhood response to child skipping school **	37.6%	31.3%	41.3%	31.3%
Very likely neighborhood response to graffiti **	66.0%	52.3%	49.2%	57.7%
Very likely that neighbors would scold a disrespectful child **	16.8%	17.0%	19.3%	13.0%
Very likely that neighbors would break up a fight **	44.1%	39.2%	45.8%	45.8%
Very likely neighbors organize to stop closing of a fire station **	46.7%	49.4%	49.2%	57.4%
Strongly agree close-knit neighborhood that pulls together	18.4%	15.5%	13.5%	11.3%
Strongly agree neighbors help one another **	30.4%	20.7%	27.1%	25.0%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not get along with one another **	31.5%	25.1%	20.6%	29.8%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not share the same values **	20.5%	13.2%	8.4%	14.3%
Strongly agree people in neighborhood can be trusted **	27.1%	13.2%	17.0%	14.9%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

Whites were more likely to have more close friends and confidants. Asians appeared most likely to live in social isolation, with about 18% saying they had no close friends and about 18% indicating they had no one in whom they could confide.

**Table 3.2 Personal relationships by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Six or more close friends **	34.6%	23.9%	23.5%	26.8%
No close friends **	11.1%	9.7%	12.5%	17.9%
Three or more people to confide in **	54.6%	49.5%	47.8%	43.6%
No people to confide in	14.0%	15.7%	15.1%	18.2%
Have personal friend who owns a business **	54.7%	47.3%	48.5%	55.4%
Have personal friend who is a manual worker **	52.5%	53.6%	53.9%	38.2%
Have friend who has been on welfare **	21.4%	48.3%	37.8%	25.0%
Have friend who owns a vacation home **	58.5%	41.1%	35.4%	42.9%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

Blacks appeared to be most isolated within their groups. They were least likely to have a Latino or Asian friend. White non-religious and black Protestants appeared to be most isolated from persons of other religious groups.

**Table 3.3 Diversity of personal relationships by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
If Protestant, have non-Protestant friend	83.2%	55.9%	91.4%	x
If Catholic, have non-Catholic friend	86.4%	82.9%	76.1%	x
If Jewish, have non-Jewish friend	85.8%	x	x	x
If other religion, have friend different religion	90.5%	67.3%	78.6%	80.0%
If not religious, have very religious friend	53.5%	84.8%	69.8%	20.0%
Have friend who is Latino	55.1%	50.5%	90.2%	55.4%
Have friend who is Asian	39.8%	25.5%	33.9%	91.2%
Have friend who is African American	53.7%	98.0%	59.6%	54.4%
Have friend who is gay/lesbian	48.3%	44.3%	50.8%	33.9%
Have friend who is a community leader	40.8%	55.3%	44.0%	37.5%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

X = LT 15 responses so omitted

Across all major racial/ethnic groups, about half of respondents reported having guests in their home of a different race. Given the hyper-segregation of housing between blacks and whites, this suggests that at least some social relationships transcended the housing patterns. Blacks did express that they were more likely to bring home a white (58%) than Whites to bring home a black (46%). The same pattern existed for Latinos, who were more likely to bring home a white (69%) than Whites were to bring home a Latino (49%).

**Table 3.4 Family friends by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Family member brought home in the last few				

years:

African American **	46.6%		60.7%	42.9%
White/Anglo **		58.3%	69.9%	64.3%
Latino/Hispanic **	49.3%	45.6%		44.6%
Arab/Muslim **	14.9%	21.9%	14.5%	21.6%
Gay/Lesbian **	42.3%	42.4%	58.7%	39.3%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

Blacks appeared to be the most prolific volunteers, with nearly 75% reporting having volunteered somewhere. They were particularly active through churches, and nearly half reported volunteering for a youth program or to help the poor or elderly. Latinos reported volunteering the least, which could be a result of their much younger average age and consequent need for time with children, lower average long-term connection to their neighborhoods because so much of the population is immigrant, or lack of institutional opportunities.

**Table 3.5 Type of volunteering by race**

	White	Black	Latino	Asian
Volunteered somewhere **	69.3%	74.7%	61.2%	68.4%
Place of worship **	39.0%	52.2%	29.7%	53.7%
Health related **	24.4%	25.0%	15.3%	22.6%
School or youth program **	36.1%	46.1%	37.3%	39.3%
Help poor or elderly **	35.7%	46.1%	22.7%	30.4%
Arts or culture **	14.4%	15.4%	10.5%	21.4%
Neighborhood/civic group **	26.3%	34.0%	19.4%	23.2%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

Fairly consistent patterns emerged across racial groups on trust, with whites the most trusting and African Americans the least, this consistent with national patterns.

The far higher level of trust reported by Whites probably contributes to higher levels of overall happiness, but also positions Whites better to take advantage of all that the Chicago-area offers. Because of the racial segregation that pervades white and African American neighborhoods, whites tend to encounter other whites, who have higher trust levels, while low-trusting blacks likewise are more likely to encounter other persons who trust little. This can help whites to be more effective job seekers, form political organizations more easily, better take advantage of public spaces and institutions and raise their children in safer, more socially engaged environments. And in fact, whites do enjoy less unemployment, higher voter turnout and live in safer neighborhoods. The lack of neighborhood-level trust, particularly in black communities, contributes to the higher levels of crime that tend to be found there. (Samson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997) The inability to trust police has a reciprocal effect where police receive less cooperation investigating crimes, and in turn may distance themselves from local residents.

This is not to say that the lack of trust experienced by so many African Americans, and to a lesser degree Latinos, is not without cause. Centuries of discrimination, police brutality, segregation, social isolation, economic distress and high levels of residential mobility have taken a toll. This history and its remnant

in current social conditions must be acknowledged; yet its impact also must one day pass for African Americans and Latinos to take full advantage of what the metropolis offers. This requires fairness on the part of the majority population and other empowered persons, but also a willingness to recognize where people and institutions do operate fairly and where opportunity actually does exist, on the part of racial groups who have experienced a history of discrimination.

**Table 3.6 Functional group trust by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
People can be trusted **	54.7%	32.2%	38.6%	61.1%
Trust people in neighborhood a lot **	42.7%	13.8%	21.5%	16.4%
Trust people in neighborhood only a little or not at all **	9.6%	36.3%	25.0%	16.4%
Trust coworkers a lot **	50.4%	20.5%	33.6%	22.0%
Trust of coworkers only a little or not at all **	9.0%	31.3%	20.3%	22.0%
Trust people at place of worship a lot **	60.6%	42.0%	42.6%	43.9%
Trust people at place of worship only a little or not at all **	5.6%	10.7%	17.6%	12.2%
Trust of people in stores where shop a lot **	27.9%	11.2%	13.6%	14.0%
Trust of people in stores where you shop only a little or not at all **	15.3%	36.9%	32.8%	28.1%
Trust police in local community a lot **	57.1%	24.0%	31.0%	29.1%
Trust of police in local community only a little or not at all **	7.4%	29.2%	22.1%	16.3%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05    \*\* = p<.01

Huge differences existed in trust of the police with Whites and Asians having far more confidence in the police than did African Americans and Latinos. These differences cannot be surprising given the history of African American relations with the police and the extraordinarily disproportionate arrest and incarceration of blacks that exists in the City and statewide. Police tactics, ostensibly in the service of preventing crime, can also have the effect of antagonizing local residents when they feel they have been unreasonably stopped, questioned or searched. Racial profiling remains a significant issue and many neighborhoods with higher crime rates, which are more likely to have more African American and Latino residents, are torn between how much police presence is enough versus too much.

**Table 3.7 Confidence in the police by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
A great deal of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law **	48.2%	23.4%	28.5%	50.0%
A great deal of confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects **	43.1%	14.7%	20.9%	35.2%
A great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally **	38.0%	15.0%	21.7%	30.9%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05    \*\* = p<.01

Within none of the racial/ethnic groups were large numbers of people highly trusting of members of other racial/ethnic groups. Percentages of persons trusting members of another group “little or not at all” are consistently around 20%. Members of particular racial groups do not necessarily report higher



levels of trust of their own group. For instance, white respondents reported greater levels of trust of other minorities than members of those groups did.

**Table 3.8 Demographic group trust by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Trust white people a lot **	29.6%	13.3%	21.9%	18.2%
Trust white people only a little or not at all **	5.1%	22.0%	19.7%	10.9%
Trust African American people a lot **	24.1%	13.1%	16.5%	14.5%
Trust African American people a little or not at all **	8.0%	20.4%	24.6%	16.3%
Trust Asian people a lot **	25.4%	11.0%	19.5%	16.1%
Trust Asian people a little or not at all **	7.1%	21.0%	23.8%	12.5%
Trust Latino people a lot **	24.2%	10.8%	19.4%	11.1%
Trust Latino people a little or not at all **	9.0%	21.2%	18.1%	22.2%
Trust Arab Americans a lot **	18.2%	8.6%	15.7%	11.3%
Trust Arab Americans a little or not at all **	18.0%	28.4%	31.6%	20.7%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05    \*\* = p<.01

### **Well-Being**

In spite of whites having better material well being, such as higher levels of education, less poverty, higher income and the like, those benefits had not necessarily purchased greater overall happiness. Despite lower levels of standing on the conventional material indicators of well-being, members of minority groups indicated equal or more satisfaction on a number of survey measures.

Latinos expressed greater overall happiness, while blacks and Latinos expressed greater optimism about the future and greater job satisfaction. This is consistent with recent findings from Pew surveys and other studies. (Cose 2011) Whites did appear to be more satisfied in their marriages or relationships.

**Table 3.9 Well-being by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Feel very happy overall **	19.2%	14.7%	25.7%	20.4%
Very optimistic about next few years **	50.5%	56.2%	60.7%	47.3%
Own health excellent **	28.6%	23.9%	23.8%	25.0%
Very satisfied with current job **	47.7%	47.1%	52.5%	32.4%
Very happy with marriage/relationship **	60.4%	45.9%	52.0%	52.6%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05    \*\* = p<.01

Whites were far more likely to report that their neighborhood was an excellent place to live, and blacks were considerably more likely to say their neighborhood became worse over the last five years – a view validated by the high out-migration of African Americans from the city over the past decade reported in the 2010 Census. Few blacks or Latinos thought outsiders would rate their communities as “excellent” either. However, blacks were also most likely to expect their neighborhood to become better.

**Table 3.10 Neighborhood quality by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Rated community as an excellent place to live **	41.6%	20.8%	22.0%	31.6%
Outsiders rate your neighborhood excellent place to live **	28.4%	16.3%	15.2%	35.7%
Neighborhood change better over the past five years **	23.0%	23.0%	27.2%	25.5%
Neighborhood change worse over the past five years **	17.1%	28.4%	19.7%	7.3%
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better **	22.9%	37.1%	33.4%	19.6%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

## Discrimination

Given the history of race relations in Chicago and the nation, responses conformed to what might be expected:

- Whites and Asians thought race relations were better than did blacks or Latinos, who have been more likely to be on the receiving end of discriminatory practices. This divide was large and significant and likely underlies majority-minority relations, sometimes making communication and integration difficult.
- Blacks were most supportive of living in racially mixed communities and of open housing laws.
- Latinos were most supportive of accepting the undocumented, while whites were most supportive of same-sex marriage.

**Table 3.11 Policy issues by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Quality of race relations in your community is good or excellent **	60.7%	44.9%	44.4%	58.9%
Favor racial integration **	73.3%	72.7%	67.8%	75.9%
Preference for racial makeup of community mix of groups **	79.5%	90.9%	84.0%	85.5%
Support laws where homeowner cannot refuse race to sell to **	69.3%	85.9%	77.4%	55.6%
Agree or strongly agree undocumented immigrants should be welcome in Chicago area community **	41.6%	42.7%	66.5%	26.9%
Agree or strongly agree persons of same sex should be able to marry **	50.7%	41.2%	45.7%	41.5%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

Blacks appeared to have the strongest sense that persons of various identities suffer from discrimination. With respect to perception of discrimination against blacks, the gap between black perception and that of other groups was so large that it is hard to imagine that the difference in perception does not inform views of public affairs, shape how whites and blacks relate to and regard one another, and contribute to the lack of trust reported by large numbers of black survey respondents.

**Table 3.12 Discrimination by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	19.8%	35.2%	37.8%	9.3%
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	26.4%	66.7%	36.1%	9.3%
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	6.8%	16.7%	10.7%	7.3%
White people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	6.7%	4.8%	4.4%	2.0%
LGBs/lesbians are hurt by discrimination frequently **	27.4%	44.3%	38.3%	10.0%
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently **	34.3%	45.2%	61.9%	20.8%
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently **	16.5%	33.3%	25.8%	8.9%
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently **	28.2%	44.2%	37.8%	10.7%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

The figures on experience of discrimination were dominated by the 61.2% of blacks who said they have been discriminated against in their lifetimes. Nearly half of Latinos reported discrimination.

People of all races who said they have experienced discrimination were most likely to say it was around work. Even for whites this can occur because of gender, rather than race, because of perceptions of reverse discrimination, or for some other reason.

**Table 3.13 Personal discrimination by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
Have been a victim of discrimination **	32.1%	61.2%	49.9%	35.7%
Related to jobs **	75.4%	74.6%	62.4%	65.0%
Related to education **	13.7%	21.6%	9.4%	10.0%
Related to housing **	8.8%	36.3%	22.6%	25.0%
Related to something else **	18.8%	29.6%	35.7%	40.0%

Difference between groups significant \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

A huge research literature has developed seeking to explain persistent Black-White segregation, particularly around housing. (Krysan and Farley 2002, Clark 1991, 1992 & 2009, Dawkins 2004, Ihlandfeldt and Scafidi 2002, Leachman 1998). Collectively these studies indicate that persistent segregation is caused by varying combinations of discrimination in housing, differences in racial preference for racial balance of neighborhoods, choices to self-segregate, fear of moving into integrated neighborhoods, and operation of the correlation of race with income in housing markets. History, culture, identity, discrimination and housing segregation in turn lead to separation in worship, work, education and other domains. While separation based on positive individual or community identity can be viewed as a good thing, when segregation or discrimination costs people opportunity for quality education, employment opportunities, health, safety or housing choice, it is a bad thing. This would seem, then, to be an area that the Chicago region must continue to work hard on improving.

## **SEX**

### ***Summary***

#### **Connectedness**

- On the vast majority of measures assessed by the survey, men and women showed little difference in their responses.
- Women tended to be a little more trusting and to see neighborhoods as closer-knit, though differences were small.
- Women indicated slightly more diversity of relationships than did men and were more likely to say a family member had brought home a member of a different racial group.
- Women were more likely to volunteer.

#### **Well-Being**

- Women were a little happier than men overall, and more optimistic about the future. However, women were markedly less happy about their marriages/significant-other relationships than were men.

#### **Discrimination**

- Women were more progressive on all of the policy issues queried in the survey.
- Women were more likely to feel that members of other racial groups or immigrants, women or seniors were hurt by discrimination, and were more likely than men to report having been a victim of discrimination.

## ***Findings***

While it is rarely considered a matter of local policy, relations between men and women, and their comparative experience of life in the region, are important. Women long suffered discrimination in the workplace and, although less so, continue to today. Even in the absence of discrimination, parity in wages or job description remains a potentially divisive issue. Violence against women remains a pressing concern and how men and women relate is central to understanding domestic violence. Women remain a minority of elected office holders. Male and female roles in parenting, children's education and other life spheres continue to evolve. It is, therefore, useful to observe whether there remain significant differences in how men and women respond to various human relations issues.

### ***Connectedness***

On the vast majority of measures assessed by the survey, men and women showed little difference in their responses. This was true of assessments of neighborhood quality, connectedness and shared responsibility, and numbers of neighbors known. Women tended to see neighborhoods as more cohesive than did men, although the differences were very small. Where there were statistically significant differences, they were only about 4% to 6% different.

Women were more likely than men to say:

- People in their neighborhood could be trusted (23.8% to 20.7%)
- Neighbors help one another (30.8% to 24.4%)
- The neighborhood would organize to prevent closing of a fire station (51.2% to 43.5%)
- They live in a "close-knit neighborhood that pulls together (19.9% to 13.5%).

Men and women reported being about equally trusting across each of the domains investigated. Men were slightly more trusting than women of

- People in the neighborhood (34.2% to 31.3%)
- Co-workers (36.2% to 32.2%)
- Confidence in police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally (34.0% to 28.0%)

Relationships ordered somewhat along traditionally gendered lines, but the differences between men and women were not great:

Men were more likely to have a personal friend who

- owns a business (56.4% to 48.9%)
- is a manual worker (58.6% to 47.6%)

Women were more likely to know someone who

- Had been on welfare (31.1% to 27.4%)
- Is African American (65.7% to 59.4%)
- Is gay or lesbian friend (52.1% to 43.7%)
- Is a community leader (46.8% to 41.5%)

Protestant women were more likely to know a non-Protestant person (79.0% to 70.2%)

Across most of the different types of volunteering investigated, women were more likely to volunteer. These included place of worship, health, schools, youth programs and helping the poor or elderly.

**Table 4.1 Volunteering by sex**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Percent volunteering somewhere **	35.4%	27.0%
Place of worship **	36.7%	42.9%
Health related **	18.5%	26.8%
School or youth program **	34.5%	42.1%
Help poor or elderly **	31.5%	38.6%
Arts or culture	13.3%	15.1%
Neighborhood/civic group	25.9%	27.4%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

### **Well-Being**

Women tended to be happier than men, and were somewhat more optimistic about the future, a result common to national surveys. As one would then expect, they were also less likely to be pessimistic, or to say they did not “feel too happy”.

Women and men were about equally satisfied with their health and with their jobs. However, women were markedly less happy with their marriages or significant other relationships, by an 8 percent margin.

**Table 4.2 Measures of well-being by sex**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Feel very happy overall	18.2%	21.1%
Feel not too happy **	24.5%	18.9%
Very optimistic about next few years	51.6%	53.9%
Very pessimistic **	13.2%	6.7%
Own health excellent *	27.3%	25.7%
Very satisfied with current job	48.3%	48.3%
Very happy with marriage/relationship **	60.7%	52.5%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Men were more likely to report having no close friends (13.6% to 9.7%) and more likely to report no one to confide in (16.5% to 13.2%), again, consistent with what one would expect.

## Discrimination

On the policy issues considered in the survey, women were consistently more open to diversity or integration, although by margins of from only 5% to 10%, figures consistent with those generally found on national surveys.

**Table 4.3 Policy issues by sex**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Favor racial integration **	70.7%	73.6%
Preference for racial makeup of community mix of groups **	79.5%	85.8%
Support laws where homeowner cannot refuse race to sell to **	69.0%	77.1%
Agree or strongly agree undocumented immigrants should be welcome in Chicago area community **	43.8%	48.0%
Agree or strongly agree persons of same sex should be able to marry **	44.3%	50.9%
Difference between groups significant *= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$		

Women were also more likely to have friendships with “minority” persons, while men were more likely to have white friends. Again, while the differences were non-random, they were by margins of from only 4% to 6%.

**Table 4.4 Friend diversity by sex**

Family member brought home in the last few years:	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
African American **	47.4%	53.7%
White/Anglo	68.9%	62.1%
Latino/Hispanic	46.7%	51.5%
Arab/Muslim	14.4%	18.1%
Gay/Lesbian ** (LGB)	43.7%	47.4%
Difference between groups significant *= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$		

Women were more likely than men to perceive discrimination in a variety of domains. Women were statistically significantly more likely than men to feel that Latinos, African Americans, LGBs, immigrants, women and seniors were frequently hurt by discrimination.

**Table 4.5 Discrimination by sex**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently *	22.7%	28.8%
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently *	33.6%	37.3%
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently	9.1%	9.5%
White people are hurt by discrimination frequently	6.4%	5.7%
LGBs are hurt by discrimination frequently *	29.8%	34.6%
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently *	38.5%	44.1%
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently **	16.9%	25.7%
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently *	30.0%	35.1%



Difference between groups significant \* =  $p < .05$  \*\* =  $p < .01$

Women were more likely than men to report having been personally hurt by discrimination (44.4% to 37.6%). Women were slightly more likely to say they had been victims in housing (21.6% to 16.1%), but men were far more likely to indicate discrimination in the "Other" category (32% to 22.8%), which in theory excludes employment, housing, and education.

## **LESBIAN/GAY/BI (LGBs)**

### ***Summary***

#### **Connectedness**

- The survey presented an overall picture of LGBs being somewhat more socially isolated than Straights.
- LGBs reported personally knowing fewer neighbors across diverse domains, and report that their neighborhood is less likely to have a collective positive response on a number of conventional social order measures.
- LGBs were only half as likely to report the neighborhood would stop “closing of a fire station”, and 6 times less likely to feel they live in a “close-knit” neighborhood. They were 3 times less likely to say that neighbors get along with one another. They were 3 times less likely to strongly agree that people in the neighborhood can be trusted.
- LGBs were a little less likely to volunteer than were Straights.
- While the differences were only borderline significant statistically, on most of the trust questions LGBs were less trusting of people in institutions they frequented. They did, however, report a higher level of overall trust of people in general.
- LGBs were substantially less confident in the police on all three survey questions than were Straights.

#### **Well Being**

- LGBs and Straights were about equally happy, although LGBs appear to be more optimistic about the future.
- LGBs were substantially less happy about the overall quality of their communities.

#### **Discrimination**

- On virtually all of the survey’s policy questions, LGBs and Straights answered similarly. LGBs were far less likely to assess the quality of community race relations as “Excellent” (6.8% to 17.8%).
- LGBs were twice as likely as Straights to strongly support gay marriage (41.2% to 23.2%), but large numbers of LGBs did not.
- LGBs were much more likely to perceive discrimination against other racial groups, seniors, women and gays. They were far more likely than Straights to say they had been a victim of discrimination themselves.

## ***Findings***

As the 2012 Illinois debate over whether religiously based adoption agencies must serve gay parents attested, the status of gays and lesbians in Illinois remained a point of contention at the time of the survey. Until only recently, gay persons have experienced such ostracism that many preferred to live closeted lives to open ones. This problem has been of such severity that many gays remain anonymous today and often gay persons go unobserved by all but their closest relations or confidants. At the time of the survey, these patterns had begun to change with the development of marriage and civil union laws in an increasing number of states but the Defense of Marriage Act remained federal law that essentially conferred on gays a separate, and many argued subordinate, set of legal rights.

The treatment of gays by much of mainstream society raises many questions about how adequately gay persons are integrated into our culture and society. Chicago has been viewed by many as a welcome environment for gays with openly gay city council members and mayors who participate in gay cultural events. Nevertheless, many gays remained closeted, fearful of ostracism and under stress. Thus a number of questions raised by the survey merit answers: how isolated did Chicago region gays feel and was it sufficient to require affirmative efforts to improve? Did gays experience at least the same degree of life satisfaction in various domains of life as do others? Finally, what were Chicagoan's views of marriage equality and did gays feel that they experience discrimination?

For this analysis, the category LGB (Lesbian, Gay, Bi-Sexual) was constructed to be compared with heterosexual, or straight, persons. While gays and bi-sexual persons have different challenges, they have long been in partnership in many ways and may have common social and political interests – as attested by the common acronym “LGBTQ” – Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transsexual, Questioning – a combination of persons with gender and sexual identities who often think of themselves as sharing common cause. By combining survey respondents who identified as either gay or lesbian, or bisexual, I attained a large enough group to make statistically meaningful comparisons between them as a group, and persons who reported themselves as purely heterosexual.

### **Connectedness**

The survey presented an overall picture of LGBs being a little more socially isolated than Straights. LGBs reported personally knowing fewer neighbors across diverse domains, and reported that their neighborhood was less likely to have a collective positive response in a number of conventional social control areas.

On a number of measures, the differences were substantial. LGBs were only half as likely to report the neighborhood would stop “closing of a fire station”, and 6 times less likely to feel they live in a “close-knit” neighborhood. They were 3 times less likely to say that neighbors get along with one another. They were 3 times less likely to strongly agree that people in the neighborhood can be trusted.

When the word “strongly” is removed from survey response categories, Straights and LGBs appeared more similar in their attitudes, but clearly LGBs were less likely to be fully satisfied with neighborhood characteristics.

**Table 5.1 Neighborhood efficacy by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
Know 10 or more neighbors personally	45.3%	39.9%
Know 5 or more employees of neighborhood businesses personally	29.9%	20.3%
Know the workplace of 5 or more neighbors	48.3%	38.8%
Have friend or neighbor who works for neighborhood business	40.0%	35.0%
Very likely neighborhood response to child skipping school	37.3%	26.2%
Very likely neighborhood response to graffiti	60.0%	56.3%
Very likely that neighbors would scold a disrespectful child	17.2%	7.1%
Very likely that neighbors would break up a fight	42.8%	35.2%
Very likely neighbors organize to stop closing of a fire station	48.4%	27.9%
Strongly agree close-knit neighborhood that pulls together	17.3%	3.0%
Strongly agree neighbors help one another	28.2%	17.5%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not get along with one another	29.1%	11.3%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not share the same values	5.1%	10.5%
Strongly agree people in neighborhood can be trusted	23.3%	7.3%

Difference between groups significant \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

LGBs and Straights were very similar in their report of their number of close friends and confidants. They were also equally likely to report diversity of personal friends. However, LGBs were much less likely to say that their confidants were relatives (5.4% to 22.8%). As one would expect, LGBs were far more likely than Straights to report having a friend who was gay (87.8% to 46.7%).

LGBs and Straights indicated different patterns of volunteering. Overall, LGBs were less likely to report volunteering than were Straights. They were much less likely to do volunteer work in a place of worship. The one arena in which LGBs were more likely than Straights to report volunteering was in the arts and culture.

**Table 5.2 Volunteering by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
Volunteered somewhere	69.6%	56.4%
Place of worship **	40.6%	26.2%
Health related	23.6%	16.9%
School or youth program*	39.0%	29.7%
Help poor or elderly *	35.5%	25.7%
Arts or culture *	14.1%	21.8%
Neighborhood/civic group	27.0%	25.7%

Difference between groups significant \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

While the differences were only borderline significant statistically, on most of the trust questions LGBs were less trusting of people in institutions they frequented. They did, however, report a higher level of overall trust of people in general.

**Table 5.3 Functional group trust by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
People can be trusted	48.0%	55.5%
Trust people in neighborhood a lot **	33.8%	20.9%
Trust coworkers a lot	41.3%	42.5%
Trust people at place of worship a lot	53.4%	46.3%
Trust of people in stores where shop a lot	22.3%	21.5%
Trust police in local community a lot	46.3%	40.8%
Difference between groups significant *=p<.05 **=p<.01		

LGBs were substantially less confident in the police on all three survey questions than were Straights.

**Table 5.4 Confidence in the police by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
A great deal of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law **	41.0%	27.7%
A great deal of confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects **	34.6%	18.9%
A great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally **	31.9%	16.0%
Difference between groups significant *=p<.05 **=p<.01		

## **Well-Being**

On most measures, there was no statistically significant difference between assessments of life satisfaction between LGBs and Straights. The single exception was optimism where, as with neighborhood improvement, LGBs tended to be more optimistic.

**Table 5.5 Measures of well-being by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
Feel very happy overall	19.9%	16.6%
Very optimistic about next few years*	53.0%	67.6%
Own health excellent	27.1%	22.3%
Very satisfied with current job	48.0%	60.7%
Very happy with marriage/relationship	56.3%	59.7%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

LGBs were decidedly less happy than are Straights about the overall “quality” of the neighborhoods in which they live. However, they were somewhat more optimistic about likely change in future years.

**Table 5.6 Neighborhood quality by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
Rated community as an excellent place to live	34.5%	20.3%

Outsiders rate your neighborhood as an excellent place to live	24.0%	13.8%
Neighborhood change better over the past five years	23.3%	27.9%
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better	26.5%	34.9%
Difference between groups significant *= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$		

## Discrimination

On virtually all of the survey's policy questions, LGBs and Straights answered similarly. Exceptions were that LGBs were far less likely to assess the quality of community race relations as "Excellent" (6.8% to 17.8%). LGBs were more likely to indicate support for undocumented immigrants, but the difference did not reach levels of statistical significance, due most likely to sample size.

LGBs also indicated a much stronger likelihood of bringing a Latino or an Arab-American person to their home in recent years, (61.5% to 49.0% and 30.5% to 15.5%) respectively. And, of course, they were twice as likely to report having brought a Gay/Lesbian person to their home in the last few years, although 19% of LGBs did not report having done so (this includes bisexuals who did not bring a gay person home).

LGBs were twice as likely as Straights to strongly support same-sex marriage (41.2% to 23.2%), but large numbers of LGBs did not. Support for same-sex marriage is complicated among gay persons. Among the reasons that LGBs may not support it include belief in traditional religious orthodoxy, rejection of marriage as a heterosexual institution, satisfaction with civil unions, or simple lack of interest in marrying.

LGBs were much more likely to observe discrimination against various groups, perhaps having become more sensitive to it in others because of personal experience. LGBs were more likely than Straights to report having been discriminated against. When asked about specific areas of jobs, education and housing, LGBs were actually a little less likely to report discrimination. Although it is hard to say what it means from the survey question, LGBs were about twice as likely to indicate discrimination in the "other" category.

**Table 5.7 Discrimination by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	24.5%	43.4%
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently *	34.8%	44.1%
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently *	8.6%	13.3%
White people are hurt by discrimination frequently	5.8%	6.2%
Gays/lesbians are hurt by discrimination frequently**	31.2%	48.3%
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently **	40.5%	60.0%
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently *	20.4%	29.9%
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently *	31.7%	42.5%
Difference between groups significant *= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$		

**Table 5.8 Personal discrimination by gender**

	<b>Straights</b>	<b>LGBs</b>
Have been a victim of discrimination **	40.4%	54.1%
Related to jobs (Gay 39% in past year)	72.7%	66.3%
Related to education (Gay 33% in past year)	16.5%	10.1%
Related to housing	19.0%	21.3%
Related to something else ( Gay 19% in past year)	25.6%	47.5%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

## **LOW INCOME**

### ***Summary***

#### **Connectedness**

- Low-income persons were more likely to experience social isolation and to see others around them as unlike themselves.
- They had fewer close friends or confidants and were much more likely to report having no close friends or confidants. They were much more likely to know little about their neighbors.
- Low-income people were less likely to know someone else who owns a business, and with the exceptions of Protestants, were less likely to know someone of a different religious identity.
- Low-income people reported far less neighborhood cohesion and were much more likely to mistrust neighbors and say neighbors are different or do not get along with one another.
- Low-income persons expressed very little trust of others and had less confidence in the police.

#### **Well Being**

- Across the measures of well-being, lower income people reported less happiness than people with higher incomes. The most striking differences were in assessment of health, overall unhappiness, quality of their community, and satisfaction with a marriage or significant other relationship.

#### **Discrimination**

- Low income persons reported less support for racial integration, but more support for open housing and undocumented immigrants.
- Across every question on perceptions of discrimination, low income persons were more likely to feel that other racial groups, seniors, women and immigrants were hurt by discrimination.
- Low income persons were much more likely to say they had been discriminated against, particularly in housing.



## Findings

With as much economic inequality as our nation and the Chicago area have, it is critical to understand in what ways that inequality may impact people’s lives. This section focuses on comparing experiences of persons with income under \$20,000 with those whose incomes are higher. The measure is admittedly crude in that it groups a person who may be a long-term unemployed mother with children and no assets with a young single who may have just finished college and still has parental resources to fall back upon – two people with the same income but very different probable life trajectories. However, even with these differences, the survey revealed important commonalities shared by low-income persons that differed from the experiences of persons with more income.

Across the different domains of the survey, low income people consistently reported less happiness, less social connection, and more discrimination. Multi-variate analysis, presented at the conclusion of the report, also suggests that, in spite of the income differences, it is often co-variates race and education that are more important drivers of people’s experiences and attitudes than income alone.

### Connectedness

Low income persons were more likely to be isolated than are people with more income. They tended to report fewer close friends or confidants. They are also less likely to know someone who has a business or vacation home – indicative of greater resources – but were more likely to know someone who has been on welfare. This relative isolation can be problematic when seeking jobs or political influence. (Gans, 1962, Holzer, 1987, Granovetter, 1995, Wilson, 1987, Quillian and Redd, 2006)

**Table 6.1 Personal relationships by income**

	Over \$20,000	Under \$20,000
Six or more close friends **	30.8%	21.6%
No close friends **	10.8%	15.8%
Three or more people to confide in **	52.9%	45.7%
No people to confide in **	14.5%	17.0%
Have personal friend who owns a business	55.3%	37.8%
Have personal friend who is a manual worker	53.1%	55.7%
Have friend who has been on welfare	26.9%	48.5%
Have friend who owns a vacation home	54.4%	29.4%
Difference between groups significant *= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$		

**Table 6.2 Diversity of personal relationships by income**

	Over \$20,000	Under \$20,000
If Protestant, have non-Protestant friend **	22.6%	35.6%
If Catholic, have non-Catholic friend	83.5%	85.9%
If other religion, have friend different religion **	81.6%	63.1%
If not religious, have very religious friend	60.3%	50.0%

Have friend who is Latino	61.7%	58.0%
Have friend who is Asian **	39.6%	29.9%
Have friend who is African American	62.8%	67.5%
Have friend who is gay/lesbian	49.9%	43.5%
Have friend who is a community leader *	43.6%	50.1%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Low income persons reported lower responses on measures of connectedness, knowing fewer of their neighbors, and fewer local business people. They also reported less neighborhood efficacy, trust or shared values. These patterns likely contributed to the higher levels of crime present in neighborhoods with high concentrations of low-income persons and are consistent with the major findings of sociologists around the symbiotic nature of individual disadvantage, neighborhood decline, crime and concentrated poverty.

**Table 6.3 Neighborhood efficacy by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
Know NO neighbors personally **	4.1%	8.6%
Know 5 or more employees of neighborhood businesses personally	28.5%	32.5%
Know the workplace of NONE of your neighbors **	14.1%	30.2%
Have friend or neighbor who works for neighborhood business **	41.2%	31.3%
Very likely neighborhood response to child skipping school **	37.3%	31.4%
Very likely neighborhood response to graffiti **	62.0%	46.0%
Very UNLIKELY that neighbors would scold a disrespectful child **	11.8%	19.0%
Very likely that neighbors would break up a fight **	44.4%	33.1%
Very likely neighbors organize to stop closing of a fire station	46.5%	45.8%
DISAGREE close-knit neighborhood that pulls together **	26.5%	34.9%
Strongly agree neighbors help one another **	28.8%	18.5%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not get along with one another **	30.1%	13.0%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not share the same values **	17.6%	10.3%
Strongly agree people in neighborhood can be trusted **	23.2%	12.2%
Difference between groups significant *=p<.05 **=p<.01		

### **Volunteering**

Low-income people reported being about as likely to volunteer as do people who earn more money. Exceptions were a lower likelihood of low-income persons volunteering with youth-serving or educational organizations (28.4% to 40.6%), and a lower likelihood of volunteering with civic organizations (21.0% to 27.6%).

**Trust**

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of lower income persons in the survey was their lack of trust of others. The inability or unwillingness to trust can be toxic to workplace relations, personal relationships, health, crime prevention and education (Browning and Cagney, 2002, Bryk and Schneider 2005).

**Table 6.4 Functional group trust by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
People can be trusted **	50.6%	30.9%
Trust people in neighborhood a lot**	34.3%	21.3%
Trust people in neighborhood only a little or not at all **	14.6%	35.6%
Trust coworkers a lot **	42.6%	28.7%
Trust of coworkers only a little or not at all **	12.6%	31.8%
Trust people at place of worship a lot **	54.2%	41.6%
Trust people at place of worship only a little or not at all **	6.6%	23.2%
Trust of people in stores where shop a lot	22.1%	20.1%
Trust of people in stores where you shop only a little or not at all **	20.7%	34.1%
Trust police in local community a lot **	47.5%	34.5%
Trust of police in local community only a little or not at all **	12.4%	23.8%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05    \*\* = p<.01

Low income people were about equally trusting of white people as were people with more money, but were consistently about 8% less likely to trust African Americans, Latinos, Asian or Arab Americans.

Low income persons also had significantly less confidence in the police than did persons with more income.

**Table 6.5 Confidence in the police by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
A great deal of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law **	41.2%	28.4%
A great deal of confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects **	35.4%	22.0%
A great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally **	31.2%	25.5%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05    \*\* = p<.01

**Well Being**

Across the measures of well-being, lower income people reported less happiness than people with higher incomes. The most striking differences were in assessment of health, overall unhappiness, and satisfaction with a marriage or significant other relationship. This is consistent with studies conducted

nationally and worldwide (Lane 2001). However, once persons reach a threshold above poverty, the relationship between wealth or income and happiness becomes much weaker.

**Table 6.6 Well-being by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
Feel very happy overall **	20.2%	15.4%
Feel not too happy **	18.7%	34.0%
Very optimistic about next few years **	54.2%	47.7%
Very pessimistic	9.6%	10.3%
Own health excellent	29.3%	10.2%
Very satisfied with current job	48.5%	41.4%
Very happy with marriage/relationship **	58.3%	37.5%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Low income persons surveyed were more likely than higher income persons to say that their neighborhood had gotten better over the past five years, but they were also more likely to say that it had gotten worse. This paradox is explained by the presence of some low income people in neighborhoods that have benefitted from development, or have become more affluent, gained amenities, or become safer because of gentrification. Other low income persons, whose neighborhoods have worsened, live in places that have declined with disinvestment, home foreclosures and out-migration, which contribute to loss of businesses, wealth, and persistent crime.

**Table 6.7 Neighborhood quality by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
Rated community as an excellent place to live **	35.6%	20.8%
Outsiders rate your neighborhood as an excellent place to live **	24.4%	14.9%
Neighborhood change better over the past five years **	22.9%	29.2%
Neighborhood change worse over the past five years **	18.9%	26.1%
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better	26.9%	30.0%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

### **Discrimination**

Lower income persons tended to be somewhat more liberal than persons with more resources on most of the issues considered, although the differences were not great. The notable exception was their lack of support (58% - still a strong majority) for “integration”. While integration has generally been considered a liberal position in the political identity spectrum because it is usually viewed as a path to greater opportunity and choice in jobs, education or housing, it can also be viewed as a dilution of social, cultural and political solidarity. This attitude can be observed among conservative religionists, racial groups and immigrant groups. Less cosmopolitan than higher income persons, lower income people who have little expectation of rising in class, and may identify with their lower income friends, acquaintances and neighborhoods, may devalue what can be accomplished through racial integration.

**Table 6.8 Policy issues by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
Quality of race relations in your community is good or excellent **	16.9%	13.5%
Favor racial integration **	74.5%	58.1%
Preference for racial makeup of community mix of groups	83.3%	83.3%
Support laws where homeowner cannot refuse race to sell to **	73.5%	77.2%
Agree or strongly agree undocumented immigrants should be welcome in Chicago area community **	16.2%	22.4%
Agree or strongly agree persons of same sex should be able to marry	47.2%	50.7%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Lower income persons consistently indicated that members of various groups were hurt by discrimination, and were somewhat more likely to report it themselves. To the extent that having low income isolates a person in a particular neighborhood or community, those persons may have less opportunity to experience discrimination, or ascribe their condition to reasons less related to how they may be treated by outsiders.

**Table 6.9 Discrimination by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	24.6%	35.6%
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	34.6%	44.85
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently **	7.5%	20.4%
White people are NEVER hurt by discrimination **	16.9%	29.5%
LGBs/lesbians are hurt by discrimination frequently **	30.8%	42.3%
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently **	41.4%	47.1%
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently **	20.4%	27.4%
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently **	31.7%	39.3%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Low income people reported experiencing more discrimination than higher income people on some measures. The most significant was in housing, where they were about twice as likely to report it. To some extent this is accounted for by the intersection of race and income, as reported in the chapter at the end of the report that utilizes multi-variate analysis to uncover the relative impacts of race and income on attitudes. But it could also be a result of landlords “discriminating” in favor of applicants who have more resources, or of the impact of the mortgage crisis on people who had fewer financial resources – many of whom may feel discriminated against.

**Table 6.10 Personal discrimination by income**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>
Have been a victim of discrimination **	39.7%	52.2%
Related to jobs (Low income 26% in past year)	71.9%	73.7%
Related to education (Low income 10% in past year)	16.0%	14.1%
Related to housing (Low income 21% in past year) **	17.4%	32.7%
Related to something else (58% in past year)	26.1%	30.3%

Difference between groups significant \* =  $p < .05$  \*\* =  $p < .01$

## **SENIORS**

### ***Summary***

#### **Connectedness**

- On most measures of connectedness, seniors did not differ markedly from younger people, reporting that they lived in communities of similar quality and cohesiveness.
- Seniors were more likely than younger people to report more friends and a variety of types of personal relationships.
- Seniors were less likely to report having friends of different racial/ethnic or religious identities.
- Seniors reported higher levels of trust of people in different institutional settings, other racial/ethnic groups, and the police than younger people.

#### **Well Being**

- Seniors tended to be happier overall than younger people and rated their communities as better places to live.

#### **Discrimination**

- Seniors assessed the quality of race relations in their communities about the same as did non-seniors.
- Seniors were equally likely to say they favored racial integration but had a higher preference for a community “the same as” the respondent .
- Seniors were more conservative regarding laws around home sales. They were also less likely to agree that same sex marriages should be legal. They were more likely to say that Whites are hurt by discrimination and less likely to say Latinos had been.
- Seniors were less likely to say they had been a victim of discrimination.

## Findings

A significant question is whether seniors are overly isolated. Older persons can find themselves isolated in their homes, or one of their children’s homes, with limited, or no, mobility. Retirement homes can narrow access to new relationships, as can problems with hearing or sight. New technologies, which younger persons use to communicate, can be foreign to older persons.

While surely many seniors are isolated, seniors responding to the survey reported having more friends than the average survey respondent. However, on other measures of neighborhood connection, they appeared less connected. As one would expect, they were less connected to workplaces or businesses.

Seniors appeared to view their neighborhoods as more cohesive than did younger persons. This was consistently true across most of the measures surveyed. The one sizeable exception was whether they believed neighbors would break up a fight – probably an unlikelihood where neighbors may themselves be older, or in retirement communities, where fights would, indeed, be unlikely.

It is important to note that the survey would have failed to garner responses from seniors experiencing very high levels of isolation. Older residents span a wide range of social settings: from the recently-retired person in their 60s who may have accrued a wide variety of friends and personal relationships over a lifetime, to an older person, many of whose acquaintances may have passed and whose children have moved, who lives relatively isolated in a nursing home. The survey necessarily tended to capture seniors (defined here as either over 65 or having retired) capable of responding and so likely over-reports social connection.

**Table 7.1 Neighborhood efficacy by age**

	<b>Non-seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Know 10 or more neighbors personally **	43.8%	51.7%
Know 5 or more employees of neighborhood businesses personally **	30.0%	26.3%
Know the workplace of 5 or more neighbors **	49.4%	38.3%
Have friend or neighbor who works for neighborhood business	40.3%	35.6%
Very likely neighborhood response to child skipping school	36.7%	37.5%
Very likely neighborhood response to graffiti	60.1%	56.8%
Very likely that neighbors would scold a disrespectful child **	16.4%	20.6%
Very likely that neighbors would break up a fight **	44.2%	33.2%
Very likely neighbors organize to stop closing of a fire station *	46.9%	51.0%
Strongly agree close-knit neighborhood that pulls together	16.7%	16.6%
Strongly agree neighbors help one another	27.4%	29.0%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not get along with one another	27.5%	31.3%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not share the same values	16.1%	20.4%
Strongly agree people in neighborhood can be trusted	21.5%	26.7%

Difference between groups significant \* = p < .05 \*\* = p < .01



Seniors indicated that they had about the same number of friends and confidants as did younger people, suggesting that in the main for seniors capable of being reached by a survey, isolation is not a major problem. Perhaps because of the accumulation of acquaintances over time, seniors appeared more likely to have a range of friends with different experiences.

**Table 7.2 Personal relationships by age**

	<b>Non seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Have personal friend who owns a business **	45.1%	61.5%
Have personal friend who is a manual worker **	44.7%	61.5%
Have friend who has been on welfare **	69.1%	80.3%
Have friend who owns a vacation home	49.1%	49.4%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Seniors did appear to be somewhat confined to friendships with persons who are like themselves. While there appeared no differences on a number of relationship questions between seniors and non-seniors, there were significant differences in the extent to which they claimed friends unlike themselves religiously or racial/ethnically. Many seniors may have formed their core friendships in decades past when Chicago had few Latinos or Asians, and when separation between Whites and African Americans was even greater than it is now. And Jewish seniors were less likely than younger Jewish people to report having a non-Jewish friend.

**Table 7.3 Diversity of personal relationships by age**

	<b>Non-Seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
If Protestant, have non-Protestant friend	76.6%	69.8%
If Catholic, have non-Catholic friend	83.0%	82.1%
If Jewish, have non-Jewish friend *	91.0%	70.8%
If other religion, have friend different religion	78.7%	76.9%
If not religious, have very religious friend	56.9%	53.3%
Have friend who is Latino **	63.1%	45.2%
Have friend who is Asian **	39.0%	31.7%
Have friend who is African American **	64.4%	52.1%
Have friend who is gay/lesbian **	50.4%	34.1%
Have friend who is a community leader	44.4%	43.4%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

Seniors were also less likely than non-seniors to report that a family member brought home a person of a different race - again emphasizing some of the insularity of the senior social experience.

**Table 7.4 Family friendships by age**

	<b>White Non-Senior family member brought home:</b>	<b>White Senior family member brought home:</b>	<b>Black Non- Senior's family member brought home:</b>	<b>Black Senior's family member brought home:</b>
African American	48.3%	38.8%		
White			57.3%	63.4%
Latino	51.0%	41.4%	45.8%	44.9%
Arab/Muslim	16.4%	8.9%	24.1%	13.5%
Gay/Lesbian	44.8%	30.9%	42.9%	39.4%

Seniors appeared about as likely to volunteer as did non-seniors in most volunteer areas considered in the survey. Exceptions were health-related activities where they were about 5% less likely to volunteer and school or youth activities, where they were 17% less likely to volunteer. While this survey does not explore it, seniors become less likely to volunteer once health becomes a significant barrier to capability, mobility and energy.

**Trust**

As a whole, seniors appeared to be more trusting than non-seniors. They had higher levels of trust of people in the neighborhood, places of worship, and the local police. Seniors were substantially more likely to have confidence in the police in the three areas investigated. They also expressed greater trust of most of the racial/ethnic groups considered. This is consistent with what would be expected of a birth cohort that came of age prior to the social changes of the Sixties and tended to have grown up in smaller, more homogenous communities. But it is also possible that seniors have lived in their current residence longer than have younger people and so know it better.

One area where seniors appeared less trusting was of coworkers, an area of potential vulnerability for an aging person. Among the racial/ethnic groups, they also expressed more distrust of Arab-Americans – perhaps as a result of the combination of the reporting of world affairs and the relative isolation of many seniors from ethnically diverse settings, as noted above.

**Table 7.5 Functional group trust by age**

	<b>Non-seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
People can be trusted	47.4%	48.3%
Trust people in neighborhood a lot **	31.2%	41.9%
Trust coworkers a lot**	41.4%	38.7%
Trust of coworkers not at all **	4.2%	12.4%
Trust people at place of worship a lot	51.6%	59.9%
Trust of people in stores where shop a lot **	21.0%	29.4%
Trust of people in stores where you shop only a little or not at all **	23.9%	17.9%
Trust police in local community a lot **	44.2%	54.0%

Difference between groups significant \* = p<.05 \*\* = p<.01

**Table 7.6 Demographic group trust by age**

	<b>Non-seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Trust white people a lot **	23.5%	35.5%
Trust African American people a lot	19.8%	25.2%
Trust Asian people a lot *	21.1%	26.1%
Trust Latino people a lot *	19.8%	27.1%
Trust Arab Americans a lot	16.1%	17.4%
Trust Arab Americans a little or not at all *	22.1%	28.7%

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01

Seniors expressed more confidence in the police than did younger people. This was true across city and suburbs, although senior confidence was slightly lower in the Chicago. The finding is consistent with the senior reports of higher neighborhood efficacy and greater trust and general happiness.

**Table 7.7 Confidence in the police by age**

	<b>Non-seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
A great deal of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law **	38.7%	48.6%
A great deal of confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects **	32.3%	41.6%
A great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally **	29.5%	39.5%

Difference between groups significant \*=p<.05 \*\*=p<.01

### **Well-Being**

Overall, seniors were more likely to say they felt happy than did younger people. This is consistent with data from national surveys (Stone et al 2010). Those few seniors who worked, were also more likely to say they were satisfied with their job. Seniors were happier with their marriages or relationships, also common to national survey findings. And they were generally happier about where they live and were more optimistic than are younger persons.

**Table 7.8 Well-being by age**

	<b>Non-Seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Feel very happy overall **	19.0%	24.2%
Very optimistic about next few years	53.6%	47.9%
Own health excellent **	27.4%	20.8%
Very satisfied with current job (of those few seniors who work)	48.1%	55.3%
Very happy with marriage/relationship	56.5%	60.4%

Difference between groups significant \*= p<.05 \*\*= p<.01

**Table 7.9 Neighborhood quality by age**

	<b>Not Senior</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Rated community as an excellent place to live **	32.4%	41.2%
Outsiders rate your neighborhood as an excellent place to live **	22.5%	28.9%
Neighborhood change better over the past five years	56.2%	60.7%
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better **	59.1%	68.1%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

**Discrimination**

Seniors assessed the quality of race relations in their communities about the same as did non-seniors and were equally likely to say they favored racial integration. They had a lower preference for “mixed” communities (75.4% to 83.9%) and consequently a higher preference for a community “the same as” the respondent - perhaps not surprising as when people age they might prefer less change and novelty.

Seniors were more conservative regarding laws around home sales, with 36.7% believing the “homeowner should decide for himself” who to sell to, as opposed to only 23.4% of younger persons who believed that. They were also less likely to agree that same-sex marriages should be legal. Seniors came of age during a period that was more socially conservative on these issues than the present one. This social conservatism is observed in other national surveys analyzing age cohorts.

**Table 7.10 Discrimination by age**

	<b>Non-seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently *	26.4%	22.1%
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently	35.4%	36.5%
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently or sometimes *	61.9%	68.9%
White people are hurt by discrimination frequently or sometimes **	41.1%	52.9%
LGBs/lesbians are hurt by discrimination frequently	32.6%	30.1%
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently **	42.7%	32.5%
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently	21.5%	21.6%
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently	32.8%	31.4%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

**Table 7.11 Personal discrimination by age**

	<b>Non-seniors</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
Have been a victim of discrimination **	42.7%	31.5%
Related to jobs (% in past year)	27.7%	26.9%
Related to education (% in past year)	15.8%	15.8%
Related to housing (% in past year)	18.7%	22.4%
Related to something else (% in past year)	26.8%	27.6%
Difference between groups significant *= p<.05 **= p<.01		

## WHAT DRIVES DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES?

To analyze the underlying causes of respondent attitudes, the study employs two types of statistical analysis: logistic regression (ExpB expresses how much more likely a person is to exhibit a dependent variable due to a particular attribute) and linear regression (Coefficient B indicates positive association of an independent variable with the dependent variable when the figure is positive, and negative when the figure is negative).

The value of these types of analyses is that they weigh the relative effects of all explanatory variables against one another, so as to suggest what the true underlying determinants of variation in a dependent variable are. For instance, low-income blacks reported much discrimination, but was this mostly because they were black, because they were low-income, or is it because of some of both? Regression analysis helps us answer that question.

### *Happiness*

The table below presents a logistic regression that indicates how much more likely an individual was to be happy or unhappy based on the presence of each surveyed characteristic. Focusing on those characteristics that achieved statistical significance (95% or more confident of the figure), we can identify a number of predictors of happiness and unhappiness in Chicago regional survey respondents.

The keys to happiness would seem to have been:

1. Building stronger quality communities and enhancing trust in those communities
2. Helping people to have strong marriages or relationships with significant others, and making sure people have others in whom they can confide
3. Creating job satisfaction.
4. Eliminating discrimination and its legacies
5. Improving people's health

#### Factors associated with respondents reporting happiness

Being Asian made one 192% more likely to be happy  
Being in excellent health made one 100% more likely to be happy  
Being Latino made one 95% more likely to be happy  
Persons assessing their communities as higher quality were 72% more likely to be happy  
Persons happy with their marriages/relationships were 67% more likely to express overall happiness  
Persons with more confidants were 15% more likely to be happy

#### Factors associated with respondents reporting less happiness

Being male made one 60% less likely to be happy  
Workers unhappy with their jobs were 57% less likely to express overall happiness  
Strong English speakers were 45% as likely to be happy

### *Unhappiness*

Factors associated with respondents reporting unhappiness

- Males were 71% more likely to indicate unhappiness
- Persons who had been discriminated against were 71% more likely to be unhappy
- People dissatisfied with their jobs were 51% more likely to be unhappy.

Factors associated with reporting less unhappiness

- Persons with happy marriages/relationships were 67% as likely to unhappy
- Persons assessing their communities as higher quality were 59% as likely to be unhappy
- People with excellent health were 48% as likely to be unhappy
- Persons who trust others were 47% as likely to be unhappy
- Latinos were 43% as likely to be unhappy
- People living in Chicago were 42% as likely to be unhappy
- LGBs/Lesbians were 31% as likely to be unhappy

The list is interesting both for what is on it, and for what is not. Having a job, or being low income were not independently sources of happiness or unhappiness. Being LGB did not make one happier, but it made one less likely to say you are unhappy.

**Table 8.1 Predictors of happiness and unhappiness**

	Predictors of HAPPINESS		Predictors of UNHAPPINESS	
	Significance	Probability Exp(B)	Significance	Probability Exp(B)
Male	.006	.662	.001	1.710
Rating of community	.000	1.722	.000	.594
Employed	.232	1.239	.742	.939
Job dissatisfaction	.000	.576	.000	1.517
Strength of marriage/relationship	.001	1.671	.032	.677
Protestant	.975	1.007	.702	.912
Catholic	.969	1.008	.413	.830
No religion	.911	.974	.203	1.370
Number of confidants	.015	1.153	.650	.974
College graduate	.428	.877	.716	1.070
Trust others	.252	1.187	.000	.475
African American	.325	1.272	.548	.861
Latino	.000	1.953	.001	.438
Asian	.022	2.925	.108	.290
Speak English well	.001	.453	.465	.830
Gay/Lesbian	.460	1.254	.013	.311
Been discriminated against	.493	.901	.001	1.745
Low income	.547	.811	.748	.901
Senior	.970	1.020	.548	.634
Chicago	.427	.879	.000	.425
Excellent health	.000	2.008	.000	.483
Constant	.000	.009	.013	4.677

Nagelkerke R Square = .189 and .221

**Discrimination**

What were the drivers of the experience of discrimination? Did respondents report discrimination because of their identity as a racial/ethnic minority? Or did they more likely have the experience because they were low income, or did not speak English well? To identify drivers of reports of discrimination, a logistic regression was conducted to identify the correlates with whether a respondent indicated that they had ever experienced discrimination.

The analysis indicates overwhelmingly that the defining characteristic of likelihood of reporting discrimination remained racial/ethnic membership with being black making one about three and one half times more likely to report discrimination (257% more), and being Latino making one almost twice as likely (91% more).

Factors associated with more report of discrimination

- Being black made one 257% more likely
- Being Latino made one 91% more likely
- LGBs or lesbians were 63% more likely
- Persons with college degrees were 53% more likely
- Being low income made one 43% more likely
- Strong English speaking made one 42% more likely

Factors associated with less report of discrimination

- Healthy people were only 85% as likely
- Males were only 80% as likely
- Seniors were only 76% as likely
- Protestants were only 67% as likely

It is probable that one’s consciousness of discrimination has a strong impact on whether one reports it. The best educated persons and best English speakers were more likely to say they had been discriminated against. Seniors, on the other hand, who may have reached adulthood at a historical time when there was less consciousness of discrimination’s many forms, reported less of it.

**Table 8.2 Predictors of perception of discrimination against self**

	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Probability Exp(B)</b>
Male	.010	.800
Neighborhood quality	.149	.915
Employed	.577	.949
Protestant	.002	.674
Catholic	.148	.840
No religion	.449	.895
College	.000	1.535
African American	.000	3.578

Latino	.000	1.910
Asian	.822	1.077
Speak English well	.011	1.421
Gay/Lesbian	.009	1.636
Low income	.010	1.430
Senior	.055	.765
Chicago	.095	1.169
Excellent health	.011	.858
Close friends	.440	.990
Constant	.653	.876

Nagelkerke R Square .121

We might also be curious about whether discrimination appeared to people to be an ongoing problem, as opposed to an earlier life experience, and why.

Just as with discrimination over one’s entire life course, being black or Latino were the strongest determinants of whether one reported a recent experience of discrimination. The data suggests, however, that blacks were experiencing less discrimination relative to the general population with time. For lifetime discrimination they were 257% more likely than whites to report it; but for discrimination within the past year they were “only” 190% more likely to report it.

Being a senior appeared to have protected one somewhat from discrimination as well. Most seniors are no longer exposed to the discrimination risk of the workplace or the job search, and have little contact with law enforcement. While income can be a barrier to finding housing, most landlords consider older, more stable persons to be better tenants than the young.

Taken together, the biggest influences on whether a person reported having been discriminated against during the past year are:

Factors associated with recent discrimination

- Being black made one 290% more likely
- Being Latino made one 108% more likely
- Strong English speakers were 49% more likely
- LGBs/Lesbians were 70% more likely

Factors associated with less recent discrimination

- Being Protestant made one only 70% as likely
- Employed persons were only 75% as likely
- Seniors were only 47% as likely

**Table 8.3 Predictors of experienced discrimination within past year**

	Significance	Probability Exp(B)
Male	.261	.879
Employed	.022	.755



Protestant	.035	.706
Catholic	.972	1.005
No religion	.462	.868
College	.010	1.368
Black	.000	2.946
Latino	.000	2.086
Asian	.375	1.469
Speak English well	.032	1.483
Gay/Lesbian	.018	1.700
Low income	.078	1.337
Senior	.000	.467
Chicago	.538	1.077
Health	.045	.859
Constant	.000	.167
Nagelkerke R Square		.082

### ***Confidence in the police***

A key element of neighborhood safety is the relationship of local residents to the police. People are more likely to have confidence in police officers when they do their job well, and they are more likely to do it well when neighborhood residents have confidence in them and work with them.

So what drove whether people had confidence in the police is an important thing to understand. Was support for the police based on the race of a person? Based on their income? Generational? Experiential? Temperamental?

The multivariate analysis indicates that the strongest drivers of confidence in the police were:

Factors associated with confidence in the police:

People who trust  
Protestants  
People who say they live in a close-knit community  
Good English speakers

Factors associated with lack of confidence in the police:

Latino  
Black  
Living in Chicago  
Have been discriminated against  
Low income

The results speak clearly to the history of police-neighborhood relations in Chicago, which in many instances have been problematic, particularly with regard to African-Americans and low income people. The issue is symbiotic – how residents and police treat one another affects the overall quality of the relationship. But the data is clear: restoring trust is important, communicating effectively is important and having “close-knit” community is important.

**Table 8.4 Predictors of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law**

	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Significance</b>
	<b>B</b>	
Male	-.001	.969
Close knit community	.143	.000
Work full time	.015	.659
Protestant	.091	.050
Catholic	.062	.167
No religion	-.080	.135
Have personal friend who owns a business	.028	.404
Have friend who owns a vacation home	.000	.996
Have friend who is a community leader	.000	.990
College	-.041	.235
Trust people	.279	.000
Black	-.253	.000
Latino	-.316	.000

Asian	.097	.419
Speak English well	.175	.000
Gay/Lesbian/Bi	.083	.246
Low income	-.113	.024
Chicago	-.257	.000
Senior	-.005	.918
Been discriminated against	-.122	.000
Constant	3.439	.000

Adjusted R Square= .207

### **Connectedness**

As the Chicago region continues to grow more socially diverse, and that diversity spreads across the region geographically, relationships between members of different demographic groups will be essential for economic development, preventing crime, and building strong communities. What predicted whether a person had a diverse set of relationships across many different types of people?

#### Factors associated with more diverse relationships:

Latino  
College educated  
Speak English well  
Live in Chicago  
Volunteer  
Live where neighbors help one another

#### Factors associated with fewer diverse relationships

Senior

While Chicago has definable “Latino” communities, Latinos tend to be less segregated than African Americans residentially. In the suburbs they experience even less segregation than in the city. Consequently, they are more likely to live and work with more different types of people. Strong English speakers obviously have an advantage in relationship-building across groups not shared by persons more limited to a non-English language. And the more educated appear either more willing or more able to cross social or cultural boundaries. Living in Chicago was a strong predictor of diverse relationships, in part probably because of self-selection in residence of Whites either open to diversity, or who particularly value diversity, but also because living and working in Chicago makes it much more likely than in the suburbs that one will encounter people of different backgrounds.

**Table 8.5 Predictors of number of diverse relationships**

	<b>Coefficient B</b>	<b>Significance</b>
Male	.115	.252
Close knit community	-.010	.848
Work full time	.153	.159
Protestant	-.029	.845
Catholic	-.055	.696

No religion	.047	.787
College	.568	.000
Trust people	.117	.249
Black	-.078	.606
Hispanic	.627	.000
Asian	.039	.916
Speak English well	.517	.001
Gay/Bi	.620	.007
Low income	.158	.324
Chicago	.343	.002
Senior	-.519	.001
Neighbors help one another	.178	.011
Excellent health	.024	.725
Volunteer	.622	.000
Constant	3.382	.000

Adjusted R Square= .201

## Trust

The simple comparison of sub-regions, Chicago, Cook suburbs, and collar counties indicated significant differences in average levels of trust across the three areas. While those average differences do, indeed, exist, the multi-variate analysis indicates that the sub-regional differences were driven less by place than by other population characteristics.

### Factors associated with trust

Whites were approximately twice as likely to trust

Asians were 90% more likely to trust

Excellent health made one 73% more likely to trust

College education made one 97% more likely to trust

Non-poor were about 60% more likely to trust

### Factors associated with less trust

Blacks were only 51% as likely as whites to trust

Hispanics were 69% as likely as whites to trust

Low income persons were 63% as likely as higher income persons to trust

As was discussed earlier in the report, social trust is important for success in many fields from education to business to politics. That a person's being trusting appears to be so race/class-based in the Chicago region reveals some of the challenge faced to for low-income and minority persons to be able to take advantage of the scope of opportunity that the Chicago region offers.

**Table 8.6 Predictors of Trust**

	Exp (B)	Significance
Excellent health	1.729	.009
Employed full time	1.129	.160

Protestant	.948	.666
Catholic	.935	.572
No religion	.961	.784
Less than high school	1.297	.013
College	1.972	.000
Black	.511	.000
Hispanic	.695	.002
Asian	1.984	.051
Speak English well	1.604	.001
Gay/Bi	1.283	.188
Low income	.627	.001
Chicago	.830	.045
Male	.861	.077
Constant	.598	.005

Nagelkerke R2 .100

### Value of Social Capital

We don't know if people become more open to diversity because they know more different types of people, or know more different types of people because they are open. But the survey revealed a strong correlation between the diversity of one's personal connections and acceptance of people who may be unlike yourself. On most measures below, the more areas in which a person had socially diverse relationships, the more accepting were their answers on survey questions bearing on acceptance of social or cultural diversity.

**Table 8.7 Correspondence of attitudes to number of religiously and socially diverse relationships**

	<b>Number of religiously and socially diverse relationships</b>
<b>Trust of Arab Americans</b>	
A lot	5.8
Some	5.2
Only a little	4.3
Not at all	3.5
<b>Racial Integration</b>	
Integration	5.4
Something in between	4.3
Separation	3.8
<b>Preference for community makeup</b>	
Mix of groups	5.4
Some other group	3.2
Same as respondent	3.8

<b>Fair Housing</b>	
Homeowner cannot refuse	5.3
Homeowner decide for self	4.4
<b>Undocumented immigrants welcome</b>	
Strongly agree	5.3
Agree	5.1
Neither	4.6
Disagree	5.1
Strongly disagree	4.8
<b>Same-sex marriage</b>	
Strongly agree	5.4
Agree	5.1
Neither	4.5
Disagree	4.9
Strongly disagree	5.0

## HOW DID THE CHICAGO AREA COMPARE NATIONALLY, AND WERE WE IMPROVING?

### *Summary*

- All the data considered, human relations in Chicago appeared to be gradually improving, but on most measures the region remained in the middle range nationally, and was probably below average on some measures.
- Chicago area residents considered race relations to be of roughly the same quality as did people nationally. However, black-white perceptions of race relations were more different in Chicago than they were nationally.
- Differences in black-white perceptions of discrimination were stronger in Chicago than nationally. This was driven by high black perceptions in Chicago, and low white perceptions, although the white perception has been rising since the 1990s.
- Chicago-area residents have less trust of the police than if was found in national surveys. Significant racial gaps existed both locally and nationally. Overall the Chicago region reported generalized trust levels comparable to national averages, with the suburbs higher.
- Respondents to national surveys appeared to be somewhat happier than Chicago respondents.
- Local support for open housing policy had improved since the 1990s and blacks and whites appeared to interact more socially.
- Comparisons of data from the 2010 survey with national surveys taken for the Harvard Social Capital project indicate little change from Chicago's 2001 results that placed it in the lower middle nationally on many indicators of strength of social capital.

## ***Findings***

It is difficult to compare the quality of human relations in Chicago with other places because there is no uniform set of surveys administered nationally with which to make comparisons. However, we can compare responses to questions on the Chicago survey with data from questions asked on a number of major surveys historically for Chicago, such as the MCIC survey data set from 1990 through 2001, and national surveys such as Gallup polls, surveys done for the Harvard Social Capital project, and the General Social Survey.

Considering Chicago over time, we can look to two particular benchmarks: The Harvard Social Capital Survey conducted in 2001 and the Great Divide survey conducted in 1993. The Harvard survey focused on various domains of social capital and found Chicago wanting. At that time, Chicago scored near the bottom among 43 other places studied nationally in the areas of Social Trust, Volunteering, and Inter-Racial Trust. It scored in the national center on most other forms of social capital. The data developed here suggests that the Chicago area has probably improved some since then, but trust of the police remains low, other forms of trust are less than ideal. Blacks are much less trusting than whites and volunteering appears somewhat low by national standards.

The other significant study, the Great Divide, based on a regional survey by Metro Chicago Information Center in 1993, a survey similar to the one reported here, focused on differences in perceptions of race-related issues among whites, African Americans and Latinos. That study found significant differences between races in reported experience and perception, findings replicated in the 2010 study 17 years later. The 2010 survey suggested that experiences of discrimination, particularly upon blacks, are diminishing, but white-black differences in perception and experience of discrimination remained quite strong. While blacks appeared more optimistic about the future than were whites, a finding replicated national Gallup surveys at the time, they still reported living in less efficacious neighborhoods, trusted the police, and others, less, reported lower quality neighborhoods, and by some measures appeared more socially isolated than members of other racial/ethnic groups. So one may conclude that over those two decades race relations had slowly improved, but work remained to be done.

These findings are validated by three important objective human relations trends. First, residential segregation of Whites and African Americans, as measured by the dissimilarity index, has receded slowly in recent decades, although both Chicago and the region remain hyper-segregated. Second is the remarkable reduction in violent crime rates over the past 20 years. A 2011 Brookings study (Kneebone and Raphael, 2011) found that Chicago had the largest crime reduction of the largest 100 U.S metropolitan regions between 1990 and 2008. Violent crime is perhaps in itself, and evidence of, failure of human relations. It is related to the neighborhood efficacy, social trust and optimism about the future. It is related to confidence in the police. Safety is related to happiness and health. Finally, civil unions legislation passed relatively without controversy in the Illinois state legislature and went into effect in 2011. This, with its implications for acceptance of lesbian and gay relationships, was an important milestone in acceptance of social and cultural diversity. And so evidence from these three domains suggests at least slow improvement in Chicago-area human relations were occurring at the time.

## ***Race relations***



Comparison of the Chicago survey with national Gallup surveys suggests that Chicago-area residents considered race relations to be of about the same quality as did people nationally. There was, however, a larger gap between white and black perceptions of race relations in Chicago than nationally.

The 2010 survey found 17% of respondents overall assessing race relations as excellent and 40% as good. This was similar to national Gallup results from 2008 where 10% of Gallup respondents felt that race relations between blacks and whites were very good and 58% felt they were somewhat good.

In Chicago in 2010, 60% of Whites said race relations were excellent or good compared to only 44% of Blacks who said this, a 16% difference. Nationally the difference was only 11% (70% for Whites to 61% for Blacks), so arguably the racial divide on this in Chicago would appear to have been to be a little more pronounced than nationally.

In the Chicago area 10% of persons considered white/Hispanic relations to be good and 55% somewhat good. Perceptions were similar between whites and Hispanics with 9% of whites indicating they were good and 56% somewhat good. Hispanics reported 12% good and 59% somewhat good. Nationally Hispanics rated white/Hispanic race relations more highly than did whites, while locally whites rated it higher.

### ***Discrimination***

Comparable perception gaps appeared to exist between Chicago and nation around white-minority perception of discrimination. When asked whether various racial groups have been "hurt by discrimination", racial gaps in perception emerged in the 2010 findings that were a little larger than differences that appeared in the national Gallup surveys. Chicago respondents seemed to consider racial problems more acute, and the gaps between white and black perceptions were somewhat larger in Chicago (around 40% difference) than nationally (around 30% difference) on some questions.

### ***Chicago Responses:***

In Chicago, only 26% of whites believed blacks were hurt by discrimination while 67% of blacks did.

In Chicago, only 20% of whites believed Latinos were hurt by discrimination while 38% of Latinos did.

In Chicago 26% felt that Latinos and 36% felt that blacks were hurt by discrimination frequently, figures somewhat higher than the Gallup numbers suggested.

### ***National Gallup Responses:***

Overall 23% of Gallup respondents felt black children have less chance than white children to get a good education. (whites 19%, blacks 49%)

When asked whether blacks were prevented from getting "any housing they can afford", overall, 20% believed they could not, but racial groups divided on the issue with only 13% of whites believing this, but 47% of blacks believing it.

On the question, "Are blacks treated less fairly at work", 18% agreed overall, but that was comprised of only 12% of white respondents who agreed, compared to 53% of black.

On the question "do you think blacks have as good a chance as white people in your community to get any kind of job for which they are qualified ... ?" In 2009 approximately 20% of respondents nationally felt that they "don't have as good a chance". This figure had declined from around 30% as recently as 1993. For whites, only 16% believed they had less chance, but 56% of blacks felt that way.

When asked whether racial minorities have equal job opportunities as whites? Overall 53% agreed, but 60% of whites agreed, compared to only 24% of blacks.

### ***2010 Chicago Compared to 1990s Chicago***

Comparing Chicago results over time, whites have become more willing to acknowledge that discrimination occurs. Still, significant gaps between African American and white perceptions existed in the 1990s and still existed in 2010.

- MCIC data from the *Great Divide* report indicated similar patterns around Chicago in the mid-1990s: About 45% of whites believed blacks are discriminated against in hiring, compared to 80% of blacks.
- About 43% of blacks felt there was a great deal of hiring discrimination against blacks, compared to only 8% of whites.
- 27% of blacks felt they had been held back at work because of your race, while only 4% of whites felt that way of blacks.

### ***Race and Police***

Police were trusted less in the Chicago area surveys than they were nationally. Only 19% of 2010 respondents expressed "a great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally." Gallup found that regarding confidence in local police to treat blacks and whites equally, overall 37% felt a "great deal" and 36% a "fair amount" of confidence.

But the racial divide persisted with 81% of Chicago whites saying police treated whites and blacks equally, but only 45% of blacks saying this. Nationally 73% of blacks felt blacks were treated less fairly when dealing with the police, compared to only 31% of whites who felt that way.

### ***Life satisfaction***

Respondents nationally expressed greater overall life satisfaction than did Chicago respondents, but the Chicago figures were mid-range by national comparison.

Regarding overall satisfaction with life, 46% of the Gallup sample was "very satisfied" and 40% "somewhat satisfied". Nine percent were "somewhat dissatisfied" and 5% "very dissatisfied".

The 2010 survey differed markedly from Gallup, with only about 20% expressing that they feel "very happy overall", although perhaps this is a tougher standard than "very satisfied". Another 60% expressed that they were "somewhat" happy. Combined, these figures are about 6% worse than the 2008 Gallup poll. It is important to note that the 2010 survey was conducted during a period of

economic recession, while the Gallup poll preceded it. So taken in all, the happiness figures for the Chicago region were probably about mid-range nationally.

Latinos did appear to be relatively happier in Chicago than they are nationally. In the Gallup poll few differences were observed between the major racial groups, although whites appeared the most satisfied. In Chicago on the 2010 survey, 6% more Latinos expressed that they were “very happy overall” than did whites and Asians, the next two happiest groups.

**Integration**

Support for “integration” in the Chicago region appears to have increased since the *Great Divide* report in the 1990s. It found majorities of both blacks and whites “Generally favor integration”: 65% of blacks and 60% of whites. The 2010 survey found 73% of whites and 72% of blacks favoring integration.

While about 50% of whites and 40% of blacks in the *Great Divide* survey agreed with the statement “Separate but equal is OK”. In 2010 69% of whites and 86% of blacks indicated preference for open housing laws that prohibited home sellers from racially discriminating in home sales. While the questions are somewhat different, the comparison indicates stronger support for progressive policies than existed 15 years before.

The *Great Divide* report found that blacks (75%) were more likely to report close friends of another race than were whites (55%). The gap appeared somewhat smaller in the 2010 survey on a slightly different question, where 47% of whites reported someone in their family bringing a black friend home, and 58% of blacks reported a family member having brought home a white.

**Social capital in national comparison**

Comparisons of data from the 2010 survey with national surveys taken for the Harvard Social Capital project in 2006 indicate little change from Chicago’s 2001 results that placed it in the lower middle nationally on many indicators of strength of social capital. Chicagoans appear to be less satisfied with various areas of their lives, trust one another less, and have fewer social connections than people in other parts of the nation tend to report.

The table below shows that Chicago area residents responding to the 2010 survey indicated similar overall levels of trust compared to the 2006 national survey, but much lower levels of trust in most of the individual trust domains such as neighborhood, people you work with or racial subgroups. This was true for the population totals, for seniors and among Blacks. Only Chicago-area Latinos appeared to trust the same or better in the individual domains compared to the national sample of non-whites.

**Table 9.1 Trust by total, age and race; 2006 national survey and 2010 Chicago survey**

A lot	Total		Seniors		Whites		Non Whites	Blacks		Latino
	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011		2006	2011	
People can be trusted	44%	47%	47%	48%	50%	55%	29%	32%	38%	
In neighborhood	46%	32%	61%	42%	55%	43%	21%	14%	22%	
Work with	50%	41%	67%	39%	59%	50%	26%	20%	34%	
Place worship	68%	53%	82%	60%	75%	61%	49%	42%	43%	

Shop	30%	22%	35%	29%	35%	28%	16%	11%	14%
White	32%	25%	47%	36%	36%	30%	24%	13%	22%
African American	27%	21%	38%	25%	31%	24%	17%	13%	17%
Asian	29%	22%	37%	26%	32%	25%	18%	11%	20%
Hispanic	28%	21%	34%	27%	30%	24%	22%	11%	19%
Police	55%	46%	70%	54%	61%	57%	40%	24%	31%

2010 Chicagoans expressed less happiness, and were less likely to rate their community as an excellent place to live compared to the 2006 national survey. Again, Latinos were an exception, expressing greater happiness, and about the same community satisfaction as national comparison groups. Chicagoans also indicated fewer close friends and confidants than did the national sample, as a region, among seniors, and for each racial group. Each of the Chicago demographic groups did express greater satisfaction with their health than did the same groups nationally.

**Table 9.2 Well-being by total, age and race; 2006 national survey and 2010 Chicago survey**

	Total	Total	Seniors	Seniors	Whites	Whites	Non Whites	Blacks	Latino
	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011	2011
Very happy	25%	20%	36%	24%	22%	19%	33%	15%	25%
Excellent health	21%	27%	15%	21%	22%	29%	17%	24%	24%
Community excellent place to live	39%	34%	50%	41%	44%	42%	24%	21%	22%
6 or more close friends	43%	30%	54%	33%	44%	34%	35%	24%	24%
3 or more confidants	72%	52%	75%	50%	76%	55%	60%	50%	48%

Note: 2006 rating of 10 on 10 point scale estimated equates to “very happy” on 2010 survey

Chicagoans in 2010 indicated in a number of areas that they were more likely than people across the nation in 2006 to know people different from themselves in religion, race, or gender identity. This could be an indicator of openness to diversity, but also may be an artifact of the Chicago area having more large numbers of diverse types of people than do most places in the nation. Hence the likelihood of knowing someone different becomes higher.

**Table 9.3 Friendship diversity by total, age and race; 2006 national survey and 2010 Chicago survey**

	Total	Total	Seniors	Seniors	Whites	Whites	Non Whites	Blacks	Latino
	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011	2011
Friend owns business	64%	53%	63%	62%	69%	55%	48%	47%	49%
Different religion	78%	est80%	81%	80%	82%	85%	66%	60%	80%
Latino	58%	61%	43%	45%	54%	55%	69%	50%	91%
Asian	36%	62%	26%	32%	36%	40%	30%	26%	34%
African American	63%	63%	54%	52%	64%	54%	56%	98%	60%
Gay/Lesbian	35%	52%	34%	34%	57%	48%	44/50%	44%	50%

Note: Gay/Lesbian is compared to a 2001 national survey

The wording and categorization of questions around volunteering were sufficiently different between the national survey and Chicago 2010 survey to make drawing strong conclusions difficult. However, in several categories, it would appear that Chicagoans volunteered at slightly lower rates than people did nationally. Certainly a plethora of volunteer opportunities existed in and around Chicago; then again, compared to many other parts of the nation, the Chicago area enjoyed many more alternatives and variety for recreational activities. It is also possible that high rates of residential mobility, and other types of social and cultural separation, tended to militate against volunteering in social institutions.

**Table 9.4 Volunteering by total, age and race; 2006 national survey and 2011 Chicago survey**

	Total	Total	Seniors	Seniors	Whites	Whites	Non-Whites	Blacks	Latino
	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011	2006	2011	2011
Place of worship	45%	40%	47%	42%	47%	39%	42%	52%	30%
School/youth	~30%	39%	~16%	24%	~34%	36%	~32%	46%	37%
Poor/elderly	~35%	35%	~45%	37%	~30%	36%	~38%	46%	23%
Culture/arts	19%	14%	17%	13%	19%	14%	19%	15%	11%

Note: 2006 survey worded “participate in” rather than “volunteered”  
 2006 survey separates school and youth and separates seniors and “charity or social welfare”. An estimate was created by assuming a 50% overlap. The “~” indicates the figure is estimated from existing data.

## METHODOLOGY

Data was collected by Blackstone and Knowledge Networks working under the supervision of the Metro Chicago Information Center during the summer and fall of 2010. One fourth of surveys were collected through an internet based survey panel and the balance through a random digit dial telephone survey. Overall the survey data set has a response rate of 20%. The resulting database consisted of 3,047 cases. Cases were collected in Cook, Lake, DuPage, Kendall, McHenry, Will and Grundy counties.

Because the survey oversampled smaller counties in the Chicago regional area in order to attain useful sample sizes from each of the seven counties in the Chicago region, weights were applied to generate regional data comparable to regional representation on key variables of location, race/ethnicity, and gender. Application of these weights yielded a final data set comparable to regional characteristics on other variables of interest. Analysis was conducted of the resulting data set comparing it to Census figures on selected variables and the final data set varies little from known proportions reported in Census data at that time. Interviews of persons identified on the phone as relying upon Spanish were conducted in Spanish.

Questions used in the survey were generally worded comparably to questions utilized in the Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, General Social Survey, MCIC surveys and other surveys considering similar subject matter so as to allow comparison with other survey findings. Data on age was recorded unevenly in the surveys. Thus the category "senior" is a composite of age 65 or older when age was recorded, and a person reporting that they were "retired" when age was not recorded.

For tables comparing two categories within a variable across the entire data set, the confidence interval on findings is approximately plus/minus 3.5%. With larger numbers of sub-categories compared, confidence intervals could rise to plus/minus approximately 6%, depending on the size of population considered. Data was not reported where confidence intervals would be larger than that figure.

## NOTES

- Bok, Derek C. 2010. *The politics of happiness: What government can learn from the new research on well being*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bressi, Todd W. 1994. Planning the American dream. In Peter Katz, ed., *The new urbanism: Towards an architecture of community*. New York: McGraw-Hill: 15-28.
- Browning, Christopher R. and Kathleen A. Cagney. 2002. Neighborhood structural Disadvantage, Collective Efficacy, and Self-Rated Physical Health in an Urban Setting. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 43 (4): 383-399.
- Bryk, Anthony and Barbara Schneider. 2005. *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- Burchell, Robert, Anthony Downs, David Listokin, Hillary S Phillips, Samuel Seskin, and Naveed A. Shad. 1998. *Costs of sprawl--revisited*. (Transit Cooperative Research Program 39). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Calthorpe, Peter. 1993. *The next American metropolis: Ecology, community and the American dream*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, William A.V. 1991. Residential preferences and neighborhood racial segregation: A test of the Schelling model. *Demography* 28: 1-19.
- Clark, William A.V. 1992. Residential preferences and residential choices in a multi-ethnic context. *Demography* 30: 451-66.
- Clark, William A.V. 2009. Changing residential preferences across incomes, education, and age. *Urban Affairs Review* 44 (3): 334-355.
- Coleman, James. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94: S95-S120.
- Cose, Ellis. 2011. *The end of anger: A new generation's take on race and rage*. New York: Harper-Collins.
- Dawkins, Casey. 2004. Recent evidence on the continuing causes of Black-White residential segregation. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 26: 379-400.
- Diener, Edward and Robert Biswas-Diener. 2008. *Happiness: Unlocking the mysteries of psychological Wealth*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- DiPrete, Thomas A., Andrew Gelman, Tyler McCormick, Julien Teitler and Tian Zheng. 2011. Segregation in social networks based on acquaintanceship and trust. *American Journal of Sociology* 116 (4): 1234-83.

- Duncan, Greg J. and Stephen Raudenbush. 1999. Assessing the effects of context in studies of child and youth development. *Educational Psychologist* 34(1): 29-41.
- Farley, Reynolds, Elaine Fielding and Maria Krysan. 1997. The residential preferences of Blacks and Whites: A four metropolis study. *Housing Policy Debate* 8:763-800.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. *Trust: Social capital and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- Gallup. 2011. *Race Relations*. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1687/race-relations> (accessed August 15, 2011).
- Gans, Peter. 1962. *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian Americans*. Glencoe, NY: The Free Press.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1983. The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory* 1: 201-233.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1995. *Getting a job: A study of contracts and careers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hayner, Don and Mary A. Johnson. 1993. *The great divide: Racial attitudes in Chicago*. Chicago: *Chicago Sun Times*.
- Holzer, Harry J. 1987. Informational job search and Black youth unemployment. *The American Economic Review* 77(3): 446-452.
- Ihlandfeldt, Keith R, and Benjamin Scafidi. 2002. Black Self-segregation as a cause of housing segregation: Evidence from the multi-city study of urban inequality. *Journal of Urban Economics* 51: 366-90.
- Klinenberg, Eric. 2002. *Heat wave: A social autopsy of disaster in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kneebone, Elizabeth and Raphael, Steven. 2011. *City and suburban crime trends in metropolitan America*. Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Krysan, Maria and Reynolds Farley. 2002. The residential preferences of Blacks: Do they explain persistent segregation? *Social Forces* 80 (3): 937-980.
- Lane, Robert E. 2001. *The loss of happiness in market democracies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Leachman, Mike, Phil Nyden, Bill Peterman and Darnell Coleman. 1998. *Black, white and shades of brown: Fair housing and economic opportunity in the Chicago region*. Chicago: Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities.
- Lewis, James H. and Rob Paral. 2001. A profile of immigrants in the Illinois workforce. *Illinois Immigrant Policy Project*. Chicago: Roosevelt University Institute for Metropolitan Affairs.



- Lewis, James H. and Rob Paral. 2003. Policy implications of immigrant workers and entrepreneurs: directions for state policymakers. *Illinois Immigrant Policy Project*. Chicago: Roosevelt University Institute for Metropolitan Affairs.
- Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin and James M. Cook. 2001. Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 415-44.
- Moody, James. 2001. Race, school integration, and friendship segregation in America. *American Journal of Sociology* 107 (3): 679-716.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey, Robert J. Sampson and Stephen Raudenbush. 2001. Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence. *Criminology* 39:517-560.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1998. Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1-24.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Qullian, Lincoln and Rozlynn Redd. 2006. *Can social capital explain persistent racial poverty gaps?* National Poverty Center Working Paper.
- The Saguaro Seminar at Harvard University Kennedy School of Government. 2006. *Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey*. 2006. <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/pdfs/2006SCCSbanner.pdf> (accessed August 15, 2011).
- Sampson, Robert. J., Stephen. W. Raudenbush and Felton Earls. 1997. Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277: 918-924.
- Skocpol, Theda and Morris P. Fiorina. 1999. *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Sniderman, Paul M. and Thomas Piazza. 1995. *The Scar of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stone, Arthur A., Joseph E. Schwartz, Joan E. Broderick and Angus Deaton. 2010. A snapshot of the age distribution of psychological well-being in the United States. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. Daniel Kahneman, ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Taylor, D. Garth. 1992. *When worlds collide: Culture, conflict and reported hate crimes in Chicago*. Chicago: Metro Chicago Information Center.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Catherine Zimmer, Kevin Stainback, Corre Robinson, Tiffany Taylor and Tricia McTague. 2006. Documenting desegregation: Segregation in American workplaces by race, ethnicity, and sex, 1966-2000. *American Sociological Review* 71:565-88.
- Uslaner, Eric M. and Mitchell Brown. 2005. Inequality, trust and civic engagement. *American Politics Research*, 33(6): 868-894.

- Vischer, Robert. 2001. Racial Segregation in American Churches and Its Implications for School Vouchers. *Florida Law Review* 53-193.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woolcock, Michael. 1998. Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society* 27(2): 151-208.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1998. *Loose connections: Joining together in America's fragmented communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.