

**People and Policy:**

**A 2010 Survey of Human Relations in the Chicago Region**

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

**2017**

## INTRODUCTION

The following report was prepared from a 3,000-plus survey of households in the Chicago area conducted by the Metro Chicago Information Center in 2010 shortly before its closing. In part because of MCIC's closing, the data, was not fully analyzed or publicly presented at that time. The author was collaborating with MCIC at the time on the project, but other professional responsibilities drew him away from it in the intervening years and so the project was not completed. The data contains 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 report begun many years ago.

### **What do we mean by "human relations"?**

Human relations is how people live, work and play with one another. It is who we choose to associate with. It is how many friends and acquaintances we have and how we relate to them. It is whether we choose to accept a wide range of diversity in our human interactions, or insist on interacting with people more like ourselves.

Much research now shows that the quality of human relationships, or social capital as this is often called, contributes significantly to many important areas bearing on public policy. To name but a few areas of significance, the success of job searches, effectiveness of political decision-making, neighborhood safety, education, and to a great degree, the overall happiness of most people have been shown to depend on various aspects of human relations. (Coleman 1988; Portes 1998; Holzer 1987; Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Putnam 2000; Lane 2001; Bok 2010).

It is, therefore, important 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 through our public policies. 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.

Not since the 1990s had a broad survey of human relations in the Chicago area been conducted. (Hayner and Johnson 1993) In the absence of existing data sets on the subject, the Metro Chicago Information Center conducted a 3,000 household survey of residents across the seven-county Chicago region. The entire sample was aggregated from two separate surveys conducted across the Chicago region. Weighting procedures were used to equate the final sample to the region's actual racial/ethnic, geographic and gender composition.

The survey focused on three related but separate domains of human relations where data is non-existent outside of surveys:

#### ***How and who we relate to and trust***

The ability to trust, and be trusted, and social connection and shared responsibility, are essential for economic growth, education, preventing crime and conducting politics productively.

#### ***Perceptions of discrimination***

The long history of conflict around discrimination, and that so many people have experienced it, requires that we continually monitor the region for its experience, and how those experiences may be affecting our current quality of life and our interactions with others.

### ***Levels of individual happiness***

Many people would argue that the most important goal of public policy, ultimately, should be maximizing the happiness of the population. The ability or willingness to trust others, and freedom from discrimination are strong predictors of individual happiness.

### ***Why care about human relations in Chicago?***

Strong human relations are essential to having a strong region.

In order for the Chicago region to compete effectively globally, we must maximize the use of our human capital, our most valuable resource. This means maximizing educational opportunities, having a civic culture that supports economic opportunity and growth, and having neighborhoods that people around the world would like to live in. It also means minimizing the waste of individual and public resources on crime, punishment, and managing conflict. The Chicago region is an amazing place to live in, but like other large urban regions, it faces many challenges to remain that way, many of which revolve around human relations.

The most visible human 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. On a scale of 0 to 100, with 100 being total segregation and 0 being complete integration, Chicago has historically scored around 90 and is consistently named among the most racially segregated cities in the nation. (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 divided history and present contribute to the poverty that facilitates crime.

An important component of race relations in a place as diverse as is the Chicago area is the integration of immigrants into the native population. The benefits of this continual infusion of people from all parts of the world are huge and help make Chicago the world-class city it is. But there are also challenges including overcoming differences in language, culture, and religion (Lewis and Paral 2003; Koval et al 2006). These differences can be manifest in contention over housing, use of languages, and how to deliver public education. Chicago should, and will, continue to be home to an extraordinarily wide array of people of different national origins and cultures and how well its residents succeed in living together will in part determine our quality of life, strength of our economy, and world competitiveness.

Like most large urban areas, Chicago experiences problems with civic participation. This includes low election turnout, and weaker networks of personal relationships than those of smaller, more rural, and less mobile places (Putnam 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 declined substantially over the 20 years preceding this survey (Kneebone and Raphael 2011), as have those in most other American communities, they remain unacceptably high and homicide rates in particular rebounded to very high levels a few years after the survey. 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 to and sensitive to residents (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush 2001). 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 have other places in the nation. 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.

The following report provides findings respecting important areas of public policy that are strongly informed by an understanding of the quality of human relations. These are:

- Race relations
- Poverty
- Crime and policing
- Policies likely to produce subjective well-being or happiness
- Differences in perceived quality of life between city and suburbs
- Perceived quality of life of lesbian, gay and bisexual persons

The study begins with summary data for the 7-county region.

Readers interested in understanding more about the state of human relations pertaining to city versus suburbs, racial/ethnic groups, seniors, low-income people, gender, lesbian/gay/bisexual should view a companion report also developed from the survey, ***Race Relations in the Chicago Region***.

## **1. SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS**

### ***What is the current perception of race relations and discrimination?***

Survey results suggest that while race relations in the region were slowly improving at the time of the survey, there is yet a distance to go. While a large percentage of all respondents (41%), and African Americans, in particular (61%), reported having been discriminated against at some point in their lives, a much smaller percentage reported that it occurred within the past year (20%). The vast majority of all respondents (75%) believed racial discrimination should be prohibited in housing rentals or sales. Area residents were about evenly split on their support for same-sex marriage, and whether they believe the region should welcome undocumented immigrants. Most residents believed that members of various minority groups within the region are hurt by discrimination to some degree.

Whites were much more likely to say that the quality of race relations is good in their community (61% compared to 44% for Blacks and Latinos). 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 share 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 (54% of whites generally trust against 32% of blacks).

Controlling for a variety of possible causes, the biggest statistical driver in the 2011 survey of having experienced discrimination is being black, which made one over 3 times (257%) more likely than a White to report lifetime discrimination. Being Latino is second at 2 times as likely. Being gay or bisexual increases likelihood of reporting discrimination by 63% compared to heterosexuals. Being male, healthy, Protestant or older make it less likely that one will report having been discriminated against.

### ***Do the poor have the personal connections they need to escape poverty?***

One of the costs of poverty is the social isolation that it can create. Persons with low incomes tend to be less educated, which limits employment options and can limit access to information. Jobless persons are less likely to know employers personally, and often live in neighborhoods that have fewer job opportunities within or nearby.

The most common way of finding jobs is through word-of-mouth and so the survey findings of social isolation of many low income persons is problematic. In the Chicago area, low income people have fewer close friends or confidants (10% less likely to have 6 or more close friends), and are more likely to know little about their neighbors. They are less trusting of others (30% compared to 50% of higher income people) and less likely to know someone who owns a business (38% compared to 55% of higher income people).

This suggests that efforts should be encouraged that will help low income persons and job seekers to become aware of opportunities, live in economically diverse neighborhoods, and interact with the widest possible circles of persons.

### ***Crime and policing***

At the time of the survey, crime had been declining steadily in the City and suburbs over the past decade and the City had a new Superintendent. The survey indicated that restoring confidence in policing should be a high priority. It indicated that low percentages of Chicago residents reported confidence in the police doing their jobs well (22%) and operating fairly (19%). Suburban figures were much better at around 40% to 50% on these measures. These figures almost exactly mirror the large differences between White versus Black and Latino perceptions of policing. Additionally, the low levels of social trust reported by many residents, and lack of confidence in neighborhood efficacy and lack of shared responsibility among neighbors for social order, make law enforcement more challenging.

Statistical analysis shows that independent predictors of lack of confidence in the police include being Black, Latino, living in Chicago, being low income, and having been discriminated against.

More confidence and trust between residents and law enforcement will lead to greater cooperation in investigating crimes, and more resident participation in preventing crime. Ultimately residents and police need to be partners in law enforcement and strong trust and mutual respect are essential for that. This entails setting a high bar for professional standards, making sure that policing is as unobtrusive as possible, creating settings for positive contact between residents and law enforcement, ensuring that discrimination and inappropriate profiling do not occur, and that force is always used in proportion to need for it.

### ***What would contribute most to increasing the happiness of Chicago-area residents?***

Our nation was in part founded on the principle that individuals were entitled to the pursuit of happiness and so to the extent practicable, helping people attain it would seem to be an important function of public policy. An increasing body of research in the United States and worldwide suggests that leading predictors of happiness include living above poverty, having good health, and satisfaction in personal relationships.

In the survey, about 20% of residents across the region reported being “very happy” and 59% “somewhat happy”. Figures were higher for very satisfied with a job (48%), very optimistic (53%), and very happy with marriage/relationship (57%). These figures are roughly average compared to national surveys.

Statistical analysis indicated a person’s race/ethnicity and related experiences were the largest determinants of respondents reporting happiness and satisfaction. 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 a respondent identifying as Latino or Asian, having good health, liking their neighborhood, satisfaction with their relationship with a spouse or partner, and job satisfaction.

But particularly concerning should be the 13% or so of area residents who reported no close friends or confidants. Older adults lacking friends can be at risk during particularly hot or cold weather, and lack of friends can contribute to unhappiness or poor mental health.

The survey findings suggest, therefore, that some of the most useful things that can be done are to assure that Blacks and Latinos, in particular, do not experience discrimination, to make sure that quality health care is extended to as many people as possible, and that people maximize their job satisfaction.

### ***Do residents report differences between living in city and suburbs?***

As the Chicago region grapples with difficult questions regarding how to reduce travel times, relieve traffic congestion, reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and build affordable housing near jobs, debate inevitably develops around what constitutes high quality of life and whether policy should prefer land use that is more “urban” or “suburban” in character.

The survey results indicated many differences in perception of human relations between city and suburbs. Across a range of variables measuring how well people say they are connected to one another, and assessment of neighborhood quality, Collar County residents reported the most connection and Chicago residents reported less. Forty-five percent of collar county residents rated their community as an excellent place to live, compared to 35% of suburban Cook residents and 21% of Chicago residents.

Suburban residents reported knowing more of their neighbors, and more about them (about 10% city-suburban difference), trusted them more (18% difference), anticipated greater neighborhood responses to local problems (10% difference) and considered their neighbors more closely connected and more likely to share their values (10% difference). Statistical analysis indicates that these results are in part because the city has more low income people and has much larger challenges created by diversity and mobility, all of which inherently lead to less connection.

As the region progresses through demographic and economic change and strives to produce the greatest possible quality of life for all of its residents, it is important to consider how land use and other public policies may affect human relations and how to develop the region in ways that enhance the best of both city and suburban living.

### ***How accepted are gay persons?***

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

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. These differences were statistically significant, but generally not large.

The Chicago region appears roughly split on support of same-sex marriage, although it is important to note that the survey was fielded prior to the monumental changes that have occurred in Illinois and U.S. law that occurred in recent years.

***Methodology***

The study is built upon a survey of 3,047 households in the 7-County Chicago region conducted by telephone and with the Internet. Most results should be considered accurate to around plus or minus 4 percent.



## THE 7-COUNTY REGION SUMMARY DATA

### *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 tends 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 are 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 of individuals 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>More Than 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 useful 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 know people who practice a different religion than they do, although the non-religious are much less likely to know someone who is religious. Area residents are less likely to know someone of a different race, with about 60% of respondents saying they do. 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**

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. It is important because 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 remained in a similar place in 2010. In the Chicago region, people were most likely to volunteer in some capacity at a place of worship, and almost as likely to volunteer for a school or youth program.

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

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

Chicago performed quite low in measures of social trust in the 2001 Harvard social capital survey. The Chicago region was around the national average on trust measures in this survey, although the City of Chicago remained lower. About half of all 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 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.

As the table below indicates, the highest levels of trust were found in places of worship and the lowest in stores where people shop. Respondents tended to be guarded in their trust of people of other races or ethnicities with “a lot” of trust between 20% and 25% for each group, and “some” trust around 65%. About 25% of respondents trusted the police either “just some” or “very little”.

**Table 1.4 Levels of 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 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%

**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**

The survey indicated mixed results as to how responsive most people felt their neighbors would be to conventional threats to neighborhood social order or well-being. The survey suggests 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**

<b>Likelihood of neighborhood response:</b>	<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**

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. 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 than, 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>	
How happy do you feel	19.7%	58.7%	21.5%	
Happiness with marriage/relationship	57.0%	39.1%	3.85	
	<b>Very Optimistic</b>	<b>In between</b>	<b>Very pessimistic</b>	
Optimism or pessimism about next few years	52.8%	37.3%	9.9%	
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Assessment of own health	26.5%	52.5%	17.7%	3.3%
	<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Moderately satisfied</b>	<b>Little dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
Satisfaction with current job	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>
Rate your community as a place to live	33.6%	48.9%	14.5%	2.9%
	<b>Better</b>	<b>About the same</b>	<b>Worse</b>	
Neighborhood change over past five years	23.6%	56.8%	19.6%	
Likely neighborhood change over next five years	27.1%	60.4%	12.5%	

**Discrimination**

About 41% of all residents reported that they have been a victim of discrimination at some time in their life and about one quarter reported that it was within the past year.

Respondents were most likely to name immigrants as a group discriminated against frequently (41%), followed by African Americans (35%), seniors (33%), lesbians or gays (32%), and Latinos (26%).

**Table 1.10 Personal discrimination**

Have been a victim of discrimination	41.1%
Related to jobs (26.2% in past year)	27.6%
Related to education (14% in past year)	15.9%
Related to housing (16.7% in past year)	19.1%
Related to something else (30.5% in past year)	26.8%

**Table 1.11 Perceived victims of discrimination**

Latino people are hurt by discrimination frequently	25.8%
African American people are hurt by discrimination frequently	35.5%
Asian people are hurt by discrimination frequently	9.3%
White people are hurt by discrimination frequently	6.1%
Lesbians/gays are hurt by discrimination frequently	32.2%
Immigrants are hurt by discrimination frequently	41.4%
Women are hurt by discrimination frequently	21.4%
Seniors are hurt by discrimination frequently	32.6%

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

**Table 1.12 Race relations and policy**

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Quality of race relations in your community is good or excellent	17.2%	39.8%	34.2%	8.9%
<b>Policy preferences</b>				
Favor racial →	<b>Integration</b>	<b>Something between</b>	<b>Separation</b>	
	72.1%	25.5%	2.3%	
Preference for racial makeup of community mix of groups	<b>Mix of groups</b>	<b>Some other group</b>	<b>Same as respondent</b>	
	82.7%	2.3%	15.0%	
Support of laws where homeowner cannot refuse race to sell to	<b>Homeowner cannot refuse</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Homeowner decide for self</b>	
	73.2%	1.5%	25.3%	
	<b>Strongly Agree or agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Disagree or Strongly disagree</b>	
Undocumented immigrants should be welcome in Chicago area community	45.9%	10.6%	43.5%	
Persons of same sex should be able to marry	47.7%	10.7%	41.7%	

## 2. RACE RELATIONS

### *Summary*

- Of Chicago-area Blacks, Whites, Latinos and Asian-Americans, Blacks were most likely to report having experienced discrimination (61%), followed by Latinos (50%).
- Whites (54%) were far more likely to say they trust people in general than are Blacks (32%) and Latinos (39%).
- Being Black, Latino, Gay, better educated, poor, or speaking English well are independent predictors of the report of discrimination, with being Black the strongest.
- The perception of discrimination contributed to a lack of confidence in the police
- Blacks and Latinos were 2 times as likely as whites to believe that people other than themselves were discriminated against, and were most supportive of public policies that would advance acceptance of social diversity.
- Acceptance of racial minorities appeared to be improving in recent decades.

### **Findings**

Americans are highly segregated 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).

A huge research literature has developed seeking to explain persistent Black-White segregation, particularly around housing. (Farley, Fielding and Krysan, 1997; 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.

## Discrimination

The Chicago-area survey results on the experience of discrimination are dominated by the 61.2% of Blacks who say they have been discriminated against in their lifetimes. Nearly half of Latinos reported lifetime discrimination.

People of all races who said they have experienced discrimination were most likely to say it was around work. One might not expect whites to report discrimination, but many whites report discrimination based on gender, disability or age.

The survey results are 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, national 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 (Cose, 2011).

**Table 2.1 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 \* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$

Closely related to the high levels of racial segregation that exist across the Chicago region, and the vastly different experiences of discrimination of most Whites and Blacks, fairly consistent patterns emerged across racial groups on “trust”, with Whites the most trusting of others and African Americans the least. This is consistent with national patterns.

Fifty-four percent (54%) of whites answered that “people can be trusted” compared to only 32% of Blacks and 38.6% of Latinos. Gaps between Whites and Blacks and Latinos on trust in the neighborhood and trust of co-workers were even larger.

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 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 resulting in police receiving 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.

**Table 2.2 Community 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 \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

### **Connectedness**

Analyzing connections among different types of people is important because where differences in the number or quality of personal connections exist, group members derive significant advantages or disadvantages 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. Latinos were the most likely of the three large groups to live in racially mixed neighborhoods, but for many, language differences may impede relationships within the neighborhood. Latinos were more likely to be new arrivals in a neighborhood, which could militate against having denser, longer-standing relationships.

**Table 2.3 Neighborhood connectedness by race**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>
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

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

What are the drivers of the experience of discrimination? Did respondents report discrimination because of their identity as a racial/ethnic minority? Or did they have the experience because they are low income, or do not speak English well? To identify drivers of reports of discrimination, a statistical analysis (logistic regression) was conducted to identify the correlates with whether a respondent indicated that they had ever experienced discrimination. The complete results of the analysis are located in the Statistical Appendix.

The analysis indicates overwhelmingly that the defining characteristic of likelihood of reporting discrimination remains 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 makes one 257% more likely
- Being Latino makes one 91% more likely
- LGBs or lesbians are 63% more likely
- Persons with college degrees are 53% more likely
- Being low income makes one 43% more likely
- Strong English speaking makes one 42% more likely

#### Factors associated with *less* report of discrimination

Healthy people are only 85% as likely

Males are only 80% as likely

Seniors are only 76% as likely

Protestants are only 67% as likely

One's consciousness of discrimination likely 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. More literate and educated persons are more likely to know their rights. Seniors reached adulthood at a historical time when there was less awareness of discrimination's many forms, and so may have reported less of it on the survey. Many older whites in the sample grew up at a time when discrimination based on gender or age was considered more appropriate than it is today. A transformation across much of American society occurred during the 1970s and 1980s with the growing recognition that many of the causes of disparity for women, seniors and the disabled should be viewed as improper discrimination. Consequently, many younger people may be inclined to consider certain acts and behaviors discriminatory that their grandparents may not have.

We might also be curious about whether discrimination appears to people to be an ongoing problem, as opposed to being only an earlier life experience, and why. Being Black or Latino are the strongest determinants of whether one reported a recent experience of discrimination. The data suggests, however, that with time, Blacks are experiencing less discrimination relative to the general population. 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 appears to protect one somewhat from perception of current 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 makes one 290% more likely

Being Latino makes one 108% more likely

Strong English speakers are 49% more likely

LGBs/Lesbians are 70% more likely

#### Factors associated with *less* recent discrimination

Being Protestant makes one only 70% as likely

Employed persons are only 75% as likely

Seniors are only 47% as likely

## Recognition of discrimination against others

Blacks also appeared to have the strongest sense that persons of various identities other than themselves suffer from discrimination. The gap between Black perception and that of other groups is 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 2.4 Discrimination by race**

	White	Black	Latino	Asian
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 \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

## Diversity policies

Given the history of race relations in Chicago and the nation, responses to questions concerning issues surrounding acceptance of diversity 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 2.5 Policy issues by race**

	White	Black	Latino	Asian
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 \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

***Policy Implications***

- The perceptions of discrimination, particularly among Blacks, are sufficiently large that strong enforcement of anti-discrimination laws continues to be warranted whether in the fields of employment, housing, education, law-enforcement or others.
- While there is no single policy or program that would improve social trust, any actions by government or civic leaders that contribute to inter-racial trust-building would be valuable to the region.
- Being better educated and speaking English well were strong predictors of reporting discrimination. Since it is unlikely that we discriminate more against people with those characteristics, it is more likely that less educated persons who communicate less well may be unaware of discriminatory actions they suffer from or not fully understand their rights. Outreach on consumer, worker, housing and other rights to low-income persons and poor English speakers would help to empower those persons appropriately and rights enforcement must follow where violations are found.

### 3. POVERTY

#### **Summary**

- Low-income persons were more likely to experience social isolation.
- Low income persons reported fewer close friends or confidants - 21% of low income persons had 6 or more close friends compared to 31% of higher income persons. They were much more likely to report having no close friends or confidants – 16% compared to 11% of higher income persons.
- Low-income people were less likely to know someone else who owns a business (37%, compared to 55% with higher income).
- Low-income people were much less likely to trust people in general (31%, compared to 51% of higher income persons), were more likely to say neighbors are different or do not get along with one another, and were about 20% more likely than higher income persons to report living in neighborhoods with less social cohesion and mutually shared responsibility.

#### **FINDINGS**

Personal relationships are essential for creating and taking advantage of economic opportunity and so understanding the connections lower income persons may have is essential for devising strategies for helping people escape unemployment or poverty.

In this survey, "low income" was defined as any respondent reporting less than \$20,000 of income. 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.

#### **Connectedness**

Low-income persons are more likely to be isolated than are people with more income. They tend 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 are more likely to know someone who has been on welfare. This relative isolation can be problematic when seeking jobs or political influence. Lower income persons did claim to know more “community leaders”, but often, because of the socially isolating process, these leaders are less effective than leaders known better to higher income communities. (Gans, 1962; Holzer, 1987; Granovetter, 1995; Wilson, 1987; Quillian and Redd, 2006)

**Table 3.1 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%
Have friend who is a community leader *	43.6%	50.1%

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

Lower income persons also tended to be somewhat more isolated with respect to their religious and racial/ethnic connections. While low income Protestants did appear more likely to know non-Protestants than did higher income persons, higher income persons of “other” religions, and who were not religious, had more diversity of relationships. Higher income persons also were more likely to know an Asian, a Latino, or a gay.

**Table 3.2 Diversity of personal relationships by income**

	Over \$20,000	Under \$20,000
Protestant who has non-Protestant friend **	22.6%	35.6%
Catholic who has non-Catholic friend	83.5%	85.9%
“Other” religion who has friend with a different religion **	81.6%	63.1%
Person not religious who has a 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%

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

### **Trust**

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of lower income persons in the survey is their lack of trust of others. Only 30.9% of persons with incomes under \$20,000 expressed generalized trust of other people, while 50% of persons with higher incomes did. Differences between low and higher income groups existed by margins of 10% to 20% for every trust-related question asked on the survey.

The lack of trust can be toxic to workplace relations, personal relationships, health, crime prevention and education (Browning and Cagney, 2002; Bryk and Schneider 2005) and so can contribute to low-income persons’ difficulty advancing economically.

**Table 3.3 Community 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 \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

***Policy Implications***

- In order to facilitate economic opportunities for low-income persons, it is essential to reduce their isolation. This can be accomplished to varying degrees by utilization of labor market intermediaries, reducing geographic isolation of low income people through affordable housing strategies, and by creating social spaces where persons of higher and lower incomes can socialize.
- Despite the uneven record of financial institutions, lower income persons need to trust them in order to eventually realize financial gains through investment.
- Lower income persons tend to live in higher crime neighborhoods and the lowering of crime through greater social trust and neighborhood cohesion would contribute to economic development.



## 4. CRIME AND POLICING

### Summary

- Chicago residents reported lack of confidence in the police doing their jobs well and operating fairly, with about 20% of respondents having confidence.
- Confidence in the police is higher in the suburbs than in the City – about 20% in the City compared to around 40% in the suburbs.
- Blacks, and to some extent Latinos and low income people, are about 20% less likely to have confidence in the police than whites or higher income respondents.
- The low levels of social trust reported by many residents, and lack of confidence in neighborhood efficacy and mutual responsibility for social orders by neighbors, make law enforcement more challenging.
- Lower income persons report far less neighborhood cohesion and shared social responsibility in their neighborhoods than do higher income persons.

### Findings

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.

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. One of the most damaging casualties of Chicago's history of racial conflict and public corruption is trust of the police. Across the region in 2010, 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.

Huge distinctions exist across sub-regions of the Chicago area with respect to confidence in the police. The survey indicates 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 4.1 Confidence in the police by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>
A great deal of confidence in police to do a good job enforcing the law **	22.8%	44.9%	53.0%
A great deal of confidence in the police not to use excessive force on suspects **	19.1%	35.6%	46.4%
A great deal of confidence in the police to treat all races/ethnic groups equally **	18.7%	34.1%	40.4%

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

Significant differences also existed in trust of the police among racial/ethnic groups, with Whites and Asians having far more confidence in the police than did African Americans and Latinos. These differences reflect the history of African American relations with the police and the extraordinarily disproportionate arrest and incarceration of blacks that existed 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 4.2 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

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

**Table 4.3 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

Seniors had 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 4.4 Confidence in the police by age**

	Non-seniors	Seniors
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

So what drove whether people had confidence in the police? Is support for the police based on the race of a person? Based on their income? Generational? Experiential? Temperamental?

The statistical analysis (multiple regression located in the Statistical Appendix) 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 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.

A high correlation exists between neighborhood income and levels of crime. Connectedness of persons within neighborhoods correlates highly with crime rates. 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.

Low income persons consistently reported lower responses on measures of connectedness, knowing fewer of their neighbors, and fewer local business people. They also consistently 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 4.5 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

**Policy Implications**

- Police in Chicago need to take affirmative steps to build confidence in their performance.
- Police need to conduct intensive outreach to minority populations to build trust between residents and law enforcement.
- Professional standards and laws regarding police conduct must be rigorously adhered to.
- Laws and enforcement strategies resulting in disproportionate contact, enforcement, and sanctions should be carefully reviewed and amended where possible so as to reduce racially disproportionate results or their appearance.

## 5. POLICIES TOWARD HAPPINESS

### **Summary**

Across the region, about 20% of residents reported being “very happy” and 59% “somewhat happy”.

About half of residents reported optimism about the next few years. About 55% were happy with their marriages/relationships and 45% were very satisfied with their current job.

Across the Chicago region, a statistical analysis indicates the strongest predictors of individual happiness are:

- Trusting others
- Having strong marriages or relationships with significant others
- High job satisfaction
- Not having experienced discrimination
- Good health

### **Findings**

Arguably, the most important function of society is to help people to be happy (Jefferson, 1776; 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)

Across the region, about 20% of residents said they were “very happy”, 59% “somewhat happy” and 22% “not too happy.”

Levels of happiness, optimism, health assessment, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with a personal relationship vary with different demographic groups. In general, higher income persons, Latinos, whites and collar county residents tend to report most favorably on these indicators.

**Table 5.1 Well-being by demographic group**

	<b>Over \$20,000</b>	<b>Under \$20,000</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Latino</b>	<b>Asian- Amer</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Subs</b>	<b>Collars</b>
Feel very happy overall **	20.2%	15.4%	19.2%	14.7%	25.7%	20.4%	16.5%	19.7%	22.8%
Very optimistic about next few years **	54.2%	47.7%	50.5%	56.2%	60.7%	47.3%	54.2%	51.5%	52.4%
Own health excellent	29.3%	10.2%	28.6%	23.9%	23.8%	25.0%	26.6%	21.2%	30.5%

Very satisfied with current job	48.5%	41.4%	47.7%	47.1%	52.5%	32.4%	45.3%	46.5%	52.6%
Very happy with marriage/relationship **	58.3%	37.5%	60.4%	45.9%	52.0%	52.6%	53.7%	54.4%	61.3%

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

The table below presents results of a statistical analysis (logistic regression located in Statistical Appendix) 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 the Chicago regional survey respondents.

The keys to happiness were:

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 makes one 192% more likely to be happy

Being in excellent health makes one 100% more likely to be happy

Being Latino makes one 95% more likely to be happy

Persons assessing their communities as higher quality are 72% more likely to be happy

Persons happy with their marriages/relationships are 67% more likely to express overall happiness

Persons with more confidants are 15% more likely to be happy

#### Factors associated with respondents reporting less happiness

Being male makes one 60% less likely to be happy

Workers unhappy with their jobs are 57% less likely to express overall happiness

Strong English speakers are 45% less likely to be happy

#### ***Unhappiness***

#### Factors associated with respondents reporting unhappiness

Males are 71% more likely to indicate unhappiness

Persons who have been discriminated against are 71% more likely to be unhappy

People dissatisfied with their jobs are 51% more likely to be unhappy.

#### Factors associated with reporting **less** unhappiness

Persons with happy marriages/relationships are 67% less likely to unhappy

Persons assessing their communities as higher quality are 59% less likely to be unhappy

People with excellent health are 48% less likely to be unhappy  
Persons who trust others are 47% less likely to be unhappy  
Latinos are 43% less likely to be unhappy  
People living in Chicago are 42% less likely to be unhappy  
LGBs/Lesbians are 31% less 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.

It is easy to dismiss a concept such as “happiness” as too ambiguous to be of much value for forming public policy but, in fact, there are a number of public policies that almost certainly would result in people reporting greater happiness. These include:

**Universal access to quality health care.** In this study, and most others, quality of health is a strong driver of personal happiness. Assuring that all residents have access to health care and, therefore, a better chance of being healthy, could have a strong impact on the overall happiness of hundreds of thousands of Chicago-area residents.

**Reducing discrimination.** In this survey, the report of discrimination and racial identity were strong predictors of unhappiness and so reducing the deleterious aspects of these factors could raise happiness levels. This is probably most immediately accomplished through consistent enforcement of existing civil rights laws around employment, housing, and law enforcement.

**Improving job satisfaction.** While there is no direct way that public policy can do this short of improving economic conditions such that wages rise, a number of existing laws and policies would likely contribute to it. These include assuring that employers respect the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Family Leave Act, wage and hour laws, and keeping workplaces safe.

**Economic recovery.** Strong wage and employment growth would likely contribute to happiness in multiple ways. Beyond lifting people out of poverty, which diminishes both health and other personal resources, more income can decrease pressure on heads of households (men are less happy than women) and can potentially lead to happier personal relationships as economic stress on the family lessens – a major contributor to domestic disputes.

### ***Policy Implications***

The public policies that are likely to increase the happiness, or subjective well-being, of the most people in the Chicago region are:

- Extending health care coverage as broadly as possible
- Improving job satisfaction
- Programs or policies that lead to greater social trust, such as consistent and fair law enforcement and ethical politics
- Eliminating discrimination

## URBAN/SUBURBAN QUALITY OF LIFE

### Summary

- In 2010 the most positive assessments of places people lived in were in the collar counties, followed by suburban Cook County and then Chicago. 45% of respondents in the collar counties rated their community an excellent place to live, followed by 35% in the Cook suburbs and 21% in the City.
- The most connected people, who reported the most acquaintances, and those who viewed their neighbors as most socially responsible, were in the collar counties, followed by suburban Cook County and then Chicago.

### 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 always translate into quality personal relationships and connections. 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, or compete for resources or access to political influence. The very fact of mobility can make it harder to establish long-term or trusting relationships.

This survey found that 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 satisfaction across Chicago communities is 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 owes 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 6.1 Neighborhood quality by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties
Rated community as an excellent place to live **	20.8%	35.0%	44.9%
Outsiders rate your neighborhood as an excellent place to live **	16.0%	24.6%	29.7%
Neighborhood change better over the past five years **	26.7%	20.3%	23.1%
Neighborhood change worse over the past five years **	23.2%	21.7%	14.3%
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better **	29.3%	25.7%	26.0%

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



## 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. While there are many other reasons Chicago has a higher unemployment rate than the suburbs, the lack of personal connections can be a factor.

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 are more commonly found in Cook suburbs than in Chicago, and are 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 are generally lower in suburban communities than in the city.

**Table 6.2 Neighborhood connectedness, intervention and cohesion by sub-region**

	Chicago	Cook Suburbs	Collar Counties
Know 10 or more neighbors personally **	42.8%	44.6%	47.5%
Know 5 or more employees of neighborhood businesses **personally	25.3%	29.9%	33.4%
Know the workplace of 5 or more neighbors **	45.8%	45.2%	52.0%
Have friend or neighbor who works for neighborhood business **	34.0%	37.8%	46.3%
Very likely neighborhood response to child skipping school **	29.8%	38.1%	42.7%
Very likely neighborhood response to graffiti **	48.8%	60.9%	69.1%
Very likely that neighbors would scold a disrespectful child **	12.6%	17.8%	20.7%
Very likely that neighbors would break up a fight	34.1%	41.7%	51.9%
Very likely neighbors organize to stop closing of a fire station **	43.4%	48.4%	50.8%
Strongly agree close-knit neighborhood that pulls together **	12.4%	16.9%	20.8%
Strongly agree neighbors help one another **	18.8%	29.1%	35.0%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not get along with one another **	23.9%	26.7%	33.1%
Strongly disagree neighbors do not share the same values **	11.6%	16.5%	21.6%
Strongly agree people in neighborhood can be trusted **	13.1%	21.6%	31.2%

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 report 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 6.3 Personal Relationships by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>
Six or more close friends **	24.3%	30.8%	36.1%
No close friends **	14.1%	10.4%	10.0%
Three or more people to confide in **	42.7%	50.3%	63.4%
No people to confide in **	20.6%	12.9%	10.7%
Have personal friend who owns a business **	51.2%	49.3%	56.4%
Have personal friend who is a manual worker **	50.8%	49.7%	57.6%
Have friend who has been on welfare **	37.2%	24.7%	25.3%
Have friend who owns a vacation home **	45.4%	48.1%	58.1%

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 is 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 6.4 Neighborhood quality by sub-region**

	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cook Suburbs</b>	<b>Collar Counties</b>
Rated community as an excellent place to live **	20.8%	35.0%	44.9%
Outsiders rate your neighborhood as an excellent place to live **	16.0%	24.6%	29.7%
Neighborhood change better over the past five years **	26.7%	20.3%	23.1%
Neighborhood change worse over the past five years **	23.2%	21.7%	14.3%
Likely neighborhood change over the next five years better **	29.3%	25.7%	26.0%

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

### **Policy Implications**

The greater satisfaction respondents expressed with suburban over city life is in part driven by an independent preference for one place over the other, but also because suburbanites are wealthier, older, and report less discrimination – the latter because they are as a whole much whiter. Wealth, age and non-discrimination correlate with greater life satisfaction, whether or not the person lives in the city or suburbs. So to some degree the preference has something to do with suburban living itself, and to some degree it is because of who happens to live there.

For these reasons, and because people living in the city tend to be much more mobile, Chicago faces much greater challenges to attain connectedness and shared responsibility than do suburbs. Throughout history, socially and racially diverse and mobile communities have always been harder to maintain than more homogenous ones.

Moving the city's satisfaction and connectedness figures higher will require efforts to combat the effects of past discrimination, thoughtful development of public spaces, strong crime reduction strategies, and maintaining quality and affordable housing that encourages people to be long-time neighborhood residents.

## 6. Lesbians, Gays and Bi-Sexuals

### Summary

- 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 reported that their neighborhood was less likely to have a collective positive response on a number of conventional social order measures.

- While the differences were only borderline significant statistically, on most of the questions regarding types of trust, 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 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 (34% for Straights calling their community an “excellent place to live” compared to 20% of LGBs).
- In 2010, LGBs were twice as likely as Straights to strongly support gay marriage (41.2% to 23.2%), but some LGBs did not.
- LGBs were about 12% 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 (48% compared to 31%).

### Findings

As a 2011 debate in Illinois over whether religiously based adoption agencies must serve gay parents equally attested, the status of gays and lesbians in Illinois was 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 in 2010 the Defense of Marriage Act was 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 remain 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 is 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? Did gays feel that they experienced discrimination?

For this analysis, the statistical 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, we also attain a large enough group in the survey to make statistically meaningful comparisons between them as a group, and persons who reported themselves as purely heterosexual.

### Connectedness

The survey presents an overall picture of LGBs being a little more socially isolated than Straights in 2010. LGBs reported personally knowing fewer neighbors across diverse domains, and reported that their neighborhood is 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 7.1 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 7.2 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 7.3 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 of the police on all three survey questions than were Straights.

**Table 7.4 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 7.5 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 were 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 7.6 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 7.7 Discrimination by gender**

	Straights	LGBs
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 7.8 Personal discrimination by gender**

	Straights	LGBs
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 \*= $p < .05$  \*\*= $p < .01$

### Policy Implications

- Human rights and anti-discrimination laws pertaining to LGBTQs should be strongly enforced and gays and lesbians should enjoy all rights held by Straights.
- Gays and lesbians should be enabled to feel safe in all areas of the region.
- Community-based institutions should be supported that provide counseling and support to gay, lesbian and questioning persons, especially young people.



## 7. 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 approximately 20%. The resulting database consists 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 on 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. 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 conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, Metro Chicago Information Center surveys and other surveys considering similar subject matter so as to allow comparison with other survey findings.

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

## 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.
- Jefferson, Thomas, 1776. The Declaration of Independence. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 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.
- Koval, John, , Larry Bennet, Michael Bennett, Fasil Demissie, Roberta Garner, Kiljoong Kim, editors. 2006. *A New Chicago: A Social and Cultural Analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- 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.

- Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 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.
- Quillian, 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.
- 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.

## Statistical Appendix

### Predictors of perception of discrimination against self

	Significance	Probability Exp(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

### 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		

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

	Coefficient B	Significance
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

**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

## **METHODOLOGY**

Data was collected by survey firms Blackstone and Knowledge Networks working under contract and 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 approximately 20%. The resulting database consists 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. 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.

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.