STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-

2022

Quality of Life: How Does Race Influence Residential Satisfaction in Cities

Alexis Kelly
University of Central Florida

Part of the Race and Ethnicity Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

University of Central Florida

STARS

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

QUALITY OF LIFE:

HOW DOES RACE INFLUENCE RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION IN CITIES?

by

ALEXIS KELLY
B.A. University of Central Florida, 2021

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2022

Major Professor: Amy Donley

ABSTRACT

The main concepts addressed within this study are neighborhood security, culture in cities, immigration, White flight, and gentrification. Although Whites originally settled in cities, an influx of foreigners encouraged racial dispersion and seclusion. Ultimately, Whites fled to suburban and rural areas while racial minorities remained in the city. The historic relocation of Whites led to the neglect of the city and its occupants, Thus, the motivation for this study revolves around the idea that race-related exclusion influences quality of life and residential satisfaction in cities.

Data were obtained from the General Social Survey to examine the relationship between quality of life and the presence of multiracial neighbors. Conflict theory guided the analysis under the assumption that residential segregation persists through White avoidance of minority neighbors. Various statistical methods were performed to confirm this speculation including frequencies, Pearson correlations, crosstabulations, chi-square tests, and multiple linear regressions. The findings reflect a precise association among life satisfaction and homogeneous communities. Variables such as race, class, wealth, and willingness to live alongside Black inhabitants structured the argument regarding neighborhood integration or lack thereof.

Keywords: *quality of life (QOL), race, segregation, gentrification, White flight, diversity*

To my parents, David and Cynthia

Thank you for the unconditional love and support provided throughout this process. Without

your guidance, I would not be the accomplished young woman I am today

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Amy Donley for strengthening the outcome of this project. Your expertise and feedback truly advanced my exploration on the topic of urban sociology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Measuring an individual's quality of life (QOL) relies on perspectives of social circumstances based on actual and perceived realities. Alvarez and Müller-Eie (2017) offer an established approach to the versatile QOL subject which "includes personal satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with the physical, socio-economic, and cultural conditions under which a person lives" (p.2). QOL is heavily dependent on one's perception of life; there is no correct answer when it comes to self-rated results but there is an explicit cause as to what effects one's sense of happiness. Subjective measurements are related to a general (global) or domain-specific feelings of satisfaction based on an individual's contentment with life as a whole or their occupation. (Schuessler and Fisher, 1985). Quality of urban life, as addressed throughout the current study, focuses on a domain-specific analysis where race, poverty, crime, and immigration are taken into consideration as a response to neighborhood satisfaction (Wu, 2015).

Previous literature seeks to address the interplay between a high rated QOL and residential disparities namely segregation and displacement. Empirical urban sociologists frequently refer to the city as a place where social issues transpire (Wu, 2015). It is important to note that urban unhappiness or dissatisfaction is not reduced to living in the city. Instead, self-reported QOL is associated with the city's problems including economic, environmental, and personal vulnerability. As a result, the primary task of urban sociology is to explain similarities and differences between individual cities and urban groups to determine how these distinctions impact social life and collectivities (Wu, 2015).

The study of self-rated QOL and the presence of diversity in one's neighborhood aims to address residential disparities with the inclusion of race, and more specifically, White versus non-White urban occupants. Cities are often studied from a conflict theoretical perspective where urban inhabitants are viewed as unable to sustain a viable neighborhood based on their social circumstances (Hayes, 2021). Scholars have correlated this assumption to race, class, and socioeconomic status where those who are White, middle- to upper-class, and wealthy are more likely to reside in the suburbs, away from any city conflict such as violence (Kondo et al., 2018). While White Americans settled in the suburbs, African Americans and other ethnic minorities were constrained to the city's impoverished areas.

The primary methodological approach relies on statistical analyses pertaining to the respondents self-rated quality of life and their neighborhood demographics to determine if there is a relationship between the variables. The central model and hypothesis states that respondents are more likely to report an excellent quality of life if they reside in a racially homogeneous neighborhood. Focusing on closely related literature provides insight toward the impact of social barriers and how it relates to a successfully rated quality of life.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Neighborhood Security

Community disruptions serve as a catalyst threatening the physical and mental well-being of residents. Alvarez and Müller-Eie (2017) report any type of danger, such as natural hazards or crime, can cause fear and worry, which can have a negative impact on one's overall quality of life (p.7). Whether a threat is imminent or continuously anticipated, the idea that humans involuntarily revert to their primal nature as a protective measure prevents corporal, emotional, and environmental stability. Consequentially, residents that feel unsafe may restrict their physical activity or refrain from participating in social and civic neighborhood activities (Kondo et al., 2018). Neighborhood safety is furthermore attributed to ascribed status where "those with greatest resources will generally reside in areas containing low levels of risk, while those with limited resources will find access limited to undesirable areas often with the greatest amount of risk… associated with life chances (race/ethnic, class, and age)" (Fitzpatrick and LaGory, 2003).

Culture in the City

Ethnic enclaves in cities in the United States were originally established by poor and unskilled European immigrants (Portes and Manning, 1986). A lack of economic resources combined with minimal social capital resulted in an overwhelming presence of ethnically concentrated communities. After World War II, a new wave of immigration brought Mexicans, Cubans, and Asians to various locations including Los Angeles, Miami, and New York (Portes and Manning, 1986). However, these new inhabitants were not necessarily reduced to immigrant neighborhoods due to an influx of skilled laborers. Whilst the majority established themselves in

regions comprised of their native population, those associated with the primary labor force were shown to spatially disperse. Medical and engineering occupations, in particular, provided the greatest opportunities for social and economic mobility (Portes and Manning, 1986).

Modern urban analyses in the United States tend to emphasize a strict Black and White division while paying an inconsiderable amount of attention to the growing Hispanic population. Marrow (2009) acknowledges this disconnect with the incorporation of Latino immigrants throughout her work. To challenge the historic American Colour Line Marrow described the hostility between Hispanics and Blacks along with the assimilation of Hispanics into a dominant White society. Essentially, Marrow argued that Hispanics and Blacks view each other as competitors in the housing and job market whereas Whites favor Hispanics due to their generally lighter complexion and willingness to culturally assimilate. With that being said, Whites may prefer Hispanics over Blacks, but they are still more apt to reside next to other Whites as opposed to any racial or ethnic minority.

Logan and Zhang (2010) detail the effects of neighborhood diversity where all-White subdivisions are dramatically reducing in size because of immigration. There is evidence that having a greater Hispanic/Asian population in the neighborhood or nearby areas can help Black individuals enter neighborhoods where White individuals remain (Logan and Zhang). While this concept holds true, it also encourages White flight, the substantial movement of White homeowners to areas devoid of racial and ethnic minorities. Thus, residential integration becomes remarkably difficult to achieve due to the constant reproduction of all-minority neighborhoods (Logan and Zhang). This forces researchers to consider the viability of new and unintended ethnic enclaves.

4

Urban culture is often reduced to racial or ethnic enclaves within a given area. However, Aguilar-San Juan (2005) proposes the concept of place making where culture is purposely constructed to attract a diverse group of individuals. Unlike the aforementioned enclaves, simulated communities are established for monetary gain as opposed to generational neighborhoods with strong ties. According to Aguilar-San Juan, commercial leaders acknowledge that the business district must seek foreign investment in order to survive and develop. Zukin (1995) further develops this notion with the inclusion of symbolic economies which explains the financial relationship associated with culture. The implementation of private sectors allows urban elites to decide what group of individuals are accepted. In this aspect, social control is employed to reduce the spread of culture throughout unauthorized (predominantly White) areas.

White Flight

Although the Fair Housing Act was passed in 1968, discrimination persisted by way of White flight, and other causes (Rothstein, 2014). White flight is formally known as Whites' unwillingness to stay in areas with significant and expanding minority populations which contributes to racially segregated neighborhoods (Pais et al., 2008: 1). White migration reproduces the idea that residential segregation is a reoccurring impediment against heterogenous acceptance. Turner and Rawlings (2009) assert that exposure to diversity helps people expand their social networks by providing important possibilities for cross-racial and ethnic engagement. Pais et al (2008) otherwise found that Whites in mixed-race communities are more likely to migrate than Whites in homogenous neighborhoods, and when they do, they are more inclined to

relocate to areas with fewer racial and ethnic minorities. This information challenges the earlier claim that social integration holds a positive connotation toward quality of life.

Massey and Denton (1993) introduced the concept of hypersegregation which is defined as an overwhelming presence of racial seclusion throughout metropolitan neighborhoods and areas. Residential integration is one of the many proposed solutions to minimizing the gap between Whites and marginalized communities. However, the problem remains that Anglos, Asians, and Hispanics are all reluctant to move near African Americans. Anglos are hesitant to relocate into communities with a large minority presence because they are recognized as less safe, more disorganized, having fewer amenities, and less effective schools (Pais et al., 2008). Heterogeneous neighborhoods, although an ideal outcome, do not yield positive results pertaining to residential segregation.

Iceland et al. (2014) argue that racial intolerance is not limited to African Americans in the United States. Many immigrants cannot afford to buy or rent a property in a high-socioeconomic status (SES) neighborhood dominated by Whites. With this in mind, Iceland and colleagues stress that various ethnic populations, including Asians and Hispanics, utilize cultural assimilation as means for social advancement. Albeit Asian and Hispanic immigrants who strongly identify with their native culture were shown to remain separate from the dominant White society. According to spatial assimilation, when immigrants arrive, they frequently settle in ethnic enclaves, drawn primarily by social networks (Iceland et al., 2014). While it is common for homogeneous groups to unite after moving to a foreign territory, the issue remains that certain racial/ethnic identities prevent individuals from ascending in America.

<center>Gentrification</center>

A complementary action to White flight is gentrification; "the process by which central urban neighborhoods that have undergone disinvestments and economic decline experience a reversal, reinvestment, and the in-migration of a well-off middle- and upper-middle-class population" (Schnake-Mahl, 2020). Urban sociologists often debate the causes of gentrification with some attributing unreliable neighborhood structures (van Holm and Wyczalkowski, 2019) while others cite the fault of the creative class (Shaw and Sullivan, 2011). Ultimately, gentrification occurs when a distinct group of individuals, particularly the White middle-and-upper class, pursues desirable and profitable land opportunities.

Notwithstanding the origin, gentrification is shown to produce detrimental social, physical, emotional, and financial disturbances. Residential displacement predominantly effects minority inhabitants resulting in a brutally ironic continuation of the filtering process where the working class and the poor inherit the old failing suburbs (Smith, 1979). Gentrification heavily affects residential preservation in the sense that historic and contemporary members are ignored throughout the process of urban renewal.

While those associated with White flight seek to flee from a community with a large percentage of minority residents, gentrifiers aspire to alter the current state of a community and replace those who cannot afford the luxuries accompanying modernization. Unlike the prestigious developers involved throughout this process, uprooted locals are likely to have their protective social links broken (Schnake-Mahl, 2020). Racial and ethnic identification complicate the displacement process due to the idea that gentrifiers invade desired locations to claim the area as their own. Often, these individuals proceed with little to no regard of the current

<center>7</center>

inhabitants, including the sociopsychological impacts accompanying relocation. Schuessler and Fisher (1985) report that changes in society's structure (for example, urbanization) appear to have an impact on QOL. More importantly, the loss of a home, as well as one's social support, is pernicious to the well-being of displaced racial and ethnic minorities.

Whilst Shaw and Sullivan (2011) argue that cultural variance is to be expected in urban environments, the invasion of the creative class brought forth a noticeable disparity between Black and White residents. Blacks associate the arts, humanities, and overall creative sources as a sign of gentrification due to the fact that Blacks do not associate themselves with these disciplines. Although artistry does not always reflect gentrification, the influx of White participants does raise a valid concern for occupants in the area. Shaw and Sullivan (2011) stress engagement in a racially diverse environment, or at the very least their rejection of forces that would disturb such diversity acknowledges the objective of White middle- to upper-class homeowners and their desire to obtain valuable, and often expensive, property. With that being said, Valle (2021) concludes the abandonment of race-driven inequalities will only harm the preservation of culture in cities thus it is imperative to address urban development from an authentic stance.

In addition to pushed out racial and ethnic minorities, Pineda (2017) raises a strong point regarding the lower-class and seniors who are equivalently vulnerable to housing relocation. These groups share an underlying commonality where they lack the power and money to remain in their neighborhood. Higher-income individuals have returned to cities in the last two decades, more often to traditionally low-income areas of color than in prior decades, while lower-income groups have left or are being driven out to suburbs (Schnake-Mahl, 2020).

Although, this is not to say that gentrification is entirely tragic since gentries are wealthy and thus able to pay above market value for decrepit or desired homes. This inclusion is significant to the study of urban analysis seeing that most scholars would associate gentrification with baneful effects, yet gentrification provides positive outcomes due to monetization opportunities. While some might take advantage of the supplemental pay and vacate, those who choose to remain unintentionally benefit from less crime and an improvement in local businesses (Pineda, 2017). With respect to quality of life, gentrification relieves financial stress in limited circumstances.

Be that as it may, the disadvantages clearly outweigh the advantages due to social, labor, and housing instability. Prior literature postulates that it is only a matter of time before current residents are removed from the neighborhood. Without a proper income, gentrification can engulf the poor in debt from not being able to pay their rent; there may be more amenities, but that does not imply it is accessible to low-income families (Pineda, 2017). The added pressure of moving (willingly or unwillingly) away from familiar surroundings will inevitability impact quality of life especially when observing neighbors, relatives, or friends being evicted. Anticipating one's own eviction may cause psychological stress among low-income groups who remain in gentrifying districts (Schnake-Mahl, 2020).

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL ARGUMENT

Conflict theory originated in the works of Karl Marx (Marx, Engels and Toews, 1848) whose work sought elucidate political and economic events of an everlasting competition for scarce resources (Hayes, 2021). Marx's theory thrives on the notion that individuals are oppressed based on their life chances. Lower- and working- class individuals are subjected to substandard conditions because they simply do not have the means necessary to live like the elite. Conflict theorists argue that unequal obtainment of resources results in conflict because one class cultivates power over another so the latter seldom ascents or profits. One critique of conflict theory, however, is that it overlooks the beneficial relationship between social classes and economics (Hayes, 2021). Goods and services are traded for money in order to sustain a living thus it is difficult to dismantle capitalism entirely.

Conflict theory, in relation to urban sociology, states restricted space and units within a residential complex contributes to disputes among tenants and the owner. Additionally, conflict theorists argue money paid to the complex owner for rent plays a role in the competition of limited resources. Essentially, those who are poor must persistently work for their resources while those in a position of power continue to profit off their contributions. Marx explains this capitalistic behavior will inevitably result in noncompliance from the inferior. The complex owner, regardless of graciousness, is primarily concerned with renting the greatest number of apartment units to maximize profit, especially if bills such as mortgages and utilities must be covered (Hayes, 2021). While resource limitations perpetuate a cycle of inequality, they also reinforce the notion that social disparities are heavily dependent on economic advantages. Those

who hold minimal power are more likely to suffer at the hands of an authoritative figure seeking profit.

Conflict theory is the leading argument for this research project due to Karl Marx's belief that social issues are a direct result of economic and class struggle. The poor and marginalized are distinctly connected since they are the most prevalent groups to be suppressed or neglected owing to their subordinate position in society. According to conflict theory, disputes emerge in cities as a result of diversity or contrasting personal characteristics. This particular theory is applied to analyze an individual's self-reported quality of life based on their residential circumstances such as having neighbors of the same race, wealth, class, etc. With the help of this paradigm, the research determines if living in a racially diverse neighborhood results in lower QOL ratings. Various cultural backgrounds may prove to cause a division between city residents due to competition for scarce resources such as housing. In turn, the likelihood of a poor QOL increases as residents settle in less desired, but accessible areas.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

The statistical examination used 2018 General Social Survey (GSS) variables followed by data importation to the IBM software program, SPSS. These data were chosen because they include items that assess a person's self-reported quality of life as well as the presence of multiracial neighbors. The GSS includes a group of researchers who collect nationally representative data on Americans. Surveys are distributed through the mail, phone, in-person/groups, and online. Although each design has advantages and disadvantages, including cost and validity, survey forms allow for a wide range of responses from randomized populations, resulting in more accurate results. Individuals can publicly view attitudes toward extensive issues using this information.

Data analyses were conducted to test the research questions and hypothesis. The proposed model questions whether respondents have a higher quality of life if they are White, affluent, upper-class, neither favored nor opposed underrepresented groups residing in their community, not afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night and socialize with their neighbors. The hypothesis states respondents are more likely to report an excellent quality of life if they reside in a racially homogeneous neighborhood. Descriptive statistics and frequencies provided standard information associated with quality of life, demographics, and neighborhood composition variables. In addition, multiple crosstabulation tests were used to analyze the relationship between dependent and independent variables. Chi-square tests are included to assist the interpretation of crosstabulation results based on the Pearson chi-square value, Cramer's V

score, degree of freedom, and Pearson value. Finally, multiple linear regressions display correlation coefficients to determine the statistical significance of the included variables.

Dependent Variable

The GSS asked one question regarding the respondents self-reported quality of life. The survey asks respondents to rate their quality of life using a five-point scale ranging from excellent to poor.

Independent Variable

The GSS asked one question concerning the respondent's neighborhood demographics. The question states "Are there any ("Whites" for Black respondents, "Blacks" for non-Black respondents) living in this neighborhood now?" This variable was subsequently coded into two categories comprised of yes (0) and no (1).

Control Variables

The control variables address quality of life based on the respondents' race, wealth, class, the respondents' attitude toward half of their neighborhood containing Black residents, if an individual is afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night, and their connection to neighbors during leisure time. The addition of this data furthers the understanding of subjective QOL measurements.

The control variables are interested in answering whether White, rich, and upper-class respondents have a higher quality of life compared to Blacks or other racial minorities, the poor,

and lower-class. In other words, which race has the highest QOL? Are the rich more or less likely to report a high QOL? Does class influence QOL?

The controlled data further investigates self-reported QOL ratings based on residential demographics, safety, and social investment within the respondent's neighborhood. These variables assess race, class, and financial situations to answer if an individual is afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night or connect with their neighbors more during leisure time. The current research study is also interested in residential support for racially heterogeneous neighborhoods.

Research questions include: Are racial and ethnic minorities more scared to walk alone at night and less likely to socialize with neighbors? Are respondents more likely to report greater levels of safety and social gatherings if they are White, upper-class, and wealthy? Do Whites reside in homogeneous neighborhoods more often than minorities? Do working class members and marginalized groups report a larger presence of diversity in their neighborhood as well as favor living in a neighborhood where half of the residents are Black?

Questions associated with the control variables include:

1. What race do you consider yourself?

     o White, Black, or Other

2. Please estimate your total wealth.

     o Beginning with less than $5,000 and ending with above $10 million

3. If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in?

     o The lower class, the working class, the middle class, or the upper class

4. Indicate how you would feel living in a neighborhood where half of your neighbors were Blacks.

     o Strongly favor, favor, neither favor nor oppose, oppose, or strongly oppose

5. Would you be afraid to walk alone at night in your neighborhood?

     o Yes or no

6. Do you spend social evenings with someone who lives in your neighborhood?

     o Almost daily, several times a week, several times a month, once a month, several times a year, once a year, and never

Hypothesis

Respondents are more likely to report an excellent quality of life if they reside in a racially homogeneous neighborhood.

CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of data begins with descriptive statistics and frequencies regarding the independent and dependent variables. Tables one through four focus on the statistical association between QOL and neighborhood composition. Tables six through eleven analyze the control variables individually as a means of establishing a relationship with the independent and dependent variables. Bivariate analyses were conducted for all control variables in these tables. Finally, crosstabulations and multiple linear regressions are present in tables twelve and thirteen to examine the correlation between independent, dependent, and control variables.

Table 1 displays standard information associated with the quality of life and neighborhood composition variables. Neighborhood demographics were calculated by asking the respondent "Are there any ("Whites" for Black respondents, "Blacks" for non-Black respondents) living in this neighborhood now?" The 1.22 mean connected to neighborhood demographics indicates the majority of respondents live in a racially diverse community. QOL was calculated using a five-point Likert scale consisting of excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The QOL mean of 2.31 indicates respondents are generally satisfied with their perception of life. Low standard deviations of .411 and .955 suggests the data clusters near the mean with a limited range of values. Under the assumption of a normal distribution, a 95% confidence interval reflects the data falls between 2 standard deviations of the mean.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
RacLive	2215	1.22	.411	.169
R's QOL	2330	2.31	.955	.913

Table 2 describes a frequency analysis of the independent and dependent variables. The data shows that 78.5% of respondents reside in a neighborhood with residents of an opposite race. A significant difference was found among the respondent's neighborhood racial makeup ($p < .05$) and their quality of life ($p < .01$). Respectively, respondents are more likely to live in a racially integrated neighborhood and they are more likely to assess themselves as having a high rated quality of life.

Table 2: Frequencies

		N	Percent
RacLive	Yes	1738	78.5
Sig. (.020)	No	477	21.5
	Total	2348	100.0
R's quality of life	Excellent	479	20.6
Sig. (< .001)	Very Good	950	40.8
	Good	640	27.5
	Fair	224	9.6
	Poor	37	1.6
	Total	2330	100.0

Any opposite race in the respondent's neighborhood is abbreviated to RacLive

Table 3 reflects the results of a crosstabulation analysis. The chi-square test determined respondents, regardless of living in a racially diverse neighborhood, held almost identical QOL ratings. For example, 41% of "yes" respondents as well as 42% of "no" respondents reported a "very good" quality of life. In fact, those who reside in a racially inclusive neighborhood were more likely to report lower QOL scores consisting of "good, fair, and poor" Respondents that did not live in a community with opposite race neighbors rated their QOL as excellent (23%) and very good (44%) compared to those who did reside next to multiracial neighbors (excellent 19% and very good 41%).

Table 3: Crosstabulation with Chi-Square Test

	Excellent	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Total**
Yes	334	707	477	178	29	1725
No	109	210	122	38	6	476
Total	443	908	599	216	35	2201
Pearson Chi-Square Value 5.507		**Cramer's V .021**	**df 4**	**p-value .239**		

Note. df stands for degrees of freedom

Table 4 displays a multiple linear regression anticipating the respondent's quality of life using their race. Due to the categorical nature of race, this variable was transformed into a dummy code with White set as the reference category. A significant regression (p <.001) was found, and the Pearson value indicates there is less than a 1% probability that our null hypothesis is correct. Additionally, the r squared value of .024 indicates a weak linear correlation and does not follow a straight configuration when arranged on a graph. Only 2.4% of the total variance is determined by the independent variables. The regression intercept for Whites is valued at 2.219. The unstandardized beta coefficient of .367 for Blacks indicates an increase in the dependent

18

QOL variable. When compared to Whites, a change of 1 unit is associated with a .367 QOL

increase in Blacks and a .259 increase in Others.

Table 4: Multiple Linear Regression for Race and Quality of Life

	Unstandardized B	**Standardized Coefficients**	**Sig.**
QOL	2.219		.000
Black	.367	.054	<.001
Other	.259	.062	<.001
R Square	F	df	p-value
.024	28.377	2, 2327	< .001

Note. White is the reference category and df stands for degrees of freedom

Table 5 examines descriptive information of the control variables. The means associated

with wealth and class explain the majority of respondents are moderately wealthy and working

class. The means connected to diversity, safety, and community ties indicate respondents favor a

neighborhood with half Black residents, are scared to walk alone at night, and spend time with

their neighbors approximately once a month.

Low standard deviations of .471 for fear, .704 for class, and 1.008 for living in a half

Black neighborhood suggest the data clusters near the mean with a limited range of values.

Under the assumption of a normal distribution, a 95% confidence interval reflects the data falls

between 2 standard deviations of the mean. High standard deviations, brought upon by wealth

and community interaction, indicate a plethora of responses regarding monetary status and the

frequency of socialization. Under the assumption of a normal distribution, a 99.7% confidence

interval reflects this data falls between 3 standard deviations of the mean.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Control Variables

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Wealth	1310	5.19	3.110	9.675
Class	2333	2.42	.704	.495
LiveBlks	1544	2.73	1.008	1.016
Fear	1567	.67	.471	.222
SoCommun	1557	4.77	1.985	3.940

Social communication among neighbors in the respondent's community is abbreviated to SoCommun
A respondent's neighborhood comprised of half Black residents is abbreviated to LiveBlks

Table 6 displays the relationship between quality of life, race, and racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood. The results indicate that Whites hold the highest rated quality of life (excellent) at 22% followed by Blacks and others at 16%. Only 1% of Whites reported a poor QOL while Blacks and others maintained 3%. Not only are Whites more likely to report a higher QOL than Blacks and others, they are also more likely to report no opposite races in their neighborhood. 74% of Whites reported living in a heterogeneous neighborhood compared to 94% of Blacks and 81% of others.

Table 6: QOL rating and Presence of Multiracial Neighbors for Race

		White	Black	Other
QOL	Excellent	22.4	15.7	15.7
	Very Good	43.3	32.3	37.3
	Good	25.4	32.5	32.2
	Fair	7.7	17	11.2
	Poor	1.2	2.6	2.6
Any opp. race in neighborhood	Yes	74.3	94.4	81.3
	No	25.7	5.6	18.7

Table 7 displays the relationship between quality of life, wealth, and racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood. The results indicate that wealthier individuals report a higher QOL, with 94% of millionaires maintaining very good (23.5%) and excellent ratings (70.6%). The largest association of poor QOL ratings was 4% of respondents with a total wealth below a $5,000 dollars. Overall, the majority of respondents identified themselves as having a very good QOL regardless of their total wealth.

However, as wealth increases, the likelihood of living in a heterogeneous neighborhood greatly decreases. For example, 87% of respondents with a total wealth of less than $5,000 live in a community with racially diverse neighbors, the following category ($5,000 to $75,000) consists of 85%, the third ($75,000 to $250,000) is 82%, fourth ($250,000 to $1 million) is 78%, fifth ($1 million to $5 million) is 64%, and the last category (Above $5 million) falls to just 38%.

Table 7: QOL rating and Presence of Multiracial Neighbors for Total Wealth

		Less Than $5,000	$5,000 to $75,000	$75,000 to $250,000	$250,000 to $1 million	$1 million to $5 million	Above $5 million
QOL	Excellent	15.6	1.8	15.3	25.5	48.8	70.6
	Very Good	30.6	41	52.7	52.1	42.9	23.5
	Good	28.3	43.8	26.2	17.8	8.3	5.9
	Fair	21.4	12.6	5.4	3.8	0	0
	Poor	4	.80	.34	.70	0	0
Any opp. race in neighborhood	Yes	87.1	84.6	81.8	77.9	63.6	37.5
	No	12.9	15.4	18.2	22.1	36.7	62.5

Table 8 displays the relationship between quality of life, class, and racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood. The highest QOL rating for the lower class is good, the working and middle class are very good, and the upper class is excellent. The middle class holds the highest rated quality of life (excellent) at 54.4% followed by the working class at 32.2%, the upper class at 9.2%, and the lower class at 4.2%. The lower class reported exponentially higher rates of a poor QOL with a score of 7.7% while middle class members were the least likely at .50%. The lower class is also the most likely to report living in a heterogeneous neighborhood with 85% of members residing in a racially diverse community. The middle and upper-class were the most likely to report having no opposite races in their neighborhood (23% respectively), followed closely by the working class (21%).

Table 8: QOL rating and Presence of Multiracial Neighbors for Subjective Class Identification

		Lower	Working	Middle	Upper
QOL	Excellent	20	154	260	44
	Very Good	40	394	484	28
	Good	80	344	205	6
	Fair	53	106	60	3
	Poor	16	14	5	1
Any opp. race in neighborhood	Yes	170	763	737	59
	No	29	204	225	17

Table 9 displays the relationship between quality of life, support or opposition for residing in a neighborhood where the residents are half Black, and racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood. The results indicate that respondents who neither favored nor opposed residing in a half Black neighborhood maintained a very good quality of life at 51% followed by those who favored at 18% and those who strongly favored at 15%. Individuals reporting an excellent QOL also followed the pattern of favoring half Black residencies. Those with a neutral or favoring stance are more likely to report a higher QOL and a presence of multiracial residents in their neighborhood than those who oppose and strongly oppose. Only 74% of strongly opposed respondents live in a heterogenous neighborhood in contrast to 86% of strongly favoring respondents.

Table 9: QOL rating and Presence of Multiracial Neighbors for Neighborhood Composition

		Strongly Favor	Favor	Neither Favor nor Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose
QOL	Excellent	67	57	156	37	15
	Very Good	90	107	302	79	19
	Good	56	84	217	55	18
	Fair	15	31	69	23	11
	Poor	4	7	10	3	1
Any opp. race in neighborhood	Yes	195	212	544	141	45
	No	31	61	169	52	16

Table 10 displays the relationship between quality of life, fear of walking alone at night, and racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood. Are minorities more scared to walk alone at night and less likely to socialize with neighbors? The results indicate that those who are not afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night reported an excellent quality of life at 75%. Those who are afraid reported the lowest QOL score (poor) at 2% while those who are not afraid maintained 1%. Not only are fearless respondents more likely to report a higher QOL, but they are also more likely to report no opposite races in their neighborhood. Only 23% of those who are not afraid to walk alone at night in their neighborhood reported living in a neighborhood with a race apart from their own.

Table 10: QOL rating and Presence of Multiracial Neighbors for Fear

		Yes	No
QOL	Excellent	80	242
	Very Good	201	430
	Good	157	272
	Fair	69	80
	Poor	11	12
Any opp. race in neighborhood	Yes	433	749
	No	65	223

Table 11 displays the relationship between quality of life, community socialization, and racial makeup of the respondent's neighborhood. Those who never spend social evenings with their neighbors rated themselves as having an excellent quality of life at 26% followed by those who socialized once a month at 15%. However, those who never socialize with their neighbors are nearly three times more likely to rate themselves with a poor QOL compared to sociable respondents. Conversely, 65% of all respondents who spend their evenings socializing with neighbors rated their QOL as good and very good. Not only are sociable respondents more likely to report a higher QOL, they are also more likely to report living in a racially diverse neighborhood. Only 32% of those who never socialize with their community reported living in a heterogeneous neighborhood.

Table 11: QOL rating and Presence of Multiracial Neighbors for Community Socialization

		Almost Daily	Sev Times a Week	Sev Times a Month	Once a Month	Sev Times a Year	Once a Year	Never
QOL	Excellent	13	47	50	67	42	26	89
	Very Good	23	86	62	98	86	57	191
	Good	22	56	49	56	48	48	155
	Fair	7	26	11	17	15	11	62
	Poor	4	4	1	3	3	2	9

Pearson Chi-Square Value 40.747   Cramer's V .081   df 24   p-value .018

		Almost Daily	Sev Times a Week	Sev Times a Month	Once a Month	Sev Times a Year	Once a Year	Never
Any opp. race in neighborhood	Yes	60	163	131	180	143	100	366
	No	8	52	32	59	44	34	103

Pearson Chi-Square Value 7.093   Cramer's V .069   df 6   p-value .312

Note. df stands for degrees of freedom

Table 12 displays correlation coefficients between the variables, most of which are statistically significant. The positive correlations explain that as one variable increases, the other increases as well. The negative correlation indicates one variable increases while the other decreases. A significant relationship ($p < .05$) emerges between the dependent and independent variables, exhibiting a -.050 correlation. With this in mind, as QOL increases, the presence of any opposite races in the respondent's neighborhood decreases.

The positive correlations between QOL, socialization, and residential demographics indicate that a respondents QOL increases if they are moderately to frequently social and neither favor nor oppose living in a neighborhood with an equally divided number of Black residents. On the other hand, QOL is negatively associated with fear and opposite races in one's

neighborhood. A respondents QOL decreases if they are afraid to walk alone at night and reside in a neighborhood with marginalized groups. Wealth and class were negatively associated with socialization due to the fact that wealthy and upper-class individuals are less likely to spend evenings with their neighbors.

Table 12: Statistically Significant Correlations of Selected Variables

	Quality of Life	Wealth	Class	Neighborhood Half Black	Fear	Social Community	Any Opposite Race in Neighborhood
Quality of Life	1	-.307**	-.314**	.059*	-.129**	.053*	-.050*
Sig (2-tailed)		<.001	<.001	.022	<.001	.038	.020
Wealth		1	.474**	.116**	.115**	-.069*	.136**
Sig (2-tailed)			<.001	<.001	<.001	.040	<.001
Class			1	.042	.075**	-.043	.052*
Sig (2-tailed)				.099	.003	.090	.015
Neighborhood Half Black				1	.001	.017	.086**
Sig (2-tailed)					.969	.496	.001
Fear					1	.020	.118**
Sig (2-tailed)						.575	<.001
Social Community						1	.017
Sig (2-tailed)							.504
Any Opposite Race in Neighborhood							1

*Note. ** = p <.01; * = p <.05*

Table 13 displays the findings of the dependent variable related to the independent and control variables. A multiple linear regression anticipated the respondent's quality of life using their wealth, class, sociability, and neighborhood makeup. A significant regression (p <.001) was found, and the Pearson value indicates there is a 1% probability that our null hypothesis is correct. Thus, the results are highly statistically significant due to a slim chance of an erroneous outcome. Furthermore, the r squared value of .202 indicates a weak linear correlation and does not follow a straight configuration when arranged on a graph.

Table 13: Multiple Linear Regression

R Square	F	df	p-value
.202	12.298	8, 388	< .001

	Unstandardized B	Standardized Coefficients	p-value
(Constant) R's quality of life	3.353		< .001
Any opp. race in neighborhood	-.008	-.003	.948
Race of respondent – Black	.159	.063	1.92
Other	.209	.072	1.26
Total wealth of respondent	-.075	-.241	< .001
Subjective class identification	-.263	-.172	< .001
Neighborhood half black	.076	.079	.090
Afraid to walk at night in neighborhood	.-374	-.186	< .001
Spend evening with neighbor	.001	.002	.965

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The majority of QOL findings suggest a weak to moderate, negative relationship where wealth, class, and fear held the strongest association. Whites were the least expected group to support living in a neighborhood that is half Black while those currently residing in a heterogeneous neighborhood were more likely to accept living in a half Black community. Similarly, Whites reported higher rates of living in a neighborhood that did not include people of color.

Respondents who strongly favored living in a neighborhood with half of the inhabitants being Black (17%) had a total wealth of less than $500,000. The strongest category, neither favor nor oppose, was comprised of 50% of respondents, some of which were impecunious (total wealth less than $5,000) and some who were affluent (total wealth above $10 million). A supplemental correlation was found between wealth and quality of life (-.307) along with wealth and living in a neighborhood with opposite races (.136). Considering the respondents total wealth is above $1 million, 96% of that wealth derives from Whites. Additionally, Whites are expected to hold higher QOL ratings and are less likely to reside in a racially diverse neighborhood. 86% of respondents that do not have an opposite race in their neighborhood are White.

The research questions proved to be correct due to the fact that respondents are more likely to report an excellent quality of life and report living in a racially homogeneous neighborhood if they are White, affluent, upper-class, neither favored nor opposed underrepresented groups residing in their community and are not afraid to walk alone in their

neighborhood at night. Nonetheless, respondents were more likely to report an excellent life if they did not socialize with their neighbors, contrary to the initial belief that socialization was positively associated with an excellent QOL.

The Pearson correlation outcome regarding the dependent and independent variables indicated a weak, negative relationship. The significant results conclude there is less than a 5% probability that the null hypothesis "as QOL increases, the presence of opposite races in the respondent's neighborhood increases" is veracious. We can reject this alternative notion under the assumption that there is a difference between the parameters. The analysis confidently states the hypothesis is accurate. The fact is respondents are more likely to report a higher rated quality of life if they reside in a racially homogeneous neighborhood.

<u>Limitations</u>

A limitation occurred throughout the current research due to the QOL variable's reduction to five generalized responses. QOL, as it relates to urban sociology and residential satisfaction, should incorporate a definition based on subjective scales. Questions might include "Why do you associate yourself with such a high-quality of life?" or "How does the quality of your neighborhood/community influence your QOL rating?" In this aspect, a detailed measurement would have strengthened the outcome of this project and the identification of individual QOL factors. In the future, I suggest expanding upon QOL indicators as a means to studying significant variable interactions beyond excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor.

Additionally, the sequencing of variables in the GSS database initiates a false assumption that QOL is negatively associated with wealth and class. According to table 12, a respondent's

QOL seemingly decreases if they are wealthy and upper-class. However, the GSS places an excellent QOL as the first available response for participants whereas the highest level of wealth is placed toward the end of an expected response thus the negative correlation occurs. In reality, a respondents QOL increases is they are wealthy and upper-class.

Another prominent weakness associated with the GSS includes the lack of racial categories. Three simplified response options are not merely enough to administer accurate results pertaining to residential demographics or quality of life. Due to the rise of biracial individuals, it is imperative to include multiple identification opportunities. Incorporating this data into subsequent research projects facilitates an explanation as to how biracial tenants or proprietors navigate various cultural backgrounds. For example, this dilemma applies when an individual is Black and White, yet Whites are shown to avoid Black dominated areas, leaving researchers to determine what factors contribute to their housing accommodations.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

The results present a weak relationship between domestic segregation and residential satisfaction using an overall structure of a respondent's community. This research focused on a meso-level perspective regarding quality of life hence, it was straightforward to study the interactions between individuals and communities altogether. Evidently, neighborhood security, culture, white flight, and gentrification played a substantial role in urban development. With that being said, the central theme of homogeneity emphasized the importance of social, physical, and financial commitment to one's neighborhood. Individuals are happier if they reside in localities with comparable attributes such as wealth, race, and class.

The findings presented in this study are crucial to urban analyses since identity and space are inextricable phenomena revolving around community ties and social investment. An in-depth data analysis confirmed the validity of the hypothesis: respondents are more likely to report an excellent quality of life if they live in a racially homogeneous neighborhood. Whites were statistically reluctant to live in the same neighborhood as Blacks or other racial groups. Moreover, the study can confidently declare that quality of life is influenced by race. Living in a racially segregated neighborhood produces more satisfaction regarding the participants' perception of life.

REFERENCES

Aguilar-San Juan, Karin. 2005. "Staying Vietnamese: Community and Place in Orange County and Boston.'" *City and Community* 4(1): 37-65.

Alvarez, Ana L., and Daniela Müller-Eie. 2017. "Quality of Urban Life and Its Relationship to Spatial Conditions." *The Sustainable City XII* 223: 285-296.

Bobo, Lawrence and Camille L. Zubrinsky. 1996. "Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice?" *Social Forces* 74(3):883-909.

Brown-Saracino, Japonica. 2004. "Social Preservationists and the Quest for Authentic Community." *City & Community* 3(2):135–156.

Centner, Ryan. 2008. "Places of Privileged Consumption Practices: Spatial Capital, the Dot-Com Habitus, and San Francisco's Internet Boom," *City & Community* 7(3):193-223.

Chiswick, Barry R. and Paul W. Miller. 2005. "Do Enclaves Matter in Immigrant Adjustment?" *City & Community* 4(1):5-35

Desmond, Matthew and Nicol Valdez. 2013. "Unpolicing the Urban Poor: Consequences of Third-Party Policing for Inner-City Women." *American Sociological Review* 78(1): 117-141.

Desmond, Matthew and Bruce Western. 2018. "Poverty in America: New Directions and Debates." *Annual Review of Sociology* 44: 305-318.

Doucet, Brian. 2017. "Why Detroit Matters – Lessons and Visions." *Geography* 102(2):104-110.

Firey, Walter. 1945. "Sentiment and Symbolism as Ecological Variables." *American Sociological Review* 10(2):140-148.

Fitzpatrick, Kevin M., and Mark LaGory. 2003. "'Placing' Health in an Urban Sociology: Cities as Mosaics of Risk and Protection." *City & Community* 2(1): 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6040.00037.

Florida, Richard. 2012. "'Cities and the Creative Class.'" *City & Community* 2(1): 3-19. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203103333-53.

Freeman Anderson, Kathryn. 2017. "Racial Residential Segregation and the Distribution of Health-Related Organizations in Urban Neighborhoods." *Social Problems* 64(2): 256-276.

Gans, Herbert J. 1972. "The Positive Functions of Poverty." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(2): 275-289.

Gochfeld, Michael and Joanna Burger. 2011. "Disproportionate exposures in environmental justice and other populations: the importance of outliers" *American journal of public health* 101(1): 53–63.

Greif, Meredith. 2018. "Regulating Landlords: Unintended Consequences for Poor Tenants." *City & Community* 17(3): 658-674.

Hartinga, Philipp and Davide Radi. 2020. "Residential Segregation: The Role of Inequality and Housing Subsidies." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 178: 801-819.

Hayes, Adam. 2021. *Conflict theory definition* Investopedia. Retrieved January 7, 2022

    (https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/conflict-theory.asp).

Iceland, John, Daniel Weinberg and Lauren Hughes. 2014. "The Residential Segregation of

    Detailed Hispanic and Asian Groups in the United States." *Demographic Research*

    31(20):593-624.

Jeffres, Leo W., Cheryl Campanella Bracken, Guowei Jian, and Mary F. Casey. 2009. "The

    Impact of Third Places on Community Quality of Life." *Applied Research in Quality of*

    Life 4(4): 333–345.

Kondo, Michelle C., Elena Andreyeva, Eugenia C. South, John M. MacDonald, and Charles C.

    Branas. 2018. "Neighborhood Interventions to Reduce Violence." *Annual Review of*

    Public Health 39(1): 253–271.

Kubrin, Charis E., Hiromi Ishizawa, John M. MacDonald, Robert J. Sampson, and Roberto G.

    Gonzales. 2011. "Why Some Immigrant Neighborhoods Are Safer

    than Others: Divergent Findings from Los Angeles and Chicago." *The Annals of the*

    American Academy of Political and Social Science 641(1):148-173.

Lin, Jan and Paul Robinson. 2005. "Spatial Disparities in the Expansion of the Chinese

    Ethnoburb of Los Angeles." *Geojournal* 64: 51-61.

    https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203103333-33.

LiPuma, Edward and Thomas Koelble. 2012. "'Cultures of Circulation and the Urban Imaginary: Miami as Example and Exemplar.'" *Public Culture* 17(1): 384–392. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203103333-54.

Logan, John R. and Charles Zhang. 2010. "Global Neighborhoods: New Pathways to Diversity and Separation." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(4): 1069- 1109.

Marrow, Helen B. 2009. "New Immigrant Destinations and the American Colour Line." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32(6): 1037-1057.

Marx, K., Engels, F. and Toews, J., 1848. *The Communist Manifesto*.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 2012. "Segregation and the making of the underclass." *The Urban Sociology Reader* 192–201.

Murphy, Alexandra K. 2007. "The Suburban Ghetto: The Legacy of Herbert Gans in Understanding the Experience of Poverty in Recently Impoverished American Suburbs." *City and* Community 6(1):21-37.

Milligan, Melinda J. 2003. "The Individual and City Life: A Commentary on Richard Florida's 'Cities and the Creative Class.'" *City and Community* 2(1):21-26.

Pais, Jeremy F., Scott South, and Kyle Crowder. 2008. "White Flight Revisited: A Multiethnic Perspective on Neighborhood out-Migration." *Population Research and Policy Review* 28(3): 321–346.

Peck, Jamie. 2005. "Struggling with the Creative Class." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(4):740-770.

Pineda, Marilyn, 2017. "The Effects of Gentrification: Inhabitants, Education, and

    Displacement" *Honors College Theses* 1-45. Retrieved March 16, 2022

    (https://scholarworks.umb.edu/honors_theses/28)

Portes, Alejandro and Robert D. Manning. 1986. "'The Immigrant Enclave: Theory and

    Empirical Examples.'" *Competitive Ethnic Relation*. 47–68.

Rothstein, Richard. 2014. "The Making of Ferguson: Public Policies at the Root of its Troubles."

    Economic Policy Institute 1-41. Retrieved March 16, 2022

    (http://www.epi.org/publication/making-ferguson/)

Schnake-Mahl Alina S., Jaquelyn L. Jahn, S.V. Subramanian, Mary C. Waters, Mariana Arcaya.

    2020. "Gentrification, Neighborhood Change, and Population Health: A Systematic

    Review". *Journal of Urban Health* 97(1): 1-25.

Schuessler, Karl F., and G. A. Fisher. 1985. "Quality of Life Research and Sociology." *Annual

    Review of Sociology* 11(1): 129–149.

Smith, Neil. 1979. "Toward a Theory of Gentrification- A Back to the City Movement by

    Capital, not People." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45(4): 538-548.

Turner, Margery Austin, and Lynette Rawlings. 2009. "Promoting Neighborhood Diversity:

    Benefits, Barriers, and Strategies." *Urban Institute* 1-20.

Valle, Melissa M. 2021. "Globalizing the Sociology of Gentrification." *City & Community* 20(1):

    59-70.

van Holm, Eric J. and Christopher K. Wyczalkowski. 2019. "Gentrification in the Wake of a

    Hurricane: New Orleans after Katrina." *Urban Studies* 56(13):2763–2778.

Wacquant, Loic and William Julius Wilson. 1989. "The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in

    the Inner City." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Science* 501: 8-

    25.

Wu, Cary. 2015. Moving from Urban Sociology to the Sociology of the City. *The American*

    Sociologist 47(1): 102-114.

Zubrinsky Charles, Camille. 2003. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual*

    Review of Sociology 29: 167-207.

Zukin, Sharon. 1995. "'Whose Culture? Whose City?'" *The Cultures of Cities* 1-48.