



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2012

Neighborhood Attachment Among Latinos in Low-Income Communities

Kathleen Bachtell
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bachtell, Kathleen, "Neighborhood Attachment Among Latinos in Low-Income Communities" (2012).
Dissertations. 327.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/327

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2012 Kathleen Bachtell

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

NEIGHBORHOOD ATTACHMENT AMONG LATINOS
IN LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN SOCIOLOGY

BY

KATHLEEN E. BACHTTELL

CHICAGO, IL

AUGUST 2012

Copyright by Kathleen E. Bachtell, 2012
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extend thanks to my dissertation committee, including my chair, Rhys Williams, and co-chair David Embrick of Loyola University Chicago, and Colm O’Muirheartaigh of NORC at the University of Chicago and the Harris School at the University of Chicago. Judith Wittner provided helpful feedback regarding the interview protocol for my qualitative research and sound advice throughout the process.

A number of co-workers at NORC at the University of Chicago deserve special recognition. Cathy Haggerty helped immensely in securing funding for the qualitative research in San Antonio and planning for the in-depth interview data collection. Shannon Nelson and Nola du Toit reviewed drafts of the dissertation in various forms and served as an ongoing sounding board for discussing ideas, frustrations and successes. I am also grateful to the Annie E. Casey Foundation for funding my qualitative research in San Antonio. Please see Appendix F for a disclaimer regarding the role of the Casey Foundation and NORC in my research.

Additionally, I thank Gene Gonzalez for his gracious assistance in coordinating space in which to conduct the in-depth interviews in San Antonio. Paula Kamen of Transcription Professionals managed the transcription of the audio recordings and adapted to changing needs of the project. Samuel Alvarado of Linguavox translated the Spanish interviews and provided thoughtful commentary about both the dynamics of the interviews and cultural nuances.

Finally, I offer an emphatic “thank you” to the in-depth interview participants who took time out of their day to speak with me and my colleague. In addition to being incredibly forthcoming, honest, and gracious, they also shared stories of warm, playful, and humorous interactions that shed new light on the experience of West Side to those who live, eat, and shop there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Neighborhood Attachment	4
International Migration Studies	12
Macrolevel Mexican Migration Studies	13
Local level Mexican Migration Studies	17
Social Networks	19
The Problem	21
CHAPTER THREE: THIS RESEARCH STUDY	25
Research Questions	26
Analytical Framework	26
Hypotheses	29
Potential Contributions	30
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA AND METHODOLOGY FOR QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS	31
Data	31
Survey Neighborhoods	34
Strengths and Limitations	39
Methods	42
CHAPTER FIVE: QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS	65
Profile of Households by Race/Ethnicity	65
Trends in Neighborhood Attachment among Latinos in the <i>Making Connections</i> Survey	71
Regression Findings	73
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS	93
Evaluation	94
Formal Neighboring	98
Informal Neighboring	100
The Religious Element	103
Neighborhood Naming	104
Length of Residence	109

Sentiment.....	110
CHAPTER SEVEN: METHODS AND DATA FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH ...	114
Background: San Antonio Survey Neighborhood.....	114
Methods.....	121
Data.....	129
Strengths and Limitations	130
CHAPTER EIGHT: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS	132
Migration History and Family Ties	132
Neighborhood Conditions	135
Interactions with Neighbors	148
Giving and Getting Help	154
Use of Neighborhood Services.....	161
Community Activism and Formal Neighboring.....	168
Neighborhood Naming.....	170
CHAPTER NINE: DISCUSSION OF QUALITATIVE FINDINGS	175
CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD	
ATTACHMENT STUDIES.....	180
The Salience of Country of Origin	180
How the Conditional Approach Fits West Side	187
Conclusions	191
APPENDIX A: SCREENING SCRIPT FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS	194
APPENDIX B: ADVANCE LETTER FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS.....	198
APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS	201
APPENDIX D: PROTOCOL FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS	204
APPENDIX E: PICTURES FROM IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWING EFFORT IN	
SAN ANTONIO.....	221
APPENDIX F: DISCLAIMERS	230
REFERENCES.....	232
VITA.....	242

LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary of Multivariate Models in Past Studies of Neighborhood Attachment.....	8
2. Weighted Response Rates from Waves 1-3 of Making Connections Survey	33
3. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Site at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted).....	37
4. Race/Ethnicity of Respondent by Site at Wave 3, (Unweighted Frequencies and Weighted Percentages).....	43
5. Operationalization for Race/Ethnicity Categories	45
6. Operationalization for Dependent Variables.....	47
7. Operationalization for Single Independent Variables.....	51
8. Operationalization for Index Independent Variables.....	53
9. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Race/Ethnicity at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted).....	66
10. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Race/Ethnicity at Wave 3 for Five Sites (Weighted).....	67
11. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Race/Ethnicity at Wave 3 for San Antonio (Weighted).....	68
12. Neighborhood Attachment by Race/ethnicity at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted)	72
13. Neighborhood Attachment by Race/ethnicity at Wave 3 for Five Sites (Weighted).....	74
14. Neighborhood Attachment by Race/ethnicity at Wave 3 for San Antonio (Weighted) ^a	75
15. Bivariate Relationships between Independent Variables at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted).....	76
16. Regression Models Predicting Components of Neighborhood Attachment for All Sites at Wave 3	80

17. Regression Models Predicting Components of Neighborhood Attachment for Five Sites at Wave 3	83
18. Regression Models Predicting Components of Neighborhood Attachment for San Antonio at Wave 3	86
19. Percent Change in Neighborhood Naming between Waves 2 and 3 by Race/ ethnicity for All Sites (Weighted)	106
20. Percent Change in Neighborhood Naming between Waves 2 and 3 by Race/ ethnicity for Five Sites (Weighted).....	108
21. Percent Change in Neighborhood Naming between Waves 2 and 3 by Race/ ethnicity for San Antonio (Weighted)	108
22. Profile of In-depth Interview Respondents	126

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Conceptual Model of Influences on Neighborhood Attachment.....	28
2. San Antonio Survey Neighborhood Map.....	35
3. Factors with Strongest Influences on Neighborhood Attachment for All Sites at Wave 3	88
4. Commercial Strip Along Old Highway 90.....	222
5. Westside Education and Training Center.....	222
6. Classroom Inside Westside Education and Training Center.....	223
7. Examples of Advertisements for Education and Employment Training Program Opportunities in West Side.	223
8. San Antonio Food Bank.....	224
9. H-E-B Grocery Store	224
10. Mexican Food Items at H-E-B Grocery Store.....	225
11. Tire Shop in West Side.	225
12. Local Businesses Popular Among In-depth Interview Respondents: Bill Miller Bar-B-Q.....	226
13. Local Businesses Popular Among In-depth Interview Respondents: Dollar General.	226
14. New Commercial Development Along Guadalupe Street.	227
15. Bars on Window in Classroom at Center.....	228
16. “Tagging” on Commercial Building Within Residential Area in West Side.....	228
17. Residential Area in West Side.....	229

ABSTRACT

Neighborhood attachment, defined as an individual's feelings about their social commitment to a particular community, has been a central focus of studies involving space and place (Smith 1975) and community activism (Guest and Lee 1983, Crenshaw and St. John 1989) in the U.S. Yet despite the advancement of this work and a growing body of qualitative research exploring the dynamic experiences of immigrants and their descendants in particular communities, it is not clear how being born in the U.S. versus Mexico or Latin America impacts the formation of neighborhood attachment among Latinos. This limits our understanding of urban renewal, as the growth of the Hispanic population has been identified as a key source of recent revitalization in American cities.

My research employs mixed methods to investigate the experiences of low-income Latino households in six urban neighborhoods across the U.S., with a focus on Latinos of Mexican descent in San Antonio, Texas. My main objective is to compare levels of neighborhood attachment between U.S.-born and foreign-born Latinos and to understand the financial, contextual, and social factors that influence these perceptions. I use data from the *Making Connections* Survey, a neighborhood-based longitudinal study funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, to investigate the influence of demographic and household characteristics, socioeconomic factors, neighborhood conditions and social networks on six distinct components of neighborhood attachment. To expand on the survey findings, I conducted in-depth interviews with a subsample of Latino households

that participated in the survey in San Antonio. I use a grounded approach to explore the contexts in which social interaction via informal and formal networks influence native-born Latinos' everyday experiences of family and community, and how cultural practices and social organization attach meaning to residents' commitment to places. My findings help illuminate the processes and mechanisms through which neighborhood effects are transmitted in a particular context (Sampson et al 2002).

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Sociologists' interest in communal attachments extends back to the work of Robert Park (1929) and the Chicago School of Sociology. This tradition suggested that stressful elements of urban environments (e.g. economic hardship) could weaken social attachments to one's community and produce *social disorganization*. "Despite the physical proximity of city people, social distance prevails," observed E.S. Borgadus in 1926 (included in Burgess 1971, 48). Over 70 years later, research by Woldoff (2002) challenges this assumption and argues that imprecise measurements of neighborhood attachment have led past researchers to overstate the importance of local stressors. Contemporary research in urban settings has emphasized the practical implications of neighborhood attachment for community organization efforts and public policy. Chaskin (1997) writes, "The recognition of a neighborhood identity and the presence of a sense of community seem to have clear value for supporting residents' acknowledgment of collective circumstances and providing a basis and motivation for collective action" (540). Yet despite the advancement of this work and a growing body of qualitative research exploring the dynamic experiences of immigrants and their descendants in particular communities, it is not clear how being born in the U.S. versus Mexico or Latin America impacts the formation of neighborhood attachment among Latinos. That past studies have left the nation's largest ethnic minority group out of the equation limits our

understanding of communal attachments in an increasingly diverse racial and ethnic landscape.

This research study employs mixed methods to investigate the experiences of low-income Latino households in six urban neighborhoods across the U.S., with a special focus on native-born Mexican Americans in San Antonio, TX. My main objective is to compare the levels of attachment to one's neighborhood between native-born and foreign-born Latinos and to understand the financial, contextual, and social factors that influence these perceptions. I use data from the *Making Connections* Survey, a neighborhood-based longitudinal study funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, to investigate the influence of demographic and household characteristics, socioeconomic factors, neighborhood conditions and social networks on six distinct components of neighborhood attachment. To expand on the survey findings, I conducted in-depth interviews with a subset of Latino households that participated in the survey in San Antonio. This site was selected because it had the largest proportion of Latino respondents from which to draw a subsample and a long history infused with Mexican culture and the Spanish language. I employed a grounded approach to gain further insight into Latinos' social interactions through informal and formal networks. The interviews also shed light on the *contexts* in which informal and formal sources of support influence their everyday experiences of family and community, and how cultural practices and social organization attach meaning to residents' commitment to places. My findings may help to understand the processes and mechanisms through which neighborhood effects are transmitted in a particular context (Sampson et al 2002). They

may also inform alternative measurements of neighborhood satisfaction and offer a new image of a supportive neighborhood.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

One motivation for this study is to address the disconnect between studies involving neighborhood processes and effects and the literature on Latino migration and settlement. To demonstrate this disconnect, I will review the previous research that is relevant to my conceptualization of the factors influencing neighborhood attachment in stages. I begin by defining neighborhood attachment and highlighting the use of this concept in studies of mobility, community-based research, and policy evaluations. I then examine the work of migration researchers involving Latinos' experiences at both the macro and local levels. Finally, I summarize the discussion of social networks, as it has been widely acknowledged that the costs of migration and resettlement are met in large part by contributions from relatives and friends (Durand and Massey 1992, Menjívar 2000, Hermanu 2006). This has consequences both for new migrants and the U.S.-born or more established migrants who provide aid.

Neighborhood Attachment

Neighborhood attachment, often defined as an individual's feelings about their social commitment to a particular community, has been a central focus of studies involving space/place (Smith 1975) and a "major growth industry in sociology" (Guest et al 2006). Observers of the industrialization of the U.S. economy and growth of cities during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries characterized the neighborhood as

the cornerstone of urban society. Neighborhoods were said to provide a “stable way station for a mobile urban population” (von Hoffman, 119). With roots in the Chicago School studies of urban ecology (see Warren 1978 for a review), interest in neighborhoods reemerged in the late 1960s and 70s. The prolific work of Herbert Gans was hugely important in drawing attention to population mix and neighborhood solidarity. In *The Levittowners* (1967, 1982) Gans argues that community outcomes in modern communities (specifically in suburbia) are conflict-ridden and unending. Like Gans, Spykman (1926, 1971) characterized the sociological character of cities as a paradox between spatial proximity and social distance and social relationships between city dwellers as brief incidental associations, “based neither on a sharing of common values nor on a co-operation for a common purpose” (58). Yet Gans rejected the idea that this renders neighborhoods socially meaningless. “The test of community,” he writes, “is not cohesion or a high level of participation, but whether, when problems arise, people . . . come together, literally or figuratively, to solve the soluble ones effectively and democratically” (1982, xvi). Warren (1978) later attributed what he perceived as false claims about the declining significance of neighborhoods to an overemphasis of primary groups following Tönnies’ original concept of *Gemeinschaft*, in which individuals develop a strong association to the larger society based on face-to-face, intimate contact and similar interests.

By the 1980s, sociologists seemed to have finally arrived at the general consensus that neighborhoods represent a meaningful social unit in that they contain “a significant volume of social and person-place transactions” (Taylor et al 1984, 104). Guest and Lee (1984) concluded, “The neighborhood lingers as a social unit in the minds of most

contemporary urbanites” (53). Herting and Guest (1985) also hailed the continuing salience of neighborhoods and observed that perceptions of the social environment (e.g. types of people and friendliness) were the strongest predictors of overall satisfaction with the local area. Urban renewal efforts – some promised and failed, others sorely needed but consistently ignored - and gentrification motivated many to launch “localist political revolts.” The depiction of the neighborhood as a “way stations for a mobile urban population” (von Hoffman 1994; 247, 119) regained its footing.

Some of the most celebrated contemporary neighborhood studies have been tied to the continuing study of low-income populations in and around the urban core. In fact, Small and Newman (2001) proclaimed that “the literature on neighborhood effects has produced some of the most fruitful, and in some ways the most sophisticated, recent work in urban poverty.” Concepts have been explored under the titles of “neighborhood cohesion” (Smith 1975) and “bonding social capital” (Brisson and Usher 2005). The study of communal attachments is inherently interesting to sociologists but also has practical implications for community organization efforts and public policy. For example, Guest and Lee (1983a) find that neighborhood attachments influence individuals’ propensity to take actions to resolve neighborhood problems. Crenshaw and St. John (1989) suggest that the same influence is observed on willingness to defend neighborhood interests. Earlier studies by Gans (1962, 1967), Davies (1966), and Kramer (1969) demonstrate similar potential for collective action when neighbors band together.

The main focus of study of neighborhood attachment as a dependent variable has been to isolate the household characteristics and contextual factors that predict neighborhood attachment and cohesive neighborhoods (Smith 1974). Table 1 summarizes

the factors that have been considered in past statistical analyses. Guest et al (2006) open with an age-old debate about the “organic” nature of neighborhood attachment: "...Are neighbor ties in parts of the metropolis simply a reflection of the individual statuses of the residents, or do they also reflect aggregated characteristics of the neighborhood environment?" (367). They found that after controlling for individual-level attributes like homeownership, length of residence, having children under age 16 in the household, education and income, neighborhood-level variables had weak or modest effects on neighbor interaction, neighbor organizing, and knowing one's neighbors. They find support for Gans' *social class perspective* and his position that neighborhood context is not a primary driver of individual behavior. Yet they caution readers not to misinterpret their findings as evidence that neighborhood context is irrelevant to social interaction. "The major caveat," they write, is that the relationships between structural variables and social ties are "only weakly contextual in the sense in which we have defined the term – that context influences behavior beyond the effects of individual-level variables" (382-383). Brisson and Usher (2005), using data from the first wave of the *Making Connections* Survey, also find limited effects in HLM models of neighborhood-level factors beyond individual characteristics on bonding social capital. Their dependent variable is synonymous with my measure of sentimental attachment, based on questions regarding social trust and cohesion derived from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). Differences in population density, income, stability, homeownership, education, and income-by-sex and income-by-race/ethnicity interactions accounted for only 8% of the variance in bonding social capital. They suggest that the

Table 1. Summary of Multivariate Models in Past Studies of Neighborhood Attachment

Study	Independent predictor 1	Independent predictor 2	Dependent variable
Guest et al (2006)	Neighborhood-level Attributes: Area age Commercial concentration Social disorganization Residential stability Community affluence Percent foreign-born Percent Black	Individual-level Attributes: Homeownership Length of residence Child under age 16 Education Income	Neighbor Interaction Neighbor Organizing = Knowing Neighbors
Swaroop and Morenoff (2006)	Neighborhood-level Attributes: Concentrated disadvantage Stability Latino/immigrant concentration Density Community institutions Disorder	Individual-level Attributes: Female Age Race/ethnicity Education Income Occupational status Marital status Years in neighborhood No. of moves Neighborhood size	Instrumental Organizations Problem-Solving Actions Expressive Organizations Informal Neighboring
Woldoff (2002)	Demographics: Age Race Sex Marital status Children in household	Stressors: Physical disorder Social disorder Victimization Perception of crime	Sentiment Evaluation Routine Neighboring = Social Neighboring

Study	Independent predictor 1	Independent predictor 2	Dependent variable
	Education Rent/own Length of Residence		Formal Problem Solving Informal Problem Solving
Bolan (1997)	Demographic and Socioeconomic Attributes: Homeownership Child age 6-17 Age Education Marital status Income	Mobility Length of residence Number of moves + Time to find home Move to reason Move from reason Distance of move	Sentiment Evaluation = Interaction with Neighbors Neighbor Organizations Knowing Neighbors
Herting and Guest (1985)	Social Environment Physical Environment Housing Characteristics Location Services Local Institutions		Overall Satisfaction =

homogeneity of low-income neighborhoods in the sample may account for the limited variation in bonding social capital due to neighborhood differences.

Through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM), Woldoff (2002) examines the impact of neighborhood stressors like physical and social disorder and victimization on six components of neighborhood attachment: sentiment, evaluation, routine neighboring, social neighboring, formal problem solving and informal problem solving. Her data are derived from a 1988 survey with residents in Nashville, Tennessee. Upon introducing a number of demographic controls, she finds that the impact of community stressors varies across types of attachment. Social disorder exerts a strong and uniformly negative influence on all forms of attachment, but the influence of physical disorder is limited – it decreases attitudinal but not behavioral attachment. This conflicts with earlier work by Herting and Guest (1985), who observe that social ties, followed by perceived quality of the physical environment, drive overall satisfaction with the neighborhood. Victimization and perceptions of crime also do not have the negative impact on attachment in Woldoff's models that one might expect. Her conclusion suggests that neighborhood disorder actually increases residents' willingness to collaborate toward solving a common local problem. Bolan (1997) introduces residential mobility as an additional factor potentially influencing neighborhood attachment. Like Woldoff and Guest and Lee (1983), he explores sentiment and evaluation as separate components of attachment. He also includes three dependent measures of behavioral attachment: interaction with neighbors, involvement in neighbor organizations, and knowing neighbors' names. His data are gleaned from a survey with residents in Seattle and suburban King County, Washington in the late 1970s. He finds

that the variables related to mobility experiences, including the number of times the respondent moved since age 18, length of time required to find a new home, reasons for moving to and from a given place, and the distance of the move, have a weak to moderate influence on long-term communal attachment. This work succeeds in drawing attention to the importance of mobility and other life events that are likely to exert an intervening influence on the formation of neighborhood ties.

Differences in levels of attachment between ethno-racial groups or between native- and foreign-born residents have not been emphasized in most work on this topic, presumably because the influence of these variables is not statistically significant or because the authors' data include insufficient numbers of racial and ethnic minorities (Arvizu and Garcia 1996, 123). For example, Taylor et al (1984) reassert the argument made in their earlier work that neighborhood attachment can be modeled at the group level, and indeed find that the strongest direct effect on neighborhood naming was race (defined as the proportion of black respondents on the block). Yet they devote only a paragraph to this finding and merely speculate that the lower levels of naming observed among blacks may be due to their tendency to think more in terms of their block (122). One exception comes from Woldoff (2002), who reports that being African American significantly impacted nearly every aspect (5 out of 6) of neighborhood attachment. She echoes the arguments by Pattillo-McCoy (1999, 2007) that "race is critical in shaping neighborhood experiences for African Americans" (108). Bolan (1997) has also contributed to an understanding of the difference in attachment among distinct social populations. He finds that new migrants and highly-mobile individuals are for the most part "just as willing as other residents to establish cognitive ties and formal attachments

to the new environment” (234). No known study has systematically explored the differences in neighborhood attachment between native- and foreign-born Latinos. Swaroop and Morenoff (2006) attempt to explore the contextual effects of Latino/immigrant concentration on attachment but are constrained by the absence of a measure indicating country of origin in the PHDCN dataset.

International Migration Studies

Because this study aims to contrast the experiences of U.S.-born Latinos with foreign-born Latinos, it is appropriate to look to the international migration literature for clues about the political and economic factors that may influence their attachment to neighborhoods. Over the past century, American migration researchers have developed sophisticated measures of socioeconomic status to model the potential success of immigrants and their children (Lee 1966, Hammermash and Bean 1998, Bean and Stevens 2003). Hispanics have attracted particular attention due to their status as the largest minority group in the U.S., above-average fertility rates, and the preponderance of undocumented migration across the U.S.-Mexico border (Census 2000, Bean and Stevens 2003). As stated by López and Stanton-Salazar,

The Mexican-American case stands apart. They and their parents lack many of the resources that have allowed other recent groups of newcomers to thrive...In California and the Southwest, Mexicanos and their children are not “just another” immigrant-based ethnic group. They are instead by far the largest “minority” and are rapidly becoming the single largest ethnic group (2001).

Bean and Stevens (2003) devote a separate chapter to the case of Mexicans apart from their review of migration flows, theories, and contexts, arguing that the key feature that distinguishes them from other immigrants is that so many are unauthorized low-skilled laborers (42). They conclude this chapter by echoing the sentiments of

demographers who claim that the growth of the Hispanic population – consisting overwhelmingly of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans - represents the most important demographic shift of the 21st century. Yet, Mexican migration studies have been polarized into two main camps, one focused on macro-level economic and demographic trends and the other on micro-level processes. I briefly review these two camps below.

Macrolevel Mexican Migration Studies

The first major concentration of migration studies focuses on macro-structural factors – mainly political and economic – that push Mexicans out of Mexico and/or pull them into the United States. A solid body of scholarship from Jorge Durand (1988, 1998), Doug Massey (e.g. Massey et al 2002), and Rubén Hernández-León (2008) examines migratory circuits between the U.S. and Mexico and the integration of Mexicans and Mexican Americans in the U.S. economy (see also Hagan et al 2008). Duran and Massey (1992) argue that when communities first take part in migration, young men are the first to travel – generally without their families and often illegally, seeking work in the unskilled labor economy. Women and children generally follow for a variety different reasons (Donato 1999, 3-4; Lee 1966, 51). Since the 1960s patterns of Mexican migration have shifted to include increasing numbers of entire families (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2007, 52).

Alejandro Portes and Rubén Rumbaut have led a recent charge to explore the nuanced experiences of second generation immigrants – that is, American-born children whose parents migrated from another country (2001). Some have attributed the lower socioeconomic gains observed among some second generation immigrant groups (relative to first generation migrants) to a defensive reaction to adverse conditions

including the reassertion of ethnic identities (*reactive ethnicity theory*). Others claim that outcomes vary across immigrant groups because some groups are able to "opt out" of integration into the American mainstream while racial politics encourage other groups to "lose" their ethnic distinctiveness (*segmented assimilation theory*). Also important for this research are the connections drawn by macro-level migration scholars between the trajectories of immigrants and their children and national policies regarding immigration and welfare. In the following section I review some of the most important policy changes associated with the 1996 welfare reform and highlight their impact on immigrants and their descendants. These effects may be particularly acute in high-poverty communities like those sampled for the *Making Connections* Survey.

National Trends in Welfare and Public Assistance and the Impact on Immigrants and Their Descendants

The 1996 welfare reform passed by President Clinton brought a dramatic blow to the safety net assistance that had established for the poor through New Deal programs in the 1930s. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act required work in exchange for temporary cash assistance to eligible families for a maximum of five cumulative years (reduced in some states). Reductions to cash assistance programs have been somewhat offset by the distribution of noncash benefits, particularly food stamps. In 2009, three million households had received public assistance income during the past 12 months¹ while 11.7 million received Supplemental

1. Irving, Shelley. October 2010. "Public Assistance Receipt in the Past 12 Months for Households: 2008 and 2009." American Community Survey Briefs. U.S. Census Bureau. Available online

Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits (food stamps).² The 1996 reform also had consequences for health insurance among the nation's poor. Prior to 1996, individuals receiving public assistance were automatically enrolled in Medicaid. The elimination of this dual-enrollment, coupled with drastic increases in the costs of healthcare, has contributed to an increase in the number of Americans who live without health insurance each year. Estimates suggest that 15.4% of Americans (46.3 million) were uninsured in 2008. Hispanics are more likely to lack coverage than other major racial/ethnic groups; 30.7% were uninsured in 2008 versus 10.8 for non-Hispanic whites and 19.1% for blacks.³ Though the percentage of children in poverty who are not covered by health insurance decreased between 2007 and 2008, more than one in six Hispanic children are uninsured (17.2% versus 6.7% for non-Hispanic white, 10.9% for Asian, and 10.7% for black children respectively).

The Social Security Administration now requires that all applicants provide proof of permanent residence at a U.S. address and engages in tighter policing of this requirement. This presents a problem for male transnational agricultural workers and women domestics, for whom the flexible nature of their work often leads them to stay with friends, relatives, or employers. Informal workers are generally paid “under the

at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acsbr09-13.pdf>.

2. Loveless, Tracy. September 2010. “Food Stamp/Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Receipt in the Past 12 Months for Households by State: 2008 and 2009.” American Community Survey Briefs. U.S. Census Bureau. Available online at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/acsbr09-8.pdf>.

3. DeNavas-Walt, Carmen; Proctor, Bernadette; and Jessica Smith. September 2009. “Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2008.” Current Population Reports . *U.S. Census Bureau*. Available online at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2009pubs/p60-236.pdf>.

table” and have no Social Security records of their income. As a result, some agricultural workers have received letters from the Social Security Administration demanding that they back-pay Supplemental Security Income benefits (Staudt and Capps 2004). Staudt and Capps also note that differences of eligibility among mixed immigrant families further obscures the availability of state supports. Food stamp and public housing programs often prorate benefits based on the number of members who are either citizens, legal permanent residents, or otherwise qualified to receive public assistance. In other words, mixed families have “checkerboard eligibility.” Furthermore, as of 1996 states have the right to cut Medicaid for immigrants (Staudt & Capps 2004, 265-266).⁴ The federal government crafted the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) to make up for some of this loss and indeed makes health insurance benefits available for children who are legal permanent residents or naturalized citizens. However, children too are subject to the 5-year residence requirement and may be therefore ineligible during the most crucial years of human development (Capps et al 2004, 244). These restrictions against migrants bring increased dependence on U.S.-born relatives and friends to provide material and emotional assistance as they transition to a new land.

Even after the bust of the U.S. real estate market in 2008, housing prices in many areas remain outside the reach of the poor and near-poor. Unemployment rates as high as 12 and 13% in states like California and Nevada⁵ have severely limited buying power and

4. Included in Kretsedemas and Aparicio (2004).

5. <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/laus.pdf>

pushed many homeowners into foreclosure. Minority and low-income households are particularly vulnerable. Those who had been attracted to buy due to relaxed down payment requirements or interest-only loans turned increasingly to credit cards to cover monthly costs. A report by the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University shows that the number of personal bankruptcies filed in 2008 was nearly double the rate filed in 2006 (1.1 million versus 600,000, respectively) (2009, 3). Despite ambitious intervention by the federal government, the housing market remains imbalanced by reduced demand on one side and an excess supply of vacant units on the other. As a result of these reductions to public assistance programs since 1996, rising healthcare costs, and the 2008 economic recession, immigration to the U.S. has slowed and native-born members of minority groups are falling on historically hard times (Joint Center for Housing Studies, 2009).

Local level Mexican Migration Studies

The second main camp in the sociological study of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans has attempted to address some of the shortcomings of the macro-level studies by employing qualitative research methods and focusing on two key areas: gender and space/place. Qualitative inquiry has been successful in examining processes of negotiation and systems of meaning that are untapped by survey data gathered at single points in time. It authenticates real lives and human agency.⁶ Durand and Massey (1992) identify a particular strength of qualitative studies based in specific communities: to

6. Neale, Bren. 24 September 2010. Plenary Kenote Presentation at the Society for Longitudinal and Life Course Studies Inaugural Conference. Cambridge, England.

“provide a tool for analyzing the migration process in a way that is historical, developmental, and sensitive to the effects of local conditions as well as to those of the national political economy” (13).

In the 1970s and 80s, Latina sociologists trained in feminist methods – women like Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo and Patricia Fernández-Kelly – brought awareness to the importance of changing constructions of gender in varied immigrant experiences. They demonstrated how the bifurcation of migrant labor demands on a global scale – coupled with the dramatically increased participation of women in the U.S. workforce – has created an equally dramatic dependence on domestic services in receiving countries like the U.S. (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). In *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence* (2007), Hondagneu-Sotelo draws on data collected through in-depth interviews and participant observation with Latina domestic workers – women who clean houses, care for children, and/or complete other household chores – in Los Angeles in the mid- to late-1990s. The data provide a window into the contradiction between American ideologies of work and democracy and the necessities of contemporary labor conditions. She suggests that the perils of domestic work are symptomatic of global employment trends toward increasingly decentralized, flexible labor. More recently, interview studies by Mary Waters’ (1999) and Clara Rodríguez (2000) have shed light on the complex constructions of ethno-racial identity among black immigrants and Latinos, respectively. They raised new questions about how Latinos configure their transnational identities using concepts of space, heritage, and family.

Social Networks

The dependence on resources via social networks among low income populations has been well established in the sociological literature. Social networks have proven to be of fundamental importance to alleviating the chronic stress associated with living in poverty (Howard 2006, Edin and Kefalas 2005, Hansen 2005, Stack 1974). As noted by Small and Newman (2001), social networks may be linked to neighborhoods but often extend beyond neighborhood boundaries. Migration studies have built on these findings by positioning social networks in a global context and by questioning the assumption that migrants' interactions through these networks are stable and conflict-free.⁷ Through her research with Latina immigrant domestics in California Hondagneu-Sotelo (2001) highlights how social networks are vitally important for creating labor markets and regulating the occupation of domestic service, a job performed disproportionately by Central American and Mexican women. She begins her chapter on informal networks with the following: "There is a parallel universe of women doing paid domestic work; it remains invisible . . . until the moment when it is tapped. Then, the linkages act like dye to make visible the points of connection that socially and spatially link women of different groups and different needs" (63).

Menjívar's (2000) research with undocumented Salvadorans in San Francisco explores a different function of social networks, providing support throughout the process of migration and resettlement. This function is echoed by Hernández-León in his 10-year

7. The costs associated with receiving informal support from family and social networks are also explored among poor mothers by Howard (2006).

investigation of migratory networks between Monterrey, Mexico and Houston, TX. He observes that “the ties that residents have sustained with each other for years as neighbors proved to be a key source of migratory social capital” (2008, 123). This can be viewed as a transnational extension of Spykman’s (1926) emphasis on secondary contact and “brief, incidental associations” as the backbone of social life in cities (included in Burgess 1971). Yet Menjivar’s emphasis on the sensitivity of social networks to economic conditions weighs heavily on my analytical framework and hypotheses.

As for the influence of social networks on neighborhood attachment, Herting and Guest (1985) find that the social character of neighborhoods is the strongest predictor of subjective neighborhood evaluations. Perkins et al (1990) report evidence that social environment (along with physical conditions) exert more influence on neighborhood attachment behaviors than criminal activity. On the other hand, Smith (1975) cautions that social interaction among neighbors, while important, provides an “insufficient characterization of the solidarity of the local area” (147). An assumption guiding my research is that the influence of economic hardship is mediated by social networks that provide material, emotional, and care giving assistance to households. I draw inspiration from Menjívar (2000), who stresses the dynamic nature of social networks and their vulnerability to economic pressures. I will therefore explore the hypothesis that Latinos’ ability to give and get support through social networks is constrained by material conditions – that is, that their propensity to “reach out” will be directly influenced by the financial status of their household. This may in turn shape their feelings of attachment to the neighborhood.

The Problem

Despite a well-developed literature on neighborhood attachments and a growing body of qualitative research exploring the dynamic experiences of immigrants and their descendants in particular communities, it is not clear how the economic disadvantage associated with native-born origin that has been observed among Latinos in the *Making Connections* neighborhoods impacts their sentimental and evaluative perceptions of their community. The trade-off for the careful attention to immigration policy and large-scale demographic trends by macro-level researchers is that this work does not typically explore local contexts (see, for example, Donato 1999). Scarce attention is devoted to the particular *content* of informal social networks, religious affiliations, and community organizations. Similarly, migration studies that draw exclusively on administrative data from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS, formerly the INS) or decennial census raise more questions than answers about the *interior logic*⁸ of people's lives, including the social and emotional significance of membership in a particular community. The use of more detailed survey data provides additional measures of neighborhood conditions (e.g. cleanliness, quality of services, etc.) and social interaction, but neighborhood attachment has typically been based on a limited number of indicators (Woldoff 2002, Herting and Guest 1985, Keller 1968). Several authors have criticized the measures used to represent neighborhood attachment and cohesion as being poorly conceptualized or oversimplified (Smith 1974, Smith 1975, Austin and Baba 1990, Woldoff 2002). "As a

8. See <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/research/resources/Timescapes.aspx>.

result," writes Smith (1975), "neighborhoods which may be deficient in overt social interaction but strong in some other aspect of social cohesion may not be recognized for their communal strengths" (1745). Qualitative differences between neighborhoods and their residents may be missed. Even when employing sophisticated statistical techniques, most researchers of neighborhood effects have been unable to make causal links between elements of the social environment and specific outcomes (Small and Newman 2001). Discussions have instead focused on strong associations or correlations. Many empirical studies suffer from insufficient observation of the time people actually spend in their neighborhoods, the quality of interaction with their neighbors, and the potentially tenuous processes through which perceptions of neighborhood life develop. The "how questions," as noted by Small (2004), have remained a black box. Marta Tienda writes: "Before encouraging further statistical modeling to capture neighborhood effects, more conceptual groundwork is needed to specify . . . the exposure, selection, and feedback effects that define how neighborhoods shape the behavior of the poor" (1991, 258; cited in Small and Newman 2001)."

It is difficult to tap into abstract concepts like neighborhood attachment with closed-ended questions. Hondagneu-Sotelo and other qualitative researchers have made considerable contributions toward a richer understanding of Latinos' experiences at the local level, but individual case studies of Mexican and Mexican American communities have been charged with producing contradictory generalizations on several topics (Durand and Massey 1992). Despite including an obligatory caveat in their description of methods cautioning that the absence of a random sample precludes them from making statistical generalizations, "...this inherent weakness has not stopped most researchers,

who find the temptation to generalize too great to resist.” In addition, many of the strongest qualitative community studies (e.g. Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994 and Menjívar 2000) have focused on undocumented migrants. The legal instability of these individuals directly governs their integration into particular occupational niches. The social consequences of their constrained legal and economic opportunities cannot be overestimated and often limit the comparability of experiences between illegal Mexican migrants and Mexican Americans.

The reciprocal dynamics between U.S.-born Latinos, their households, and surrounding neighborhoods merit further study for several key reasons. First, Hispanics are the largest minority group in the United States, and yet they have been ignored in comparative studies of neighborhood attachment and in urban poverty debates in general (Small and Newman 2001). Second, while migration rates have sharply declined following the economic downturn of 2008, the growth of Latino, Asian, and Caribbean immigrants in U.S. cities continues to provide a major source of population growth in areas characterized by the outmigration of whites and blacks. Additionally, the gap between foreign-born and U.S.-born Mexicans is growing at the national level (Borjas 1999; Bean, Gonzalez Baker and Capps 2001). A recent report by the Pew Hispanic Center indicates that Latinos have been harder hit by the economic recession that began in 2007 than other groups, with an unemployment rate and increase in the poverty rate that far exceed national figures. As of December 2011, 11.0% of Latinos were unemployed, versus 8.5% of all Americans. Similarly, between 2006 and 2010, the

increase in the poverty rate among Latinos reached nearly six percent, from 20.6% to 26.6%. This far exceeds the increase in poverty among Whites and Blacks.⁹ Additionally, the report shows that foreign-born Latinos are especially likely to perceive that they have been more negatively affected than other groups (62% versus 45% among native-born Latinos) (Taylor et al 2012). These demographic and economic trends alone beg for closer study of Latino experiences. It has also been well-documented that neighborhoods present an important arena for acquiring political power among economically disadvantaged and racial minority populations, who, generally speaking, are not well represented through general election and legislative processes (Hays and Kogl 2007). In this way, low-income Latinos need their neighborhoods more than is true among middle class Whites. “Neighborhood organization,” write Hays and Kogl, “is based on the expectation that, if properly mobilized, the poor represent a large enough segment of the urban electorate that elected officials can hardly ignore their needs” (182).

9. However, Blacks still had a slightly higher poverty rate than Hispanics in 2010 (27.4% versus 26.6%, respectively).

CHAPTER THREE

THIS RESEARCH STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine how being born in the U.S. versus Mexico or Latin America impacts the formation of neighborhood attachment. The low levels of human capital observed among Mexicans and their U.S.-born descendants (Bean and Stevens 2003) make disadvantaged urban areas an appropriate location for investigation. The community-based nature of the *Making Connections* Survey – the quantitative data source for this study - bears unique potential for investigating populations in high poverty areas in that it acknowledges the “situatedness” of neighborhoods and the great diversity of poor places. My focus on Latinos in San Antonio will contribute to the existing literature on Latinos and Mexican migrants by providing more in-depth information about the challenges facing low-income families among the nation’s largest ethnic minority group. The wealth of survey data available for Latino households at several points in time make it possible to sketch a portrait of their experiences that is not possible with information solely from Census or labor statistics. In the words of Berthoud (2000), longitudinal data offers “a movie rather than a snapshot” (15). My research will improve on earlier mixed-method studies of low-income communities (e.g. Edin and Kefalas 2005, Menjivar 2000) by gathering in-depth data from the same respondents who participated in as many as three waves of the *Making Connections* survey. I make direct associations between the in-depth interview responses and survey data from waves 2 and

3, and occasionally draw on the survey data from wave 1. This covers a time span of up to 11 years. The addition of qualitative methods also allows me to evaluate whether any relationships observed among the survey variables are truly causal or due to selection or other spurious factors.

Research Questions

My research questions include the following:

1. Are there differences in the degree of neighborhood attachment expressed by native-born and foreign-born Latinos?
2. To what extent is the impact of native- versus foreign-born origin mediated by social networks?
3. What role does interaction through formal and informal networks play in shaping residents' perceptions of their community?
4. What are the particular resources – material, emotional, or otherwise - that Latinos derive through social networks?
 - a. Through what processes are these resources transferred?

Analytical Framework

What is a Neighborhood?

Following Chaskin (1997), I conceive of neighborhoods as including several dimensions: a social space, a symbolic unit, as well as sets of relationships and institutions. My sociological interest in neighborhood boundaries lies in their potential to “define the conditions under which communication and social life are actually maintained” (Park 1971, 3). I am also influenced by the *neighborhood context approach*

outlined by Warren (1978), which communicates the idea that individuals are affected by the social environment and historical legacy of their neighborhoods even if they are unaware of a connection to the community (315). In other words, neighborhood effects do not require individual identification with neighbors, just as participation in race or gender is not voluntary in racialized, gendered social systems (Lewis 2004). This contrasts Sykman's image of the "associational nature" of social life in cities, wherein the individual exerts conscious participation and creates circles of his choosing (1971, 57). However, the frequency and quality of social interactions have been long-since shown to influence the boundaries that respondents draw around their personal neighborhood (see Guest and Lee 1984 for a review). They may predict how much effort someone is willing to put forth to pursue neighborhood interests or improve conditions. I am also influenced by Guest and Lee's caution that neighborhoods do not necessarily represent cohesive, consistent social groupings. Residents may identify with several different subgroups within the official boundaries of a neighborhood and relations between subgroups may range from apathetic to hostile. As argued by McKenzie (1971, 167), physical structure and culture may be parts of the same complex, but the relationships that form between human beings are ever-changing in response to the forces exerted by this complex.

Figure 1 below illustrates my conceptual model of the influences on neighborhood attachment. Included in the white boxes are single attributes or sets of predictors that will be explored in depth. The gray box represents the six dependent variables aimed to capture the various dimensions of neighborhood attachment. The first dimension refers to one's evaluation of whether their neighborhood is suitable for raising




Figure 1. Conceptual Model of Influences on Neighborhood Attachment.

children. The second and third aspects involve engaging in formal and informal interactions with neighbors, with formal activities including things like speaking to a local political official and volunteering for community events and informal activities including casual encounters at social get-togethers and giving or receiving monetary help or favors. The fourth is neighborhood naming – that is, the ability to specify the name of one’s neighborhood. Next, I examine the length of residence in the neighborhood as an indication of one’s “rootedness” in the community. The final component of neighborhood attachment is sentiment, or the emotional significance that an individual attaches to the social character of their neighborhood. This involves assessments of kindness, collective trust, and shared values among residents.

Hypotheses

My research questions are repeated below, followed by hypotheses.

R₁: Are there differences in the degree of neighborhood attachment expressed by native-born and foreign-born Latinos?

H₁: U.S.-born Latinos will exhibit lower overall levels of attachment to their neighborhoods than foreign-born Latinos.

R₂: To what extent is the impact of native- versus foreign-born origin mediated by social networks?

H₂: When economic factors and social interaction are considered, the effect of origin will disappear.

R₃: What role does interaction through formal and informal networks play in shaping residents' perceptions of their community?

H₃: Interaction through social networks will be the most powerful predictor of neighborhood attachment.

R₄: What are the particular resources – material, emotional, or otherwise - that Latinos derive through social networks?

H_{4.1}: Non-financial help in the form of childcare and employment information/referrals will represent the resources most frequently received from social networks, as reported in the survey.

H_{4.2}: The in-depth interviews will reveal that social networks contribute to feelings of belonging and being needed in one's community.

R_{4a}: Through what processes are these resources transferred?

H_{4a}: Giving and getting help involves negotiations that are conflict-ridden and sensitive to material conditions at both the giving and receiving ends.

Potential Contributions

My focus on native-born Hispanics in six communities will contribute to the existing literature by providing more in-depth information about the challenges facing low-income families among the nation's largest ethnic minority group. The longitudinal nature of *Making Connections* will enable me to respond to a critique of the research that is typically done with children in disadvantaged neighborhoods (see Timberlake 2007, 320) by examining the duration of exposure to a given place. I will attempt to respond to critiques by Sampson et al (2002), who write:

Although much effort that been put into understanding the structural backdrop to neighborhood social organization, we need a deeper focus on cultural, normative, and collective-action perspectives that attach meaning to how residents frame their commitment to places . . . Researchers . . . need to redouble their efforts to investigate neighborhoods social processes in truly dynamic, interactive fashion. (474, 472)

My interest in social networks and informal support could reveal clear and actionable needs for help and services, but may also speak to the strength of certain networks and families' agency in requesting and receiving different kinds of help. These findings may identify opportunities for policy intervention in specific areas as well as alternative measurements of socioeconomic improvement and well-being.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA AND METHODOLOGY FOR QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Due to the mixed methods employed for this study, let us begin with a review of the methods used for the quantitative component of my research. The next chapter reports findings from this component. Chapters 7 and 8 follow the same organization for my qualitative research in San Antonio, Texas.

Data

The *Making Connections* survey (<http://mcstudy.norc.org>) was conducted in 10 low-income neighborhoods across the U.S. The neighborhoods are located in the metropolitan areas of Des Moines, IA; Indianapolis, IN; Denver, CO; San Antonio, TX; Seattle, WA; Milwaukee, WI; Oakland, CA; Hartford, CT; Providence, RI; and Louisville, KY. A number of organizations contributed to the design, implementation, and analysis of this research: the Annie E. Casey Foundation, NORC at the University of Chicago, Urban Institute (UI), research advisors from Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago and Case Western Reserve University, and representatives from each of the *Making Connections* sites. The survey is part of a larger initiative funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation aimed to assess the needs of families and children and to foster supportive communities that meet those needs. While the initiative intended to produce community-wide, long-term improvements in disadvantaged neighborhoods – namely, greater educational successes and better health outcomes for children and increased

income and assets for families – it is generally understood that changes of this scale occur slowly. Thus the main contribution of the survey data was to supply information about the experiences and needs of residents in the target neighborhoods rather than an evaluation of specific programs (Hayes and Kinglsey 2011, 2).

The survey was administered approximately every three years during a ten-year period. Baseline survey data were gathered between 2002 and 2004 in the ten sites listed above and a first follow-up effort ('Wave 2') was completed between 2005 and 2007 in each site. Between 2008 and 2011 NORC completed a second round of follow-up interviews ('Wave 3') in seven of the ten sites. See Table 2 for the weighted response rates in each round. Interviews for the *Making Connections* neighborhood surveys were executed using a paper and pencil questionnaire that was then keyed into a computer-assisted data entry system (CADE). The main questionnaire topics include the following: 1) neighborhood connections, 2) neighborhood actions (including engaging in efforts to improve neighborhood conditions and perceptions of safety, disorder, and cohesion), 3) services and amenities, 4) organizations and volunteerism, 5) family hardship, 6) income and assets, and 7) demographics. Additionally, a separate set of questions are devoted to the experiences of children living in the household, including items about child care arrangements, schooling, participation in extracurricular activities, and health.

The *Making Connections* study design is unique in that it combines both cross-sectional and longitudinal (panel) methodologies. In each wave, NORC employed area probability sampling techniques to select a random set of addresses to represent each target neighborhood. In households with children, one child was randomly selected to be the focal child, and the parent or guardian who knew the most about the focal child was

Table 2. Weighted Response Rates from Waves 1-3 of Making Connections Survey

Site	Wave 1		Wave 2		Wave 3	
	<i>N</i>	Response rate (%)	<i>N</i>	Response rate (%)	<i>N</i>	Response rate (%)
Des Moines	786	68	813	77	800	77
Indianapolis	785	69	804	79	802	81
Denver	779	66	818	74	839	75
San Antonio	821	74	803	78	846	81
White Center (Seattle)	792	68	801	76	809	77
Milwaukee	697	71	801	79	n/a ^a	n/a
Oakland	697	67	803	75	n/a	n/a
Hartford	701	63	802	81	n/a	n/a
Providence	735	70	804	81	814	83
Louisville	703	78	812	83	798	87
Total/average	7,496	69	8,061	78	5,708	80

^a Wave 3 data collection was not conducted in Milwaukee, Oakland, or Hartford.

chosen as the respondent (meaning the selection of the respondent was not random). In adult-only households, the focal child selection process was skipped and one adult was randomly chosen to be the respondent. In waves 2 and 3, interviewers re-visited these sampled addresses in person or by telephone with the goal of collecting data with the current occupants. Many times, the occupants have not changed. Other times, new people have moved in.

NORC also subsampled new addresses at the start of each follow-up effort to include buildings that have been constructed or renovated since the previous wave. This methodology yields a cross-sectional snapshot of neighborhood residents at different points in time. *Making Connections* is also longitudinal in that NORC 1) re-interviewed families that remained at sampled addresses within target neighborhoods and 2) tracked

families with children that moved to a *new* address, be it inside or outside of the neighborhood.

Survey Neighborhoods

In 1999, the Annie E. Casey Foundation identified 22 cities to be part of an exploratory phase for a new neighborhood transformation/family development initiative. In each site, local teams including members of the Casey staff, national and local consultants, representatives from community foundations and neighborhood associations, and city agencies were formed. A team leader was identified in each site. In 2002, the Foundation selected ten communities for a cross-site evaluation in the form of a household survey. These sites were chosen because they had community support organizations that 1) were engaged in community outreach that was consistent with the Foundation's mission to support families with children and 2) could facilitate data collection on the ground. AECF "was purposeful in selecting neighborhoods that demonstrated characteristics such as institutional support that would increase the probability of program success" (Brisson and Usher 2005, 650). The Foundation, with help from the local partners and NORC, also defined the geographic boundaries of the survey sites. The boundaries are often nuanced. In San Antonio, the survey neighborhood was drawn to include residents mainly in the West Side community but also some from within the Edgewood school district (see Figure 2). "The initial thinking," recalls one representative from the planning committee, was to try to include as many people as




Figure 2. San Antonio Survey Neighborhood Map. Source: English, Ned. 2011. NORC at the University of Chicago. Image available online at <http://mcstudy.norc.uchicago.edu/study-design/>.

possible. But the tradeoff is that you can't offer as much.”¹ Recall that the survey was but one component of a larger initiative through which the Foundation provided funding for place-based services, educational and recreational programs, and the salaries of the staff members who ran them. Leaders were charged with balancing desires to involve a large number of their constituents with practical limitations surrounding the administration of the survey and the delivery of services to community members.

The demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the survey neighborhoods also vary considerably. This will be discussed in further detail in the Findings chapters. Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for the survey respondents who were living in the neighborhood during the wave 3 data collection period (2008-2011). The city of Denver neighborhood is home to large Latino and foreign-born populations with predominate origins in Mexico and Vietnam. Most are renting and display high residential mobility, including considerable long-distance movement (Bachtell and Latterner 2011). Denver sample members were slightly younger than the overall average, with a mean age of 42 versus 44 years, and less likely to be married (24.4% versus 34.4% among all respondents). Their households included a smaller proportion with children 32.3% versus 46.6% overall) and have higher levels of education than the other sites (57.6% have more than a high school degree versus 35.1% overall).

1. Campa, Dennis. 26 October 2011. Personal conversation.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Site at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted)

Characteristic	All respondents	Denver	Des Moines	Indianapolis	San Antonio	White Center	Providence
Age (mean)	44.4 (78.21)	41.8 (51.82)	43.7 (62.94)	44.8 (63.14)	45.1 (132.44)	44.1 (63.25)	43.7 (65.91)
Female (percentage)	66.0	53.6	65.1	61.9	69.8	61.5	69.8
Interview in English (percentage)	85.2	86.1	89.8	97.8	87.4	83.5	63.2
Interview in Spanish (percentage)	13.9	13.0	10.2	2.3	12.6	10.2	36.8
Interview in other language (percentage)	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
Married (percentage)	34.4	24.4	32.4	25.0	37.5	44.3	30.6
Kids in household (percentage)	46.6	32.3	46.5	37.4	51.7	45.1	48.3
Less than high school degree (percentage)	35.1	24.4	24.1	35.7	45.6	16.5	33.7
High school degree or higher (percentage)	64.9	75.6	76.0	64.3	54.4	83.5	66.3
Household income last year (median)	\$21,400 (132494)	\$30,000 (117782)	\$26,000 (84778)	\$25,000 (109113)	\$18,000 (150853)	\$42,000 (153420)	\$17,000 (108146)
Homeowner (percentage)	44.4	35.2	52.1	47.3	45.5	54.1	26.9
n (unweighted)	3,682	631	619	621	620	629	562

a. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses for continuous variables.

b. City-wide figures are derived from the 2005-2009 ACS estimates. Median family income has been adjusted for inflation to 2009 dollars. The homeownership rate is equal to the number of owner-occupied homes divided by the total number of housing units.

Des Moines stands apart from the other sites with a majority of homeowners (52.1% versus 44.4% overall) and a large minority of individuals with a high school degree but no college (39.1% as compared to 35.1% for all respondents). The population here is predominately non-Hispanic White and Black, with a smaller but growing population of Latinos (10% in the baseline¹ versus 17% at wave 3. Indianapolis is predominately Black and markedly monolingual; nearly 98% of respondents completed the interview in English and the remaining 2% spoke Spanish. The Indianapolis neighborhood residents, like those in Denver, are less likely to be married than residents in the other four sites (25.0% of respondents in Indianapolis were married at the time of the wave 3 survey, versus 34.4% overall).

San Antonio is distinct in having a large percentage of female respondents (69.8%), more households with children (51.7% versus 46.6% overall), low levels of education (45.6% had less than a high school degree), and low household incomes (\$18,000 versus \$21,400 overall). Many of these characteristics are mirrored if not exaggerated in Providence, where similarly large percentages of respondents were female (69.8%), lived with one or more children (48.3%), or had low incomes (\$17,000). Residents in Providence were the most likely to speak Spanish (36.8%) of all the sites and the least likely to own their home (26.9%). At the opposite end of the spectrum, White Center residents are the best-off in financial terms. The median household income there was \$42,000, nearly two times the median among all sites. 54.1% of neighborhood

1. See Coulton et al 2009, Table 1.

residents in White Center were homeowners, and 44.3% were married – each roughly ten percent higher than the respective figures among residents in all sites (44.4% and 34.4%). White Center also has the largest presence of other language-speakers (mostly Vietnamese) at 6.3%.

Despite these differences, the sites share three main similarities: they are all located in urban sectors of metropolitan areas, are economically disadvantaged, and are the focus of local community outreach efforts funded in part by the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Strengths and Limitations

The *Making Connections* Survey data offer three main strengths to this research. First, the rare availability of longitudinal household-level data allow for the investigation of the impact of changing economic situations on residents' perceptions of the neighborhood and neighbors. *Making Connections* is one of few surveys that track households over time (for another example, see Gould Ellen and O'Flaherty 2007). This addresses a past criticism of neighborhood research claiming that it often fails to reveal how social organization and neighborhood attachment change over time (Small and Newman 2001). Second, as noted by Rawlings et al (2007), the survey's sampling within target, low-income neighborhoods enables one to control for neighborhood context and thus analyze differential experiences among native-born versus foreign-born Latinos based more on household characteristics rather than contextual factors (7). This alleviates some concerns about the non-random distribution of individuals into neighborhoods (a "selection bias") and thus the validity of observed contextual effects (Jencks and Mayer 1990). Finally, the data supply a rich set of measures of the quality and frequency of

interactions with neighbors, support networks, and neighborhood attachment. Many of these measures are derived from questions that have appeared in other well-known surveys like the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN).

A few limitations of these data must also be acknowledged. First, the neighborhoods from which the sample was drawn are not representative of any larger geographic or municipal populations. Neighborhoods for the survey were selected by the Annie E. Casey Foundation with assistance from local leaders based on the presence of existing grass-roots or community organizations whose missions were consistent with the objectives of the *Making Connections* initiative. It is possible that disadvantaged communities in other U.S. cities may yield different findings. Second, because the survey neighborhoods are each characterized by low overall socioeconomic status (despite considerable variation in geographic size and racial/ethnic composition), very little information can be gleaned about the experiences of higher-SES Latinos. Third, it should be noted that the Making Connections sample contains a majority of female respondents. This is due in large part to the respondent selection procedure used in households with children; interviewers randomly selected a child and then requested to speak with “the parent/guardian who knows the most about [CHILD’S NAME].” Because women are still more likely than men to be primary caregivers, this results in a female gender bias of about 16%.

Additional limitations pertain to assumptions behind my analytical approach. As discussed by Warren (1978) Guest and Lee (1984) and others, a recurring problem when studying neighborhoods is that the boundaries of their territories may be defined in different ways. There are considerable discrepancies in the spatial and social definitions

of neighborhoods between ‘official’ sources (e.g. the U.S. Census Bureau), community organizations, and residents. Urbanites have been shown to recognize multiple names for the same territory and to perceive smaller symbolic groupings within larger areas (Guest and Lee 1984). Furthermore, the boundaries defined in target sites for the *Making Connections* Survey are not synonymous with Census geographies. The Foundation, with help from the local partners and NORC, drew the geographic boundaries of the survey sites. Local leaders were responsible for naming the territory within the target area. As a result, the target area in some sites is divided into separated named neighborhoods, while sites like San Antonio bear a single name (West Side). During the interview, respondents were not supplied a standard definition of their neighborhood; rather, they were encouraged to devise their own reference boundaries.² In the baseline this approach was formalized further by asking respondents to draw the boundaries of their neighborhood on a printed map displaying major streets and landmarks (see Coulton et al 2011 for an analysis of the *Making Connections* findings, or Taylor et al 1984 for findings among a stratified sample of Baltimore residents). This could have important implications for analyses of spatial relationships in neighborhood attachment or for policy recommendations that were specific to a particular territory. However, such applications

2. In the baseline, interviewers read the following introduction: “Many of the questions will be about your neighborhood. By neighborhood, I mean the area around where you live and around your house. It may include places you shop, religious or public institutions, or a local business district. It is the general area around your house where you might perform routine tasks, such as shopping, going to the park, or visiting with neighbors. Please take a look at this map of the area. Study it for a moment and use this pen to draw the boundaries of what you consider to be your neighborhood.” In waves 2 and 3, the mapping exercise was not repeated. Interviewers simply began with the statement, “Now, I want to ask some questions about where you live.”

are not the goal of this study. I acknowledge that “neighborhood” in the minds of respondents may not coincide with the territory defined for the survey. I argue that what is more important, and what is supported by extant literature, is that people tend to think about neighborhoods in terms of nearby people rather than just a specific spatial or institutional unit (Guest and Lee 1984). I find little evidence that the discrepancies in neighborhood boundaries would yield greater bias among any particular ethno-racial group.

Methods

Analytical Data Set

This research study incorporates survey data for six sites at three points in time since 2002. The analytic unit, or unit of analysis, is the household. I use these data to investigate communal attachment within the context of particular neighborhoods. My analytical sample includes 3,682 households who were living within the target neighborhood boundaries at the time of the wave 3 survey (the “wave 3 neighborhood snapshot”). Unless noted otherwise, the frequencies and other statistics reported in tables have been weighted to represent the population of households within *Making Connections* neighborhoods at the time of the wave 3 survey (2008-2010).³ Households that moved at wave 2 or 3 are not included. Table 4 indicates the racial and ethnic composition of the analytical sample by site based on self-reporting. National figures from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey estimates are provided in the “U.S.”

3. Specifically, I use the variable `whhpop_wave3_neigh` from the Making Connections cross-site database.

Table 4. Race/Ethnicity of Respondent by Site at Wave 3, (Unweighted Frequencies and Weighted Percentages)

Race/ ethnicity	U.S.		All respondents		Denver		Des Moines		Indianapolis		San Antonio		White Center		Providence	
	n	%	n	% ^a	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
White (non-Latino)	198,415,102	65.8	1,122	25.9	185	40.9	313	47.4	219	56.2	20	6.9	302	45.4	83	14.2
Black	36,496,027	12.1	775	12.4	96	10.3	147	23.7	348	32.3	12	2.3	49	7.5	123	24.1
U.S.-born Latino	27,941,135	9.3	791	35.3	194	26.9	23	5.2	7	1.6	455	69.4	34	4.6	78	13.8
Foreign-born Latino	17,535,803	5.8	624	18.6	99	15.5	83	14.6	20	4.2	127	20.1	83	15.5	212	35.7
Asian	13,043,433	4.3	189	3.7	27	2.3	26	4.4	7	1.2	0	0.0	103	17.3	26	4.8
Other/ Multiracial	8,030,033	2.7	181	4.2	30	4.2	27	4.7	20	4.5	6	1.4	58	9.8	40	7.4
Total	301,461,533	100.0	3,682	100.0	631	7.8	619	11.0	621	12.1	620	43.4	629	12.9	562	12.8

a. Because the San Antonio neighborhood is much larger than other sites in terms of geographic area and population, cases from that site are weighted more heavily. This is evident in the percentages for All respondents, particularly for the percentage of U.S.-born Latinos.

column for context; however, it should be noted again that the survey neighborhoods are not representative of the general U.S. population. The sample includes 1,122 white, 791 U.S.-born Latino, 775 Black, 624 foreign-born Latino, and 189 Asian respondents (including a small number born in the U.S.), along with 181 respondents who identified as some other race or multi-racial. Table 5 provides more detail regarding how these mutually exclusive racial/ethnic categories were operationalized. I use the term “Latino” in lieu of “Hispanic” because the survey participants are more likely to refer to themselves as the former. Of course, readers should be reminded that Latinos/Hispanics as a group include a great diversity of peoples from countries in South America, Central America, and Spain (Small 2004, xvii).

The overrepresentation of Latinos in the survey sample facilitates the application of statistical techniques and also speaks to the influx of Latinos into urban areas that have previously experienced out-migration by whites (Betancur 1996, Frey and Farley 1996, Bean and Stevens 2003). Among the six sites included in this analysis, Indianapolis has the smallest proportion of Latinos (about 6%). The survey neighborhood population there is predominately non-Latino White (56%) and African American (32%), with very few foreign-born residents. At the opposite end of the spectrum, the survey population in Providence is half Latino (50%), with a majority of foreign-born Latinos from the Dominican Republic and Guatemala. Denver also has a much larger share of Latinos than the national level (42%), with a ratio of roughly 2 U.S.-born Latinos for every 1 born in another country. San Antonio, the largest of the six sites in terms of geographic area, is almost exclusively Hispanic (90%). This proportion is roughly a third greater than the proportion of Hispanic/Latino residents living in the city of San Antonio (61%,

Table 5. Operationalization for Race/Ethnicity Categories

Variable	Description	Question Text
White (non-Latino) Black	Self-identified as not Latino/Spanish/Hispanic and White. Includes foreign-born Whites (n=43). Self-identified as Black or African American. Includes foreign-born Blacks (n=68).	7.1 Do you consider yourself to be of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin or descent? (PROMPT IF NEEDED: This group includes people of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American, and any other Spanish background.) (1=No, not Latino/Spanish/Hispanic, 2=Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, 3=Yes, Puerto Rican, 4=Yes, Cuban, 5=Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino (SPECIFY))
U.S.-born Latino	Self-identified as Hispanic/Latino/Spanish and born inside the U.S. (including Puerto Rico). Most identified his/her race as "other" (n=505) followed by White (n=263). Includes a small number who identified race as Native American (22), Black (n=15), or Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (n=5).	7.2 What race do you consider yourself? CODE ALL THAT APPLY (1=Native American or Alaska Native, 2=Asian, 3=Black or African American, 4=Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 5=White, 6=Other (SPECIFY))
Foreign-born Latino	Self-identified as Hispanic/Latino/Spanish and born outside the U.S. Most identified his/her race as "other" (n=468) followed by White (n=129). Includes a small number who identified race as Black (n=22), Native American (11), or Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (n=5).	
Asian	Self-identified as Asian. Includes a majority of foreign-born Asians (n=170), mainly from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, and a small number of U.S.-born Asians (n=16).	7.3 In what country were you born? (1=United States, not including Puerto Rico, 2=Other (SPECIFY), 3=Puerto Rico)
Other/ Multiracial	Self-identified with more than one racial category. 24 are foreign-born. Does not include respondents who self-identified as Hispanic.	

according to ACS 2005-2009 estimates). Unlike the Latino respondents in Providence, lineage within the San Antonio survey area extends predominately into Mexico but is mediated by at least one generation of U.S. citizenship.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical tests were performed using SAS 9.2 software. I used common factor analysis to identify variables that were associated with a single latent factor. I refined the indices to measure both independent controls (perceptions of neighborhood disorder and safety concerns) and dependent variables. I then used OLS and logistic regression modeling to examine the influence of each predictor on six measures of neighborhood attachment. These forms of multivariate analysis enable one to test hypotheses about the relationships among several variables while controlling for certain characteristics (Miller 2005).

Referring again to the conceptual map in Figure 1, recall that the boxes to the right of the arrow represent the six dependent variables. Further detail about the operationalization of each dependent measure is included in Table 6. Because different types of variables call for different statistical techniques, I present the four dichotomous dependent variables first in proceeding tables, followed by the two continuous variables. The dichotomous dependent variables include dummy variables measuring 1) the respondent's evaluation of the "goodness" of the neighborhood (whether he/she thinks the neighborhood is a good place to raise children), 2) whether the respondent reported engaging in formal neighboring activities like talking to a local political official about a neighborhood problem, 3) whether the respondent reported engaging in informal neighboring activities like attending religious services in the neighborhood or getting

Table 6. Operationalization for Dependent Variables

Variable	Type ^a	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Evaluation	D	Dummy variable indicating whether respondent thinks the neighborhood is a good place to raise children (1= Yes, 0 = No)	1.4: Do you think this neighborhood is a good place to raise children? (0=No, 1=Yes)	0	1
Formal neighboring	D	Dummy variable created from five items indicating whether respondent reported engaging in any of the following activities: spoken to a local political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement, talked with a local religious leader to help with a neighborhood problem or improvement, gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem, volunteered or helped out with activities in the community, or served as an officer or on a committee for any local club or organization	<p>2.1 Have you (or any member of your household) spoken with a local political official like a city councilman, county supervisor, or state legislator about a neighborhood problem or improvement? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>2.2 Have you (or any member of your household) talked to a local religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or neighborhood improvement? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>2.3 Have you (or any member of your household) gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize neighborhood improvement?</p> <p>4.1 Over the past 12 months, have you volunteered or helped out with activities in your community? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>4.1a Was the volunteer work in your neighborhood? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>4.4 In the past twelve months, have you served as an officer or served on a committee of any local club or organization or religious organization? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>4.4a Is this organization inside your neighborhood or outside your neighborhood? (1=Inside my neighborhood, 2=Outside my neighborhood)</p>	0	1

Variable	Type ^a	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Informal neighboring	D	Dummy variable created from four items indicating whether respondent reported engaging in any of the following activities: attend religious services inside the neighborhood, get help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides) from family members who live in the neighborhood, get help or support besides money from friends who live in the neighborhood, or attended a neighborhood get-together (festival, picnic, etc.) during the past year	<p>4.2 Do you attend religious services inside your neighborhood or outside your neighborhood? (1=Inside my neighborhood, 2=Outside my neighborhood, 3=Don't attend)</p> <p>4.3 To your knowledge has there been any sort of neighborhood get-together during the past year – say a festival, celebration, picnic, something like that? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>4.3a Did you attend? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>6.25 How often do you get help or support besides money, like babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides from people in your family that do not live with you? (1=Often, 2=Sometimes, 3=Rarely, 4=Never)</p> <p>6.25a Do these family members live in the neighborhood? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p> <p>6.27 How often do you get help or support besides money from friends? (1=Often, 2=Sometimes, 3=Rarely, 4=Never)</p> <p>6.27a Do these friends live in the neighborhood? (0=No, 1=Yes)</p>	0	1
Gave name of neighborhood	D	Dummy variable indicating whether respondent reported a codable name for his/her neighborhood. Those who said their neighborhood does not have a name or provided a name that could not be recognized as the name of a place during data cleaning are coded as 0.	1.2 What is the name of your neighborhood?	0	1

Variable	Type ^a	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Length of residence	C	Length of residence in neighborhood for the respondent, in years	1.3 How long have you lived in this neighborhood?	0	36
Sentiment	C	Average score across five items indicating the extent to which the respondent agrees that he/she lives in a close-knit neighborhood; that people in the neighborhood are willing to help their neighbors; that people in the neighborhood generally get along; share the same values; and can be trusted	<p>1.5 I'm going to read some statements about your neighborhood, the people in it, and things that happen in the neighborhood. For each statement, tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, or strongly disagree. (1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree)</p> <p>1.5a I live in a close-knit neighborhood.</p> <p>1.5b People in my neighborhood are willing to help their neighbors.</p> <p>2.7a People in my neighborhood generally get along with each other.</p> <p>2.7b People in neighborhood share the same values.</p> <p>1.5e People in neighborhood can be trusted.</p>	0	5

a. D = dichotomous; C = continuous.

help from neighbors, and 4) whether the respondent reported a recognizable name for his/her neighborhood. The continuous variables include 1) a measure of tenure in the neighborhood, defined as the number of years during which the respondent has lived there, and 2) an index measuring sentimental attachment to the neighborhood that provides an average across five items assessing the respondent's perception of social cohesion among neighbors.

I include additional variables related to demographic background (e.g. age, sex, and interview language), household composition (married, presence of children), educational attainment, income, and home ownership as controls in the models. I also include four indices based on constructs that have been demonstrated to influence neighborhood attachment in past empirical studies. These include measures of 1) economic hardship experienced by the household (lacking money for prescription drugs, monthly bills, or food, or periods of prolonged unemployment), 2) perceptions of neighborhood disorder (graffiti, litter/trash, vacant or boarded-up buildings, etc.), 3) concerns about safety, and 4) a rough indication of the strength of the respondents' social networks outside the neighborhood. Table 7 provides a description of each of the single independent variables – that is, those drawn directly from survey questions. Table 8 provides the same information for the independent index variables that were constructed by summarizing values across several different survey items.

Dependent Variables: Neighborhood Attachment

Numerous authors have demonstrated that research involving communal attachments must distinguish between the attitudinal, evaluative, and behavioral components that contribute to the social experience of neighborhoods (Smith 1975).

Table 7. Operationalization for Single Independent Variables

Variable	Type	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Age	C	Continuous variable indicating respondent age in years	R5. What was [NAME]'s age at (his/her) last birthday?	16 ^a	75 ^b
Female	D	Dummy variable indicating that the respondent is female, with 1= Yes, 0 = No	R4. Is [NAME] male or female? (1=Female, 0=Male)	0	1
Interview in English	D	Dummy variable indicating that the wave 3 interview was done using English materials, with 1 = Yes, 0 = No	n/a - pre-printed on questionnaires	0	1
Interview in Spanish	D	Dummy variable indicating that the wave 3 interview was done using Spanish materials, with 1 = Yes, 0 = No	n/a - pre-printed on questionnaires	0	1
Interview in other language	D	Dummy variable indicating that the wave 3 interview was done using materials in some other language (mostly Vietnamese), with 1= Yes, 0 = No	n/a - pre-printed on questionnaires	0	1
Married	D	Dummy variable indicating that the respondent is married, with 1= Yes, 0 = No	R8. What is [NAME]'s relationship to [RESPONDENT]? (1=Husband/wife, 0=Other)	0	1
Kids in household	D	Dummy variable indicating that there is one or more child living in the household, with 1= Yes, 0 = No	n/a - Constructed from count of children living in the household.	0	1

Variable	Type	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Less than high school degree	D	Dummy variable indicating that the respondent's highest educational level is less than a high school degree, with 1 = Yes, 0 = No	7.11 What is the highest level of education you have completed? (1=Less than high school, 0=Other)	0	1
High school degree	D	Dummy variable indicating that the respondent's highest educational level is a high school degree, with 1 = Yes, 0 = No	7.11 What is the highest level of education you have completed? (1 = High school, 0=Other)	0	1
More than high school degree	D	Dummy variable indicating that the respondent's highest educational level is more than a high school degree, with 1 = Yes, 0 = No	7.11 What is the highest level of education you have completed? (1 = More than high school, 0=Other)	0	1
Household income last year	C	Continuous variable indicating household's income from all sources last year, in U.S. dollars. For bivariate and multivariate regression models, this is converted to the natural log per capita (divided by the number of people living in the household).	6.20 What was your total household income from all of these sources for the last 12 months? 6.20a-6.20j Did it amount to less than [DOLLAR AMOUNT, IN \$10,000 INCREMENTS], more than [DOLLAR AMOUNT], or what?	0	199,999
Homeowner	D	Dummy variable indicating whether respondent (and spouse/partner) owns their house/apartment or is in the process of buying, renting to own, or buying on contract	6.29 Do you (an your spouse or partner) own this (house/apartment), rent it, or what? (1=Own, rent to own, or buying on contract, 0=Other)	0	1

a. The survey is typically conducted with adults over the age of 18. In a few rare instances, an underage parent was selected to be the respondent based on selection procedures in households with children.

b. Respondents over the age of 75 were topcoded to equal 75.

Table 8. Operationalization for Index Independent Variables

Variable	Type	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Economic hardship	C	Sum of four items indicating whether in the past year the household had experienced a time when they did not fill or postponed filling a prescription for drugs; were not able to pay the mortgage, rent, or utility bills; were without enough money to buy food; or when the respondent or spouse/partner had been without work due to unemployment for 4 weeks or greater	<p>5.1 During the past 12 months, did you (or any member of your household not fill or postpone filling a prescription for drugs when you (or another member of your household) needed them? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>5.1a Was lack of insurance or money a reason why you (or any member of your household) did not get the drugs you needed? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>5.2 During the past 12 months, was there a time when (you/you and your family) were not able to pay your mortgage, rent or utility bills)? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>5.7 In the last 12 months, that is, since [NAME OF CURRENT MONTH] of last year, was your family ever without enough money to buy food? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>6.10 How many weeks during the last 12 months were you without work because of unemployment?</p> <p>6.17 How many weeks during the last 12 months was your (spouse/partner) without work because of unemployment?</p>	0	4

Variable	Type	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Neighborhood disorder	C	Average score across seven items indicating how frequently the respondent rates the appearance of graffiti; litter/trash; vacant, abandoned or boarded up buildings; drug dealers, drug users, or drunks; traffic safety problems; gangs; and prostitution	<p>2.6 Next, I'm going to read a list of conditions that neighborhoods may have. Please tell me whether the condition is "very rare" or "very common" in your neighborhood by using a scale of 0 to 6 where 0 indicates that the condition does not occur in your neighborhood, 1 indicates that the condition is "very rare" and 6 indicates that the condition is "very common." If the problem is neither common nor rare then use the number 3.</p> <p>2.6a Graffiti on buildings and walls.</p> <p>2.6b Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets.</p> <p>2.6c Vacant, abandoned or boarded up buildings.</p> <p>2.6d Drug dealers, drug users, or drunks hanging around.</p> <p>2.6e Traffic safety problems</p> <p>2.6f Gangs/gang activity.</p> <p>2.6g Prostitution.</p>	0	6

Variable	Type	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Safety concerns	C	Average score across six items indicating the extent to which the respondent thinks the neighborhood is a safe place for children; feels safe at home at night; feels safe being out alone during the day; would stop to speak with someone if they asked for directions at night, feels most children go trick-or-treating in the neighborhood on Halloween, and thinks most criminal activity going on in the neighborhood is committed by non-residents	<p>2.5 In today's neighborhoods, many people have concerns about safety and security. These next statements have to do with your opinions about these issues. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the statement on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 indicates that you "disagree very strongly" and 7 indicates that you "agree very strongly." If you do not have feelings one way or the other about the issue then use the number 4.</p> <p>2.5a My neighborhood is a safe place for children.</p> <p>2.5b I feel safe at home at night.</p> <p>2.5c I feel safe being out in my neighborhood alone during the day.</p> <p>2.5d If someone stopped me at night to ask directions, I would probably stop to speak with them.</p> <p>2.5e On Halloween, most of the children go trick-or-treating in this neighborhood.</p> <p>2.5f Most criminal activity going on here is committed by people living outside of this neighborhood.</p>	0	6

Variable	Type	Description	Question text	Min	Max
Social network	C	Sum of three items indicating whether the respondent gives financial help to friends or family in other countries, gets help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides) from family members outside the neighborhood, and gets help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides) from friends outside the neighborhood	<p>6.23 Sometimes families give financial help, either to other people they live with or to friends and family outside. Did you give any financial help like this in the last 12 months? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>6.23a Was any of this financial help to friends or family in other countries? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>6.25 How often do you get help or support besides money, like babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides from people in your family that do not live with you? (1=Often, 2=Sometimes, 3=Rarely, 4=Never)</p> <p>6.25a Do these family members live in the neighborhood? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p> <p>6.27 How often do you get help or support besides money to friends? (1=Often, 2=Sometimes, 3=Rarely, 4=Never)</p> <p>6.27a Do these friends live in the neighborhood? (1=Yes, 0=No)</p>	0	3

Composite variables offer the appeal of easy interpretation but obscure which factors are responsible for the effect (Massey 1998). To measure neighborhood attachment, I draw on six distinct components of neighborhood attachment identified in past empirical studies. I begin with the expectation that these components have unique relationships with other neighborhood and household characteristics (see Guest and Lee 1983).

Dependent Variable 1: Evaluation

The first dependent variable provides a rough indication of the respondents' evaluation of the "goodness" of the neighborhood. This dummy variable draws from an early item in the main questionnaire that asks, "Do you think this neighborhood is a good place to raise children?" (Yes/no). Two additional items were considered for inclusion in an index with the response from this question: "How does the future look for this neighborhood? Is this neighborhood likely to get better, stay the same, or get worse?" (1=Get worse, 2=Stay the same, 3=Get better) (FUTURE) and "My neighborhood is a safe place for children" (Continuous scale ranging from 1 to 7, where 1=Disagree very strongly, 4=Do not have feelings one way or the other, and 7=Agree very strongly) (SAFECHLD). However, results from principal components analysis suggested that these measures could not be reduced to a single artificial variable. Principal components analysis is a variable reduction procedure that is useful for identifying redundancy across a set of measures (colinearity) and developing a smaller number of variables that can be used to predict other outcomes (see Hatcher and Stepanski 1994, chapter 6, or Guest et al 2006 for an example of the application of this technique in the neighborhood attachment literature). I decided to include only the question, "Do you think this neighborhood is a good place to raise children?"

Dependent Variable 2: Formal Neighboring

The second and third dependent variables tap into behavioral attachment. The second dependent variable indicates whether the respondent reported engaging in any formal neighboring activities, such as speaking to a local political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement, talking with a local religious leader to help with a neighborhood problem or improvement, getting together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem, volunteering or helping out with activities in the community, or serving as an officer or on a committee for any local club or organization. This echoes Burkhardt's (1971) concept of *participation*, defined as "the extent to which residents participate in organizations whose members are residents of the neighborhood or whose primary focus is generalized neighborhood problems or activities." Guest et al (2006) include a similar construct titled "neighbor organizing," described as activities taken by residents to defend their neighborhood (374). I included five items from the *Making Connections* Survey and incorporated two related follow-up questions to isolate just those activities happening within the neighborhood (see Table 6).

Dependent Variable 3: Informal Neighboring

The third dichotomous dependent variable accounts for informal neighboring – that is, engaging in voluntary interactions with neighbors for social or need-based purposes other than solving a neighborhood problem. Here, my operationalization deviates from Woldoff's (2002) construct of informal attachment. My construct encompasses a wider scope of activities than Woldoff categorizes as forms of routine and social attachment. Relatedly, my construct parallels the typology presented by Swaroop and Morenoff but also includes an element of what they label "expressive organizations."

After observing from initial frequencies that very few respondents reported engaging in many different forms of neighboring, I examined four items and assigned a score of 1 if the respondent had reported engaging in any one or more of the following activities: attending religious services inside the neighborhood, getting help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides), getting help or support besides money from family members who live in the neighborhood, or attending a neighborhood get-together (festival, picnic, etc.) during the past year.

Dependent Variable 4: Neighborhood Naming

The final dichotomous dependent variable indicates whether the respondent provided a codable name for his/her neighborhood. Those who said their neighborhood does not have a name, said the area had a name but could not supply it, or provided a name that could not be recognized as the name of a place during data cleaning (i.e. “the hood”) are coded as 0. Studies by Taylor et al (1984) and Guest and Lee (1983) provide convincing evidence that neighborhood naming can be viewed as “part and parcel of attachment to place” (104), yet distinct from elements of satisfaction. In Taylor et al’s 1984 study of 66 Baltimore neighborhoods, 69% of respondents supplied a name for their neighborhood. They conclude that naming is a product “of the local social ecology, conditioned by the composition and processes of the groups that are extant on each block” (121).

Dependent Variable 5: Length of Residence

Mobility has been shown to impact economic and social well-being and is studied intensely in research on neighborhood effects. Dagger (1997) argues that citizenship “grows out of attachment to place and its people – out of a sense of community – that

only forms over time” (162). Frequent mobility is said to lower the likelihood of establishing communal ties. While length of residence is more commonly used as an independent control in studies of neighborhood attachment (see Guest et al 2006, Woldoff 2002, Bonaiuto et al 1999, etc.), Burkhardt (1971) uses residents’ reporting of their desire to continue living in the local area as an indication of their commitment. While similar questions have been asked for certain sites in select waves of the *Making Connections* Survey, for the purpose of maximizing data comparability I instead use respondents’ tenure in the neighborhood. This variable is derived from the question, “How long have you lived in this neighborhood?” I recoded responses into the number of years. This yields a continuous dependent variable with values ranging from 0 to 36 years (see Table 6). Larger values were top-coded prior to the release of the survey data to protect the identities of the longest-term residents.

Dependent Variable 6: Sentiment

The final dependent variable, a measure of sentimental attitudinal attachment, draws on an area of prolonged interest in the literature on communal attachment. Using a sample of Seattle residents, Guest and Lee (1983) find that sentiment exerts independent and “impressive” effects on residents’ propensity to move and to take political action. They find that the presence of friends and neighbors, along with population composition, were among the strongest predictors of sentiment. Woldoff (2002) defines sentiment using three items indicating whether the respondent feels “at home” in the community, whether he or she would miss the area if forced to move, and finally, the strength of his or her ties to the neighborhood. My index of sentiment will include five items from the *Making Connections* Survey that were adopted from the social cohesion index used in the

Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). Respondents reported the degree to which they agreed that they lived in a close-knit neighborhood, that people in the neighborhood were willing to help their neighbors, that people in the neighborhood generally got along, shared the same values, and could be trusted. The mean score of these five questions will form my measure of sentimental attachment (SC). The validity and reliability of this scale have been established by Dorsey and Forehand (2003), Ranking and Quane (2002), and several others (see Brisson and Usher 2005).

Independent Variables

Tables 7 and 8 describe the operationalization for independent variables. Variables that reflect single attributes like age, sex, and educational attainment are included in Table 7. Variables that were constructed by summarizing or adding values across several survey questions are included in Table 8. The constructed indices are described in further detail below.

Economic Hardship

The Family Hardship segment of the *Making Connections* questionnaire supplies several indicators of economic stressors. I calculated the sum of four yes/no items indicating whether in the past year the household had experienced a time when they did not fill or postponed filling a prescription for drugs; were not able to pay the mortgage, rent, or utility bills; were without enough money to buy food; or when the respondent or spouse/partner had been without work due to unemployment for 4 weeks or greater.¹

1. I recoded UNEMPLMT and SPUNEMPL, both continuous variables, into a single dummy variable, with a period of unemployment lasting 4 weeks or greater for either the respondent or

Values range from 0 to 4, with 4 representing the most forms of financial hardship experienced by the household.

Neighborhood Disorder

Additional questions adopted from the PHDCN supply a measurement of neighborhood disorder. My framing of this concept is influenced by Woldoff (2002), who examines physical signs of disorder apart from social incivilities and includes crime-related measures in the latter category. Although they will not be a primary focus of my research, these factors are relevant because “when resident experience disorder or crime, they are said to lose their sense of commitment to the neighborhood” (92). Over 30 years ago, Maran (1979) found that perceptions of environmental problems including crime, rundown housing, trash or litter, and abandoned structures were the major predictors of overall neighborhood satisfaction. Contemporary research suggests that these factors still weigh heavily on residents’ perceptions of their neighborhoods. I calculated the average score across seven items indicating how frequently the respondent observes graffiti; litter/trash; vacant, abandoned or boarded up buildings; drug dealers, drug users, or drunks; traffic safety problems; gangs; and prostitution in their neighborhood. The result is a continuous variable with values ranging from 0 to 6.

spouse/partner set to equal 1 and periods less than 4 weeks set to 0 (UNEMPLMT_R). NOPAYBIL, NOPHONE, NOFOOD, and UNEMPLMT_R were then added together to form a single index, HARSHIP.

Safety Concerns

This index is the average score across six items indicating the extent to which the respondent thinks the neighborhood is a safe place for children, feels safe at home at night, feels safe being out alone during the day, would stop to speak with someone if they asked for directions at night, feels most children go trick-or-treating in the neighborhood on Halloween, and thinks most criminal activity going on in the neighborhood is committed by non-residents. Like the neighborhood disorder index, values for this continuous variable range from 0 to 6.

Social Networks

Because I predict that social networks will exert a strong influence on neighborhood attachment, I examined questions in several segments of the *Making Connections* questionnaire. Due to concerns about multicollinearity, I used a process of elimination to identify social connections with individuals who did not live in the respondents' neighborhood.² The end result is the sum of three items indicating whether respondent gives financial help to friends or family in other countries, gets help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides) from family members outside the neighborhood, and gets help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides) from friends outside the neighborhood.

2. For example, question 6.25 in the wave 3 main questionnaire reads, "How often do you **get** help or support besides money, like babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides from people in your family that do not live with you?" (OFTGTHLP) (1=Often, 2=Sometimes, 3=Rarely, 4=Never) A follow-up question (6.25a) asks, "Do these family members live in the neighborhood?" (FAMHOOD) (1=Yes, 0=No). I first created a dummy variable to identify those respondents had answered "often" or "sometimes" at question 6.25 and "no" at question 6.25a. I then folded the value of the new dummy variable, along with recoded measures from other questions, into the index.

Control Variables

Households with children (or in the childbearing stage) and homeowners are expected to have a “special locality investment” that leads to increased involvement in the community (Guest and Lee 1984). Those with higher levels of education or income are also predicted to hold higher levels of attachment. Conversely, “low investment” groups like renter and adults outside of child-bearing age are believed to have more specialized needs that ultimately impact their overall satisfaction with the local area (Herting and Guest 1985). I include control variables to account for basic demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, marital status, household composition (the presence or absence of children), and educational attainment. Because income is highly skewed³ and because larger families should require larger incomes, for the bivariate and multivariate regression models I converted household income to the natural log per capita (the log of the total household income divided by the number of people living in the household). This can be interpreted as the income per person in thousands of dollars, based on the U.S. dollar in 2008-2011. See Table 7 for further details.

3. Kennickell 1999.

CHAPTER FIVE

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

I present my findings from the quantitative analysis of the survey data in three main sections. The first set of tables report descriptive statistics for the independent variables and bivariate relationships with each of the dependent variables. I then discuss my findings from the logistic and OLS multivariate regression models.

Profile of Households by Race/Ethnicity

Tables 9-11 report descriptive statistics for the independent variables by racial/ethnic group for households in all six sites, the five sites other than San Antonio, and just San Antonio, respectively. They are presented separately to allow for more deliberate evaluation of the potential for the San Antonio cases to pull observations from other sites in a given direction due to the larger population in this site. Recall that percentages are weighted to reflect the populations within the target neighborhoods at the time of the wave 3 survey. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses under summary statistics for continuous variables. Due to the small number of White, Black, and other/multiracial respondents in San Antonio, readers should interpret figures for these groups with caution. Figures for Asians in San Antonio are not included due to insufficient cell sizes.

The mean age for respondents in all sites is 44 years. Blacks have the highest mean age at nearly 46 years and those respondents who identified with some “other” race

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Race/Ethnicity at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted)

Variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
Age (mean)	44.4 (78.21)	44.3 (72.33)	45.9 (61.24)	44.0 (104.61)	44.7 (75.17)	45.7 (60.76)	40.5 (66.4)
Female (percentage)	66.0	61.2	67.5	66.1	72.9	58.1	66.4
Interview in English (percentage)	85.2	99.9	99.8	93.7	37.8	76.4	97.6
Interview in Spanish (percentage)	13.9	0.1	0.2	6.3	62.1	0.0	2.4
Interview in other language (percentage)	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	23.6	0.0
Married (percentage)	34.4	28.9	21.6	35.4	47.6	61.6	14.0
Kids in household (percentage)	46.6	32.7	47.3	49.5	59.8	45.7	47.6
Less than high school degree (percentage)	35.1	24.2	22.2	37.6	58.5	23.1	27.6
High school degree (percentage)	29.8	26.2	37.7	33.4	21.8	35.0	28.7
More than high school degree (percentage)	35.1	49.6	40.1	29.1	19.8	41.8	43.7
Household income last year (median)	\$21,400 (132494)	\$30,000 (152969)	\$19,347 (88969)	\$20,000 (134685)	\$16,300 (82908)	\$40,000 (138847)	\$20,000 (106681)
Homeowner (percentage)	44.4	50.2	36.3	44.5	41.8	59.1	29.2
Economic hardship (mean)	1.0 (5.44)	0.9 (4.92)	1.2 (4.07)	1.0 (6.86)	1.1 (5.76)	0.6 (3.52)	1.5 (5.63)
Neighborhood disorder (mean)	2.6 (7.61)	2.7 (6.6)	2.4 (5.25)	2.9 (9.99)	2.2 (8.01)	1.9 (5.71)	3.2 (7.24)
Safety concerns (mean)	2.2 (6.05)	2.2 (5.52)	2.0 (4.43)	2.3 (8.08)	2.2 (6.05)	2.4 (4.45)	2.4 (5.82)
Social network (mean)	0.5 (3.26)	0.4 (2.78)	0.5 (2.67)	0.4 (4.15)	0.6 (3.6)	0.6 (2.51)	0.4 (2.9)
n (unweighted)	3,682	1,122	775	791	624	189	181

a. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses for continuous variables.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Race/Ethnicity at Wave 3 for Five Sites (Weighted)

Variable	Total	White (non-Latino)		U.S.-born Latino		Foreign-born Latino		Asian		Other/multiracial	
Age (mean)	43.8 (61.56)	46.1 (65.17)	44.8 (57.18)	38.1 (59.63)	40.6 (54.09)	45.7 (60.76)	40.5 (63.91)				
Female (percentage)	63.1	57.4	65.2	64.6	75.3	58.1	62.0				
Interview in English (percentage)	83.5	99.9	99.7	83.0	24.6	76.4	98.5				
Interview in Spanish (percentage)	14.9	0.1	0.3	17.0	75.2	0.0	1.5				
Interview in other language (percentage)	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	23.6	0.0				
Married (percentage)	32.0	30.0	23.5	21.8	46.5	61.6	16.4				
Kids in household (percentage)	42.7	26.3	47.9	55.9	66.8	45.7	41.8				
Less than high school degree (percentage)	27.1	19.1	21.6	34.6	52.8	23.1	17.9				
High school degree (percentage)	30.2	26.2	39.5	31.5	25.4	35.0	32.2				
More than high school degree (percentage)	42.7	54.7	38.8	33.9	21.8	41.8	49.9				
Household income last year (median)	\$26,000 (124068)	\$36,000 (146866)	\$20,000 (88149)	\$20,712 (95181)	\$18,000 (78129)	\$40,000 (138847)	\$20,000 (106780)				
Homeowner (percentage)	43.5	54.6	36.7	26.0	33.1	59.1	32.3				
Economic hardship (mean)	1.1 (4.55)	0.9 (4.72)	1.2 (4.04)	1.0 (3.99)	1.3 (4.91)	0.6 (3.52)	1.3 (5.05)				
Neighborhood disorder (mean)	2.6 (6.03)	2.9 (6.08)	2.4 (5.16)	2.9 (5.58)	2.1 (6.37)	1.9 (5.71)	2.9 (6.4)				
Safety concerns (mean)	2.2 (4.84)	2.2 (5.23)	2.0 (4.35)	2.3 (4.57)	2.1 (4.59)	2.4 (4.45)	2.3 (5.67)				
Social network (mean)	0.5 (2.72)	0.5 (2.72)	0.5 (2.62)	0.5 (2.63)	0.6 (2.91)	0.6 (2.51)	0.4 (2.68)				
n (unweighted)	3,062	1,102	763	336	497	189	175				

a. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses for continuous variables.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Race/Ethnicity at Wave 3 for San Antonio (Weighted)

Variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
Age (mean)	45.1 (132.44)	30.1 (179.62)	58.6 (154.51)	45.0 (126.52)	49.4 (118.38)	n/a	40.6 (128.56)
Female (percentage)	69.8	89.9	93.6	66.4	70.2	n/a	92.7
Interview in English (percentage)	87.4	100.0	100.0	95.6	52.8	n/a	92.7
Interview in Spanish (percentage)	12.6	0.0	0.0	4.4	47.2	n/a	7.3
Interview in other language (percentage)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	0.0
Married (percentage)	37.5	20.6	0.0	37.8	48.9	n/a	0.0
Kids in household (percentage)	51.7	81.6	40.2	48.4	51.9	n/a	82.1
Less than high school degree (percentage)	45.6	63.4	28.5	38.1	64.9	n/a	85.5
High school degree (percentage)	29.2	26.5	17.1	33.7	17.6	n/a	7.3
More than high school degree (percentage)	25.2	10.1	54.4	28.3	17.5	n/a	7.2
Household income last year (median)	\$18,000 (150853)	\$18,000 (290908)	\$6,700 (47286)	\$20,000 (156983)	\$16,000 (92856)	n/a	n/a ²
Homeowner (percentage)	45.5	16.4	32.4	47.7	51.7	n/a	10.6
Economic hardship (mean)	1.0 (8.58)	0.4 (10.92)	1.1 (7.19)	1.0 (8.4)	0.9 (7.98)	n/a	2.2 (12.54)
Neighborhood disorder (mean)	2.7 (12.79)	1.7 (16.58)	2.4 (9.8)	2.8 (12.26)	2.3 (12.47)	n/a	5.1 (4.98)
Safety concerns (mean)	2.3 (10.03)	1.9 (14.03)	2.2 (8.16)	2.3 (9.91)	2.3 (9.86)	n/a	3.1 (5.67)
Social network (mean)	0.4 (5.1)	0.0 (1.74)	0.2 (4.11)	0.4 (4.98)	0.5 (5.5)	n/a	0.3 (7.09)
n (unweighted)	620	20	12	422	127	0	6

a. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses for continuous variables.

b. Figures where cell sizes are less than 5 have been suppressed.

or as multiracial have the lowest mean at 41. As prefaced earlier in the Limitations section, the respondent selection processes among households with children (asking for the parent or guardian who knows the most about the focus child) resulted in a ratio of 1.5 female for every 1 male respondent. The female bias is largest among foreign-born Latino respondents (74%) and smallest among Asians (58%). Not surprisingly, nearly all White respondents completed the interview in English while 38% of foreign-born Latinos opted to do the interview in Spanish and 24% of Asians completed the interview in another language (mainly Vietnamese). Yet Table 11 reveals an overwhelming preference for English among U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio. Despite having more bilingual Spanish interviewers available to complete interviews in this site than in other locations, all but 4% were done in English.

Marriage rates vary considerably across groups. 62% of Asian respondents identified a spouse or partner living in their household, while this applied to only 14% of respondents in the other/multiracial group. Roughly half of the households included children. Foreign-born Latinos were the most likely to have children (60%) and Whites the least likely (33%). In socioeconomic terms, the survey sample generally upholds expectations of urban neighborhoods that are often the focus of community change initiatives (Coulton et al 2011). Whites reported above-average education levels and above-average household incomes (half had more than a high school degree and the median income was \$30,000).¹ Asians reported the highest median household income

1. Because the natural logarithm of income per capita does not lend itself to easy interpretations, the unadjusted household income (the sum of all sources of income from all household members) is

(\$40,000) and above-average education levels. Reports of economic hardship were infrequent among this group, with a mean score of just 0.6 on the scale ranging from 0 to 4. Foreign-born Latinos stand out as the least-educated and lowest-earning group (59% did not hold a high school degree and the median income was around \$16,000). Other/multiracial respondents reported above-average educational levels and near-average incomes, but reported more frequent experiences of economic hardship in the past year (with a mean score of 1.5 versus the overall mean of 1.0). Homeownership, based on whether the respondent indicated that he or she and/or his or her partner owned their home apartment or were in the process of buying or renting to own, also varied across groups. Asians were the most likely to be homeowners (61%) and other/multiracial respondents were the least likely to own (29%). It is again worth noting the figures for U.S.-born and foreign-born Latinos in San Antonio. Both groups stand out in the near even ratio of homeowners to non-homeowners (48% and 52% respectively). This is due in large part to the affordability of single family homes in the West Side neighborhood.

The final three independent variables reveal modest differences across groups. Other/multiracial respondents and U.S.-born Latino reported the most negative assessments of their communities in terms of neighborhood disorder (with mean scores of 3.2 and 2.9, respectively). Like Asians, foreign-born Latinos they reported less frequent observations of disorder than the other groups but simultaneously held above-average

reported in Tables 9-11.

concerns about safety. In terms of social networks, the two groups with sizeable concentrations of immigrant respondents, foreign-born Latinos and Asians, reported slightly stronger networks than the other groups, but the differences were very small (with a mean score of 0.6 for each of these two groups versus 0.4 for each of the other three groups).

Trends in Neighborhood Attachment among Latinos in the *Making Connections* Survey

Respondents who self-identified as some other race or multiracial were the least likely to indicate that their neighborhood was a good place to raise children (54% versus 71% among all groups; see Table 12). Blacks were noticeably more engaged in formal and informal neighboring than other groups, with roughly 44% responding affirmatively for each of the two measures. Asians were more likely to engage in formal neighboring activities like speaking with a local political leader about a neighborhood problem or doing volunteer work in their community than to interact informally with neighbors, as in attending a neighborhood get-together or exchanging goods or favors (37% and 28%, respectively). At the other end of the spectrum, foreign-born Latinos were unlikely to report engaging in either form of neighboring (27% and 28%, respectively). Differences in sentimental attachment across groups are negligible.

There are two striking differences among the six measures of neighborhood attachment across racial/ethnic groups. The first is the sizeable portion of U.S.-born and foreign-born Latinos who did not supply a name for their neighborhood: 27% and 24%, respectively. Neighborhood naming was far more common among Whites (85%), Blacks (90%), and other/multiracial respondents (90%), and nearly universal among Asians

Table 12. Neighborhood Attachment by Race/ethnicity at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted)

Dependent variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
<u>Dichotomous variables</u>							
Evaluation (% yes)	70.6	67.0	70.5	71.7	76.3	76.4	53.8
Formal neighboring (% 1 or more)	36.5	41.9	43.9	34.6	27.3	37.4	36.5
Informal neighboring (% 1 or more)	32.5	30.3	44.2	32.9	28.2	28.1	32.0
Gave name of neighborhood (%)	80.8	84.9	90.2	72.6	75.8	93.8	90.2
<u>Continuous variables</u>							
Length of residence (median)	6.7	5.0	6.0	11.0	6.0	6.0	4.0
Std. deviation	60.0	51.0	47.0	85.0	50.0	38.0	42.0
Sentiment (mean)	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.2
Std. deviation	3.7	3.3	2.9	4.7	3.9	3.0	3.4
n (unweighted)	3,682	1,122	775	791	624	189	181

(94%). Yet, Table 13 reveals that Latinos in the five sites other than San Antonio more closely mirrored other racial/ethnic groups in their propensity to provide a name for their neighborhood. In fact, all but 3% of U.S.-born Latinos provided a name. Neighborhood naming among U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio, like in other sites, was far more common than among foreign-born Latinos (67% versus 55%, respectively; see Table 14). However, it seems that there may be a site effect that influences all racial/ethnic groups in San Antonio. This will be explored further in Chapters 7 and 8.

The second major difference is the median length of residence among U.S.-born Latinos, 11 years, nearly twice as long as the median for any other group. This is influenced heavily by the lengthy tenure of U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio, half of whom have lived in the neighborhood for 14 years. Table 13 reveals that when San Antonio respondents are omitted, the median tenure among U.S.-born (as well as foreign-born) Latinos is actually slightly below the overall median of 5.5 years. Other race/multiracial respondents remain the newest group of residents in the five sites.

Regression Findings

As a preliminary step, I used logistic and OLS regression procedures to calculate the bivariate relationships between each independent and dependent variable, without controlling for other factors. The results are reported in Table 15. On its own, race/ethnicity seems to influence all of the aspects of neighborhood attachment except for sentiment and appears especially important for determining one's propensity to supply a name for his/her neighborhood and length of residence in the neighborhood. Household income exerts a small but significant influence on every aspect except for length of residence and economic hardship follows a similar pattern (but has a significant

Table 13. Neighborhood Attachment by Race/ethnicity at Wave 3 for Five Sites (Weighted)

Dependent variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
<u>Dichotomous variables</u>							
Evaluation (% yes)	68.9	64.6	70.5	66.9	75.7	76.4	61.6
Formal neighboring (% 1 or more)	41.5	46.0	45.4	36.0	31.4	37.4	40.2
Informal neighboring (% 1 or more)	34.6	31.4	44.8	37.7	30.8	28.1	34.9
Gave name of neighborhood (%)	93.5	93.1	92.8	97.1	93.9	93.8	91.9
<u>Continuous variables</u>							
Length of residence (median)	5.5	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	4.0
Std. deviation	43.0	48.0	44.0	40.0	30.0	38.0	42.0
Sentiment (mean)	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.2
Std. deviation	2.9	3.1	2.6	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.2
n (unweighted)	3,062	1,102	763	336	497	189	175

Table 14. Neighborhood Attachment by Race/ethnicity at Wave 3 for San Antonio (Weighted)^a

Dependent variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
<u>Dichotomous variables</u>							
Evaluation (% yes)	72.9	84.8	52.2	72.5	76.9	n/a	10.6
Formal neighboring (% 1 or more)	29.9	11.0	26.3	34.3	22.7	n/a	14.5
Informal neighboring (% 1 or more)	29.8	22.0	37.1	32.0	25.1	n/a	14.5
Gave name of neighborhood (%)	61.1	14.1	56.3	67.4	55.3	n/a	80.8
<u>Continuous variables</u>							
Length of residence (median)	9.2	0.5	3.0	14.0	8.0	n/a	4.0
Std. deviation	105.0	113.0	140.0	105.0	88.0	n/a	34.0
Sentiment (mean)	3.5	3.8	3.1	3.5	3.6	n/a	2.7
Std. deviation	6.2	8.4	12.0	5.8	6.5	n/a	6.1
n (unweighted)	620	20	12	455	127	0	6

a. The small sample sizes for Non-Latino Whites, Blacks, and other-multiracial persons in San Antonio may account for some of the wide variations observed across dependent variables. Readers should be cautious when interpreting these findings on a larger scale.

Table 15. Bivariate Relationships between Independent Variables at Wave 3 for All Sites (Weighted)

Independent variable	Dependent variable					
	Dichotomous ^{a b}			Continuous ^{a c}		
	(Logistic regression coefficients)			(OLS regression coefficients)		
	Evaluation	Formal neighboring	Informal neighboring	Gave name of neighborhood	Length of residence	Sentiment
White	-0.228 (.017)	*** (0.016)	*** (.017)	0.389 (.024)	*** (.467)	-0.052 (.029)
Black	-0.009 (.024)	*** (.021)	*** (.021)	0.876 (.039)	*** (.623)	-0.026 (.039)
U.S.-born Latino	0.077 (.016)	*** (.015)	0.025 (.015)	-0.742 (.021)	*** (.42)	0.074 (.027)
Foreign-born Latino	0.352 (.021)	*** (.020)	-0.252 (.02)	-0.357 (.027)	*** (.525)	0.051 (.033)
Asian	0.305 (.045)	*** (.038)	-0.219 (.041)	1.313 (.083)	*** (1.091)	-0.010 (.068)
Other/multiracial	-0.763 (.036)	*** (.036)	-0.027 (.037)	0.814 (.062)	*** (1.02)	-0.282 (.064)
Age	0.003 (.000)	*** (.000)	0.009 (.000)	0.008 (.001)	*** (.011)	0.006 (.001)
Female	-0.175 (.017)	*** (.015)	0.197 (.016)	-0.712 (.024)	*** (.433)	-0.140 (.027)
Interview in English	-0.140 (.022)	*** (.022)	0.103 (.021)	-0.923 (.042)	*** (.576)	-0.018 (.036)

Independent variable	Dependent variable					
	Dichotomous ^{a,b}			Continuous ^{a,c}		
	(Logistic regression coefficients)			(OLS regression coefficients)		
	Evaluation	Formal neighboring	Informal neighboring	Gave name of neighborhood	Length of residence	Sentiment
Interview in Spanish	0.129 (.023)	*** -0.546 (.022)	*** -0.085 (.022)	*** 0.809 (.042)	*** -2.518 (.592)	0.025 (.037)
Interview in other language	0.254 (.087)	** 0.180 (.075)	*** -0.346 (.085)	*** 13.357 (64.794)	* -5.574 (2.195)	-0.086 (.137)
Married	0.241 (.017)	*** 0.157 (.015)	*** 0.103 (.015)	*** 0.074 (.022)	** 1.121 (.432)	0.098 (.027)
Kids in household	0.047 (.016)	** -0.454 (.015)	*** -0.098 (.015)	*** -0.703 (.021)	*** -7.428 (.393)	*** -0.159 (.026)
Less than high school degree	-0.007 (.016)	*** -0.710 (.016)	*** -0.293 (.016)	*** -0.737 (.021)	*** 0.243 (.433)	*** 0.100 (.027)
High school degree	-0.002 (.017)	*** -0.178 (.016)	*** 0.025 (.016)	*** 0.012 (.023)	*** 0.734 (.452)	* -0.068 (.028)
More than high school degree	0.009 (.016)	*** 0.830 (.015)	*** 0.262 (.015)	*** 0.772 (.024)	* -0.915 (.433)	-0.037 (.027)
Household PCI last year (log) ^d	-0.045 (.003)	*** 0.052 (.003)	*** 0.026 (.003)	*** 0.162 (.005)	*** 0.534 (.079)	0.006 (.005)
Homeowner	0.338 (.016)	*** 0.686 (.015)	*** 0.250 (.015)	*** 0.280 (.021)	*** 11.296 (.369)	*** 0.207 (.026)

Independent variable	Dependent variable					
	Dichotomous ^{a b}			Continuous ^{a c}		
	(Logistic regression coefficients)			(OLS regression coefficients)		
	Evaluation	Formal neighboring	Informal neighboring	Gave name of neighborhood	Length of residence	Sentiment
Economic hardship	-0.245 (.007)	0.049 (.007)	0.047 (.007)	0.117 (.01)	-0.897 (.186)	-0.133 (.012)
Neighborhood disorder	-0.687 (.006)	0.075 (.005)	0.016 (.005)	0.114 (.007)	0.031 (.129)	-0.216 (.007)
Safety concerns	-1.224 (.009)	-0.059 (.006)	-0.161 (.006)	0.013 (.008)	-0.380 (.162)	-0.345 (.008)
Social network	0.037 (.012)	0.063 (.011)	-0.102 (.011)	0.248 (.018)	-2.967 (.301)	-0.055 (.019)

a. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

b. Coefficients for dichotomous dependent variables were calculated using bivariate logistic regression models.

c. Coefficients for continuous dependent variables were calculated using bivariate OLS regression models.

d. PCI = per capita income.

relationship with length of residence). The social network index appears to matter most for length of residence and neighborhood naming. But do these findings hold up when holding other attributes constant?

The results from the multivariate logistic and OLS regression models for each of the six dependent variables are shown in Table 16. Tables 17 and 18 report the same results when separating out responses from the five sites and just San Antonio residents, respectively. Reference categories, or the dummy variables created from a nominal measure with more than two categories that have been withheld from the models, are shown in italics. In the following discussion I highlight the independent factors from Table 16 with a coefficient of .7 or larger (either positive or negative) that is statistically significant at the .001 level. Non-significant or smaller coefficients are discussed when they could have important implications for community outreach efforts and policy interventions. Figure 3 highlights the factors exerting the strongest influence on each component of neighborhood attachment. Factors are listed in descending order of magnitude from top to bottom in each column. Positive influences are denoted with a plus sign (+) and negative influences are followed by a dash (-).

Evaluation

All else being equal, the factor that exerts the largest influence on the likelihood to evaluate one's neighborhood as a good place to raise children is the safety concerns index. A 1-point increase in safety concerns lowers the logged odds of a favorable evaluation by 1.086. In other words, each additional point in the safety concern index reduces the odds of indicating that the neighborhood is a good place to raise children by

Table 16. Regression Models Predicting Components of Neighborhood Attachment for All Sites at Wave 3

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave Name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
<i>Intercept</i>	5.127 *** (.087)	-1.800 *** (.061)	-1.494 *** (.061)	0.117 (.084)	-2.295 (1.215)	4.390 *** (.079)
<i>White (ref)</i>						
Black	-0.126 * (.048)	0.192 *** (.035)	0.779 *** (.034)	1.095 *** (.067)	1.726 * (.74)	-0.026 (.048)
U.S.-born Latino	0.328 *** (.033)	-0.182 *** (.024)	0.063 ** (.024)	-0.605 *** (.035)	6.126 *** (.499)	0.149 *** (.032)
Foreign-born Latino	0.793 *** (.052)	-0.730 *** (.04)	-0.384 *** (.039)	-1.395 *** (.051)	1.590 * (.773)	0.097 (.05)
Asian	0.383 *** (.09)	-0.444 *** (.062)	0.070 (.061)	1.335 *** (.134)	-1.667 (1.258)	-0.044 (.082)
Other/Multiracial	-0.712 *** (.062)	-0.098 * (.05)	0.340 *** (.048)	0.931 *** (.095)	-1.004 (1.032)	-0.085 (.067)
Age	0.012 *** (.001)	0.020 *** (.001)	0.014 *** (.001)	0.002 (.001)	0.350 *** (.016)	0.002 (.001)
<i>Female (ref)</i>						
Male	-0.130 *** (.029)	0.269 *** (.021)	-0.420 *** (.021)	0.466 *** (.035)	-0.579 (.441)	-0.016 (.029)

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave Name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
<i>Interview in English (ref)</i>						
Interview in Spanish	-0.783 *** (.054)	0.492 *** (.041)	0.479 *** (.04)	2.478 *** (.066)	-1.302 (.791)	-0.126 * (.051)
Interview in other language	-0.522 * (.144)	0.824 *** (.103)	-0.135 (.109)	13.185 (107.8)	-1.381 (2.158)	-0.095 (.14)
Married	0.091 * (.031)	0.023 (.023)	0.296 *** (.023)	0.507 *** (.034)	-3.322 *** (.472)	0.037 (.031)
Kids in household	0.053 (.039)	-0.366 *** (.029)	0.057 (.029)	-0.300 *** (.044)	-3.427 *** (.601)	-0.167 *** (.039)
Less than high school degree	-0.351 *** (.034)	-0.327 *** (.026)	-0.193 *** (.025)	-0.286 *** (.036)	0.318 (.511)	0.064 (.033)
<i>High school degree (ref)</i>						
More than high school degree	-0.211 *** (.032)	0.784 *** (.023)	0.170 *** (.023)	0.532 *** (.036)	0.646 (.487)	0.000 (.032)
Household per capita income last year (log)	-0.065 *** (.007)	-0.060 *** (.005)	0.043 *** (.005)	0.112 *** (.008)	-0.783 *** (.104)	-0.019 ** (.007)

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave Name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
Homeowner	0.032 (.03)	0.577 (.022)	0.059 (.022)	-0.116 (.034)	7.144 (.455)	0.060 (.03)
Economic hardship	0.006 (.012)	0.184 (.009)	0.086 (.009)	0.160 (.014)	0.016 (.178)	-0.041 (.012)
Neighborhood disorder	-0.489 (.01)	0.145 (.007)	0.122 (.007)	0.252 (.011)	0.588 (.146)	-0.092 (.009)
Safety concerns	-1.086 (.013)	-0.121 (.009)	-0.242 (.009)	-0.134 (.013)	-0.406 (.182)	-0.296 (.012)
Social network	-0.166 (.018)	0.109 (.014)	-0.101 (.014)	0.323 (.025)	-1.859 (.279)	-0.053 (.018)
<i>F</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	92.050	85.040
<i>R</i> ²	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.431	0.411
-2 log likelihood	64527.125	73596.129	71237.312	40130.825	n/a	n/a
<i>df</i>	19	19	19	19	19	19

a. OLS regression is used to predict the income ratio (log). Logistic regression results for the binary dependent variables.

b. Binary logit regression coefficients are reported for the binary dependent variables.

c. Standard errors are in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 17. Regression Models Predicting Components of Neighborhood Attachment for Five Sites at Wave 3

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
<i>Intercept</i>	5.496 (.119)	-1.532 (.083)	0.545 (.081)	1.631 (.203)	-3.651 (1.306)	3.928 (.087)
<i>White (ref)</i>						
Black	0.083 (.051)	0.151 (.037)	0.558 (.037)	0.417 (.082)	1.291 (.589)	0.006 (.039)
U.S.-born Latino	0.232 (.061)	-0.037 (.047)	0.354 (.045)	1.486 (.164)	2.322 (.734)	0.043 (.049)
Foreign-born Latino	0.700 (.082)	-0.214 (.06)	0.940 (.06)	1.090 (.18)	-0.233 (.935)	0.041 (.062)
Asian	0.465 (.091)	-0.501 (.062)	0.674 (.06)	0.568 (.142)	-1.686 (.961)	0.088 (.064)
Other/Multiracial	-0.575 (.066)	-0.268 (.051)	0.187 (.049)	0.312 (.117)	-1.242 (.803)	-0.048 (.053)
Age	0.003 (.001)	0.014 (.001)	0.001 (.001)	-0.023 (.003)	0.334 (.017)	0.002 (.001)
<i>Female (ref)</i>						
Male	-0.081 (.037)	0.007 (.027)	-0.442 (.027)	-0.009 (.068)	-1.073 (.432)	-0.034 (.029)
<i>Interview in English (ref)</i>						
Interview in Spanish	-0.463 (.085)	0.044 (.062)	0.116 (.062)	-0.232 (.186)	-0.927 (.963)	-0.116 (.064)

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
Interview in other language	-0.400 (.145)	0.785 *** (.102)	-0.612 *** (.099)	14.276 (197.9)	-2.256 (1.613)	-0.001 (.109)
Married	0.084 (.044)	0.126 *** (.031)	0.109 *** (.031)	0.306 *** (.074)	-2.256 *** (.495)	0.025 (.033)
Kids in household	-0.195 *** (.052)	-0.239 *** (.038)	-0.103 ** (.037)	-0.433 *** (.094)	-2.023 *** (.601)	-0.059 (.04)
Less than high school degree	-0.554 *** (.048)	-0.143 *** (.036)	-0.078 * (.035)	0.141 (.073)	0.982 (.557)	-0.040 (.037)
<i>High school degree (ref)</i>						
More than high school degree	-0.096 * (.042)	0.762 *** (.03)	0.123 *** (.03)	1.101 *** (.073)	-0.622 (.48)	-0.001 (.032)
Household per capita income last year (log)	-0.050 *** (.009)	-0.051 *** (.006)	-0.019 ** (.006)	0.099 *** (.016)	-0.498 *** (.101)	0.004 (.007)
Homeowner	0.141 *** (.039)	0.517 *** (.028)	-0.069 * (.028)	0.394 *** (.07)	5.376 *** (.449)	0.092 ** (.03)
Economic hardship	0.088 *** (.015)	0.100 *** (.011)	0.103 *** (.011)	0.152 *** (.029)	-0.078 (.181)	-0.018 (.012)

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
Neighborhood disorder	-0.601 (.014)	0.212 *** (.01)	0.104 *** (.01)	0.182 *** (.024)	0.447 ** (.156)	-0.094 *** (.01)
Safety concerns	-1.007 *** (.017)	-0.097 *** (.012)	-0.277 *** (.012)	0.075 ** (.028)	0.174 (.185)	-0.235 *** (.012)
Social network	-0.348 *** (.024)	-0.043 * (.018)	-0.330 *** (.018)	0.141 ** (.047)	-0.875 ** (.282)	-0.017 (.019)
<i>F</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	46.010	50.010
<i>R</i> ²	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.317	0.337
-2 log likelihood	23054.65	38359.432	39369.277	9139.401	n/a	n/a
<i>df</i>	19	19	19	19	19	19

a. OLS regression is used to predict the income ratio (log). Logistic regression results for the binary dependent variables.

b. Binary logit regression coefficients are reported for the binary dependent variables.

c. Standard errors are in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 18. Regression Models Predicting Components of Neighborhood Attachment for San Antonio at Wave 3

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
<i>Intercept</i>	4.807 (.127)	-2.043 *** (.095)	-0.979 *** (.088)	-0.060 (.11)	5.556 (2.976)	4.328 *** (.167)
<i>U.S.-born Latino (ref)</i>						
Foreign-born Latino	0.486 *** (.061)	-0.924 *** (.05)	0.097 * (.044)	-1.585 *** (.061)	-4.409 ** (1.468)	-0.087 (.083)
Non-Hispanic (of any race)	-.339 *** (.08)	-0.897 *** (.078)	1.614 *** (.064)	-1.994 *** (.079)	-5.079 ** (1.807)	0.126 (.101)
Age	0.023 *** (.002)	0.037 *** (.001)	0.018 *** (.001)	0.016 *** (.002)	0.348 *** (.042)	0.002 (.002)
<i>Female (ref)</i>						
Male	-0.098 (.051)	0.411 *** (.035)	-0.806 *** (.035)	0.385 *** (.047)	0.255 (1.193)	0.056 (.067)
<i>Interview in English (ref)</i>						
Interview in Spanish	-1.127 *** (.075)	0.611 *** (.059)	0.307 *** (.055)	2.447 *** (.087)	-0.521 (1.787)	-0.061 (.101)
Married	0.125 ** (.047)	-0.222 *** (.037)	0.464 *** (.033)	0.417 *** (.044)	-4.327 *** (1.152)	0.075 (.065)
Kids in household	0.522 *** (.064)	-0.658 *** (.047)	0.672 *** (.046)	-0.308 *** (.059)	-4.330 ** (1.569)	-0.194 * (.088)
Less than high school degree	-0.069 (.051)	-0.739 *** (.041)	0.392 *** (.035)	0.060 (.048)	-0.129 (1.206)	0.083 (.068)
<i>High school degree (ref)</i>						
More than high school degree	-0.295 *** (.053)	0.635 *** (.039)	-0.112 ** (.037)	0.116 * (.048)	2.490 (1.297)	0.031 (.073)
Household per capita income last	-0.097 ***	-0.095 ***	0.068 ***	0.008	-1.046 ***	-0.035 *

	Evaluation (Dichotomous)	Formal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Informal neighboring (Dichotomous)	Gave name of neighborhood (Dichotomous)	Length of residence (Continuous)	Sentiment (Continuous)
year (log)	(.012)	(.009)	(.008)	(.011)	(.283)	(.016)
Homeowner	0.011 (.051)	0.475 *** (.038)	0.765 *** (.035)	-0.497 *** (.047)	9.283 *** (1.223)	0.063 (.069)
Economic hardship	-0.136 *** (.018)	0.320 *** (.015)	-0.130 *** (.013)	0.129 *** (.018)	0.148 (.461)	-0.039 (.026)
Neighborhood disorder	-0.345 *** (.013)	0.071 *** (.011)	0.086 *** (.01)	0.194 *** (.014)	0.759 * (.351)	-0.076 *** (.02)
Safety concerns	-1.229 *** (.021)	-0.166 *** (.014)	-0.288 *** (.013)	-0.258 *** (.017)	-0.920 * (.455)	-0.264 *** (.026)
Social network	0.171 *** (.032)	0.133 *** (.022)	-0.067 ** (.021)	0.089 ** (.032)	-2.786 *** (.722)	-0.092 * (.041)
<i>F</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.420	21.950
<i>R</i> ²	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.497	0.444
-2 log likelihood	17069.143	26238.32	30165.246	18310.564	n/a	n/a
<i>df</i>	15	15	15	15	15	15

a. OLS regression is used to predict the income ratio (log). Logistic regression results for the binary dependent variables.

b. Binary logit regression coefficients are reported for the binary dependent variables.

c. Standard errors are in parentheses.

d. Due to the racial and ethnic homogeneity of the San Antonio survey neighborhood, the following independent variables could not be included in the multivariate regression models: White, Black, Asian, Other/multiracial, and Interview in other language. A dummy variable was added to capture all non-Hispanic ethnic and racial identities. No further adjustments were necessary for language because all San Antonio respondents completed the interview in English or Spanish.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.



Figure 3. Factors with Strongest Influences on Neighborhood Attachment for All Sites at Wave 3. Positive influences denoted by a plus sign (+) and blue text. Negative influences denoted by a negative sign (-) and red text.

66%.¹ It is perhaps not surprising that outcomes from a question about raising children are influenced heavily by concerns about safety, particularly when one of the six questions included in the index reads, “My neighborhood is a safe place for children.”

Foreign-born Latinos are significantly more likely to indicate that their neighborhood is suitable for raising children than Whites. Their odds are 1.2 times the odds of reporting a positive evaluation (agreeing that the neighborhood is a good place to raise children) among Whites. Being some other race/multiracial also exerts a significant influence on evaluation, but in the opposite direction: the coefficient of -0.712 translates into a reduction in the odds of reporting a positive evaluation by 51% among other race/multiracial versus White respondents. Finally, having completed the interview in Spanish is associated with a 0.783 decrease in the logged odds of holding a positive evaluation, or a reduction of 54% in the odds.

Formal Neighboring

Three factors stand out as exerting a particularly strong influence on formal neighboring: having completed the interview in a language other than English and Spanish, holding an educational background beyond high school, and being foreign-born Latino. Being an “other language” speaker is associated with a 0.824 increase in the logged odds of engaging in formal neighboring beyond those observed among English speakers. In other words, the odds of formal neighboring are 128% higher for other language speakers than for English speakers. A similar increase is observed among those

1. This is calculated by taking the exponentiated coefficient for safety concerns, 0.338, subtracting 1, and multiplying by 100. See Pampel 2000, pgs. 35-37.

with higher education levels: they are 119% more likely to engage in some form of formal neighboring. Homeownership is also associated with a more significant increase in formal neighboring. Conversely, the odds of engaging in formal neighboring are 52% lower for foreign-born Latinos than Whites. This makes sense, given that engaging in local politics and volunteer activities suggests a level of familiarity or being “plugged in” that may be less common among migrants. A significant decrease in the odds of formal neighboring is also observed among Asians, although the coefficient falls below the .7 threshold established for my analysis (-.444).

Informal Neighboring

The factor which exerts the greatest influence on informal neighboring in the six sites is race. Blacks are 118% more likely to engage in informal interactions with neighbors than Whites. A smaller yet significant increase in the odds of informal neighboring (61%) is associated with speaking Spanish. Factors associated with moderately decreased odds (a reduction of 25% or more) of informal neighboring include being male (-34%) and foreign-born Latino (-32%).

Neighborhood Naming

The last dichotomous dependent variable, measuring the propensity to supply a name for one’s neighborhood, reveals a particularly strong influence by race/ethnicity. All racial/ethnic groups were significantly more (Black, Asian, other/multiracial) or less (foreign-born Latino, U.S.-born Latino) likely to name their neighborhood than Whites at the .001 level. Yet the largest coefficient is associated with having completed the interview in Spanish. The odds of supplying a name for the neighborhood among Spanish-speakers is nearly *11 times* greater than the odds observed among English

speakers. It is interesting that the impact of this factor moves in the opposite direction than the coefficient associated with being foreign-born Latino (-1.395).

Length of Residence

The first OLS regression model accounts for 43% of the variance in the fifth dependent variable, measuring the respondent's tenure in the neighborhood. Not surprisingly, the strongest predictor of this outcome is homeownership. Those households that own or are in the process of buying their home are predicted to have lived in the neighborhood for seven years longer than those who are renting or have other arrangements. In the opposition direction, strong negative effects are associated with having children in the household and being married. There is also a considerable negative influence associated with the strength of one's social network outside the neighborhood. Each additional point on the social network index is associated with a decrease in length of residence by nearly 1.9 years. While less pronounced, household per capita income is also associated with a decrease in neighborhood tenure; for each 1% increase in total household earnings (after adjusting for household size), length of residence decreases by .783 years (about 9 months and 12 days). Combined with the negative influences observed with having children and being married and the positive influence of perceived neighborhood disorder (each additional point on the disorder scale is associated with an increase of roughly 7 months in the length of residence), these findings paint a picture of stability that is in many ways contrary to prevailing expectations among community activists and policymakers. Among these six sites it seems that longstanding residents could be viewed as being "stuck" rather than voluntarily rooted in their neighborhoods.

The impact of race/ethnicity is less pronounced for this measure of neighborhood attachment, with the exception of a strong positive increase of roughly six years associated with being U.S.-born Latino. Readers should be reminded that this is due in large part to the stability of the target neighborhood in San Antonio.

Sentiment

No independent factors yield a coefficient of .7 or larger (in either direction) for sentiment. It seems that the scores on this scale are not significantly influenced by race/ethnicity (with the exception of being U.S.-born Latino), age, sex, or education. The strongest predictor is the safety concerns index, with each additional point associated with a decrease of .296 in the level of sentimental attachment. Small but significant negative influences are also observed for having kids in the household, neighborhood disorder, social networks outside the neighborhood, economic hardship, and household per capita income.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

In this chapter I revisit my research questions to elaborate on the findings from the quantitative analysis of the wave 3 Making Connections Survey data.

R₁: Are there differences in the degree of neighborhood attachment expressed by native-born and foreign-born Latinos?

H₁: U.S.-born Latinos will exhibit lower overall levels of attachment to their neighborhoods than foreign-born Latinos.

My first objective for this research was to investigate whether there are significant differences in the levels of neighborhood attachment among U.S.-born and foreign-born Latinos. I hypothesized that U.S.-born Latinos would exhibit lower overall levels of attachment. My findings from Tables 12-14 and the multivariate models suggest that this is true for evaluation and neighborhood naming: foreign-born Latinos were more likely than U.S.-born Latinos to indicate that their neighborhood was suitable for raising children and more frequently provided a name for their neighborhood during the interview. Tables 13 and 14 reveal that the latter must be peeled back further. When the responses from San Antonio residents are excluded, we find that there is a site effect influencing the results for neighborhood naming. While the overwhelming majority of both groups named their neighborhoods with language that was recognizable to NORC coders, U.S.-born Latinos were 3% more likely to do so (97% versus 94% among

foreign-born Latinos). The trend suggesting that foreign-born Latinos have more positive evaluations of their neighborhoods holds up when breaking out the San Antonio responses, and when controlling for other factors in the multivariate logistic regression model (see Table 16).

My hypothesis proved incorrect for three other aspects of neighborhood attachment: formal and informal neighboring activities and length of residence.¹ There were no real differences in levels of sentimental attachment between U.S.-born and foreign-born Latinos in any combination of the sites. Taken with the findings for evaluation, formal and informal neighboring, neighborhood naming, and length of residence, this suggests that the levels of attachment vary across the six components. Those Latinos born in the U.S. do indeed engage more frequently in formal and informal neighboring activities, and are more likely to report a recognizable name for their neighborhood, but they are slightly less optimistic about whether their neighborhood is a good place to raise children. Further discussion is devoted to each component of neighborhood attachment below.

Evaluation

In the final OLS model, both U.S.-born and immigrant Latinos are predicted to be more likely to offer a positive evaluation of their neighborhood as a place to raise children than Whites, but the coefficient for the latter is about twice the size of the

1. Note again that the longstanding residence of U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio inflates the median residence for this group overall. When San Antonio is excluded, the medians for these groups are equivalent (see Table 13).

former. Tables 13-14 indicate that this trend holds up even after separating out San Antonio residents. And while U.S.-born Latinos in the survey neighborhoods had higher household incomes, more education, and were more likely to own or be in the process of buying their home than foreign-born Latinos, they reported higher level of neighborhood disorder and were slightly more concerned about safety in the neighborhood (see Table 9). While it is not possible to extrapolate this finding to all Latinos living in low-income urban areas, it is in keeping with observations of declining optimism among second generation immigrants due to segmented assimilation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). The theory of segmented assimilation attempts to explain the process through which intergenerational migration produces different outcomes due to social stratification. If assimilation theory accounted for the success of European immigrants in fusing with the American mainstream during the “First Great Wave” of immigration between roughly 1850 and 1930, segmented assimilation describes the *absence* of upward mobility across generations of several new immigrant groups. The groups that most aptly follow this model are those considered “black” in North America² or hail from a socioeconomically disadvantaged position in their country of origin (Alba 1999, 18). Persistent residential segregation renders them more likely than Whites to experience prolonged exposure to racism in the U.S. (Massey and Denton 1993), as in the U.K. and many other parts of the world (Astell-Burt 2011).

2. Alba notes that segmented assimilation is not necessarily limited to black migrants and has in fact been observed among some Mexican Americans by Matute-Bianchi (1991).

One question in the survey allows for a rudimentary test of this theory among Latinos in the *Making Connections* sample. 2.6h in the main questionnaire asks, on a six-point scale ranging from “very rare” to “very common,” how frequently “racial incidents” occur in the neighborhood. If a respondent felt that racial incidents did not occur in the neighborhood, the interviewer recorded a 0. After examining the distribution of responses to this question, I recoded them into a new dichotomous variable with those who answered 0 or 1 (“does not occur” or “very rare, respectively) set to equal 0 and values greater than or equal to 2 set to equal 1. Segmented assimilation theory would predict that Latinos born in the U.S. would be more likely to have experienced racial discrimination and may thus be primed to perceive racial tensions in their neighborhood. Weitzer and Tuch (2002) have found that perceived personal experience with racial profiling is one of the strongest predictors of attitudes toward the police. This is particularly consequential for Black men. Among those ages 18 to 34, a remarkable 73% indicated that they had been subjected to racial profiling at least once. This is associated with a pronounced racial gap in attitudes about the police, with African Americans being consistently more likely to perceive racial profiling as a widespread problem. Adegbenbo et al (2006) report evidence of a similar correlation between experiences of racial prejudice and distrust for the healthcare system. However, in a later article, Weitzer and Tuch (2005) find that Hispanics differ significantly from Blacks in their perceptions of racialized policing. While a majority of Hispanics felt that the police provided poorer service to black and Hispanic neighborhoods (as compared to White neighborhoods), Blacks were 17% more likely to believe that Hispanic neighborhoods were treated unfavorably (107).

Roughly a quarter of all respondents reported some amount of racial incidents occurring in their neighborhood. U.S.-born Latinos were about 3% more likely than immigrant Latinos to report this, though the difference was not statistically significant when including all six sites ($t\text{ value}=-1.19$, $P=.236$). Interestingly, when examining Latinos outside of San Antonio, the difference becomes much more pronounced and statistically significant, with 40% of native-born Latinos reporting racial incidents versus 22% of foreign-born Latinos ($t\text{ value}=-5.67$, $P<.0001$). It makes sense that the racial and ethnic homogeneity of the San Antonio neighborhood (and overwhelming presence of Hispanics in the greater San Antonio region) would decrease the preponderance of racial tension, and this is supported by the fact that only 17% of all San Antonio Latinos reported racial incidents occurring in their neighborhood versus 28% of Latino respondents in the other sites. This echoes findings from studies of ethnic density, racism, and health in the U.K. Using data from the Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities and the 1991 UK Census, Bécarras et al (2009) observe a lower prevalence of racism in ethnically dense areas and suggest that the negative influence of racism on self-reported health may be lessened as ethnic density increases. Yet authors employing regression analyses with survey data alone have had difficulty accounting for the *processes* through which the presence of same-group social support among neighbors shapes one's attachment to a particular place. To date authors have typically stopped at acknowledging the considerable variation in the extent to which individuals perceive their neighborhoods as communities with the potential to improve or empower residents (Warren and Warren 1977, Hays and Kogl, 2007).

Another possible explanation is offered by Portes and Zhou (1993), who suggest that immigrant groups facing severe discrimination in the U.S. are likely to exhibit *reactive ethnicity*, or a defensive reaffirmation of one's ethnic distinctiveness. The second generation is thought to then adopt an "adversarial stance" toward white America similar to that observed among poor native-born blacks and some Hispanics (192). This population has also been said to hold the key to discovering the future of immigrant integration and more broadly, the contours of our ethno-racial landscape (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, Levitt and Waters 2002). Compelling evidence presented by Waters (2001) and Portes and Rumbaut (2001) demonstrates how migrant trajectories in the current American context are inextricably tied to the dynamics of racial and ethnic stratification and thus by marked differences in intergenerational mobility. While the main focus of my research is to examine the influence of native- versus foreign-born origin on neighborhood attachment as mediated by various individual-level and household-level factors, it is important to consider the structural factors like racial and ethnic stratification which position Latinos to experience their neighborhoods in particular ways. However, the findings from the in-depth interviews discussed in Chapters 7 and 8 suggest that universal theories about generational differences in the effect of perceptions of crime and disorder on neighborhood attachment are not easily applied in West Side.

Formal Neighboring

The OLS coefficients suggest that foreign-born Latinos are among the least likely to engage in formal neighboring activities, including speaking with local political officials or religious leaders about neighborhood problems, doing volunteer work in the

neighborhood, or serving on a committee for a local organization. This effect holds after controlling for other demographic and economic factors. At the opposite end of the spectrum, nearly 44% of Blacks reported engaging in one or more of these activities (Table 12). Given the small percentage of residents who typically participate in community organizations or other community improvement efforts and the fact that sustained involvement is rare (Hay and Kogl 2007, Small 2004), it makes sense that groups whose roots in a given location extend less than one generation would have more limited access to the types of social capital that ease entry into these activities. Organized mobilization requires that individuals are “plugged in” to some extent – that is, that they have exposure to the communication of local concerns and information about local actors. Mobilization around local issues also tends to be sporadic, in response to a perceived threat to individual and/or group interests (von Hoffman 1994, 248). The infrequent engagement reported by foreign-born Latinos may actually speak to their more positive characterization of neighborhood conditions and less perceived need for involvement (see Tables 9-11). Additionally, the legal ramifications associated with many forms of immigrant status, such as being undocumented, having entered the U.S. with a temporary tourist or employment-based visa, or attempting to sponsor the lawful entry of a family member, presents considerable demands in terms of time and money that may detract from migrants’ ability to get involved in local organizations when problems arise. 29% of foreign-born Latinos across all sites reported that they were

citizens of the U.S. Of the 71% who said they were not a citizen, just under half (46%) had come to the U.S. with a green card (as a permanent resident) and 51% had some “other” status.³ The latter could include those holding temporary visas as well as those who entered the U.S. illegally. Without the safety net of citizenship, immigrants may be sympathetic to the concerns of community leaders and organizers but lack the time and energy to participate in collective activities.

Informal Neighboring

Informal neighboring has attracted sustained interest from social scientists because it provides a key arena for the transfer of social capital, that is, connections, norms, and trust that facilitate collaboration for mutual benefit. Numerous studies have demonstrated that “life is easier in a community blessed with a substantial stock of social capital” (Putnam 1995, 2). Informal neighboring is a particularly important component of communal attachment for low-income populations in that it is more accessible to those facing harsh material constraints than formal neighborhood engagement and requires less insider knowledge. A newcomer may greet a neighbor from his or her porch or attend a block party, with little or no preparation and without financial cost. Small’s (2009) research with mothers of children attending childcare centers in New York City suggests that even weak ties or acquaintanceships between neighbors may be effective in transferring information, and that stronger social ties provide social support and foster trust (113). Carol Stack’s landmark book *All Our Kin* (1974) demonstrates the palpable

3. A final 3% had entered as refugees.

influence of social ties in providing daily childcare in a poor urban setting. Edin and Lein (1997) also studied low-income mothers in four cities and found that behind paid and informal work, their second main strategy for making ends meet was to get cash assistance through social networks.

When considering the transfer of non-financial help like babysitting, lending household items, and giving rides, informal neighboring demonstrates how households in the postindustrial labor market are responding to the increasing scarcity of stay-at-home parents (specifically mothers). In a small study of residents in the small industrial city of Waterloo, Iowa (n=70), Hays and Kogl found evidence of frequent informal interactions with neighbors. 50% had given or received help with a task in the last month, 42% had watched a neighbor's house, and 40% had borrowed a tool. Yet only 33% of *Making Connections* respondents overall had reported engaging in similar activities, and the figure fell to around 28% among foreign-born Latinos and Asians. It should be noted that Hays and Kogl's analysis also included more casual exchanges like engaging in small talk or discussing (but not necessarily acting on) a neighborhood problem with neighbors. These exchanges are not directly targeted by questions in the *Making Connections* survey but may present a critical source of neighborhood identification and collective trust.

As noted by Hansen (2005), recent national quantitative studies have contradicted earlier qualitative studies in showing that individuals in the middle class are more likely to have stronger domestic care networks than those living in poverty or working class conditions. Hansen also notes an ironic shift in the value judgments that have been attached to these stronger networks: "the connectedness of middle-class families," she writes, is "taken to be a marker of health and vibrancy...Poor, working-class, and

racial/ethnic communities continue to be seen as aberrant, but now by a new norm [of isolation and social deprivation]” (11). The equally-low levels of informal neighboring among foreign-born Latinos and Asians in the *Making Connections* neighborhoods seem to suggest polar interpretations, as the former have the lowest percentage of female employment across racial/ethnic groups (44%) and the latter have the highest, at nearly 71% (as measured by the current status of the respondent). This bifurcation carries into the regression models. When controlling for education, household income, economic hardship, and other factors, the influence of being Asian on the propensity to engage in informal neighboring becomes insignificant while being foreign-born Latino continues to exert a negative influence, with a coefficient of $-.384$. An interesting nuance is that having completed the interview in Spanish has the opposite effect: it has a positive coefficient of $.479$. With the exception of Blacks, the results in Table 12 are somewhat consistent with Hansen’s summary of recent national findings. Two thirds of *Making Connections* respondents do *not* appear to be “clambering to assemble networks out of necessity” (12) based on this limited set of survey items. A crude reading of this finding evokes the image of an increasingly isolated American family cast by Putnam (2000) and by Gould Ellen and O’Flaherty (2007), who observes: “Americans are sharing goods much less than they used to. They are preparing meals for smaller groups...[and] the average refrigerator, furnace, stove, television set, and security alarm are used by fewer people than was the case a generation ago” (389). This again raises questions about the frequency and social significance of episodic, casual verbal exchanges with neighbors in poor communities with large foreign-born populations. These exchanges are not directly targeted in the survey. How are norms of reciprocity negotiated when structural factors

(e.g. the increasing dependence on female labor in the American workforce) or material conditions constrain one's ability to return favors? How important are "horizontal ties," as compared to "vertical ties" (Putnam 1995) that yield increased political and economic capital, for low-income Latinos and other minority groups? These questions require further investigation through qualitative methods and will be discussed further in Chapters 7 and 8.

The Religious Element

While the overall trends in informal neighboring suggest engagement by only a third of respondents, one component of the informal neighboring index item merits disaggregation. This measure gauges attendance at religious services. Putnam (1995) and many others have argued that religion continues to serve as a primary vehicle for building communal trust and collaboration between co-residents (see also Small 2009, 202). Despite declining rates of regular church attendance, Americans are still more likely to engage in religious affiliations than any other form of association (Chaves 2004, Putnam 1995). Nearly 70% of respondents in the 2010 General Social Survey, a national survey of adults conducted by NORC since 1972, reported attending religious services at least once or twice a year.⁴ Religious organizations are particularly important for encouraging civic engagement among low-income communities (Wuthnow 2001). Of the *Making Connections* respondents surveyed in these six sites, 62% indicated that they attended

4. National Data Program for the Social Sciences: Codes for the Spring 1970-2010 Surveys. Available online at http://publicdata.norc.org:41000/gss/documents//BOOK/GSS_Codebook_mainbody.pdf.

religious services and 31% did so inside their neighborhood. My qualitative research in San Antonio suggests that church may hold even greater significance among residents in West Side: 24 out of 33 of the in-depth interview respondents were members at a church within the neighborhood (as they defined it).⁵ This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 8.

Neighborhood Naming

Individuals exert agency in constructing their own sense of place and attaching that place to their social identity (Coulton et al 2011, Stedman 2002). In the early words of Gans (1926), “It is because communication is fundamental to the existence of society that geography...may be said to enter into its structure and organization at all” (14-15). Groups who share strong local ties are generally apt to supply a specific name for their neighborhood. Taylor, Gottfredson, and Shumaker (1984) found that among residents in 66 Baltimore neighborhoods, communities in which respondents held positive evaluations about the future of their neighborhood had higher rates of neighborhood naming. Some scholars, particularly geographers and city planners, have suggested that ecological factors such as the distinctiveness of street layouts contribute to the “nameability” of a neighborhood (for example, see Ross 1962). Local groups also play an important role in increasing awareness of a particular locale (Festinger, Schachter, and Back, 1950; cited in Taylor et al 1984). Conversely, Hunter (1974) demonstrated that

5. Three respondents explicitly stated that their church was located outside of West Side. The location of the respondent’s church was unclear in five interviews.

newcomers have trouble describing their surrounding landscape and provide narrow definitions of their communities.

There appears to be a site effect influencing the results for neighborhood naming among *Making Connections* participants. The logistic regression results suggest that being foreign-born Latino, U.S.-born Latino, and having done the interview in Spanish are all associated with decreased odds of providing a recognized name for one's neighborhood. But Table 13 reveals that Latinos in the five sites other than San Antonio more closely mirrored other racial/ethnic groups in their propensity to provide a name for their neighborhood. In fact, all but 3% of U.S.-born Latinos and 6% of foreign-born Latinos provided a name. Neighborhood naming among U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio, like in other sites, was more common than among foreign-born Latinos (67% versus 55%, respectively). Yet the rates of supplying a name are consistently lower in San Antonio than in all other sites across racial/ethnic groups. To further investigate the comparatively low levels of neighborhood naming among U.S.- and foreign-born Latinos in San Antonio, in Table 19 I report change in the naming variable between waves 2 and 3 of the survey. Note that this includes respondents who participated in both waves and remained within the boundaries of the survey neighborhood at wave 3. The term "unlearned" is used to indicate that the respondent provided a recognized name for the neighborhood in wave 2, but did not do so in wave 3. "Learned" indicates that the respondent did not provide a recognized name for the neighborhood in wave 2, but did so in wave 3. This terminology should be taken with a grain of salt. Respondents may have reasons for not naming or naming their neighborhood that are not related to learning or acculturation.

Table 19. Percent Change in Neighborhood Naming between Waves 2 and 3 by Race/ethnicity for All Sites (Weighted)

Variable	Total	White (non-Latino)		Black		U.S.-born Latino		Foreign-born Latino		Asian		Other/multiracial	
"Unlearned" name	4.5		1.5	4.5		8.6		3.6		0.7		0.0	
No change	82.0		90.5	85.1		73.2		74.2		95.0		89.7	
"Learned" name	13.5		8.0	10.4		18.2		22.2		4.4		10.3	
n (unweighted)	1,215		443	283		234		130		62		63	

The longitudinal data suggest that the salience of neighborhood names is more in flux among Latinos than among other groups. While 22% of foreign-born and 18% of U.S.-born Latinos “learned” the name of their neighborhood in wave 3, nearly 9% of the latter “unlearned” the name. When we remove the respondents from San Antonio, the responses from U.S. born Latinos become much more stable (see Table 20). This further suggests that there is something unique about the experiences of U.S.-born Latinos in that site. Yet the trend of “learning” the neighborhood name among foreign-born Latinos holds up. 17% did not provide a recognizable neighborhood name in wave 2, but did so in wave 3. Finally, Table 21 displays the change in neighborhood naming in just San Antonio. We still see about a fifth of foreign-born Latinos “learning” the neighborhood name, but the distribution among U.S.-born Latinos is unlike the distribution for any other group. More are found to have changed responses than not. It is particularly curious that over a quarter had previously provided a recognized name for their neighborhood but did not do so in wave 3. It is worth acknowledging that were there some minor methodological differences in the coding of the neighborhood name data from wave 2. Names of subdivisions, apartment complexes, streets, etc., as well as names in Spanish, seem to have been coded as invalid (999) frequently in wave 2 but less so in wave 3. But this would actually have the effect of exaggerating the “learned” figures, and would have had the same effect across all sites and racial groups. So this does not explain the unlearning among U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio. Closer inspection reveals that among those San Antonio residents who remained in the neighborhood at wave 3, those who were classified as having failed to provide a neighborhood name were generally coded as such because they said the neighborhood did

Table 20. Percent Change in Neighborhood Naming between Waves 2 and 3 by Race/ethnicity for Five Sites (Weighted)

Variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
"Unlearned" name	1.8	1.5	3.6	1.2	1.8	0.7	0.0
No change	89.3	90.3	87.3	96.3	81.1	95.0	88.2
"Learned" name	8.9	8.2	9.2	2.5	17.1	4.4	11.8
n (unweighted)	1,046	439	280	101	103	62	61

Table 21. Percent Change in Neighborhood Naming between Waves 2 and 3 by Race/ethnicity for San Antonio (Weighted)

Variable	Total	White (non-Latino)	Black	U.S.-born Latino	Foreign-born Latino	Asian	Other/multiracial
"Unlearned" name	8.9	n/a	n/a	25.9	9.6	n/a	n/a
No change	70.1	n/a	n/a	37.5	70.0	n/a	n/a
"Learned" name	21.0	n/a	n/a	36.6	20.4	n/a	n/a
n (unweighted)	169	n/a	n/a	133	27	n/a	n/a

a. "Unlearned" indicates that the respondent provided a recognized name for the neighborhood in wave 2, but did not do so in wave 3.

"Learned" indicates that the respondent did not provide a recognized name for the neighborhood in wave 2, but did so in wave 3.

Respondents may have reasons for not naming or naming their neighborhood that are not related to learning and/or acculturation.

not have a name rather than calling it something outside the standard code frame. In Chapter 8 I share findings from the in-depth interviews in San Antonio which shed light on some of the geographical nuances of this site that seem to discourage the identification of mutually exclusive, distinct neighborhoods.

Length of Residence

As observed by R.D. McKenzie in 1926, fluidity, or the range of spatial opportunity for movement, is often inversely related with mobility, the frequency of relocation. Residents of low income urban areas are predicted to “come and go in continuous succession” but stay within smaller geographic boundaries than residents of high-income areas (included in Burgess 1971, 170). In past work my co-author and I have found that among wave 3 *Making Connections* respondents in Denver, Des Moines, Indianapolis, San Antonio and White Center, stability is highest in San Antonio, the largest site in terms of neighborhood size (Bachtell and Latterner 2011). The San Antonio target neighborhood, West Side, covers 24.4 square miles versus an overall average of 6.7 miles for the other four sites. This finding holds when adding in the last two *Making Connections* sites, Providence and Louisville, and upon examining households with and without children separately (Hayes and Kingsley 2012). 63% of San Antonio respondents had not moved in the past three years, and among those who had moved, relocation from outside the county was extremely rare (2.4% versus 11.5% among all sites). Despite the proximity of San Antonio to Mexico, transnational migration was rarely reported (less than 1% of moves). This site has the highest rate of home ownership and, as mentioned previously, the population is distinct in that it is largely Hispanic and U.S.-born.

In my OLS regression model predicting length of residence, homeownership remains the strongest predictor after controlling for other factors. Being a homeowner is associated with an increase of roughly 7 years in neighborhood tenure. The influence of race and ethnicity is washed out with the exception of being U.S.-born Latino, which is associated with an increase of roughly 6 years. In San Antonio the influence of homeownership is nearly double the magnitude of the influence observed in the other five sites. As shown in Table 18, San Antonio homeowners are predicted to report an additional 9 years (approximately) of residence in the neighborhood. The impact of origin among Latinos in San Antonio is also more in line with theoretical expectations that foreign-born migrants will be newer to the neighborhood than those born in the U.S.; the difference shown in Table 18 is roughly four and a half years ($P=0.003$). Note that the reference category for the race/ethnicity variable in Table 18 is U.S.-born Latino instead of White – unlike in previous tables – due to the small number of non-Hispanics in the San Antonio neighborhood. The importance of homeownership for promoting longstanding communal ties will be discussed further in Chapter 10.

Sentiment

Research by Venkatesh (2000) and Gregory (1998) highlights the emotional attachments that people develop to their neighborhoods. Venkatesh cites the work of Henri Lefebvre, who coined the term *social space* to emphasize the process through which individuals *produce* meaningful zones with which to identify through their everyday interactions. Lefebvre argued that space is a social construction and endorsed a methodological approach that focuses on the processes of production. Venkatesh describes how even within housing developments, tenants further differentiated

themselves in relation to their specific building or floor and described these sub-spaces in more personal terms (38-39).

Predicting sentimental attachments to the neighborhood proved difficult using the *Making Connections* Survey data. Mean scores in the sentiment index did not vary much by racial and ethnic category and no independent variables in the OLS regression model were associated with a significant coefficient greater than .7 in either direction. Safety concerns had the strongest effect, with a coefficient of -.296. Having kids in the household had a more modest but still significant negative effect, and being U.S.-born Latino was associated with an increase of .149 in the sentiment score. An interesting finding to be discussed in Chapter 8 is that safety concerns among Latinos in West Side did not seem to preclude them from expressing positive views of their neighborhood in comparison to others during the in-depth interviews. Coupled with the absence of strong predictors in the regression model for sentiment, this suggests that feelings about the closeness of a neighborhood are highly complex and may be driven by other factors not yet accounted for.

R₂: To what extent is the impact of native- versus foreign-born origin mediated by social networks?

H₂: When economic factors and social interaction are considered, the effect of origin will disappear.

My second research question involved assessing the degree to which the impact of U.S.- versus foreign-born origin is mediated by social networks. I expected that the effect of origin would be negated when controlling for economic factors and the strength of social connections outside of the neighborhood. The coefficients in Table 16 suggest that

origin continues to exert some influence on five of the six forms of neighborhood attachment (all but sentiment) after adding these controls; however, the direction of the influence is generally the same for both groups. The big exception is length of residence, with U.S.-born Latinos having much longer tenures than Whites while foreign-born Latinos tend to be much newer to their neighborhoods.

R₃: What role does interaction through formal and informal networks play in shaping residents' perceptions of their community?

H₃: Interaction through social networks will be the most powerful predictor of neighborhood attachment.

While limitations in question wording constrained my ability to parse out social connections that respondents had outside of the neighborhood, my expectation that the measure such networks would be the strongest predictor of neighborhood attachment did not ring true in the multivariate models. While the coefficients associated with the social network measure for formal neighboring, informal neighboring, neighborhood naming, and length of residence were all significant at the .001 level after controlling for all other factors, their influence was surpassed by another factor in all categories.

My final two research questions are best explored using qualitative methods. They are as follows:

R₄: What are the particular resources – material, emotional, or otherwise - that Latinos derive through social networks?

R_{4a}: Through what processes are the particular resources – material, emotional, or otherwise - that Latinos derive through social networks transferred?

In the following chapter I review the methods employed for the second component of my research involving in-depth interviews with a subset of wave 3 *Making Connections* Survey respondents in San Antonio, TX. I then share findings from the in-depth interviews. In Chapter 9 I return to these research questions and discuss the implications of the in-depth findings for understanding neighborhood attachment among Latinos in low-income communities.

CHAPTER SEVEN

METHODS AND DATA FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

It is difficult to understand the emotional significance of resident experiences with survey data alone. A mixed method design is advantageous for gathering more detailed contextual information that can be combined and contrasted with quantitative findings. Speaking in depth with past survey respondents in San Antonio proved crucial for developing a richer understanding of the processes influencing Latinos' communal attachments and the narratives they use to describe their neighborhood. The goal was not to buttress support for generalizable "truths" about all Latinos living in low-income areas, but to gain a deeper understanding of the historical, behavioral, and social factors at work in this particular site.

Background: San Antonio Survey Neighborhood

My decision to focus on residents living on the west side of San Antonio was influenced by two factors. First, this site had the largest proportion of Latino respondents from which to draw a subsample for the in-depth interviews. Second, as will be discussed further in this section, Mexican culture and the Spanish language are integral elements of West Side's local history. Unlike the survey neighborhoods in Providence and Denver, the Hispanic population in San Antonio is much more homogenous; residents are almost exclusively of Mexican and Mexican-American descent. The area is unique, even among other predominately Latino cities in the southwest, in that so many

Latino families have roots in the area extending back multiple generations. One limitation of focusing on this site is that it affords limited information about the experiences of Hispanic immigrants from other Latin American countries and transnational migration patterns outside of Mexico. I found these limitations to be offset by the richness of Mexican culture and the ubiquity of Spanish influences in West Side.

San Antonio had the largest population increase between 2000 and 2010 among the top ten most populous U.S. cities.¹ It now stands behind Phoenix as the nation's seventh largest city (Census 2010). San Antonio has experienced marked sprawl as families are attracted by lower housing prices, larger lots, and new schools in adjacent and "fringe" suburbs. Data from the 2010 Census suggest continuing population shift away from the inner city to the tune of nearly 8,000 residents (a 3% loss) toward the north and west suburbs. To the frustration of city leaders, "... the siren song of the outlying suburbs remains irresistible" (Tedesco et al 2011, 1). Roughly half of the inner city population² (more than 133,000 people) lives within the survey neighborhood, West Side (Wilson and Saasta 2005). As mentioned earlier, West Side stands apart from the other sites in that it is almost entirely homogenous in ethno-racial terms. West Side is a historically Hispanic neighborhood. In 1998 all but 6% of West Side residents identified as Hispanic and 9 out of 10 were of Mexican origin (Brischetto et al 2000, 3). It has been referred to as the "cultural epicenter for Mexican immigrants in San Antonio" (18). The

1. <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-01.pdf>

2. Based on Census 2000 data.

larger migration trends at the city level are also observable within the west side, as gentrification and increasing social mobility among Hispanics is drawing the population toward Northwest Side areas (Tedesco et al 2011).

Aside from being predominately Mexican American, the most pronounced characteristics of the survey neighborhood in San Antonio are its low education levels and high unemployment rates. President Roosevelt selected West Side to become the location of one of the nation's first public housing developments in 1939, and as of 1995 it remained the 11th poorest neighborhood in the country (Brischetto et al 2000, 1; Tatum 1998, 6). Residents today are overwhelmingly poor. According to 2008 data, the median income for West Side families is \$25,000 and one child in three lives below the federal poverty level of \$21,200 for a family of four³ (Wilson and Saastad 2008). A third of working-age males (16-64) and 49% of working-age women were without jobs in 2008 (Wilson and Saastad 2008), and these rates are likely to have increased further since the 2008 national economic collapse. Kelly Air Force Base, a major source of jobs in San Antonio and one of the U.S. Air Force's first facilities, was deemed to have "excess capacity" and was closed in 1995.⁴ Some military activities were transferred in 2001 to Lackland Air Force Base and the new Port San Antonio, a 1,900 acre complex that is home to an industrial airport, railport, and commercial lease space.⁵ Another contributor

3. 23 January 2008. *Federal Register* 73(15): pp. 3971–3972. Retrieved from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/08poverty.shtml>.

4. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/kelly.htm>.

5. <http://www.portsanantonio.us/StoreImages/collateral/kellyfield-pg1-2-compact.pdf>.

to job losses has been the departure of manufacturing employers from the West Side area of San Antonio, as in the closing of the Levi Strauss plant in 2003 (preceded by large-scale layoffs in 1990 and 1999). The expansion of the tourist and healthcare industries has not reached West Side, as it has other parts of San Antonio. West Side commerce today is comprised mainly of small strip malls, convenience stores, and restaurants. Certain enclaves within West Side benefit from university resources, as in the area surrounding St. Mary's University, or renewed commercial interest from city partners, as in the blocks adjacent to the Guadalupe Cultural Arts Center and other businesses on Guadalupe Street.

Family demographics in West Side are also unique. West Side households are twice as likely to have children as the average household in San Antonio (36). Brischetto et al (2000) report that "A majority of children under age 6 who live in the West Side corridor area are growing up in single-parent households and two in five of their parents are not in the labor force" (3). In the West Side Corridor area, which includes eight census tracts in the center core of West Side, the percentage of births to teenage mothers is 3.7 times the percentage among all births in the city (7% and 26%, respectively) (32). The West Side school district reports standardized test scores below state averages and the nearby Edgewood district witnessed a 13% decline in enrollment from 1990 to 2000 (8, 12). Today, less than half of residents age 25 or older in the West Side neighborhood graduated college. Only 4% hold a college degree.

In terms of infrastructure and public amenities, the city of San Antonio has struggled to elevate standards in old neighborhoods in West Side to match those of newer areas on the south and north sides. Residents commonly complain of damaged roads,

insufficient traffic signage, drainage issues and flooding, and illegal dumping (City of San Antonio Planning Department 2004). Two noticeable improvements have included the installation of sidewalks and curbs along many streets and the expansion of trash collection services. Another shift has involved the depopulation of city-run public housing developments into private Section 8 housing. The demand for properties accepting Section 8 housing assistance exceeds the supply (Brischetto et al 2000, 31).

Despite this generally depressed economic and educational profile, a paradoxical feature of West Side is that homeownership rates are relatively high (Brischetto et al 2000). Many families who would be priced out of suburban areas are able to afford homes in West Side, where there is an ample stock of homes built before the seventies. The Westside Development Corporation (WDC) estimated that the median home value within its territory, which is bordered by Cincinnati Avenue to the north, Highway 90 West to the south, 36th Street to the west and IH-35 to the east,⁶ was just \$49,432 (Nivin et al 2008, 3). Implications of the affordability of housing in the area will be discussed further in Chapter 10.

Community Resources

While poor in most economic terms, the supply of organizational and community-building resources in San Antonio survey neighborhood is robust. In 2000 there were more than 112 social service agencies operating more than 250 programs in the area (Brischetto et al 2000, 1). The majority of these agencies provide educational and job

6. <http://www.sanantonio.gov/news/NewsReleases/nrWestsideDevCorp.asp?res=1440&ver=true>

training or job placement services. They provide critical opportunities to establish professional connections and acquire social capital, considering that one in four households in West Side do not have access to a vehicle and the immediate area is void of any dominant employer or industry (Brischetto et al 2000, 20). Early efforts to establish collaborations with community members for *Making Connections* were facilitated by existing partnerships through the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) network, which operated in 26 sites in San Antonio and Bexar County in 2011.⁷ There are nine Head Start locations on the West Side and three four-year colleges (Brischetto et al 2000, 5, 16). The Westside Education & Training Center (WETC) offers post-secondary programming in the areas of general computer literacy and office skills, specialized jobs in the water treatment, manufacturing and healthcare fields, and courses for college credit. Staff members also help address the logistical demands of entering the labor force by distributing vouchers for business clothes and gas money. WETC spans 31,000 square feet and had enrolled 2,000 students in its first two years (Wilson 2008). The Neighborhood Place-Edgewood (NP-E, or El Hogar de Los Vecinos in Spanish) also provides an expansive space for training, counseling, meetings, and recreation. When I visited the NP-E in the late summer of 2008 as part of a training session for NORC field interviewers, the walls of one room were decorated with streamers and colorful signs that read “Dance Therapy!” The sound of basketballs being dribbled emanated from the gym.

7. Muñoz, Henrietta. 26 October 2011. Presentation at Local Management Entity (LME) Convening. Denver, CO. Also see <http://www.vitasa.org/>.

Another, highly-visible community resource in West Side is the San Antonio Food Bank (SAFB). It is the 14th largest food bank in the United States and can be seen for miles along Highway 151 and Old Highway 90. In 2010 SAFB received over 44 million tons of donated food and made distributions to more than 500 agencies throughout southwest Texas.⁸ SAFB was recently featured on the Bravo network's popular cooking competition show "Top Chef Texas." A picture of SAFB is included in Appendix E.

Faith-based organizations also have a very strong presence in the neighborhood. "When people of the West Side are asked 'Where do you live?' the response is frequently a parish name" (Brischetto et al 2000, 47). Parishes are also credited with administering some of the most effective delivery of family-based services. Catholicism dominates, with the Roman Catholic Church represented by 22 congregations (Wilson and Saasta 2005, 2). A review of the local history reveals that faith-based engagement in the area is not new. In the 1970s Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) and the affiliated Metro Alliance (METRO) mobilized millions of dollars for streets and sanitation projects, libraries and other school improvements, and housing loans (7). The organizational strength of Roman Catholic Parishes in West Side was a driving force in the formation of COPS by the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF). IAF is the flagship national community organizing network started by Chicagoan Saul Alinsky, generally regarded as the founder of "street smart" community organizing. Now one of the largest

8. <http://www.safoodbank.org/index.php/info/about-us>

and most celebrated neighborhood-based organizations, COPS continues to advocate for the day-to-day needs of poor and working class Mexican-Americans in San Antonio and has infused more than a billion dollars into its neighborhoods (Warren 2001, 4). Among its ranks are nine of the ten parishes located in the West Side corridor area (Brischetto et al 2000, 44). On September 16, 2005, 91 businesses, religious and community organizations, and schools participated in West Side Alive!, a block party that attracted approximately 800 visitors. In 2005 the celebration was extended over a period of two weeks (Wilson and Saasta 2005, 14).

Methods

With the help of an experienced NORC field interviewer, I conducted in-depth interviews with a small subset of U.S.- and foreign-born Latino respondents from the *Making Connections* West Side neighborhood in San Antonio, Texas. My initial reason for choosing San Antonio as the focus site was because the survey population is almost entirely Latino and would supply the largest sample from which to recruit in-depth interview participants. The results from my quantitative analysis of the survey data provided clues that there may be particular nuances operating in San Antonio that distinguished the experiences of Latinos from those living in the other five sites. The in-depth interviews would provide the opportunity to further explore the potential site effect and try to understand the local factors which influence neighborhood attachment. In this section I describe the methods employed to prepare for and execute the qualitative data collection effort.

Local Leader Convening in Denver

To gain insight from local leaders in San Antonio and exposure to common challenges and successes occurring among community leadership initiatives in other *Making Connections* sites, I attended a convening of community organizers, representatives from United Way and other non-profit organizations, researchers, and others connected with the *Making Connections* initiative in Denver, CO during the fall of 2011. The convening provided me with an introduction to the elements of successful community engagement, as identified by organizers. A leader from San Antonio reflected, “In our community, what sells is what comes out of people’s mouths,” stressing the importance of door-to-door home visits.⁹ The San Antonio team shared successes from a three-year project titled My Voice Matters/Mi Voz Cuenta, which recruited members from 200 families living in the west side to speak about what they believed to be the needs of the community. Leaders from other cities echoed this idea in discussing “family ambassadors” who helped communicate “authentic engagement.” I also had the opportunity to speak with a West Side resident who stressed the obvious yet often neglected importance of offering incentives that respond directly to families’ needs. She suggested that residents be entered into a raffle upon signing up for a given program. Another leader spoke of a successful community event at which residents received bags of fresh produce in exchange for their attendance. “There’s never too much relationship,” a representative from Louisville commented, “(but) you need to establish relationships

9. Muñoz, Henrietta. 26 October 2011.

that *yield value* (to residents).”¹⁰ Both of these ideas – that resident engagement is predicated on the delivery of information from trusted individuals and that people generally get involved when faced with a specific problem and when doing so brings hope of tangible benefits – would surface several times during my qualitative interviews with former *Making Connections* Survey respondents in San Antonio.

In-depth Interview Sample

Preparing a sample for the in-depth interviewing effort unfolded in several steps. First, a systematic random sample was drawn from the wave 3 survey dataset using SAS software. Cases were first sorted by city and Census block to minimize the geographic clustering of sampled participants. I then filtered the harmonized wave 3 survey data to isolate those respondents who met the following criteria:

- From the San Antonio survey
- Lived within the boundaries of the survey neighborhood as of wave 3 (see Figure 3)
- Self-identified as Latino/Hispanic (U.S.-born or foreign-born)
- Demonstrated some facility in English: completed the wave 3 interview in

English or in Spanish but said they understood English “well” or “very well”

529 households met these criteria (roughly 85% of the total number of respondents in San Antonio, as indicated in Table 4). Cases were then allocated into five replicates, each containing a representative sub-sample of 76 households. Replicates offer the advantage

10. Jackson, Dana. 26 October 2011.

of increasing response rates by beginning with a small number of cases and releasing more for screening and recruiting as needed. The entire population of 95 eligible foreign-born cases were included and oversampled in each replicate to equal a third of the number of U.S.-born cases, with 19 and 57 in each replicate, respectively. This was in accordance with the goal of completing in-depth interviews with foreign-born Latinos at a rate higher than present in the survey sample.

Telephone Screening

A small team of NORC field managers and field interviewers assisted in re-contacting respondents in October and November of 2011 to determine their willingness to participate in an in-depth interview and to screen them for eligibility based on the following criteria:

- Age 18 or older
- Some facility in English: completed the wave 3 interview in English or in Spanish but said they understood English “well” or “very well”
- Hispanic/Latino (U.S.- or foreign-born)
- Currently live in the San Antonio survey neighborhood

Appendix A includes the screening script that was read to potential respondents. Once eligibility had been established, we attempted to schedule a time for the in-depth interview and then mailed an advance letter that reiterated the purpose of the study, provided contact information for myself and the administrator for NORC’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), and reminded them of the date and time of their scheduled interview (Appendix B).

271 of the eligible households were dialed at least once during the telephone screening phase. Connecting with respondents by telephone proved extremely challenging. While we had phone numbers for everyone from the wave 3 survey, many had been disconnected.

In-person Screening

We quickly adapted hard copy materials to go visit a subset of residents in person whom we had previously dialed unsuccessfully. This proved to be critical for reaching respondents at home and gaining their trust. It also gave me a taste of the sights and sounds that people described in the interviews. For example, upon arriving at one home with several cars in the driveway, we entered the front yard through an unlocked iron gate and were followed by a stray pit bull puppy that had passed in between the bars. It inched its nose close to my leg as we knocked on the front door and followed us back to the car, presumably hoping for a handout of food. Similar experiences resurfaced in many stories respondents shared with me about their “outside dogs” and encounters with both domesticated and stray dogs in their neighborhood. I also gained a better appreciation for the aesthetic improvements brought to an old neighborhood when streets are repaved and sidewalks installed, as had been done recently in parts of the neighborhood close to a university.

In-depth Interviews

With the help of a local NORC interviewer, I interviewed 33 West Side residents in mid-November. The interviews lasted approximately an hour and a half. A local community college graciously provided me and my colleague with space in one of their facilities on the west side to speak with respondents (hereafter referred to as “the

Center”). One interview was conducted at the home of one elderly respondent who was not physically able to travel to the center. Table 22 reports the demographic characteristics of the in-depth interviewees. They are roughly comparable to the characteristics of all Latinos who participated in the wave 3 survey in San Antonio. Over a quarter of the in-depth interview respondents were foreign-born, all with origins in Mexico.

Table 22. Profile of In-depth Interview Respondents

Characteristic	n
<u>Origin</u>	
U.S.-born	24
Foreign-born (Mexican)	9
<u>Language</u>	
Completed interview in English	25
Completed interview in Spanish	8
<u>Sex</u>	
Female	21
Male	12
<u>Age</u>	
20s - 50s	11
51 or older	22
<u>Education</u>	
Less than high school degree	14
High school degree or higher	18
<u>Homeownership</u>	
Homeowner	23
Renting or other arrangement	10
<u>Household characteristics</u>	
Children in household	15
Adult only	18
Total	33

a. Characteristics are based on the wave 3 survey data.

We administered a written consent form at the start of each interview (see Appendix C). The interview protocol is included in Appendix D. It focused on (a) family background, (b) neighborhood conditions and relationships, (c) childcare, (d) financial and informal support, and (e) other socio-demographic factors, including language and employment. To ensure that participants' experiences and observations were accurately reflected in the study findings, some interviews were audio recorded with the respondent's consent. I later commissioned a professional transcription service to transcribe the recordings. At the end of each interview, we paid respondents \$30 in cash as a thank-you for their time.

Language Issues

While facility in English was included in the screening criteria for the in-depth interviews, it would be impossible to ignore the importance of the Spanish language and Mexican culture in the lives of West Side residents. Even at the city level, Hispanics comprise the majority of the population, 63%, and 46% of persons age five and older speak a language other than English at home (Census 2010). These characteristics are greatly exaggerated on the west side. To preserve and understand the complexity of residents' experiences, I accepted that some amount of translation from Spanish to English would be required. An undergraduate semester in Granada, Spain and continued study at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign provided me a working knowledge of Spanish. To prepare for the interviews I enrolled in conversational Spanish classes at a private language center in Chicago and renewed my exposure to Spanish media, including newspapers, novels, and podcasts.

Upon arriving in San Antonio, I sought help from a local, bilingual NORC interviewer who had conducted interviews in the last wave of the *Making Connections* Survey. Eight respondents indicated a strong preference for speaking Spanish or had limited comprehension of English. We conducted their interviews in Spanish. When possible, I typed the respondent's answers in English while the respondent and bilingual interviewer spoke in Spanish. The Spanish interviews were audio recorded and sent to a professional transcription service.¹¹ The audio recordings proved invaluable for preserving non-semantic details not immediately decipherable from the transcripts, including variations in volume and pitch that suggest changes in emotion, laughter, and other occurrences that can bring additional meaning to textual responses. I sought help from a certified Spanish-English translator to translate the audio recordings and transcripts into English. The translator provided thoughtful commentary about respondents' dialect and vocabulary, and helped identify nuances in their responses that might not be apparent to a native English speaker. We revisited the audio recordings at several stages to clarify discrepancies and ambiguities. All persons involved with the project signed copies of NORC's Statement of Professional Ethics.

Field Notes

In addition to speaking with residents, I recorded a small amount of field notes during my stay in San Antonio to recall observations related to neighborhood perceptions, cultural factors, and other relevant topics. I stayed in a hotel downtown but

11. One Spanish interview was not sent for transcription and translation because the respondent's speech was slow and clear enough for us to interpret his responses during the interview.

spent most days on the west side. My time at the community center gave me the opportunity to make small talk with a few of the adult students, read local newspapers, ads, and informational flyers about educational and vocational programs, and watch residents file into computer labs to work on resumes. One evening I discovered that the furniture had been cleared from the main foyer for an exercise class. Women of various ages from the neighborhood stood in a circle, some in athletic pants, others in jeans, curling exercise bands. Outside the center, I shopped for groceries at HEB, passed tire shops and new AutoZone stores, stopped for gas, sampled house-made tacos, and visited Walgreens and Target stores on the west side. In other parts of the city, I visited the San Antonio zoo on the north side, browsed the Alamo for the second time, and chatted with waiters, bartenders, and valet attendants downtown.

Data

After all the interviews had been transcribed (either during the interview or later by the transcription/translation team), I compiled all responses into a simple Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. This allowed for a systematic review of the answers to each question across respondents, as well as across questions for a given respondent. I merged in select variables from the wave 3 survey, including basic demographic indicators and a subset of the independent and dependent variables used in my statistical analysis. I then developed and refined code frames for each question to identify important themes. Coding was completed through an iterative process of grouping questions by topic (e.g. neighborhood conditions, interactions with neighbors, etc.), reading the responses to a given question, assigning codes, examining the distribution of codes, and highlighting excerpts that illustrated each code (see Weiss 1994, chapter 6). I also noted unique variations in the

manner in which respondents spoke about the experience or construct being coded to lessen the probability of mischaracterizing the meaning of their statements. For example, if when asked what changes had occurred in the neighborhood a respondent said, “Some new gas stations, I guess, but that’s about it,” I assigned a code for new commercial development but noted the respondent’s qualifier suggesting that he did not perceive dramatic changes in the neighborhood.

In regards to the re-presentation of other’s words, I follow the example set by Pattillo-McCoy (1999). I omit verbal fillers like “um,” or, in Spanish, “pues” or “bueno,” along with false starts to sentences. I deviate occasionally from absolutely literal transcription of responses to make the meaning of statements easier to grasp (Weiss 1994, 193-194). I preserve elements of “Tex Mex,” the local variety of “Spanglish” that was commonly used by respondents. I also retain common contractions and abbreviations like “kinda” for “kind of.” I do so in an attempt to demonstrate how people in West Side *really* talk and also because these linguistic practices speak to the unique convergence of Anglo and Mexican cultures in San Antonio.

Strengths and Limitations

The data from the 33 in-depth interviews, along with discussions with local leaders and my personal observations and field notes from my time in San Antonio, sketch a portrait of neighborhood life that is more nuanced and multi-dimensional than evident from the survey data alone. Talking to people in an open-ended conversational format proved essential for tapping into the emotional and psychological significance of events and the construction of narratives surrounding the goodness of the neighborhood. Yet just as there are limitations to the scientific claims that can be asserted about a

population when using the survey data, it is necessary to acknowledge the constraints within which I offer findings from the in-depth interviews with West Side residents. First, I do not suggest that the observations and opinions that surfaced in my interviews are representative of the full range of experiences among West Side residents. The semi-random selection of respondents in the Making Connections Survey, which prioritizes caretakers in households with children, yielded a bias toward women within my in-depth interview sample. And while my analytical sample from the wave 3 survey does include newcomers to the neighborhood, by nature of approaching only past survey respondents for the in-depth interviews I ensure that all participants will have lived in the neighborhood for at least three years. Undocumented immigrants are also not well represented; however, at least one in-depth interviewee lacked legal status. On a larger scale, readers should be reminded that while I present survey data from six sites, the in-depth interviews were conducted only with residents in San Antonio. A logical next step in the continuation of this research would involve similar in-depth interviews with residents in the other five sites or at least those with large populations of Latinos (Denver, Providence, and White Center).

CHAPTER EIGHT

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

In this chapter I present key findings from 33 in-depth interviews conducted during November of 2011 with Latino residents of West Side who had previously participated in the *Making Connections* Survey. Proper names of individuals, address information, and other details have been edited to protect the identity of respondents.

Migration History and Family Ties

It was not far into the interviewing process that I began to appreciate the extensive multigenerational ties that the in-depth respondents shared with the west side. Three questions specifically targeted the process by which the respondent's family came to live in the neighborhood, where their parents lived and what type of work they did, and where their relatives currently lived. 17 respondents indicated that they or their spouse had been born and/or raised in West Side. 10 indicated that their parents had roots in the area. Respondents' and their parents' upbringings often coincided within the space of a few blocks, as in the case of one 23-year old man who told me, "My mother was born about 2 or 3 streets down from where I live. My father was born in the house we live now" (U.S.-born male). Over three quarters (26) listed relatives in San Antonio and two thirds (22) had at least one family member living in West Side. Remaining relatives were fairly evenly split across other parts of Texas, U.S. cities outside of Texas, and Mexico (reported by 10, 13, and 10 respondents, respectively). Perhaps not surprisingly, the most

common origins in Mexico were concentrated in areas close to the Texas-Mexico border, in the northeastern states of Coahuila, Tamaulipas, and Nuevo León.

A number of family-related themes surfaced during the interviews, centered on caretaking obligations, the idea that it is “better to be close to family,” the practice of selling or willing one’s home to a family member, and anecdotes emphasizing the large size of their family. As an example of the last theme, one Vietnam War veteran shared memories of his 14-person family growing up as migrant workers in West Side and in Michigan. “We were a large family,” he noted, “like sardines” (laughs). Regarding their living conditions, he joked, “We used to say, ‘Let’s go back to the sardine can!’” (U.S.-born, age 61). He mirrored several others by painting a similar picture of his current situation. When asked if he had relatives in the area he again joked, “You don’t want to know. I got a lot of them! Like ants” (U.S.-born male). Life events such as a divorce or job change sometimes heightened the importance of family to respondents and motivated respondents who had previously left West Side to return. One respondent shared the following about her decision to live in West Side: “After my divorce . . . It’s my old neighborhood that I grew up in. I wanted to be closer to my parents that live two blocks from me. . . They are both elderly. . . At the time it was also closer to my employment” (U.S.-born female, age 47). She later mentioned that her sister lived two blocks from her, her aunt (who is also her god mother) was within three blocks away, and that she had several other relatives living “5 minutes this way, 5 minutes that way away.”

Another important theme concerns the transfer of homes amongst family members. Ten respondents indicated that they had inherited or purchased their home from someone in their family or in their spouse’s family. Sometimes homes were

purchased because the family member was having financial or health problems, or following their death. One 25-year-old man described how his wife had lived in their current home her entire life. When his mother-in-law starting falling behind in the mortgage payments three years ago she offered to sell the home to the respondent and his wife, whom he had met while working at a local barbecue restaurant. Another woman shared a similar story, explaining that her home had been one of three properties owned by her husband's grandfather. She and her husband bought the home from his grandparents when the grandfather's health started declining. Her husband's aunt moved into another one of the three homes (U.S.-born female, age 47). Other home sales among family responded to the immediate financial needs of the receiving party rather than the seller. This is illustrated in the following excerpt from a U.S.-born woman:

I'm originally from San Antonio. I grew up on the south side. The area where I live now, it's a house given, well, sold, by my husband's father to my husband. At the time, we needed a place to live, and I had complications from a surgery. My father-in-law said we could just pay the taxes on everything because we had no way to pay bills (because I was disabled). I've been living on the west side for 29 years. (Female, age 61)

In addition to these family-related factors, respondents also shared logistical reasons for coming to live in West Side. Six individuals described affordable housing options in the area, as when one woman told me, "(The) neighborhood...that's all I could afford" (U.S.-born, age 72). For immigrants in particular, the area provided a set of housing and employment opportunities during their transition to the United States. One man carefully articulated in Spanish the process by which he became a homeowner in West Side:

I came from Piedras Negras, Coahuila (Mexico)...I was working for (a large tire company). Well, we were able to get residency status through my dad because

he's an American citizen. So, we went to live with him while we waited to get our papers because we arrived here with all the right permits. First we arrived and lived (at my dad's home). We were there for about 4 to 6 months... We already had our social security numbers and everything else, but until we were sure that we were going to stay is when we rented a little house in the same area... We waited until we had everything in order. And then 2 to 3 years (later) we bought our house where we live now. Now we have been there about 5 or 6 years. My dad lives on (names street) and I live on (street) and so... we're only separated by the alley. (Mexican-born, age 58)

Other foreign-born respondents shared stories of their families coming to the area as migrant workers or street vendors, or to be reunited with a spouse following a period of transnational employment-based separation. Another feature of the area that proved to influence the migration of both foreign- and U.S.-born respondents to West Side was the availability of jobs at several large military bases. Seven respondents shared stories of their parent or grandparent working at Kelly or Lackland Air Force Base, performing jobs in fields ranging from maintenance to package inspection to special weapons.

Neighborhood Conditions

When asked to describe what it is like living in their neighborhood, respondents painted two recurring and seemingly paradoxical images of neighborhood life. On one hand, nearly half (14 out of 33) described the neighborhood as being a quiet, calm place. Nearly a third (11) suggested that relations between neighbors were friendly and cohesive, "like a family." If they had observed problems in the neighborhood such as conflicts between residents or crime, they did not feel personally affected by these events. For example, one male in his sixties, a Vietnam War veteran, stated, "It's quiet in the daytime. Nighttime it gets a little rowdy. You hear cops, ambulances. But you know, (it's all) routine. You're probably going to hear that a lot." Several (8) seemed comforted by the presence of longstanding residents in their neighborhood, including elderly couples

whose children had since left to form their own families and younger residents who had inherited homes from a parent or other family member, or moved in to care for them. Nearly a third (10) indicated that neighbors “watched out for each other,” which proved to serve a specific function related to the second, stronger theme among responses that would appear contradictory to the image of a peaceful neighborhood. The West Side residents with whom I spoke repeatedly described their neighborhood as a place where “one has to take precautions” due to the preponderance of petty theft, drugs, “mischievous youth,” home invasions, and at times, violent crimes. Over one third of my respondents (12) had been personally victim to a crime or had an encounter with someone who they perceived to threaten their personal safety. Home invasions and theft of personal property were the most common crimes reported. Other crimes included vandalism to cars and drive-by shootings. Three respondents described incidents in which someone had suspiciously knocked on their door after midnight and asked for money or, in one case, appeared to be under the influence of drugs and made what the respondent perceived to be sexually inappropriate gestures (the police later attributed the incident to the man “celebrating” his release from jail and suggested that he had mistaken her home for the home of his cousin). Interestingly, though, personal experiences as the victim of a crime or perceived criminal threat did not have the universal effect of making respondents “give up hope” for the neighborhood. While some did in fact indicate that they felt more fearful after these events, others responded with humor and pragmatism. The following vignette from a U.S.-born male Korean War veteran demonstrates both elements:

I can't leave nothing outside because (people cutting through my yard) steal it...They stole all my plants. They stole a big one that I had, I think it weighed over 400 pounds. I put it full of sand so they wouldn't take it, and full of water so it would be wetter. One time my wife and I went out partying and came back. I said to my wife, 'Hey, something's wrong.' She said, 'I don't see nothing different.' (I said), 'The plant's gone, man!' (chuckles) (age 78).

Another woman described how staying inside allowed her to avoid conflict with renters on her block:

Across the street, there (used to be an) older couple but they rent it out to other people. Several (of the) original people are gone. (They're) kinda rowdy, so we tend to just stay inside. They get drunk and we don't drink so we tend to just leave them alone. (U.S.-born, age 47)

When asked if she felt safe in the neighborhood, she joked that her three dogs functioned as an alarm system, but noted that they had to keep them farther back from the street in order for the mailman to deliver their mail. Several others mirrored this matter-of-fact, light-hearted response to the deviant behavior of neighbors and the preponderance of crime in the neighborhood.

Other respondents, particularly elderly women, seemed to have been more emotionally shaken by these types of incidents and expressed fear, sadness, and regret. One seventy-two year-old, U.S.-born woman captured the power these crimes and the people who commit them held over some neighborhood residents:

You want to talk to your neighbors but you can't. Because of them selling drugs, selling marijuana cigarettes and all that, and they don't hide. You can be on your front porch and you can smell the marijuana. You cannot tell them nothing because they will come and scratch your car, break the window, or do something.

Another woman echoed,

On my right side, I can't talk to those people because they sell drugs. They have family across the street, down the street too. As much as I want good neighbors, I don't have them...It's very hard for me to live clean, and they're living dirty (U.S.-born, age 72).

West Side Reputation

While not explicitly targeted in the in-depth interview protocol, narratives about the reputation of the west side surfaced at several points. Most often respondents suggested that West Side was commonly associated with high crime rates, poverty, and disrepair. I also heard about West Side's dangerous reputation from bartenders, wait staff, and hotel employees during my stay in San Antonio. While walking out to my car one night around 7:30 after an interview, I chatted with a police officer who helped patrol the Center. Upon hearing the sound of tires squealing in the distance, he raised a finger and said, "See what I deal with? This is not a good neighborhood to be in." In fact, he said it was the worst area in San Antonio. Several of my respondents acknowledged this reputation but refuted it, saying that they "didn't see it." The following example is from a 23-year-old U.S.-born man.

My neighborhood . . . First, you were kinda fearful, that attitude that gets put in your mind about living on that side of the city. People think there's a lot of gangs, people getting killed, but that's from other people that don't live here. I've lived there all my life. I've experienced it, and it's not that way.

He later stated that "There's that joke about trying to stay alive, over on the west side" and acknowledged that the rumored gangs and bullies were likely "out there." But again, he qualified that had not had personal experiences with these individuals and had only seen them on television. Another example featuring this language comes from a first generation Mexican immigrant: "When I first arrived, a neighbor told me to be careful because there were always gun fights and they just riddled that house over there with bullets...But since I have been here, I've never seen anything like that" (Female, age 52).

One woman who was accompanied by her sister during the interview provided a more vivid articulation of the neighborhood's reputation as a devalued, dangerous place. She echoed several others in acknowledging this reputation but ultimately refuting it. By employing a comparative technique, she reasons that living in a poor neighborhood on the west side allowed her greater peace of mind.

Respondent: They call us the west side because we're known to be the bad side of town. How can I say the word? Like the west side, people talk about the west side like it's . . .

Sister: Gangster

Respondent: Like the gutter.

Sister: But in reality, it's like high class. You'll see on the news . . . there is bad stuff happening in (other parts of town).

Respondent: (Lists specific intersection), that side of town is a nice area, but I guarantee there are people over there that don't sleep because they're worried about how they're gonna pay their mortgage (and for their) brand new cars. Me, I sleep fine. I have a little house but I'm very comfortable. (U.S.-born, age 46)

Note the similarity of this narrative to the following observation from a slightly older woman who had lived in West Side for nearly 40 years:

About the west side . . . They're always saying 'West Side, West Side' (makes sour face), but I don't think like that. I think it's about the people. They say there's drugs, but there's drugs everywhere. I knew this guy, he had this big house, and he told me his son was on drugs. It happens everywhere. I'm not ashamed that I was born on the west side. I said to my sister, 'We were brought up here. Don't be ashamed of that.' This is what counts (motions to her chest), what comes out of your heart. (U.S.-born, age 58)

The idea that the character of individual residents trumps any aggregate label applied to the West Side was also endorsed by another 58-year-old U.S.-born woman. She

commented: “The neighborhood’s not like the north side, (not) a fancy neighborhood, but it’s a nice neighborhood. It’s about what kind of people live in the neighborhood.”

A few respondents were more cognizant of racial and ethnic dynamics operating in West Side. The following exchange is worth considering at length in that it combines several of the themes identified earlier and also demonstrates an awareness of how one’s social location influences individual experiences of the west side.

Respondent: (People from the north side are) scared to come down here...Especially if you’re white or don’t know the culture. I grew up here, so I don’t...

Interviewer: Do you think that reputation is justified?

Respondent: It depends, just like anywhere else. When you get out of your car, you gotta be careful. A lot of it is ignorance. You get stereotyped. Another Hispanic person from the north side, you can come and be alright. But someone else, you come down and see the torn-down buildings and have this (negative) perception. I can come over here and be alright, but still you have to be careful. Especially during the night. (U.S.-born female, age 58)

Another respondent, a long-time West Side resident and homeowner, shared many of the same comments about the “shady” reputation of the neighborhood but also identified with the Hispanic elements:

Oh yeah, there’s a community of people (on the west side). It’s a different kind of people. I like it. One of the reasons why I wanted to come back (from Los Angeles is that it has) more of a Latin atmosphere. My Spanish is terrible too, but I get by. I’m sure there’s some people that don’t want to be associated with the west side because of its reputation, but I think that’s everywhere. It has a shady reputation of being not the most friendly unless you know people, know where you’re at. You just got to be careful in the neighborhood, especially at night. Don’t be in certain parts at night because it’s not safe. (U.S.-born male, age 54)

Changes in the Neighborhood

When asked to comment on the history of the neighborhood and any changes that had taken place over time, the most frequently cited observations involved the emergence of new businesses, infrastructure improvements, and traffic increases due to population growth. Nearly two thirds of respondents (21) mentioned these types of changes. Generally, respondents were encouraged by new commercial property development, including chain car washes, gas stations, and fast food restaurants, and pleased with street improvements. A smaller subset listed the expansion of educational programs, school improvements, and a new library downtown. Yet the enthusiasm of some residents was tempered with the sentiment that these developments were merely an indication of how West Side was “slowly but surely catching up with the rest of the world.” Those who had lived in the neighborhood for several decades or whose family members were longtime residents described the west side as a formerly rural area populated with ranches, wooded land, dirt streets (some still remain), and occasionally, an independently-owned corner store selling convenience items. My own observations of West Side support the characterization of the neighborhood as a decidedly “un-urban” place. Small single-family bungalows predominate, and while yards along many blocks are generally small, the scarcity of multi-level buildings and dusty climate contribute to a sense of vastness. Back country seems never far out of reach. While driving through West Side today, one is likely to pull up behind a rusty pickup truck driven by cowboy hat-clad man with a weathered face. And yet, it is also likely to find that truck turn into a freshly poured asphalt parking lot to reach a brand new, franchised gas station.

A second theme among respondent's descriptions of the changes that had occurred in the neighborhood concerned the racial and ethnic characteristics of the population. While most respondents identified the neighborhood as predominately Hispanic, they shared slightly different recollections of the migration of other ethno-racial groups and estimations of the relative size of the U.S.-born Mexican American population. Consider the following examples:

All the time it was pure Mexicans (U.S.-born female, age 56).

It used to be a lot of Hispanic people. Now it's more of a mix. I've never talked to anyone directly from Mexico, that I'm aware of. I'm of Mexican descent, but I don't speak Spanish and don't (know anyone from Mexico) (U.S.-born male, age 23).

(The people have) not changed over time. You still see Hispanic and Black people, still the same...(Husband of respondent interjects) 60% (born in the U.S.) and 40% Mexican (U.S.-born female, age 48).

Now you see a couple Blacks here and there. Used to be all Mexicans. More Blacks came after that hurricane (Katrina). They put them all over here in (a public housing development) (U.S.-born male, age 54).

. . . Everybody is Hispanic . . . And everybody is friendly. The majority are from the U.S. I don't know anyone on the block from Mexico. (U.S.-born female, age 46).

These differences reflect the distinct framings of the neighborhood across respondents. It became clear throughout the interviews that the term "neighborhood" evoked different images for different people and that many considered their "neighborhood" to be their immediate block. This is consistent with findings from Coulton et al (2010) and Guest and Lee (1984) that residents often perceive their neighborhood as occupying a considerably smaller area than the boundaries used by many officials and community

initiatives. The following excerpt from a Mexican-born Spanish speaker demonstrates this tendency, as the respondent lists the buildings surrounding his home.

Many of the homes have been restored . . . The church in front fixed their parking. It has two parking lots. It has one on each side of the street and they're big. They made them new. New businesses also. On the corner there was a house and now it's a business and they sell...like used things, furniture. And in front there is a store that sells candy and where the street sellers buy their supplies for selling, like the little kids that sell in the street with their musical vending carts, they buy there . . . (Foreign-born male, age 52)

One of the most surprising findings from the in-depth interviews emerges from a question asking respondents to compare the problems of their neighborhood to a “typical” neighborhood. Although the questions about neighborhood conditions elicited frequent discussion of crime, drugs, and concerns about personal safety, all but four respondents indicated that their neighborhood was no more troubled than other places. In fact, 13 stated that it was less troubled. Another four respondents did not provide a definitive assessment of their neighborhood as compared to a “typical” neighborhood, but implied that things were improving and that while certain precautions were necessary, “it’s probably like that everywhere.” The following excerpt exemplifies this type of response.

Well, I haven’t lived in other neighborhoods but from what I have seen on television I think that things are improving. Yes, because now you can walk safely. There are always boys that are mischievous but at least...you still see them walking with a beer, but they don’t bother you . . . (Mexican-born male, age 58)

This comment is also illustrative in that it demonstrates how respondents often called on information from news reports and word-of-mouth to situate their neighborhood and other parts of the city in a hierarchy of desirability. One woman stated, “I don’t think we have problems, not that bad. Every time I see something bad (on the news) it’s always on the north side, or northeast or east side” (U.S.-born, age 48). Another woman who

expressed the most negative opinions about West Side among the in-depth respondents asked rhetorically, “I mean, come on, (in) what neighborhood can you drive through and not have your windows up?” (U.S.-born, age 58). She went on to qualify that there were other factors which made driving with the windows down unlikely, such as wanting to preserve the air conditioning. But the whole of her comments suggest that while she was very dissatisfied with her neighborhood, she was convinced that other neighborhoods had problems too.

Another tendency was to refer only to one’s block or even a portion of the block in answering this question. For example, one 25-year-old male began by explaining, “Maybe less considering I live on a dead-end. Maybe somebody further down has problems with people speeding. For me, I’m alright” (U.S.-born). Another woman echoed, “I’m kinda isolated to my little street. I don’t really know what goes around in the whole (neighborhood) (U.S.-born, age 58). The physical buffer of only a few homes sometimes proved sufficient for distancing respondents from feeling personally affected by crime and disrepair in the neighborhood. Consider the following comment from a U.S.-born, 56-year-old woman who completed the interview in Spanish:

The same, it’s the same everywhere. If you move over here, over here they are fights. (But) there are no fights at my house, at my house, there’s nothing. They’re all different, but mine . . . as much as, like in other places, where my cousin lives, sometimes we go over there and there are fights, because there are bars around there . . . But over here there aren’t any bars...

Another response from a Mexican-born male respondent living in a public housing complex mirrors this comment and others in suggesting a certain tolerance for crime and other neighborhood disruptions.

There's not that much issues. Some gunshots, but not often. I talk to the maintenance guy and he tells me what's going on, but I don't want to get too involved . . . I think other places have more problems with drugs, stealing cars, stripping them, etc.

A final theme among these narratives involved citing a specific example of a friend, co-worker, or family member whose neighborhood was, in the respondent's estimation, worse off. The following excerpt demonstrates this tendency and is worth quoting in length.

Respondent: In my opinion it has less. I know like anyplace, there are good neighborhoods and bad neighborhoods. The north side in San Antonio is perfect; it's goody goody. But not anymore. My neighborhood is quiet, better than a lot of other places. It's not perfect, but compared to those places (it's better). I tell some of my friends that want to relocate to San Antonio...They ask what part would be best to live at. I tell them to come over here to the west side...

Interviewer: So you feel like your neighborhood is in a good part of the city?

Respondent: Oh yeah. East side is the worst. A friend of mine, his car broke down over there. He got robbed and killed. That stuff happens all around. About two months later, a guy's car broke down, they raped his wife. I tell my wife, 'No, let's raise our kids here.' My brothers are cops and they say the same thing, 'Don't go over to the east side. Don't even bother.' I say, 'Okie dokie, no place like home!' (U.S.-born male, age 61)

Other variations of this line of reasoning revealed an exercise in self-reflection, an attempt to view other areas more objectively. For example, one Mexican-born woman stated, "About the same. Where I work, I was talking to one of the ladies, and she lives on the north side. She said, 'Oh no, we have the same problems here. Maybe you just don't notice them.' So I guess it's the same thing everywhere" (age 46).

Among the four respondents who suggested that their neighborhood had more problems than a typical neighborhood, all happened to be U.S.-born (though, recall that the majority of U.S. citizens felt their neighborhood was no worse off) and seemed to feel personally affected by a crime or other unpleasant interactions with people in the neighborhood. The following is one example. “Before, I would say I didn’t even think about it because most of the people were working people, just trying to make a living. But now, with drugs all over the place, that worries me more than where my daughter lives (on the northeast side of San Antonio)” (U.S.-born female, age 73). Another respondent who had lived in the neighborhood for 33 years shared a frightening experience that happened near her home:

I see policemen, about six months ago. A guy was banging on his girlfriend’s car with a brick. I called my neighbor and said, ‘Do you hear that?’ That’s where I see things different now. It happens on Saturday. I hear screaming. My door is secure but I still put those big heavy chains in front of the door because the guys now, you know, they are strong now and I live by myself. If they (try to break in) they’re gonna break their leg! (laughs). But that’s how the neighborhood is changing. (U.S.-born female, age 62)

A couple things are worth noting in this excerpt. First, it strikes me that, crudely speaking, the incident that this respondent observed with the man banging on his girlfriend’s car may be considered no more menacing than the shootings and fights reported by those respondents who ultimately concluded that they were still better off than residents living elsewhere. Second, that she chuckled at the thought of a male intruder breaking his leg while trying to break into her home demonstrates the same kind of pragmatism that I observed among the majority of respondents. Their reactions to adverse events seem tempered by a general tendency to distance oneself from the “real” victims of the event and to presumably resist the temptation to give up hope for the

neighborhood. This, I argue, speaks to the extent to which aspirations to live in a “good” neighborhood exert a powerful influence on the meanings respondents attach to conflicts with neighbors and deleterious conditions in the neighborhood.

I was intrigued by this after completing the first few interviews and began probing respondents to explain if they would ever consider moving, and if so, what their ideal neighborhood would be like. Data are available for 24 out of the 33 total interviews. The pattern observed when respondents were asked to compare the problems of their neighborhood to those of a “typical” neighborhood is replicated here. Only four respondents indicated that they would definitely consider moving away from the west side, or described an ideal neighborhood that was radically different from their current situation. Nearly two thirds (15) suggested that they would not leave West Side, although six of them qualified that they would like a new house, improved traffic infrastructure, or would choose to live in a different part of the neighborhood (typically toward the periphery). The remaining nine spoke frankly about their attachment to the neighborhood. Below are examples.

I guess I have an attachment to the area, to the home. My mom says, ‘Why don’t you sell the house?’ The only way I would do that is if the neighborhood got corrupted. Not only me, but a lot of people have a lot of good memories from the neighborhood. Family is very important to me and my mother, growing up there. I always get excited when I hear a good family is moving in, bringing decency and respect to the neighborhood. (U.S.-born female, age 58)

To me, I don’t know what everybody else is going to say, but it’s a nice place to raise a family. It’s not like before, during my dad’s time (when it was worse). If you raise your kids right, you can’t go wrong. Everybody gets along. It’s a nice neighborhood. It’s like L.A. (Los Angeles), you know, there are good parts and bad parts. (U.S.-born male, age 61)

For many respondents, close ties to family living in the area and care taking responsibilities played a big role in maintaining their attachment to the neighborhood.

The following excerpt from a 63 year-old Vietnam War veteran illustrates this point.

I was out (of the west side) for about 30 years. I remember when I got back, and everyone was taking care of my mom. They said, ‘Okay, now it’s your turn. It was a good move, and it was at the right time. I have no regrets in my life, in my 63 years. I’ve seen it all, this whole country and half the world. I’m satisfied with that. (U.S.-born male)

A retired Navy technician expressed a similar sentiment but endorsed a more expansive interpretation of the term “family” based on cultural ties with Hispanic neighbors.

Interviewer: Would you ever move?

Respondent: No, I’d say no. I’d stay in my same area...

Interviewer: What do you like about this neighborhood?

Respondent: *Mi raza*. My people, my family. This is my home. The reason why I left was because I was in the service. (U.S.-born male, age 57)

Interactions with Neighbors

Information regarding the quality and frequency of interactions with neighbors was gathered in two ways during the in-depth interviews. First, respondents were asked to list the five people with whom they were closest and to describe the activities they did with each person. Given the focus of this study, we occasionally encouraged respondents to consider neighbors in addition to friends and family members. Later in the interview, one question asked explicitly, “How well do you know your neighbors?” This was followed with questions regarding the types of activities the respondent engaged in with neighbors, when and where these activities generally took place, and whether they ever attended celebrations (birthdays, quinceañeras, etc.) together. Perhaps not surprisingly,

respondents often described varied interactions with individual households in the neighborhood. In line with the interview data regarding neighborhood conditions, respondents generally described relations that at a minimum included cordial greetings (“saying ‘hi’ and ‘bye’”) and occasional chatting. Ten seemed to appreciate that neighbors afforded each other personal space and “didn’t insist on interfering.” Consider the following excerpt from a 61-year-old U.S.-born man:

Our neighbors, they’re not nosy. We keep in touch, look after each other’s backs. It’s family-like. They’re not rowdy, we’re not rowdy. Everybody compromises. If we have a party we have it in the back and don’t get too loud. They’ll ask me, ‘Mr. (N), we’re going to have a little party, ok?’ We compromise.

Yet the data suggest that respondents generally had a relationship with at least one neighbor or neighboring family that extended to invitations to barbecues, birthday parties, weddings, and other celebrations. This was true for 26 out of 33 respondents. Some of the factors encouraging this level of intimacy included the presence of long-term homeowners on the block (mentioned by 16 respondents) and a shared sense of responsibility to watch out for each other and each other’s property (mentioned by 11 respondents). For example, one U.S.-born man explained, “We have three new neighbors, but the other four have been there for years. We’re pretty tight knit in that area. We’re always saying ‘Hi,’ asking, ‘Oh, do you need anything?’ We’re always helping each other” (Age 54). Another woman echoed this by describing her 78-year-old neighbor as one of her closest contacts: “I’ve known her for 28 years, since I’ve lived in my house. Her husband is in rehab, been sick. We talk on the phone, to see how she’s doing. Talk everyday on the phone or over the fence” (U.S.-born, age 61).

An important nuance to this presumably “tight-knit” quality of the neighborhood is that while invitations to social gatherings were frequent, respondents often identified barriers motivating them not to attend. One common line of reasoning was that they preferred to keep celebrations just amongst family and felt compelled to offer the same courtesy to neighbors. This again speaks to the generally large number of family members who resided in West Side and the frequency with which respondents interacted with them. One man joked in Spanish, “...It’s more family, when we get together, especially with the family because just with them, there are many!” (Mexican-born, age 58). Another woman echoed, “Oh my God, weekends are (full of) parties for the family. If it’s not one, it’s another. Last week we had one breakfast party, then a baby shower, and then my grandson’s party at the park” (U.S.-born female, age 58).

Respondents revealed a sort of intermediary category of social exchange associated with celebrations – preparing a plate of food for those not in attendance. Exposure to a neighbor’s food supplied respondents with information about what “kind of people” their neighbors were and a sense of familiarity. This is evident in the following comment from a 36-year West Side resident.

They have parties, birthday parties, and (my neighbor across the street) will say, ‘Oh, so and so had a birthday party.’ And for the Thanksgiving they’re going to get together. I don’t want to go because I’m so shy, but (my neighbor across the street) will go and sometimes she’ll bring me a plate. Or next door, they’ll bring me a plate sometimes.” (U.S.-born female, age 62)

The social significance of plates was also evident while interviewing the retired Navy veteran who earlier described his neighbors as being “mi raza. My people, my family.” We did the interview on his front porch because his mobility was constrained by dependence on a walker and other health conditions. While we spoke, community

members were in the process of setting up a street festival directly in front of his home, including a stage and rows of tables covered with bright yellow and orange plastic tablecloths. The street had been recently repaved and the crisp white of newly-installed sidewalks stood out in contrast to the bright colors of the tables and the t-shirts worn by volunteers. A line of people was beginning to form out the back door of the Pentecostal church that organized the event. The following exchange occurred as we were finishing up the interview.

Respondent: It's a pretty good neighborhood, like I said. They'll bring me something because I can't go over there (pointing to festival, indicating that neighbors will bring him a plate of food).

Interviewer: Oh, they'll bring you something?

Respondent: I hope so. Last year they did.

Interviewer: Do you know what the festival is for?

Respondent: Oh, I don't know . . . something. (U.S.-born male, age 57)

In some ways, the succinctness of this respondent's speech makes it easier to isolate the elements which inform his positive evaluation of the neighborhood. That his neighbors were cognizant of his disability and willing to bring him a plate of food from the street festival last year left an impression on him that seems directly tied to his feeling connected to neighbors and among "his people."

Transferring plates also serves as one way in which neighbors look after each other's well-being and exchange favors. While discussing interactions in the neighborhood fifteen respondents reported providing some form of help to or receiving help from a neighbor. In the following excerpt, another long-time West Side resident

seems to group invitations to social events, plates of food, and watching over each other's homes under the same umbrella of helpful neighborly conduct.

When they have parties or they have something going on they'll come and invite us, or they'll bring us a plate. They'll come and say, 'Oh, we're going to Mexico. Can you look after the house?' If I need something they're there to help me. They go back and forth (to Mexico) fairly often, visit family over there. (U.S.-born female, age 48)

Respondents also described bringing neighbors homemade cookies around Christmas time and occasionally tamales, although tamales were sometimes intended for sale. Other non-food forms of help that respondents associated with their level of familiarity with neighbors included giving rides to doctor's appointments, mowing grass and performing other yard work, sharing electricity (by running an extension cord to a neighbor's house) and driveway space, lending tools, and cleaning inside a neighbor's home.

Given the frequent discussion of crime and drugs in the neighborhood conditions section of the in-depth interviews, one might guess that deviance among neighbors would present a prominent barrier to social interaction. It is interesting that only five respondents reported any form of negative behavior ("acting dirty") among their neighbors. The following exchange demonstrates how one woman struggled to connect with neighbors due to their involvement in illegal activities.

Interviewer: How well do you know your neighbors?

Respondent: Not well well well. We just say 'Hi, bye.' My son is the one that talks to mostly the whole block. He says he was helping (a neighbor), cutting the grass, doing this and that. I go and make sure he was there. I just know my next door neighbor. Her daughter just had a baby. But they do things that you aren't supposed to do (motions that they smoke marijuana). I have to leave because when I see that my stomach starts to hurt. I put incense cones in my front and back yard (to try to cover up the smell). Her son is always going in and out of prison . . . (U.S.-born female, age 42)

She went on to describe another neighbor who reportedly shoots her porch light out every time the respondent turns it on and throws beer cans in her yard. Yet these behaviors, while frustrating to the respondent, did not seem to quell her desire to be helpful to neighbors. She later stated, “But two houses down I have people that ask me to keep an eye on their house, and I do.” Note the similarity of this vignette to the following comment from another woman in her forties:

I tried talking to all my neighbors when we first moved in, but no one really wanted to speak to me. The woman next door has I don’t know how many guys going through there. Kitty corner, my daughter went over selling raffle tickets and they told her never to come back. She came home crying...(But) I’m one of those neighbors that is keeping an eye on everyone. Even when I was working (respondent was laid off at the time of the interview). I am always watching out for my neighbors . . . (U.S.-born female, age 47)

A final example comes from the 58-year-old Spanish-speaker who joked about the large size of his extended family:

We get together, but we’re not, I mean, I don’t drink . . . And they do drink but they’re not fighters. In the beginning yes, when we would invite...the son-in-law and the relatives, they would get drunk and they would want to fight, but we would calm them down. ‘Hey, get out of here. Go back to your own house!’ I don’t allow that because I get along well with all the neighbors. Yes, others want to fight and shoot off their guns. Yes, I do see that they want to fight but they calm down. I right away tell them to leave and go home because I don’t want any problems.

In each of these examples it is evident that the respondent is disappointed by the criminal or disruptive behavior of their neighbors but seem to compartmentalize this disappointment in order to remain open to connections with other neighbors or, as in the last example, to a general sense of social connectedness to the entire neighborhood.

Giving and Getting Help

One thing that became readily apparent in the in-depth interviews was the often blurry distinction between being at the giving versus receiving end of assistance when it comes to transfers between family members, friends, and neighbors who are all faced with strong economic constraints. Though we tried to focus the discussion on giving and getting help separately, there was considerable overlap in the direction of responses. Close inspection of this overlap suggests that the problem was not that respondents did not understand the question, but that these exchanges often serve multiple purposes and may have different meanings to different people. For example, several respondents were grateful to have their yard work performed by a young person on the block but also suggested that they were helping that young person by paying \$10 or \$20 for this service. They shared stories about negotiating the frequency with which lawns would be mowed in order to balance one person's interest in garnering wages with the other person's desire to have their needs met without incurring too much cost.

Giving Help

The specific items transferred among family, friends, and neighbors varied considerably; however, all 33 in-depth interview respondents reported providing some sort of assistance and all but two reported receiving some sort of assistance. The most frequent form of help provided by respondents consisted of giving rides or loaning one's vehicle to someone – typically a neighbor. Over half of respondents had provided this type of help. Those with grandchildren often described dropping them off and picking them up from school several times a week, if not more. Another favor included in this category is using one's vehicle to run an errand for someone, as in going to the bank to

make a deposit. The second most commonly reported form of help given involved cooking a meal specifically for another person or family, sharing leftover food or baked goods, or purchasing a meal or snack from a restaurant. Yet these transfers did not occur without consideration of the cost of food. Favorite Mexican dishes like tacos, rice, and tamales carried a particular currency in that they could be sold within the community as a source of income. The gray area between a favor and a paid chore is illustrated in the following excerpt, in which a 57-year-old Spanish speaker describes a recent exchange with her son:

Respondent: My daughter in-law, my son's wife, she calls (my son) a Mama's boy. (My son) called me on Saturday. (I asked) 'What does my boy want?

Son: 'Did you make tamales?'

Respondent: 'Yes, they're in the freeze.

Son: 'I want tamales.'

Respondent: 'But those are for selling to pay my taxes...No.'

Son: 'That's okay, Ma.'

Respondent: And right away I took them out and I warmed them up and then they arrived here. 'Son, I'm warming up the tamales.'

Daughter-in-law: 'See, what'd I tell ya? Mama's boy.'

Respondent: Just because I did what he wanted. (U.S.-born female)

An additional factor making food a powerful commodity in the community involves the popularity of "plate sales," or fundraisers organized by a family, group of families, or

organization to raise money for an individual faced with a variety of circumstances.¹ One respondent complained about the ubiquity of these events, saying, “they’re always selling, raffle tickets, cookouts, whatever...’Get your daughter on Nickelodeon’ or something. ‘Get someone out of jail.’ ‘He needs new clothes; he’s gonna get out of jail’” (U.S.-born, age 58). Yet most respondents spoke warmly of these events and seemed to think of them as an effective way to earn money in a short amount of time. Consider the following comments from another U.S.-born woman in her late 40s:

Respondent: This Sunday they wanted me to cook for a plate sale. For a cousin. They asked me. I just say, ‘Buy me the ingredients and I’ll make it.’ I’ve cooked for weddings, quinceañeras, baby showers, church.

Interviewer: Have you ever hosted a plate sale?

Respondent: Yes. Two years ago, I had two surgeries. Trying to get back on my feet was kind of hard. I had a plate sale for my taxes. Everything went great.

In addition to cooking a meal specifically for another person or family, sharing leftover food or baked goods, and purchasing a meal or snack from a restaurant, four respondents described helping to cook a dish specifically for a celebration or holiday without the intent of sale. The same woman who had hosted a plate sale to pay for her taxes also indicated that because her cooking skills are well-known, she frequently cooks for birthday parties and church activities as a favor.

1. Churches and other organizations also host plate sales to raise funds for a variety of causes. In this section, the discussion is focused on the transfer of monetary and non-monetary assistance among individuals rather than organizations.

The third most common form of help that respondents had given was more explicitly monetary: providing cash to someone for paying a bill, other monthly expense, or covering the cost of a needed repair. Thirteen respondents indicated that they or someone in their household had offered this type of help to someone, although two described events that occurred one or more years in the past. This type of monetary help was typically restricted to family members. Similarly, another type of favor commonly performed by respondents, babysitting (mentioned by 11 respondents), was generally done for grandchildren, nieces and nephews, and other close relatives. It is interesting that despite having very little income on which to draw, 11 respondents reported paying weekly tidings to their church, or donating money, food or clothing to charitable causes (often organized by their church), and four indicated that they occasionally gave money to panhandlers. Other forms of assistance provided by respondents included sharing or giving someone money to buy groceries and household items and paid chores like babysitting or cutting someone's hair for money (each mentioned by 8 respondents). Seven respondents were sending or had recently sent monetary remittances to a family member in Mexico. The particular impetus for these payments varied considerably, as demonstrated in the following comments from an elderly Spanish speaker:

Respondent: Yes, I have sent money to Mexico, to family. Like my aunt, I was collecting a little money and I sent it to her. I hadn't sent my aunt anything before because she would visit us and when they visited we would buy her a shirt or something. And later, also to a nephew, the son of one of my female cousins that was going to get his doctorate and I sent him some money to help him a little.

Interviewer: How important is this money to them?

Respondent: It was important because it was to help with expenses like when she was sick and needed it out of necessity. And in Mexico you

have to pay for all your college tuition . . . (Mexican-born female, age 72)

Another woman described how she had sold plates of chicken, sausage, rice and beans at \$6 each to help pay the hospital bill for her ailing mother in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico. Four others spoke of sending money to cover family members' utility or medical bills or basic necessities. Conversely, one respondent was sending money to his sister-in-law in Coahuila for paying off credit card debt he incurred before securing legal immigration status in the U.S.

Getting Help

The image of “patchworking” offered by Kibria (1993) and endorsed by Menjívar (2000), which describes an uneven and sometimes haphazard merging of different resources from a number of individuals, can be applied to many of the stories shared by West Side residents in the in-depth interviews. While nearly all respondents reported receiving at least one form of help from a family member, friend, neighbor or acquaintance, both the nature of the assistance and the degree to which they could depend on its availability varied considerably. The most frequently reported class of help received involved assistance with home repairs and yard work (13 respondents). This was often performed by an adult child of the respondent or a neighbor, but could also involve an ex-spouse, grandchild, or friend. Home repairs and yard work stood out as being fairly uncomplicated exchanges. Respondents succinctly described instances in which they needed something done like mowing the grass or raking leaves and with little negotiation required, someone did it. For example, one Spanish speaker explained,

I also have another guy that was a *compañero* (friend) of my son's. When my older son was younger and he would invite him there. (He would say) ‘Go with

me. Pick up the trash.’ He went to work with him and when we need something, they know and they call me. (Mexican-born female, age 52)

The second most commonly reported form of assistance that respondents received was money to help pay for a bill or needed repair (mentioned by 12 respondents). As was the case in the data regarding help given, respondents typically reported receiving this type of cash assistance from close family members like a parent or adult child. This parallels Cecilia Menjívar’s (200) findings from her interviews with Salvadoran immigrants in San Francisco. “Relatives or close friends could provide (material help), as it was easier to let someone sleep on a couch or let them at least eat tortillas, but financial help involved a closer, more enduring relationship...” (141). Some West Side residents described an active, ongoing relationship of exchange with a close relative and felt comfortable asking for help to pay a bill without an expectation of reciprocity, as in the following excerpt from a respondent and her husband, who accompanied her during the in-depth interview:

Respondent: My mother-in-law and father help us a lot.

Husband: It’s been since January of this year that I applied for disability and it was finally approved this month. In between they were helping us out with money and food.

Respondent: But my dad has always helped me, regardless, whether I have money or I don’t. We never ask my mother-in-law. We just say, ‘Oh, we don’t have this or that,’ and she would just say, ‘Oh, let me lend you that.’ A couple times she did lend us \$100 or \$200, but that was the largest amount (and we’d have to pay her back). But if it was a smaller amount she would just give it to us. They’re both great help (U.S.-born female, age 48).

When asked if there had ever been a time when she asked for help from someone, but they could not or chose not to provide it, another young woman responded, “No, ‘cuz we hardly don’t ask. It’s only between my parents and us. We’re really close and we don’t

like going to other people. We know how they are” (U.S.-born, age 21). For others, there were limitations as to the frequency of requests, the amount involved, and the conditions in which it was supplied, even among close family members. Some respondents described how caring for an elderly or disabled family member was reciprocated by the care recipient “taking care of the bills.” Others described more estranged relationships with parents or grown children that made these types of requests uncomfortable if not hostile. One woman was distraught over recent events following her divorce and being laid off that had transpired between her and her mother:

I never asked my mother but one time. I got so pissed off because I never asked to borrow stuff or for money. I was the one married to someone with money. I asked my mom for \$100 and said I’d repay her in three days. She asked for my ring as collateral. I told her forget it, I didn’t need anything from her . . . (U.S.-born female, age 47)

This respondent described facing considerable economic constraints because she was not working at the time of the interview. Her patchwork of financial assistance involved child support payments from her ex-husband, food stamps, and periodic offers to buy groceries and other necessities from the man with whom she was romantically involved. She supplemented this assistance from small amounts of income made by cleaning house and ironing clothes for people, selling her jewelry and hosting garage sales.

Two other common themes amongst the in-depth responses regarding help provided by others mirror themes in the data on help given. Nine respondents discussed receiving groceries or household items and seven had been offered meals, leftover plates of food, or baked goods. One Spanish speaker described how she and two neighbors with whom she was close would periodically borrow ingredients from one another.

“Comadre,” she would say to the mother of one of her children who lived across the

street from her, “Do you have a can of tomatoes?” (Mexican-born female, age 72).

Another woman recalled how her son would call her up and say, “Mom, what are you making for dinner? Don’t. I’m buying something (for you to eat)” (U.S.-born, age 54).

Another three respondents commented that a family member, friend, or neighbor had helped cook for a special occasion.

Use of Neighborhood Services

The *Making Connections* Survey provides ample data indicating which types of services respondents patron in the neighborhood and a measure of their satisfaction with applicable services. The in-depth interviews presented an opportunity to explore the degree to which the use of services afford respondents with meaningful social interaction that may then influence their attachment to the neighborhood. Respondents were first asked to describe the kinds of businesses or facilities that they visited in the neighborhood. A series of simple questions like, “Do you go alone, or with someone else?” and “How well do you know the people that work there? Other customers? Do you talk with them?” then elicited rich information about the social significance of these outings.

The general impression that surfaces through the in-depth data exemplifies Small’s (2009) characterization of non-intimate social ties established through casual, brief encounters. Yet while these encounters did not typically transcend into the sharing of intimate personal information, they seemed to supply small but repeated doses of positive feeling to the West Side respondents. On the whole, respondents found the employees at neighborhood businesses to be helpful, friendly, and personable. 24 out of 33 suggested that they shared some level of familiarity with the staff. A smaller but

substantial number, 14, described occasional encounters with neighbors, friends from high school, former jobs, etc., and acquaintances while visiting neighborhood businesses.

Interestingly, the in-depth data suggest that respondent's material constraints have the effect of increasing opportunities to engage with employees and other customers. The need to reduce costs encourages conversations about where the best deals are and how to get the most value out of coupons. The excerpt below from a Spanish speaker illustrates this process.

Interviewer: What kinds of businesses or facilities do you visit in this neighborhood?

Respondent: H-E-B and La Fiesta (chain grocery stores).

Interviewer: Do you see a lot of people you know there?

Respondent: Yes . . . Since that is where we shop, you almost always run into the same people. 'Hello, how are you?' (we'll say). 'Oh my! The avocados are so expensive! The tomatoes . . . ' Just about any comment. (Mexican-born female, age 72).

Another respondent, a U.S.-born man, shared a similar experience.

Interviewer: Do you talk with the staff?

Respondent: Oh yeah, they'll say, 'You again?' I say, 'Oh yeah, buy one get one free!' They know I joke around a lot. (Age 61)

This again reinforces the efficacy of weak social ties for transferring practical information about saving money and the potential for these weak ties to strengthen with frequent interaction (see Chapter 6).

A final example of bargain shopping introduces another important aspect of the varied functions that trips to neighborhood businesses serve for respondents. Many (12) described them as destinations for family outings or as being family-oriented.

Yes, we enjoy it. I think we go these little stores so often that they know me and my mom. We go with coupons, etc. We (respondent and her 11-year-old daughter) just tag along. Family Dollar (a bargain chain store) opens at 8 AM. Anything that runs on sale in this area, by 1 PM, forget it, it's gone. (U.S.-born female, age 47)

That such a large contingent of U.S.-born Hispanics in West Side have lived in the area for multiple generations plays a significant role in securing the image of businesses being run by families, for families. In the following excerpt, 58-year-old Spanish speaker describes how his own immediate family members and the family members of the employees at several local businesses who overlap.

I've been here in the United States for 10 years and my dad has been here in San Antonio for 20 or maybe 30 years and people know that we don't cause problems...In AutoZone (a chain auto parts store), two friends of my brother work there. They were in school together. Here at the (butcher shop), the sons of the owner were practically all in school with my brothers. When the tire repair shop guy arrived we became friends because I worked at the tortilla shop for about 5 years . . . I know (him), the wife, his son, and they treat me like part of their family. (U.S.-born male)

Another Spanish speaker, a Mexican-born woman in her early fifties, described how an employee at her local bank met and later married her nephew through the respondent's sister, who also has an account at the bank. She indicated that she occasionally went the bank with the sister and the respondent's daughter. Other respondents described lengthy but enjoyable visits to the grocery store or Walmart, prolonged by their children's fascination with toys and other merchandise. It is worth noting that not all of the joint family outings represent targeted efforts to experience something with a family member. As discussed earlier, care taking responsibilities sometimes meant that respondents had to bring a family member with them when they visited neighborhood businesses, and these

experiences could be complicated by struggles to find handicapped parking spaces, wheelchair accessible facilities, and the like.

A third factor that seems to promote social investments through the use of neighborhood services has to do with the shared Mexican culture that predominates in West Side. Nine respondents spoke of visiting independently-owned Mexican restaurants and taco houses, the availability of tortillas, chorizo, and other ethnic grocery items, and Spanish-speaking staff. However, while the presence of Mexican businesses, goods, and employees contribute to a shared cultural identity, they were sometimes met with disappointing reviews. The following excerpt reveals how one respondent's desire to invest in the "Hispanic area in the neighborhood" is hampered by the poor quality of the service she receives at a local grocery store.

. . . I go to rinky dinky restaurants and they're okay. But (La) Fiesta, I'll tell you what can improve. Their staff could be friendlier. One time the staff was really rude. I go over to this other H-E-B, I call it the Gucci H-E-B, and everything is 'Oh, yes ma'am.' So at this Fiesta I think they could be courteous to the people that shop there...But Fiesta is more like in the Hispanic area (gesturing air quotes) in the neighborhood. I'll go there if I have to, but otherwise I won't. A lot of time I'll go because I want to help the community, but the cashiers are just not friendly. (U.S.-born female, age 58)

In a somewhat similar vignette, another woman explained why she preferred to grocery shop at an H-E-B outside her neighborhood because of the rough clientele and poor quality of the Mexican goods at her H-E-B:

My H-E-B, I don't really like it. I guess it's the people that go there. There are projects nearby. This man opened a pack of tortillas and was going through each one, putting his hands, his germs on them. It was like, ugh. I don't buy sweetbread from there either because my son used to work there and said (that) they had maggots and they would just brush them off. (U.S.-born female, age 42)

In this final example, a 23-year respondent is able to articulate how these negative experiences at neighborhood stores have a damaging effect on the community's reputation.

Respondent: One of the reason I avoid places like the Walmart (is that) I've found bottles that are open, half missing, or food items that someone has taken a bite out of. I haven't seen that at H-E-B. But I've seen a bunch of other things that put that stipulation on, like barefoot kids walking around with their own cell phones.

Interviewer: What is your reaction to that?

Respondent: To me, it puts me in a state of disgust . . . that it's going to bring that kind of attention to this side of town. A self-fulfilling prophecy, I guess. (U.S.-born, male)

Others commented that the tortillas and tamales that were so beloved in Mexican culture were fattening. Despite these varied reactions, the recognition of Mexican-oriented businesses and Hispanic employees in the area by many respondents seems to indicate that they are a key element to identifying the neighborhood as a decidedly Hispanic community.

These factors – the economic need to comparison shop, the tendency to patron services with other family members, and the prominence of Mexican culture – help explain why only six respondents described their visits to neighborhood services as just “running in and out.” Despite the frustrations cited above about the people and products at certain “Hispanic hubs” in the neighborhood, only nine out of 33 respondents shared any negative comments regarding their use of neighborhood facilities. This is consistent with the trend observed among the in-depth data on neighborhood conditions. While respondents do occasionally cite complaints about unpleasant or otherwise satisfactory elements of the neighborhood materializing in poor quality services, they are generally

satisfied by their experiences visiting neighborhood facilities and seem to look forward to the opportunities afforded by these experiences to engage with employees and other customers.

The in-depth interview data also reveal that West Side's reputation for having a strong presence of churches and faith-based organizations is appropriately earned among my respondents. With only one exception, all identified a church to which they belonged, and at least 24 out of 33 respondents were members at a church within the neighborhood (as they defined it).² Catholicism was the most common denomination reported (by 19 respondents), followed by non-denominational Christian followings. This is again consistent with the distribution of faith-based institutions in West Side. One or two respondents also attended one of each of the following types of churches: Pentecostal, Baptist, Jehovah's Witness, Lutheran, Evangelical, and Protestant. Nine respondents indicated that they were not currently practicing their religion but still identified with a specific church. Those who attended regular services most commonly were joined by at least one family member and often several relatives, including extended family members who also lived in the neighborhood. Several indicated that their family's membership to the church extended multiple generations, as was true for this 54-year-old woman: "It's down the street from (my) house. Been our church for the longest time. My grandmother started going there. My cousins went to the Catholic school attached to the church. I used to take my mother, but now with her (health) condition, she doesn't want to be bothered"

2. Three respondents explicitly stated that their church was located outside of West Side. The location of the respondent's church was unclear in five interviews.

(U.S.-born). Others described how their adult children, grandchildren, and other extended relatives who had roots in West Side would occasionally return to the neighborhood to attend church with them on Sundays.

Reports of encounters with neighbors and acquaintances at church and engaging in social gatherings with fellow church members were less frequent than in the sections on the use of neighborhood services and interactions with neighbors, respectively. One caveat is that while respondents often volunteered information about neighbors extending invitations to celebrations and social gatherings that they ultimately did not accept, they generally spoke only of those church get-togethers that they attended (8 out of 33 respondents). The most likely scenario involved a meal, celebration, fundraiser, or other activity that was organized by the church. More intimate gatherings were held at the home of a fellow church member with whom the respondent had become friendly or a nearby restaurant. Only four respondents explicitly mentioned intermingling with neighbors at church and only three were involved in some form of prayer group or organized faith-based activity outside of regular services.

I was intrigued to find that respondents reported attending services in Spanish and in English with equal frequency.³ Seven indicated that they attended services in both languages, either by alternating service times based on the linguistic needs of the family member(s) who accompanied them or by frequenting bilingual services. This observation

3. A few respondents did not specify the language of services they preferred but later provided enough information about their use of each language to infer the most probable response. The preferred language of religious services was not identifiable for five respondents.

foreshadowed a larger discovery as to the tremendous amount of toggling between the two languages that characterized respondents' everyday lives. 28 out of 33 respondents indicated that they had conversations in both English and Spanish with relatives, friends, neighbors, and co-workers. "What I can't say in Spanish, I'll say in English" stated one woman (U.S.-born, age 48). Another woman who completed the interview in Spanish elaborated how her church on the north side responded daily to the linguistic needs of patrons:

Interviewer: Do you attend services in English or Spanish?

Respondent: Spanish. If English speakers go, they get a translator. The youth meeting is in English, but the regular church meeting is in Spanish. If the pastor sees that there are more English speaking people, then he'll start in English and get a Spanish translator, but if he sees there are a few English speakers, then they use the radio and someone translates (Mexican-born female, age 52).

Another woman who spoke English during the interview described how the pastor at her Christian church conducted services in Spanish but tried "to do both because she knows we have a little trouble with the Spanish" (U.S.-born, age 47). Bilingualism proved to be a central facet in respondent's daily activities and will be discussed again in Chapter 10.

Community Activism and Formal Neighboring

The open-ended format of the in-depth interviews provided a window into the activities respondents understood to comprise some effort to support their community. We asked, "Do you participate in any community organizations?" but allowed respondents to interpret "participate" however they saw fit. Seventeen described some form of engagement, although six of these respondents referred to past activities in which they were no longer involved. Not surprisingly, the most frequent community

improvement efforts were organized by a religious organization (typically the respondent's church, or the church of a family member). Eight respondents described attending fundraisers like food drives, carnivals, and soup kitchens. The second most frequent type of community activism was organized by the school district. Six respondents had engaged in school-sponsored fundraisers or had volunteered to serve in the parent teacher association (PTA) or other committee. Only four indicated involvement in a purely neighborhood-focused organization, including COPS (Communities Organized for Public Service). This is consistent with Small's (2004) finding that very few individuals actually participate in organized efforts to improve the neighborhood and rarely do so without a specific "inciting mechanism." He cites theories from economists and business strategists about the 80/20 phenomenon, in which 80% of observable change in is likely to be the result of efforts by 20% of the population (Juran 1954; Gladwell 2000, cited on page 177). But in the interest of approaching neighborhood attachment from the bottom up, it is worth noting that three West Side residents answered this question by noting that they have donated household items to Goodwill and, in one case, informally gotten neighbors together to clean up alleys, fallen tree limbs, and the like. It suggests that they have desires to be helpful to neighbors and/or the community at large, even if in practice those desires translate into very small, short-term investments. Another small group of respondents could not claim to be involved in formal neighborhood organizations but nonetheless seemed to value this type of engagement. This is illustrated in the following response from the U.S.-born woman who complained about the service at her H-E-B in comparison to the "Gucci H-E-B" that she preferred.

Interviewer: Do you participate in any community organizations?

Respondent: I want to start. I haven't, but since I'm going through this divorce, I want to start being more involved. That's where I'm going today, to meet this group to try to bless someone. Later today (Saturday) I'm going to a Mexican restaurant to meet former classmates, the class of 1971. We're going to collect money to be able to bless a family for Thanksgiving, give them a basket of food or a gift card...That's my way of being more involved in my community. (Age 58)

Another respondent, a 25-year-old married father, expressed a desire to speak on behalf of his neighborhood if given the opportunity:

Respondent: There's really nobody to put that stuff together, so I'd say no (I don't participate in any community organizations).

Interviewer: Would you, though?

Respondent: If they actually came to our house and tried to get people together, I think I would go. Like if they needed a spokesman or something like that. (U.S.-born male)

When examining the in-depth data on community activism, no clear patterns emerge distinguishing U.S.-born residents from those born in Mexico. Six out of nine immigrants indicated some involvement in community-based efforts, and this was true of 11 out of 24 non-immigrants. That the foreign-born respondents were so connected to organizations in the neighborhood (particularly through church) again speaks to the unique demographic characteristics of West Side and the low housing costs which have enabled low-income Hispanics to establish long-term roots in the area, often spanning several generations.

Neighborhood Naming

Consistent with findings from Coulton et al (2011) and my quantitative analysis of the wave 3 survey data, the in-depth interview respondents used a wide variety of

names to identify the area that they perceived to comprise their neighborhood. More than 15 unique responses were supplied. The most common name was that assigned to the survey area by local leaders, “West Side.” This was endorsed by 15 out of 33 respondents. Of the 14 other names or categories of names (e.g. a particular school, park, restaurant, etc.) identified during the in-depth interviews, only two were endorsed by more than one or two respondents. The data here reveal the same mix of terminology observed among all wave 3 survey respondents, including names of communities designated by street signs and school district materials, apartment complexes, subdivisions, and areas surrounding universities, elementary schools, other popular institutions, and parks. There is no clear pattern distinguishing the types of names supplied by U.S.-born respondents as compared with Mexican-born respondents, nor differences between English and Spanish speakers.

One advantage of the open-ended format of the in-depth interviews was that respondents had more opportunity to list the sources that supplied them with information about the name and boundaries of their neighborhood. Data are available for 27 out of 33 interviews. Respondents’ memories shed some light on the methods of communicating neighborhood names that have been most effective in the area. The most commonly cited source of information was word of mouth. Respondents often referred to the geographical division of San Antonio into four sides: the north, east, south and west. They suggested that this general division was “a given” among San Antonio residents, though the specific boundaries of the four sides may differ. “It’s not like other cities where you have names. They say the north side, west side (and so on). That’s how they divide it,” explained one U.S.-born male (age 54). Another perhaps unsurprising source of information regarding

neighborhood names consisted of practical elements like home deeds and other official records, maps, signs, and bus routes (mentioned by nine respondents). Five individuals suggested that schools and other landmarks helped to demarcate their neighborhood. The same number identified a friend, family member, or acquaintance who had told them the name of the neighborhood.

The in-depth interviews also allowed more opportunity to understand the reasons why so many survey respondents in San Antonio did *not* provide a name for their neighborhood (39%; see Table 14). 12 of the in-depth interview respondents had either stated that their neighborhood did not have a specific name, could not answer the question because they were unsure whether or not it had a name, or provided a name that was not recognizable to NORC coders in the wave 3 survey. Three did so again during the in-depth interview, despite the fact that they had all lived in the neighborhood for a minimum of 11 years. The remaining eight respondents who did not supply a name during the wave 3 survey did apply some sort of label for the neighborhood during the in-depth interview with the aid of the interviewer's probing. "West Side" or "the west side" was again the most frequent response. Below are some examples.

Interviewer: What would you call this neighborhood?

Respondent: Ah, we don't call it anything (laughs). I'm trying to think of what the Association calls it . . . The reason why I can't visualize it is because my world is my home. My neighborhood, I think about it, but that's something I can't control. (Describes how she is worried about surrounding properties being rented out by the children of original owners who have passed away).

Interviewer: What about to someone from out of town? How would you describe where you live?

Respondent: Well, the west side, next to (university). I'd say it's pretty known in San Antonio and it has really grown. (U.S.-born female, age 73)

Respondent: When we were little we used to call it 'Ghost Town.' When we moved there they said, 'Oh, this is the ghost town.' I don't know why . . . It wasn't on any signs or anything.

Interviewer: What about if you were trying to sell your house? What do you think the realtor would put as the neighborhood?

Respondent: I would put 'far west side.' (U.S.-born female, age 58)

Others offered "West Side" more readily, citing the growth of Highway 1604 and the various Air Force bases as landmarks that have drawn attention to the west side on the news and through word-of-mouth. Another woman who fell into this category reflected on the negative connotations often associated with the west side and described a set of strategies aimed at evading this reputation:

Interviewer: What would you call this neighborhood?

Respondent: You avoid it. Refer to (the Air Force base) or something like that. You try not to use 'West Side' because you get labeled. They've tried to push the 'pride of West Side,' but (the negative reputation) is always going to be there. It's not a source of pride. I think they've tried to make it (one). (U.S.-born female, age 58)

A final small subset of three respondents maintained that their neighborhood did have a name. Two of the three were Mexican immigrants who completed the interview in Spanish; however, it should be noted that the majority of respondents with these characteristics did supply a name for their neighborhood during the in-depth interview. During my stay in the area, I came to better understand how it might be possible to live there for many years without associating one's home to a specific neighborhood. As described earlier, there is an overriding sense that land and small single-family homes are

affordable, and that the individuals and families who inhabit them are free to maintain their property autonomously. Images of mettlesome homeowner associations, municipal red tape, and gated communities are distant. My general impression from my time in the area and the in-depth interviews is that space within the western quadrant of San Antonio is not divided into clearly-defined, mutually exclusive neighborhoods.

CHAPTER NINE

DISCUSSION OF QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

My first three research questions were best explored using quantitative research methods, as described in Chapters 3 and 4. They were as follows:

- R₁: Are there differences in the degree of neighborhood attachment expressed by native-born and foreign-born Latinos?
- R₂: To what extent is the impact of native- versus foreign-born origin mediated by social networks?
- R₃: What role does interaction through formal and informal networks play in shaping residents' perceptions of their community?

The in-depth interviews did, however, supply additional information related to the third research question. Small's (2009) concept of organizationally embedded actors" provides a good point of departure for this discussion. He argues that individuals can be understood as actors who draw on the resources available to them through social and organizational networks in response to structural limitations and opportunities (5-6). In *Villa Victoria* Small (2004) offers the term *neighborhood affect* to refer to the "sentiment tied to individuals, groups, or institutions in the neighborhood that motivates individuals to wish attachment to the neighborhood....or dissociation (from the neighborhood)" (164). Sentimental attachments to the neighborhood are said to discourage the formation of strong external ties. In West Side, neighborhood affect is often

synonymous with family affect due to the large presence of extended families and frequent interactions amongst relatives. For many residents the prominence of social networks with family members in the neighborhood has the effect of generating active sentiments – namely, loyalty – about the local community. The in-depth interview respondents were cognizant of this unique feature of West Side. For example, one woman who had otherwise shared generally low opinions of the neighborhood throughout the in-depth interview observed that “everyone has some family that lives close by. In this area, it’s like they’re just welcome” (age 58). She echoed others in citing frequent get-togethers among family members for birthdays and other occasions. My observation is that the significance of these get-togethers for neighborhood attachment should not be underestimated. The frequent discussion of cooking, sharing groceries, and preparing plates of leftover food suggest that social gatherings are one of the most important venues for transferring information among residents and reinforcing one’s embeddedness in social networks. Frequent interaction and frequent exposure to one another’s food also sets the groundwork for exchanging emotional and moral support. As among Menjívar’s (2000) Salvadoran informants, the West Side residents I interviewed drew on this support to deal with depression, frustration and other negative feelings caused by hardships (143). These hardships often involved the ill health of loved one which left the respondent with considerable care taking responsibilities. This had the ironic effect of inducing psychological stress for the respondent but also strengthening social ties among families and attachments to the west side.

The final two research questions are more appropriate for qualitative inquiry in that they attempt to answer “what” and “how” questions that are not easily collapsed into

mutually exclusive categories. In this chapter I review the findings from the in-depth interviews as related to each question.

R₄: What are the particular resources – material, emotional, or otherwise - that Latinos derive through social networks?

H_{4.1}: Non-financial help in the form of childcare and employment information/referrals will represent the resources most frequently received from social networks, as reported in the survey.

H_{4.2}: The in-depth interviews will reveal that social networks contribute to feelings of belonging and being needed in one's community.

Contrary to my first prediction, babysitting assistance was not among the most commonly received forms of aid provided by family members, friends, and neighbors, and discussions of employment referrals were extremely rare. The latter is likely due in part to the number of respondents who were not working at the time of the interview and to relatively limited set of questions that were asked about employment in the interview protocol. The more common experience among respondents was to have received help in the form of a home repair or yard work, money to pay bills or to finance a repair, and/or food.

But in regards to the second hypothesis, the in-depth data do support the theory that the transfer of resources through social networks has the effect of encouraging feelings of collective identity and reciprocal care in one's community. This is corroborated by respondent's frequent discussions of how neighbors "watch out for one another" and, more subtly, in the casual language used to describe exchanges between neighbors involving assistance with home repairs and yard work, borrowing tools, and

sharing groceries. Receiving a plate of home-cooked food following a special get-together seems to be particularly effective in establishing a sense of familiarity amongst neighbors.

R_{4a}: Through what processes are these resources transferred?

H_{4a}: Giving and getting help involves negotiations that are conflict-ridden and sensitive to material conditions at both the giving and receiving ends.

The expectation that altruism would be constrained by economic conditions and other contextual factors is also supported by the in-depth interview data. Just as respondent's requests for help were highly situational and strategically targeted across their patchwork of resources based on expectations about who could afford various types of expenses, their relatives, friends, and neighbors responded to these requests in context-specific ways. Respondents often endeavored to empathize with the circumstances surrounding those who were unable to supply the help they requested. For example, one man relayed the following in Spanish:

When I ask to borrow, it's because I really need it. And it's true because I make \$400 a week and I have to pay for the house, the car, the electrical bill, buy a little bit of groceries, and gasoline. And so I see that I have \$20 left over and if someone asks me for \$100, well, I can't do it. So that's how I see it. (Mexican-born, age 58)

Another man commented of his neighbors, who said they didn't have the money to help him,

I don't think they did it purposely. I always help them and I thought, maybe they just didn't want to do it. But I have to believe them. I got a little down, but a week later (my neighbor) asked if I still needed money. We're still good friends. I guess it happens to everybody. (U.S.-born, age 43)

Yet hard feelings and mistrust did emerge occasionally. One woman who had previously shared how her neighbors would often send over a plate of food when they cooked, given her rides when she did not have access to a vehicle, and even ran an extension cord from their home so that she and her husband could turn on their Christmas lights expressed frustration over her sister's reluctance to provide her with monetary assistance. "She's always complaining, 'I don't have money,'" the respondent said of her sister. "I know deep down that she's got money, but she's the type that she doesn't like to help me" (U.S.-born, age 48). During another interview, an elderly respondent and her sister described how the respondent could rely on the respondent's sons and daughter to perform strenuous household chores for her, but they were disappointed by the apathetic if not confrontational disposition of the neighbors. An excerpt is included below, from the sister of the respondent (U.S.-born, age 72).

Neighbors are supposed to have a responsibility for each other. Sometimes there is a sewer line broke, or there is a new car and they scratch it, and (the neighbors) don't do nothing about it. Me and her, we're poor, and we're Christians. I think neighbors should have a little understanding and say, this tree is going to fall on (their) yard. Food in my fridge is going bad, and people want to stay quiet.

CHAPTER TEN
CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
ATTACHMENT STUDIES

Before we act to improve urban conditions . . . we must comprehend the interlocking physical, economic, social and political factors that helped create the era of the city neighborhood...Only then will we be able to channel powerful feelings of local attachment in a positive and sustained way. Otherwise, not only will we be condemned to repeat the mistakes of the past but we will fail even to repeat its triumphs.

—Alexander von Hoffman, *Local Attachments*

In this chapter I synthesize findings from both the quantitative and qualitative components of my research to identify the main lessons for future study of neighborhood attachment among Latinos. I begin by discussing the salience of country of origin across the seven aspects of neighborhood attachment defined in the statistical analysis: evaluation, formal neighboring, informal neighboring, neighborhood naming, length of residence, and sentiment. I then offer a theoretical argument to frame the situation in West Side using a conditional approach, following the lead of Mario Luis Small (2004).

The Salience of Country of Origin

A principal objective of this research was to respond to the lack of information about neighborhood attachment among Latinos by investigating whether there are significant differences in the levels of attachment among those born in the U.S. versus immigrants. I was influenced by the work of Portes and Rumbaut (2001) and others who have found evidence of contradictory patterns of academic and economic success among

second generation immigrants and low estimations of one's ethnic community's solidarity among first generation parents from Mexico (110). I hypothesized that U.S.-born Latinos would demonstrate lower overall levels of attachment than foreign-born Latinos. My findings from the descriptive statistics and multivariate regression models using the survey data suggest that this is true for three components of neighborhood attachment: formal neighboring, informal neighboring, and length of residence.

Evaluation and neighborhood naming show the opposite effect, with foreign-born Latinos being more likely than U.S.-born Latinos to indicate that their neighborhood was suitable for raising children and more likely to provide a recognized name for their neighborhood. Closer inspection revealed a site effect influencing the results for neighborhood naming in San Antonio, but the trend of foreign-born Latinos reporting more positive evaluations of their neighborhoods held up even after breaking out the San Antonio responses and after controlling for other factors in the multivariate logistic regression model. The final component of neighborhood attachment, sentiment, does not appear to differ systematically by racial or ethnicity. I therefore conclude that the influence of country of origin among Latinos on levels of attachment varies across the six components investigated here. U.S.-born Latinos in the survey neighborhoods in Des Moines, Denver, Indianapolis, San Antonio, White Center, and Providence engaged more frequently in formal and informal neighboring activities, and were more likely to report a recognizable name for their neighborhood. Yet they were slightly less optimistic than their immigrant counterparts about whether their neighborhood is a good place to raise children.

Areas in Which U.S.-born Origin Promotes Attachment: Formal Neighboring, Informal Neighboring, and Length of Residence

The survey data suggest that foreign-born Latinos are among the least likely to engage in formal neighboring activities. These include speaking to a local political official or religious leader about a neighborhood problem or improvement, getting together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem, volunteering for activities in the community, and serving as an officer or on a committee for a local organization. Conversely, nearly 44% of Blacks (largely U.S.-born) were involved in formal neighboring. It is perhaps not surprising that engagement in local politics and formal neighborhood associations is less common among immigrant Latinos. Some amount of insider knowledge and social capital is required to connect oneself with organizers and key players in a community. An expectation that the neighborhood could be or should be better also plays a role. From his research with Puerto Rican residents in Villa Victoria, a subsidized housing development in Boston, Small (2004) argues that “residents act and become involved in their neighborhoods when such actions conform to their narrative of the neighborhood’s role in their lives” (71). In contrast to what Putnam (2000) describes as the “highly civic” generation, Small finds that the most highly engaged cohort from the Villa had done little or no volunteering for causes not directly related to their housing complex. He concludes that “community participation is not rooted in the perception that participation is good for humanity at large,” but is instead based on one’s belief that it is good for his or her immediate social environment (78). It is plausible that the infrequent formal engagement reported by foreign-born Latinos in the *Making Connections* Survey is tied to their generally positive characterizations of

neighborhood conditions and more conservative expectations about the standards to which they are entitled

My conversations with West Side residents were informative in that they allowed those respondents who were not actively taking leadership roles in a community organization or neighborhood-based activity were nonetheless able to speak about their desires to get involved or, conversely, their reasons for not participating. Seventeen respondents reported some form of engagement (past or present) but only four were involved in a neighborhood organization like COPS (Communities Organized for Public Service). Others had contributed in a more episodic way to fundraisers and festivals organized by a church or school, or by donating household items to Goodwill or getting together informally with neighbors to clean up alleys and yard debris. While these activities may not be particularly effective for generating social capital, I argue that they have a small role in reinforcing a neighborhood identity and strengthening communal attachments.

In terms of informal neighboring such as attending religious services inside the neighborhood, getting help or support besides money (babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides) from family or friends who live in the neighborhood, or attending a neighborhood get-together (festival, picnic, etc.), being foreign-born Latino was found to be associated with moderately decreased odds of engagement. The influence of being U.S.-born is significant, but small (.063). Interestingly, having completed the interview in Spanish has a positive influence on the propensity to engage in informal neighboring (.479). The in-depth interview data from West Side residents suggest that the availability of bilingual religious services and Spanish-speaking neighbors greatly facilitate informal

engagement in the neighborhood. More broadly, I find that casual encounters with neighbors at social events like barbecues and birthday parties and exchanging plates of home-cooked food or baked goods is extremely important in building social ties between neighbors.

The survey data on length of residence tell a slightly different story. Not surprisingly, homeownership has the strongest influence. This is followed by a strong positive increase of roughly six years associated with being U.S.-born Latino. The influence of being immigrant Latino is also significant, but only at the .05 level. As previously discussed, this is driven by the exceptionally long median tenure of U.S.-born Latinos in San Antonio of 14 years as compared to 5.5 years among all respondents from the other five sites. My interviews in San Antonio provided additional support to the argument that long-term residency in a neighborhood is indicative of stronger local attachments and loyalties. West Side residents frequently discussed long-term neighbors, the practice of passing down homes to family members, and the experiences of their parents growing up in the neighborhood as contributing to their intimate familiarity with the area. In addition to a positive influence on neighborhood attachment associated with lengthy tenure for the respondent, the presence of long-term residents also seems to instill a sense of stability to others in the neighborhood. This echoes the argument by Dagger (1997) that attachment to place grows over time and that as the faces of neighbors become more familiar, residents perceive their neighborhoods as more neighborly.

Areas in Which U.S.-born Origin Decreases Attachment:

Evaluation and Neighborhood Naming

In the logistic regression model predicting evaluation, both U.S.-born and immigrant Latinos are found to be more likely to offer a positive evaluation of their neighborhood as a place to raise children than Whites, but the coefficient for the latter is about twice as strong. The in-depth interview data on neighborhood conditions, perceptions about the problems in one's neighborhood compared to other neighborhoods, and thoughts about moving suggest that while U.S.-born Latinos may be more vocal about crime and disorder in the neighborhood, this does not necessarily preclude the formation of strong loyalties to their local communities. Three quarters of respondents (25 out of 33) indicated that their neighborhood was no more troubled than other places and 13 stated that it was *less* troubled. Residents reasoned that "all neighborhoods have problems" and often constructed cognitive if not logistical barriers to separate themselves from feeling the personal effects of neighborhood crime. Many avoided being out in the neighborhood at night, when they would be most likely to confront deviance and wrongdoing. This allowed them to form narratives about neighborhood life that emphasized more positive, peaceful experiences and interactions that occurred during the day.

As for neighborhood naming, both foreign-born and U.S.-born Latinos are less likely to name the neighborhood than Whites. But the biggest factor in the logistic regression model is language (having completed the interview in Spanish). There appears to be a site effect, with rates of neighborhood naming consistently lower in San Antonio across all racial/ethnic groups. Data from the in-depth interview questions related to

neighborhood evaluation revealed an interesting interaction with neighborhood naming. Those respondents who expressed both frustrations with crime and disorder in the neighborhood *and* favorable comparisons between their neighborhood's problems and the problems found in a "typical" neighborhood often narrowed their frame of reference to just their block or even a portion of the block when forming evaluative judgments about the latter. When asked to compare their neighborhood to others they evoked a neighborhood definition that was more personal and accompanied by greater trust among neighbors. This parallels Sudhir Venkatesh's (2000) observations from his work with public housing residents, who were found to carve out meaningful social subgroups within their immediate spatial environment. That West Side residents constructed frames of cohesive social spaces at their block level may be viewed as promising strategy for fostering neighborhood attachment in places lacking clearly-defined "official" neighborhoods. Returning to Lefebvre's seminal work on the social production of space, block-level framings can be predicted to supply West Side residents with "tools of thought and action" (1991). Effective strategies for translating these framings into community mobilization must succeed in connecting small and potentially isolated social groupings with larger, resource-rich organizations. The reported success of the My Voice Counts/Mi Voz Cuenta program coordinated by the *Making Connections* San Antonio Partnership may serve as a model for promoting resident leadership by identifying "ambassadors" to represent and share information with small subgroups within a larger neighborhood.

How the Conditional Approach Fits West Side

Thus far, I have avoided endorsing a unifying theory to account for the entire body of results of my research. I have done so in an effort to follow the lead of past authors of neighborhood attachment studies who suggest that understanding communal ties requires the examination of distinct behavioral and attitudinal components (Smith 1975). By examining six different forms of attachment I decrease the probability that a single theory will aptly predict levels of attachment among Latinos. I have instead drawn on existing theories from the literature on international migration and neighborhood attachment to investigate specific hypotheses for individual components of attachment or predicting factors. However, I am compelled to cite Mario Small's (2004) conception of a conditional approach as the most promising known model for characterizing neighborhood attachment among Latinos. The conditional approach treats observed mechanisms not as universal traits of poor Latino neighborhoods, but as particular to the context of a given neighborhood. It attempts to identify a combination of factors that produce a certain outcome – what Ragin (1987) calls *conjunctural causation*. Less emphasis is placed on isolating *all factors* that may have an effect on neighborhood attachment in the community. Small's (2004) concluding remarks in *Villa Victoria* provide an excellent point of departure:

Poor neighborhoods are not always isolated or uninvolved. And not all people in a given poor neighborhood are isolated or uninvolved. I suggest that understanding the conditions affecting the reasons why should be the central, not peripheral, focus of our analysis if we are to understand how neighborhood poverty affects isolation and lack of involvement. (189)

Small argues that many of the mechanisms found to be at work in the Villa would *not* be expected to operate in other poor neighborhoods. Note that unlike in Small's (2004) research, my in-depth interviews did not explicitly target transfers of social capital. I was more interested in the emotional and social experience of resource transfers among friends, relatives, and neighbors, and how those transfers influence neighborhood attachment. Nonetheless, Small's position fits the findings from my research. At the start of the project, I had some suspicions that the survey responses from Latinos in San Antonio may be somehow affected by the neighborhood's unique demographic and geographic characteristics. Recall that the survey population in this site is overwhelmingly Hispanic or Latino and the target neighborhood covers nearly five times as much territory as the median size among the other *Making Connections* sites. I did not anticipate that at nearly every stage in the quantitative analysis some indication of a site effect would surface for at least one of the dependent variables. This further convinced me that West Side should not be cast as typical of even the low-income neighborhoods that were surveyed for *Making Connections*. Instead, it serves as a site for investigating how space and interactions are negotiated within a unique combination of economic and demographic factors that promote the development of strong communal ties. In Small's words, West Side should be viewed neither as "a sample nor a universe but a case with a specific configuration of conditions" (186).

My research suggests that three conditional factors have the effect of increasing neighborhood attachment among Latinos in West Side. First, the widespread availability of affordable single-family housing is critically important. Recall that in San Antonio homeownership exerted the strongest influence on length of residence, with homeowners

predicted to have lived in the neighborhood for an additional 9 years over those who rent or have other living arrangements (see Table 18). A hearty stock of small bungalows with two or three bedrooms have been present in the area since the 1950s and are readily available for around \$50,000 at the time of this writing. Aside from the economic perks associated with homeownership, including wealth accumulation and tax benefits, there are psychological benefits tied to fulfilling the “American dream” of private ownership. The in-depth interview respondents frequently described their homes as a sort of haven from any problems occurring in the neighborhood or other parts of the city and expressed sentimental investments in its upkeep. The availability of low-cost housing can also be credited for facilitating the emergence of a second conditional factor, strong extended family networks within the neighborhood. In West Side, a key distinction is that neighbors are often family members. Low-income Latino families were drawn to West Side by a variety of factors, but are able to stay there because it is affordable. Adult children frequently inherit or purchase their parents’ homes for a reduced price. Relatives are attracted to the area by the personal testimony of family members who would not likely be able to afford a home in most neighborhoods in such close proximity to the downtown district of a major U.S. city. Care giving responsibilities that might otherwise be relegated to paid contractors and commercial services are kept “within the family.” Newcomers to the neighborhood witness the large crowds at family barbecues and other celebrations hosted by neighbors. A feeling of familiarity is communicated. Even non-close social ties among families and neighbors strengthen with frequent interaction (Small 2009, 114). This garners support for West Side’s reputation as a place for families to establish long-term roots.

The final conditional factor pertains to racial and ethnic homogeneity. While Menjívar's (2000) research informed my expectation that tensions between U.S.- and foreign-born Latinos in West Side would surface in the face of economic stressors, I found more generally that the Hispanic identity of the neighborhood was so uncontested that these divisions were rarely enacted. This is supported by the finding that only 17% of Latinos in San Antonio reported racial incidents occurring in their neighborhood versus 28% of Latinos in the other five sites in the wave 3 survey. The in-depth interview respondents' own Hispanic origins seemed fundamentally and inextricably linked to their experiences living in the neighborhood. This became apparent when asking about their use of Spanish with friends, family, neighbors, and co-workers. 28 out of 33 respondents described conversations in both English and Spanish. While several stated that their facility in speaking and/or understanding was limited and described situations in which they "got stuck," it was generally accepted that the Spanish language and Mexican culture were integral parts of daily life in West Side. All but three of the in-depth interview participants indicated that it was important that they spoke Spanish with other people in their lives. Ten respondents suggested that doing so was a necessity because they were close with one or more monolingual Spanish-speakers. Equal numbers (7 each) cited the dual-language characteristics of the local population in West Side or stated explicitly that speaking Spanish was culturally important in that it maintains a connections to one's heritage. The perception that "everyone is Hispanic," or, in the words of some respondents, "all Spanish," is part of the narrative process by which residents in this large and not well-defined territory come to attach meaning to their relationship with the neighborhood.

Conclusions

Urban theorists have long debated the consequences of local stressors such as crime, physical and social disorder, and intergroup hostility at the neighborhood level for perceptions of social proximity among neighbors. My analysis of data from the *Making Connections* Survey in six sites, along with in-depth interviews with a subset of Latino respondents in San Antonio echoes the argument of Woldoff (2002) and others who have attributed an overemphasis on the “weakening effect” of these factors on social cohesion to a conceptual oversimplification of neighborhood attachment. I find that it is indeed important to examine multiple components of attachment so that “neighborhoods which may be deficient in overt social interaction but strong in some other aspect of social cohesion” are “recognized for their communal strengths” (Smith 1975, 1745). This is supported by my finding that despite being cognizant of fairly frequent instances of crime and signs of social disorder in the neighborhood, the great majority of in-depth interview participants in West Side felt that their neighborhood was better off than others. Only four out of the 24 respondents who were asked if they would consider moving expressed a desire to leave West Side. I have argued that this reveals the powerful influences of aspirations to live in a “good” neighborhood and frequent interaction with family members in the area on the meanings residents attach to their observations of the neighborhood.

My research also supports earlier findings that the term “neighborhood” tends to evoke thoughts of nearby people rather than just a specific spatial or institutional unit (Guest and Lee 1984), and that the geographic area encompassed by those “nearby people” is often restricted to one’s immediate block (Coulton et al 2010). Park’s (1926)

observation that “social relations are so frequently and so inevitably correlated with spatial relations” and that “physical distances so frequently are, or seem to be, the indexes of social distances” remains applicable (18).

My main objective for this research was to address the dearth of knowledge surrounding neighborhood attachment among Latinos. Communal ties are worth studying within this population because they bear the potential to increase community participation and thus facilitate the accumulation of additional political power for Latinos. Despite being the nation’s largest ethnic minority group and major source of population growth in many cities that are simultaneously experiencing out-migration of non-Hispanic Whites and African Americans, Latinos are still proportionately underrepresented in the political sphere (Griffin and Newman 2007, Arvizu and Garcia 1996). They are both less likely to vote than Whites and less likely to hold political office. Empirical studies have shown that involvement in the political process increases Latino’s ability to influence educational policies affecting Latino students (Meier and Stewart 1991) and that organized efforts to mobilize Latino voters are key to electing Latino candidates (Brischetto and Engstrom 1997). Neighborhoods can also supply Latinos living in poverty with critical material resources through informal contacts with neighbors and more formal involvement with community groups. This is particularly important given that Latinos have been disproportionately affected by the housing crash of 2008 and economic recession (Taylor et al 2012). Both unemployment and increases in the poverty rate among Latinos exceed national figures.

This research has highlighted several opportunities for further study. First, it would be highly desirable to repeat the in-depth interviews with Latino residents in the

other *Making Connections* sites to provide points of comparison to the West Side findings. This work might reveal additional conditions which serve to facilitate or discourage neighborhood attachment in particular locations. Similarly, the conditional factors involving affordable housing, strong extended family networks, and racial and ethnic homogeneity that I observe in West Side could be examined using a larger sample of neighborhoods. Systematic examination of Latinos in studies of community attachment will be critical for understanding neighborhood effects in an increasingly multiethnic and multiracial American society.

APPENDIX A

SCREENING SCRIPT FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

RESPONDENT ANSWERED1 → CONTINUE TO INTRO
RESPONDENT NOT HOME2 → ARRANGE CALL BACK
RESPONDENT DOES NOT LIVE THERE/WRONG #1 → SEE IF INFORMANT
KNOWS R & CAN
PROVIDE NEW
PHONE #

IF NO, SAY: An interviewer from NORC at the University of Chicago asked you questions about your neighborhood, your access to and use of services and amenities, your children, work, and family finances.

The purpose of my call today is to ask you if you are willing to speak with an NORC employee during the fall of 2011 about your relationships with neighbors as well as friends and family members outside the neighborhood. A couple of sample questions are: "How did you (and your family) come to live in this neighborhood?" and "How well do you know your neighbors?"

The interview would last about 90 minutes. The study team will be meeting with families during the fall of this year. Unlike the survey you completed in 2008/2009, this time the interviews will be conducted at a local community center, like the West Side Education and Training Center (WETC). NORC will offer you \$30 as a thank-you for your time. The Annie E. Casey Foundation is funding the study.

If you want to be part of the study, all of the information you provide will be kept confidential. When the interviews are all done, NORC will write a report that combines responses from the interviews with the survey data we collected in previous years. The report will not use your name or identify you in any way. Your participation is voluntary. You only have to answer questions you're comfortable answering, and you can choose not to be in the study at any time.

4. Are you willing to participate in this research?

YES.....1
 NO2 → GO TO END
 NOT SURE3 → ASK TO CALL BACK

5. Great! We have appointments available from Tuesday, November 8th through Monday, November 21st. [CONSULT SCHEDULING SPREADSHEET AND SUGGEST AVAILABLE TIMES]. What day and time would be convenient for you?

-
6. [READ **ONLY** IF RESPONDENT SEEMS TO HAVE DIFFICULTY SPEAKING/UNDERSTANDING ENGLISH] It seemed from the responses you gave to the survey in 2008/2009 that you understood English well. Are you comfortable doing this interview in English, or would you prefer Spanish?

ENGLISH.....1
 SPANISH.....2

→RECORD INTERVIEW DATE, TIME, AND LANGUAGE IN SCHEDULING SPREADSHEET. CONTINUE TO NEXT1.

NEXT1: Thank you for scheduling an interview! We will send you a letter through US Postal Service mail to confirm your appointment and provide more information about this research. We have requested a room at [LOCATION] to conduct these interviews. [LOCATION] is located at:

[ADDRESS]

If the location changes, someone will call you at least 24 hours before your appointment to notify you. If you need to reschedule your appointment, please call Kate Bachtell at (312) 759-5095.

→ THANK RESPONDENT AND END CALL.

END1: This small study includes adult Latinos who live in the West San Antonio or Edgewood neighborhood and participated in the *Making Connections* Survey in the past. Thanks for taking the time to speak with me today. If you have any questions, please call Kate Bachtell at (312) 759-5095 or NORC's IRB administrator at 773-256-6302. Goodbye.

END: I am sorry you do not wish to participate in the study. If you change your mind please contact Kate Bachtell at (312) 759-5095 or NORC's IRB administrator at 773-256-6302. Thanks for taking the time to speak with me today.

APPENDIX B

ADVANCE LETTER FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

[DATE]

Dear Mr(s). [LAST NAME],

I am sending this letter because you have been selected to participate in a study about relationships among Latinos in your neighborhood. The research team would like to expand on the answers you provided to NORC during the *Making Connections* interview(s) you completed in past years and to learn more about your experiences living in this neighborhood.

I am leading this research as part of my Ph.D. dissertation, with supervision from faculty at Loyola University Chicago.

The study team will be meeting with families during the fall of this year. The interviews will be conducted at [LOCATION]. [LOCATION] is located at:

[ADDRESS]

Your appointment is scheduled for the following day and time:

[DATE] [TIME]

During the interview, I or an NORC interviewer will ask you questions about your relationships with neighbors as well as friends and family members outside the neighborhood. A couple of sample questions are: "How did you (and your family) come to live in this neighborhood?" and "How well do you know your neighbors?"

The conversation is voluntary, and you are not required to participate. You may answer only those questions you're comfortable answering, and you may choose not to be in the study at any time. Whether or not you decide to participate in the study, the conversation will not affect any services you receive, or your continued participation in the *Making Connections* study.

The conversation will last about 90 minutes. All individuals that agree to participate are offered \$30 for their time.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is funding the study and is not affiliated with the government. Your name is confidential and all conversations are private.

If you have any questions about this research or need to reschedule your appointment, please contact me at bachtell-kate@norc.org or (312) 759-5095.

If you would like to speak with my faculty advisor at Loyola University Chicago, please contact Dr. Rhys Williams, Professor of Sociology, at rwilliams7@luc.edu or (773) 508-3459.

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this important study!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kate Bachtell". The script is cursive and fluid.

Kate Bachtell
Project Director, Neighborhood Connections Study
NORC at the University of Chicago
bachtell-kate@norc.org

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

NORC at the University of Chicago

Project 5816

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**TITLE OF STUDY:** Neighborhood Connections**Project Director:** Kate Bachtell**Phone number:** (312) 759-5095

You are asked to take part in a research study under the direction of Kate Bachtell of NORC at the University of Chicago. She is conducting this research with supervision from faculty at Loyola University Chicago as part of her Ph.D. dissertation.

Other persons who work with her at NORC will also conduct interviews. You will be one of approximately 35 people in your neighborhood asked to participate in this study.

Purpose:

The purpose of this research study is to explore relationships among Latinos in this neighborhood. You have been selected for this study because the research team would like to expand on the answers you provided to NORC during the *Making Connections* interviews you completed in past years and to learn more about your experiences living in this neighborhood. A couple of sample questions are: "How did you (and your family) come to live in this neighborhood?" and "How well do you know your neighbors?"

Duration:

Your participation in this study involves an interview that typically lasts around 90 minutes.

Procedures:

During the course of this study, the following will occur:

1. To ensure that your responses are accurately reflected, the interviewer will request to audio record the conversation.
2. After you sign and return this informed consent statement an NORC interviewer will ask you questions about your relationships with neighbors as well as friends and family members outside the neighborhood. The interview will take approximately 90 minutes.
3. At the close of each interview you will receive \$30 as a thank-you for your time.

Benefits and Risks/Discomforts:

The benefits to you of participating in this study may be: contributing to the body of knowledge about social networks in this community and knowing that the information you provide will help researchers, policy makers and local service providing organizations to better meet the needs of residents. You will be paid \$30 for participating in the interview. The potential risks include discomfort with recalling times when you needed or wanted social support but could not get it from family, friends, or community members. The research team has developed procedures to mask your identity and avoid the recording of personal identifiers. At the beginning of the interview I will remind you not to disclose any identifying information. In the event that you disclose personal information during the recording and in the unlikely event that the recording is lost or stolen, there is a risk that someone could hear your answers.

Confidentiality:

Only authorized research staff at NORC will have access to your interview data. Your name and any other identifying information will be kept separate from your answers to the research questions. A number that identifies you will be associated with your research data but your name or other identifying information will be kept separate from your data. No subjects will be identified in any report or publication of this study or its results.

Payments to Participants:

You will receive \$30 as a thank you for your time and cooperation. You will be paid this sum if you start but do not complete the interview.

Right to refuse or to withdraw from the study:

Your participation is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, or may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty, or jeopardizing any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled. NORC interviewers also have the right to stop your participation in the study at any time. You may also choose to continue the interview without being audio recorded.

Questions

You have the right to ask, and to have answered, all your questions about this research. You may contact Kate Bachtell, the principal investigator, at bachtell-kate@norc.org or (312) 759-5095.

If you would like to speak with her faculty advisor at Loyola University Chicago, please contact Dr. Rhys Williams, Professor of Sociology, at rwilliams7@luc.edu or (773) 508-3459.

Institutional Review Board Approval

This project has been reviewed and approved by NORC's Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have questions about your rights as a study participant, you may call the NORC IRB Administrator toll free at 866-309-0542.

Subject's Agreement:

I have read the information provided above. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Research Subject

____/____/_____
Date

I agree to have my interview audio recorded.

Signature of Research Subject

____/____/_____
Date

Please sign one of the consent forms and keep the other one for your records.

APPENDIX D
PROTOCOL FOR IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS



Neighborhood Connections Study

NORC Project 5816

Interview Protocol

Case Id:

INTERVIEWER: BEFORE BEGINNING, ASK RESPONDENT TO TRY TO AVOID SHARING THE REAL NAMES OF INDIVIDUALS AND OTHER IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

A. Family Background

1. First I would like you tell me about your family and home. How did you/your family come to live in this neighborhood? In San Antonio?

- a. Where did your parents live? What kinds of jobs did they have?

- b. Where do your relatives live?

2. Now, I'd like to get a sense of what life is like in this household. Can you walk me through what you did yesterday?

- a. What about the weekends? What did you do last Saturday? Sunday?

- b. Were there other people there? How well do you know them?

- Did you talk with them?
- Eat with them? Who cooked the food?

B. Neighborhood Conditions and Relationships

1. I don't need to know their real names, but can you tell me about the 5 people you are closest with? [ENCOURAGE R TO USE TERMS LIKE "NEXT-DOOR NEIGHBOR," "BEST FRIEND," ETC. RATHER THAN PROPER NAMES]
 - a. How do you know them?
 - b. Which of them, if any, live in your neighborhood?
 - c. What types of activities do you do with them?

PERSON 1:

PERSON 2:

PERSON 3:

PERSON 4:

PERSON 5:

2. Can you describe what it's like to live in this neighborhood?

3. How well do you know your neighbors? [ADJUST WORDING OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS NEEDED IF R ALREADY SPOKE ABOUT NEIGHBORS IN QUESTION B1]

- a. Do you spend time with your neighbors during the week? On weekends?
- b. What types of activities do you do with neighbors? Where do you do them?
- c. Do you attend celebrations like birthdays or quinceañeras with neighbors? If so, what did you do at the last one? Where was it held? What did you eat?

4. Do you participate in any community organizations? Tell me about them.

5. Do you attend church? Where do you go?

- a. How far away is that? What neighborhood is it in?
- b. Do you attend services in English or Spanish?
- c. Who do you know there? Do your extended family members also go to that church?
- d. Do you see those people outside of regular religious services?

6. What kinds of businesses or facilities do you visit in this neighborhood? For example, do you go to a grocery store, bank, clinic, etc. nearby?

- a. How do you get there?
- b. Do you go alone, or with someone else?
- c. What happens when you go there? What's it like?
- d. How well do you know the people that work there? Other customers? Do you talk with them?

7. What do you know about the history of this neighborhood?

- a. What kinds of changes, if any, have taken place?

8. Does this neighborhood have more problems than typical neighborhood, less, or about the same? Please describe.

9. What would you call this neighborhood?

- a. How did you learn the name of this neighborhood? (i.e. from school districts, signage in the community, landmarks, festivals, materials from a community organization or realtors, word of mouth, etc.)?

C. Childcare (FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE OR MORE CHILD. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION D)

1. Can you walk me through what your child(ren) did yesterday?

2. Who does your child (or who do your children) spend his/her (their) time with regularly?
- a. What hours of the day does it cover? How many hours per week?
 - b. Where does he or she (they) receive this care (e.g., family's home, caregiver's home, elsewhere)?
 - c. How does he or she (they) get there?

3. How did you end up making this/these care arrangement(s)? What did you consider? Who did you talk to?

4. Tell me what you think about this/these arrangement(s). Does your child like it there?

5. Who takes care your child on weekends or other off-hours when you might need to work or go out, or something comes up?

D. Financial and Informal Support

1. What *financial* assistance do you **receive** from people you know?

- a. Where do they live? Are they in the neighborhood?

- b. [IF NOT ALREADY DISCUSSED AND R HAS FAMILY IN ANOTHER COUNTRY] How often do you **receive money** from family or friends living in other countries? How important is this money to you [and your family]?

2. What **financial** assistance do you **give** to people you know?

a. Where do they live? Are they in the neighborhood?

b. [IF NOT ALREADY DISCUSSED AND R HAS FAMILY IN ANOTHER COUNTRY] How often do you **give money** to family or friends living in other countries? How important is this money to them?

3. What help **other than** money do you **give** to people you know, like family, friends, and neighbors? For example, do you ever babysit their children, give them ingredients for cooking, etc.?

4. What help **other than** money do you **receive** from people you know, like family, friends, and neighbors? For example, do you ever babysit their children, give them ingredients for cooking, etc.?

5. Tell me about the last time you got help like this (**not money**) from someone.

- a. How did you ask for their help? Or did they volunteer it?
- b. Do you regularly ask this person for help? Is there someone else you ask more frequently?

6. Sometimes people ask for different kinds of help from different kinds of people. Can you think of a time when you asked for help from...
- a. What about from someone who is much older or younger than you?
 - b. Someone from the opposite sex?
 - c. Someone of a different race or ethnicity, or from another country?

7. Has there been a time when you asked for help from someone, but they could not or chose not to provide it? Please tell me about it.

a. How did this make you feel?

E. Other Socio-demographic Factors

E.I. Language

Now I would like to ask you some questions about language.

1. What language(s) do you speak with other people in this household? (IF R HAS CHILDREN) With your children? With friends and family? Co-workers?

2. How important is it to you that you speak Spanish with other people in your life?

3. Are there other members of your family or close relative who rely on you to help translate or explain information that is in English?

E.II Employment

1. What kind of work do you do? Are you working right now? How long have you been doing this work?

2. Where is your [primary] job located? How do you get to work?

3. Please tell me about your work schedule – for example, last week, what was your schedule?
 - a. How many hours did you work?
 - b. Did your hours include any hours that are outside of the regular workday (9-5)?
 - c. For this job, do you work the same number of hours each week, or does your schedule vary week to week? Do you work the same number of hours each day or does your schedule vary day to day?
 - d. How much control do you have over your schedule? Can you apply for which shift you work?

F. Closing

1. Is there anything else that you would like to share with me?

[illegible]

THANK RESPONDENT. PAY INCENTIVE FEE AND COMPLETE FEE RECEIPT FORM.

APPENDIX E
PICTURES FROM IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWING
EFFORT IN SAN ANTONIO



Figure 4. Commercial Strip Along Old Highway 90.



Figure 5. Westside Education and Training Center.



Figure 6. Classroom Inside Westside Education and Training Center.




Figure 7. Examples of Advertisements for Education and Employment Training Program Opportunities in West Side.



Figure 8. San Antonio Food Bank.



Figure 9. H-E-B Grocery Store. H-E-B is the dominant grocery store chain in San Antonio, with stores in over 150 communities around Texas). This one is on the northeast side of the city. As I returned to my car after shopping a man passed me, trying to corral a stray pit bull that was trotting through the parking lot. Source: <http://www.heb.com/sectionpage/about-us/our-stores/sd60018>



Figure 10. Mexican Food Items at H-E-B Grocery Store. Pictured here are pumpkin empanadas (fried or baked pastry) and Mexican sugar cookies from the bakery and nopalitos (pads of the prickly pear cactus) from the produce isle.



Figure 11. Tire Shop in West Side.



Figure 12. Local Businesses Popular Among In-depth Interview Respondents: Bill Miller Bar-B-Q.



Figure 13. Local Businesses Popular Among In-depth Interview Respondents: Dollar General.



Figure 14. New Commercial Development Along Guadalupe Street.



Figure 15. Bars on Window in Classroom at Center.



Figure 16. “Tagging” on Commercial Building Within Residential Area in West Side.



Figure 17. Residential Area in West Side.

APPENDIX F
DISCLAIMERS

This research was funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. I thank them for their support but acknowledge that the findings and conclusions presented here are those of the author alone, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Foundation.

Similarly, I acknowledge that the data included herein are derived from the *Making Connections* Survey, maintained in the NORC Data Enclave. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of NORC.

REFERENCES

- Adegbembo, Albert, Scott Tomar, and Henrietta Logan. 2006. "Perception of racism explains the difference between Blacks' and Whites' level of healthcare trust." *Ethnicity and Disease* 16: 792–798.
- Alba, Richard. 1999. "Immigration and the American realities of assimilation and multiculturalism." *Sociological Forum* 14, no. 1: 3–25.
- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Arvizu, John, and F. Chris Garcia. 1996. "Latino voting participation: Explaining and differentiating Latino voting." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May): 104–128.
- Bachtell, Kate, and Michael Latterner. 2011. "Predicting mobility in special populations: lessons from the making connections survey." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Phoenix, AZ. May.
- Bean, Frank, Susan Gonzalez Baker, and Randy Capps. 2001. "Immigration, spatial and economic change, and African American employment." In *Immigration and opportunity: Race, ethnicity and employment in the United States*, eds. Frank Bean and Stephanie Bell-Rose, 31–63. New York: Russell Sage.
- Bean, Frank, and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's newcomers and the dynamics of diversity*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Bécaras, Laia, Nazroo, James, and Mai Stafford. 2009. "The buffering effects of ethnic density on experienced racism and health. *Health and Place* 15, no. 3 (September): 670–678.
- Berthoud, Richard and Jonathan Gershuny. 2000. *Seven years in the lives of British families: Evidence on the dynamics of social change from the British household panel survey*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Bolan, Marc. 1997. "The mobility experience and neighborhood attachment." *Demography* 34, no. 2 (May): 225–237.

- Bonaiuto, Marino, Antonio Aiello, Marco Perugini, Mirilia Bonnes, and Anna Paola Ercolani. 1999. "Multidimensional perception of residential environment quality and neighbourhood attachment in the urban environment." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 19: 331–352.
- Borgadus, Emory. 1971. "Social distance in the city." In *The urban community: Selected papers from the proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1925*. First AMS Edition. ed. Ernest Burgess, 48–54. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Borjas, George. 1999. *Heaven's door: Immigration policy and the American economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brischetto, Robert, Victor Azios, Ronaldo Morales, and Mary Moreno. 14 June 2000. "Making connections on San Antonio's West Side: The neighborhood transformation/family development project." Report prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available online at <http://www.mc-sa.org/research/reports/pdf/Report2h.pdf> (accessed September 2, 2011).
- Brischetto, Robert, and Richard Engstrom. 1997. "Cumulative voting and Latino representation: Exit surveys in fifteen Texas communities." *Social Science Quarterly* 78, no. 4 (December): 973–991.
- Brisson, Daniel, and Charles Usher. 2005. "Bonding social capital in low-income neighborhoods." *Family Relations* 54 (December): 644–653.
- Burkhardt, Jon. 1971. "Impact of highways on urban neighborhoods: A model of social change." *Highway Research Record* 356: 391–398.
- Chaskin, Robert. 1997. "Perspectives on neighborhood and community: A review of the literature." *The Social Service Review* 71, no. 4 (December): 521–547.
- Chaves, Mark. 2004. *Congregations in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- City of San Antonio Planning Department. 2004. "University park goals and strategies report." Partnership with University Park Neighborhood. July. <http://library.stmarytx.edu/acadlib/edocs/univpark.pdf> (accessed September 2, 2011).
- Corcoran, Mary. 2002. "Place attachment and community sentiment in marginalised neighbourhoods: A European case study." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 11, no. 1 (Summer): 201–221.
- Coulton, Claudia, Tsui Chan, and Kristen Mikelbank. 2011. "Finding place in community change initiatives: Using GIS to uncover resident perceptions of their neighborhoods." *Journal of Community Practice* 19, no. 1: 10–28.

- Coulton, Claudia, Brett Theodos, and Margery Turner. 2009. "Family mobility and neighborhood change: New evidence and implications for community initiatives." Report prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation by the Urban Institute. Washington, DC November.
- Crenshaw, Edward and Craig St. John. 1989. "The organizationally dependent community: A comparative study of neighborhood attachment." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 24: 412–432.
- Dagger, Richard. 1997. *Civic virtues: Rights, citizenship, and republican liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, J. Clarence. 1966. *Neighborhood groups and urban renewal*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Donato, Katharine. Winter 1999. "A dynamic view of Mexican migration to the United States." *Gender Issues* 17, no. 1: 52–75.
- Duleep, Harriet Orcutt, and Daniel Dowhan. 2002. "Insights from longitudinal data on the earnings growth of U.S. foreign-born men." *Demography* 39 (August): 485–506.
- Duleep, Harriet Orcut, and Mark Regets. 1997. "Measuring immigrant wage growth using matched CPS files." *Demography* 34, no. 2 (May): 239–249.
- Durand, Jorge. 1988. "Circuitos migratorios." In *Movimientos de población en el occidente de México*, eds. Thomas Calvo and Gustavo López, 25–49. Zamora, Mexico: El Colegio de Michoacán.
- Durand, Jorge. 1998. *Política, modelo y patrón migratorios*. San Luis Potosí: El Colegio de San Luis.
- Durand, Jorge, and Douglas Massey. 1992. "Mexican migration to the United States: A critical review." *Latin American Research Review* 27, no. 2: 3–42.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Maria Kefalas. 2005. *Promises I can keep: Why poor women put motherhood before marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Laura Lein. 1997. *Making ends meet: How single mothers survive welfare and low wage work*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Festinger, Leon., Stanley Schachter, and Kurt Back. 1950. *Social pressures in informal groups*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Frey, William, and Reynolds Farley. 1996. "Latino, Asian, and Black segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas: Are multiethnic metros different?" *Demography* 33: 35–50.

- Gans, Herbert. 1962. *The urban villagers*. New York: The Free Press.
- . 1962. *The levittowners: Ways of life and politics in a new suburban community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gladwell, Malcolm. 2000. *The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Gould Ellen, Ingrid, and Brendan O’Flaherty. 2007. “Social programs and household size: Evidence from New York City. *Population Research and Policy Review* 26, no. 4: 387–409.
- Griffin, John, and Brian Newman. 2007. “The unequal representation of Latinos and Whites.” *The Journal of Politics* 69, no. 4 (November): 1032–1046.
- Gregory, Stephen. 1998. *Black corona: Race and the politics of place in an urban community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Groves, Robert, Floyd Fowler, Mick Couper, James Lepkowski, Eleanor Singer, and Roger Tourangeau. 2009. *Survey methodology*. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Guest, Avery, Jane Cover, Ross Matsueda, and Charis Kubrin. 2006. “Neighborhood context and neighboring ties.” *City & community* 5, no. 4 (December): 363–385.
- Guest, Avery, and Barrett A. Lee. 1984. “How urbanites define their neighborhoods.” *Population and Environment* 7, no. 1 (Spring): 32–56.
- . 1983. “Sentiment and evaluation as ecological variables.” *Sociological Perspectives* 26, no. 2 (April): 159–184.
- Hagan, Jacqueline, Karl Eschbach, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2008. “U.S. deportation policy, family separation, and circular migration.” *International Migration Review* 42, no. 1 (Spring): 64–88.
- Hakimzadeh, Shirin, and D’Vera Cohn. 29 November 2007. “English usage among Hispanics in the United States.” Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/82.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2012).
- Hammermash, Daniel, and Frank Bean, eds. 1998. *Help or hindrance? The economic implications of immigration for African Americans*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Hansen, Karen. 2005. *Not so nuclear families: Class, gender, and networks of care*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hatcher, Larry, and Edward Stepaniski. 1994. *A Step-by-step approach to using the SAS system for univariate and multivariate statistics*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.

- Hayes, Christopher, and G. Thomas Kingsley. 2012. "Making connections cross-site survey: Mobility and changes in household composition." Working Paper prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. January. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Hermanu, Emma. 2006. "migration as a family business: The role of personal networks in the mobility phase of migration." *International Migration* 44, no. 4: 191–230.
- Hernández-León, Rubén. 2008. *Metropolitan migrants: The migration of urban Mexicans to the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Herting, Jerald, and Avery Guest. 1985. "Components of satisfaction with local areas in the metropolis." *The Sociological Quarterly* 26: 99–115.
- Hockey, Jenny, and Allison James. 2003. *Social identities across the life course*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierette. 1994. *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierette. 2007. *Doméstica: Immigrant workers cleaning and caring in the shadows of affluence*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Howard, Eboni. 2006. "The informal social support, well-being, and employment pathways of low-income mothers." In *Making it work: Low-wage employment, family life, and child development*, eds. Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Thomas Weisner, and Edward D. Lowe, 256–272. New York: Russell Sage.
- Hu, Wei-Yin. 2000. "Immigrant earnings assimilation: Estimates from longitudinal data." *American Economic Review* 90, no. 2 (May): 368–372.
- Jencks, Christopher, and Mayer, Susan. 1990. "The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighborhood. In *Inner-city poverty in the United States*, eds. Laurence Lynn and Michael McGeary, 111–186. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University. 2009. "The State of the nation's housing." <http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/markets/son2009/son2009.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2012).
- Juran, Joseph. 1954. "Universals in management planning and control." *Management Review* 43, no. 11: 748 – 61.
- Keller, Suzanne. 1968. *The urban neighborhood: A sociological perspective*. New York: Random House.

- Kennickell, Arthur. 19 January 1999. "Using income data to predict wealth." *Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Survey of Consumer Finance Working Paper Series*. <http://www.federalreserve.gov/pubs/oss/oss2/papers/wealth.income.7.web.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2012).
- Kibria, Nazli. 1993. *Family tightrope: The changing lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kniss, Fred, and Paul Numrich. 2007. *Sacred assemblies and civic engagement: How religion matters for America's newest immigrants*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kramer, Ralph. 1969. *Participation of the poor*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of space*. Donald Nicholson-Smith, trans. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lee, Everett. 1966. "A theory of migration." *Demography* 3: 47–57.
- Levitt, Peggy, and Mary Waters, eds. 2002. *The changing face of home: The transnational lives of the second generation*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Lewis, Amanda. 2004. "'What group?' Studying Whites and Whiteness in the era of 'color-blindness.'" *Sociological Theory* 22, no. 4 (December): 623–646.
- López, David and Ricardo Stanton-Salavar. 2001. "Mexican Americans: A second generation at risk." In *Ethnicities: Children of immigrants in America*, eds. Rubén Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes, 57–90. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marsden, Peter, and James Wright, eds. 2010. *Handbook of survey research*. 2nd ed. United Kingdom: Emerald Group.
- Massey, Douglas. 1998. "Back to the future: The rediscovery of neighborhood context." *Contemporary Sociology* 27, no. 6: 570–572.
- Massey, Douglas. 1995. "The new immigration and ethnicity in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 21, no. 3 (September): 631–652.
- Massey, Douglas, and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, Douglas, Jorge Durand, and Nolan Malone. 2002. *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigration in an era of economic integration*. New York: Russell Sage.
- McKenzie, R. D. 1971. "The scope of human ecology." In *The urban community: Selected papers from the proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1925*.

- First AMS Edition. ed. Ernest Burgess, 167–182. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meier, Kenneth, and Joseph Stewart. 1991. *The politics of Hispanic education: Un paso pa'lante y dos pa'tras*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Menard, Scott. 2002. *Applied logistic regression analysis*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2000. *Fragmented ties: Salvadoran immigrant networks in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Miller, Jane. 2005. *The Chicago guide to writing about multivariate analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nivin, Steve, Adrian Perez, Julia Silverman, Nelson Blankenship, Jeanette Nelson, Eliza Hernandez, and Sarah Farwell. 23 June 2008. "Westside development corporation market analysis." [http://www.sanantonio.gov/wdc/files/Westside %20Development%20Corporation%20Market%20Analysis%20-.pdf](http://www.sanantonio.gov/wdc/files/Westside%20Development%20Corporation%20Market%20Analysis%20-.pdf) (accessed September 3, 2011).
- Pampel, Fred. 2000. *Logistic regression: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pattillo, Mary. 2007. *Black on the block: The politics of race and class in the city*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pattillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black picket fences: Privilege and peril among the Black middle class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Park, Robert Ezra. 1929. "The city as a social laboratory." In *An experiment in social science research*, eds. T.V. Smith and Leonard White, 3–18. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Park, Robert Ezra. 1971. "The urban community as a spatial pattern and a moral order." In *The urban community: Selected papers from the proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1925*. First AMS Edition. ed. Ernest Burgess, 3–18. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pattillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Privilege and peril among the Black Middle class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Perkins, Douglas, Paul Florin, Richard Rich, Abraham Wandersman, and David Chavis. 1990. "Articipations and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 18: 83–115.

- Pérez, Gina M. 2002. "‘La tierra’s always perceived as woman’: Imagining urban communities in Chicago’s Puerto Rican community." In *Transnational Latina/o communities*, ed. Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos G. et al., 181–204. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Taylor, Paul, Hugo, Mark Lopez, Gabriel Velasco, and Seth Motel. 26 January 2012. "Hispanics say they have the worst of a bad economy." Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2012/01/NSL-2011-economy-report_1_26_FINAL_.pdf (accessed January 26, 2012).
- Putnam, Robert. 1995. "Bowling alone: America’s declining social capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6, no. 1: 65–78.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rawlings, Lynette, Randy Capps, Kerstin Gentsch, and Karina Fortuny. 2007. "Immigrant integration in low-income urban neighborhoods: Improving economic prospects and strengthening connections for vulnerable families." Report prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation by the Urban Institute. Baltimore, MD.
- Sampson, Robert, Jeffrey Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "‘Neighborhood effects:’ Social processes and new directions in research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 443–478.
- Singleton, Royce, and Bruce Straits. 2005. *Approaches to social research*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2004. *Villa victoria: The transformation of social capital in a Boston barrio*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Small, Mario Luis, and Katherine Newman. 2001. "Urban poverty after the truly disadvantaged: The rediscovery of the family, the neighborhood, and culture." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 23–45.
- Smith, Richard. 1975. "Measuring neighborhood cohesion: A review and some suggestions." *Human Ecology* 3, no. 3 (July): 143–160.
- Spykman, Nicholas. 1971. "A social philosophy of the city." In *The urban community: Selected papers from the proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1925*. First AMS Edition. ed. Ernest Burgess, 55–64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Stack, Carol. 1974. *All our kin: Strategies for survival in the Black community*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stedman, Richard C. 2002. "Toward a social psychology of place: Predicting behavior from place-based cognitions, attitude, and identity." *Environment & Behavior* 34, no. 5: 561–581.
- Swaroop, Sapna and Jeffrey Morenoff. 2006. "Building community: The neighborhood context of social organization." *Social Forces* 84, no. 3 (March): 1665–1695.
- Tangum, Richard. 1 February 1998. *Avenida Guadalupe: 2020 master plan*. Division of Architecture and Interior Design. The University of Texas. San Antonio, TX.
- Taylor, Ralph, Gottfredson, Stephen, and Sidney Brower. 1984. "Neighborhood naming as an index of attachment to place." *Population and Environment* 7, no. 2, Special Issue on Attachment to Place (Summer): 103–125.
- Taylor, Ralph, Gottfredson, Stephen, and Sally Shumaker. 1984. "Neighborhood responses to disorder." Unpublished final report (Grant 80-I J-CX-0077, National Institute of Justice). Baltimore, MD: Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research.
- Tedesco, John, Elaine Ayala, and Brian Chasnoff. "As S.A. grows, folks go north and west." *San Antonio Express News*. March 10, 2011. <http://www.mysanantonio.com/default/article/As-S-A-grows-folks-go-north-and-west-1044510.php> (accessed August 30, 2011).
- Tienda, Marta. 1991. "Poor people and poor places: Deciphering neighborhood effects on poverty outcomes." In *Macro-micro linkages in sociology*, ed. Joan Huber, 204–212. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Timberlake, Jeffrey. 2007. "Racial and ethnic inequality in the duration of children's exposure to neighborhood poverty and affluence." *Social Problems* 54, no. 3: 319–342.
- Turney, Kristin, and Kristen Harknett. 2010. Neighborhood disadvantage, residential stability, and perceptions of instrumental support among new mothers." *Journal of Family Issues* 31, no. 4: 499–524.
- Von Hoffman, Alexander. 1994. *Local attachments: The making of an American urban neighborhood, 1850 to 1920*. Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Van Hook, Jennifer, and Jennifer Glick. May 2007. "Immigration and living arrangements: Moving beyond economic need versus acculturation." *Demography* 44, no. 2: 225–249.

- Venkatesh, Sudhir. 2000. *American project: The rise and fall of a modern ghetto*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Urban Institute. 2010. "Employment and income: Draft fact sheet." Report prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. September 3. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Warner, Rebecca. 2007. *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Warren, Donald. 1978. "Explorations in neighborhood differentiation." *The Sociological Quarterly* 19, no. 2 (Spring): 310–331.
- Warren, Mark. 2001. *Dry bones rattling: Community building to revitalize American democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Waters, Mary. 2001. *Black identities: West Indian immigrant dreams and American reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weiss, Robert. 1994. *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: The Free Press.
- Weitzer, Ronald, and Steven Tuch. 2005. "Racially biased policing: Determinants of citizen perceptions." *Social Forces* 83, no. 3: 1009–1030.
- . 2002. "Perceptions of racial profiling: Race, class, and personal experience." *Criminology* 40, no. 2: 435–456.
- Wilson, Linda, and Tim Saasta. 2005. "Having faith in communities of faith." The Diarist Project. Available online at http://www.diaristproject.org/files/San_Antonio_final.pdf (accessed September 2, 2011).
- . 2008. "Westside education & training center: Finding creative ways to combine residents' need for good jobs with employers' need for trained workers." November. The Diarist Project. http://www.diaristproject.org/files/Westside_Education_Training_Center.pdf (accessed September 2, 2011).
- Woldoff, Rachael. 2002. "The effects of local stressors on neighborhood attachment." *Social Forces* 81, no. 1 (September): 87–116.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 2001. "Mobilizing civic engagement: The changing impact of religious involvement." In *Civic engagement in American democracy*, ed. Theda Skocpol and Morris Fiorina, 331–363. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation." *International Migration Review* 31, no. 4: 975–1008.

VITA

Kate Bachtell was born and raised in the far northeast suburbs of Chicago. Before attending Loyola University Chicago, she attended the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where she graduated cum laude with departmental distinction and earned a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology in 2004. In 2007 Bachtell earned a Master of Arts in Sociology from Loyola University Chicago.

While at Loyola, Bachtell spent three years working as a research assistant and one year teaching courses on race and ethnicity and the history of Chicago in the Sociology department. Bachtell served on the Graduate Association of Sociologists and in 2008 won the Richard L. Block Prize for Student Research in Urban Sociology or Public Policy. She earned departmental distinction for both of her comprehensive examinations. In 2011 Bachtell was awarded a \$25,000 grant to support her dissertation research from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and was recently awarded \$20,000 from the Center for Excellence in Survey Research at NORC at the University of Chicago to conduct statistical and geographic analysis of residential mobility.

Currently, Bachtell works as a Senior Survey Director at NORC at the University of Chicago, where she manages the design and execution of social research projects and conducts data analysis. She lives in Chicago.

