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Abstract

Current research lacks holistic understanding of African American trust, and why it differs from the trust of other ethnic/racial groups. In order to better understand why this is, I will explore how African Americans in underserved and impoverished neighborhoods determine which organizations and institutions to trust. My study finds that the cause of erosion of trust within Englewood may be linked to minimal fiduciary trust between residents and city officials and administration. Further, my study finds that the race of an individual was not significant in determining whether Englewood residents trusted them.
Dedication

My thesis is dedicated to my family, sorority sisters, my thesis workshop group, Agnes Pastwa (and sometimes Toni Corbani), and finally Ben Smith who has showed me unwavering support and have tolerated my late night rants. I want to especially thank my mother for being there the many times throughout the past four years when I thought I could not continue, and for letting me know that she was proud of me every step of the way. I don’t say it much, but I am so grateful for the sacrifices that you and Dad have made. You are a phenomenal woman, and I so respect and look up to you every day... even after we argue.

P.S Ben, I’ll clean up the room whenever this is done. But do know, you’re in this for the long haul so it’ll probably be cyclical until I figure out a way to make it work.
Acknowledgments

Without the SOAN Department this thesis would not be possible. I would first like to thank Professor Beer my advisor for taking me on as a student and for pushing me to think more deeply and intently. I also would like to especially thank Professor Swyers who is the reason I decided to major in sociology and has shown up at the table throughout this entire project even when on sabbatical.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee for being patient with me and giving me words of encouragement throughout the way – especially Professor Graff who goes the extra mile to be there.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Histories and Literature Review</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: Methods</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Data</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Conclusion</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Trust is at the forefront of any successful organization. It instills potential organization participants with the confidence that others are acting in their best interest and that the members within that organization are all doing their due diligence to work toward a set of goals. Disruptions in trust, ranging from changes in leadership to the introduction of outsiders, can often produce hostile and uncooperative environments for all of the members/actors within a community/social group. Understanding how trust shifts is critical to the operations of grassroots organizations. Additionally, understanding how the historical discrimination and disenfranchisement of a community, such as Englewood other South and West side neighborhood of Chicago, is vital to understanding how to approach issues of trust and build working relationships.

Research Question:

Despite research on generalizable, communal, political, and ethnic trust (research showing how different racial groups trust), there is a lack of research that focuses on unpacking inter-racial trust and the causes for racial disparities in the various forms of trust. Further, there is a lack of research that observes relationships with outsiders and how these issues come into play within poor black communities in Chicago. Given this, my research looks to address the question: Does race affect Englewood residents’ trust of community organizations?
CHAPTER 1: HISTORIES AND LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Englewood

Englewood, a neighborhood on the south side of Chicago was founded in 1852 and has a long history of disenfranchisement and neglect. Investors slowly began pulling funding from the neighborhood following the flight of white Chicagoans during the 1960s. By 2000, the Englewood population had declined to about 40,222 from its 1960 peak of 97,000 residents. Englewood’s large population decline was the result of decreased opportunity, high crime rates, and high rates of poverty. Public works projects such as the construction of the Dan Ryan Expressway displaced South Side blacks into Englewood and declining numbers of operational businesses within the area led the neighborhood to plummet into a long period of economic decline. Since its fall, Englewood has been largely neglected – particularly by the city of Chicago officials.

In 1950, the beginning of construction work on the Dan Ryan Expressway (then South Expressway) forced several south-side Chicago residents (the majority of whom were black) to migrate into Englewood. Increased populations of African Americans, led to the migration of white Chicagoans out of the Southside and into surrounding suburbs. By 1960, the percentage of African Americans living within the Englewood community increased to 69 percent, and up to 17 percent of the Greater Englewood residents were at or below the poverty line. In an attempt to reverse Englewood’s declining economy, the Chicago Department of Urban Renewal presented a plan to add a pedestrian mall, which was completed in 1969 – five years after the initial proposal. By 1970, the total percentage of African Americans in the neighborhood increased to 96 percent and one in five residents in Englewood, and one in ten in West Englewood, lived below the poverty line. In 1971, The United Block Clubs of Englewood – a multiracial organization – formed, its mission was to improve the neighborhood. Research conducted by the
Volunteers for Housing Committee found that 90 percent of Englewood residents lived on blocks with abandoned buildings or vacant land. Englewood found itself in a position with little prospect of recovery by means of investment by either local municipalities or private entities, and was essentially abandoned.

Following years of redlining (beginning sometime around the 1930s) and disinvestment (largely beginning after World War II), Englewood became notorious as a low-economic status neighborhood. With large migrations of African Americans into the Englewood neighborhood panic ensued among white property owners who then fled the area (Stockwell 2005). Following the white flight, banks, landlords, and real estate owners aided blacks in moving into the area but often at higher interest rates and rents than their white counterparts (Stockwell 2005). One banker stated, “the Negro has to pay a higher rate because he is not as secure in his job” (Stockwell 2005). Englewood’s decline was exasperated further by disinvestments within the neighborhood from companies such as Sears. By 1975, poverty in Englewood had reached 27 percent and produced high rates of foreclosure in Englewood. These foreclosures prompted the Metropolitan Housing Alliance to conduct an investigation of ten savings, loans, and mortgage companies. Following the investigation, the department intervened and asked bankers to allow Englewood home owners to have more time to settle debts.

Although majority African-American by 1974, only small stores – often operated by Asian immigrants – comprised the majority of remaining shops in Englewood and relationships between merchants and residents became tense (mainly due to racial differences). Also during this year, Nazi leader Frank Collin hosted a gathering of young white individuals in Marquette Park and led violent marches into West Englewood which was predominately black. In response to Collins, many African-Americans and supporters marched into white neighborhoods; these protests continued for two years.
African-Americans were essentially being discriminated against and marginalized in their own backyards.

Neglect by local officials and law enforcement (or otherwise inefficient care) also became commonplace for residents. In 1979, former alderman Frank Brady was reported as a “missing person” to police department by his constituents. This false report was a community-led action and was made in response to Brady’s a lack of initiative to address his black constituent concerns. Brady was later “found” in City Hall. By 1980, Englewood’s black population had increased to 99 percent and the area had lost 30,000 residents. In 1985, a number of rapes were reported within the Englewood community; police response was to knock on residents’ doors and increase foot patrols to ensure safety. These efforts were shortly abandoned, due to limited staff according to the Chicago Police Department. Historian Stampley, however stated that “The police were too intrusive and the community didn’t cooperate with [their] door-to-door efforts” (Polk and Mick 1999). In the same year, the 63rd Street Mall reopened (with a 20 percent boost in business), but the Englewood Hospital closed three years later due to insufficient operational funds. Soon, Englewood residents experienced similar economic distress, and the mean household income plummeted to $18,853 which was just 54 percent of the citywide average; unemployment within Englewood rose to 26 percent.

In 1993, the Chicago Police Department (CPD) launched a pilot program that would come to be known as the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy. The purpose of this program was to assist in making policing community oriented, and as cited by CPD and former mayor Richard M Daley, “to improve the quality of life in Chicago’s neighborhoods” and efforts would be made to ensure “vigorous and impartial enforcement of the law, rapid response to serious crimes and life-threatening emergencies and proactive problem solving in the neighborhoods” (Chicago 1993). The system also
put in place a Community Advisory Committee, which was responsible for identifying
district level concerns and for setting priorities for police to address.

In 1999, the city of Chicago announced a $256 million plan to revitalize the
Englewood neighborhood. The plan was to construct commercial facilities and residential
housing, revitalize police facilities, and increase the number of parks and infrastructure
improvements overall. Some critics of the revitalization program believed that while the
city was making efforts to assist the community, it largely disregarded the districts most
prominent issues such as mental health services and community policing. Additionally,
the Englewood Police District had not been meeting the official goals of CPD (Polk and
Mick 1999). For example, following the murder of 11-year old Ryan Harris, Englewood
residents were offered little support, nor were they provided with the necessary resources
to assist individuals with coping with the traumatic psychological effects that the murder
offered to residents came from within the community itself. This caused residents to feel
as if they could not rely on the city government to help them when and where they most
needed it. Schools, churches and neighborhood organizations worked to reduce violence.
Despite this, chronic violence in turn seems to have produced more violence as well as
fear, anger, and depression within the community. Issues with mental health also
contributed to social ills such as substance abuse and increased unemployment, making
mental health a central issue amidst large amounts of violence.

High crime and violence between 2000 and 2010, likely contributed to the decline
of Chicago’s African-American community by 7 percent (or 200,000 people), specifically
amongst its middle class black families who moved away from the community. Further
poverty rates reached 48 percent in 2014 (Bogira 2014). During his inauguration, mayor
Rahm Emanuel noted, “No great city can thrive by shrinking, the best way to keep people
from leaving is to attract the jobs that give them a good reason to stay” (Little and Mihalopoulos 2011). While well intentioned in his approach, Emanuel’s speech depicts what residents in Englewood are frustrated by: a lack of understanding of the actual issues that plague the community. Further, former Chicagoans cited that the revitalization that was promised to residents often did not reach their own neighborhoods while they saw downtown and gentrified areas improve dramatically. Rodney Smith, a former Chicago resident, stated that the CPD “promised to get the gangs and the drugs under control, and there was no real change (Little and Mihalopoulos 2011). This lack of fulfillment of promises contributed to “middle class erosion”. James Turner, an engineer at the University of Chicago and former resident states “You can’t trust the city, you can’t trust it to have peace unless you are somewhere on the North Side, next to the lake, Mayor Rahm Emanuel can do something and put the police where they should be [on the south side]” (Little and Mihalopoulos 2011). What Turner is expressing is the lack of trust that some residents and former residents have for the city to treat their community justly – compared to some northern communities.

The history of Englewood outlines a history of disenfranchisement and neglect at the hands of city officials. Further, Englewood’s history helps to understand some of the growing frustrations and discriminations that continue to exist among south-side residents. Due to a long history of abandonment, Englewood has seen a rise of community organization participation among residents. It is within these organizations that community members seek to resolve communal issues at a grassroots level.

**Community Organizations**

In 2010, and in response to government inefficiencies, the Resident Association of Greater Englewood (R.A.G.E) was founded with the purpose of bringing together “homeowners, stakeholders, business owners, professionals, students, parents and
grandparents fighting to transform and empower Greater Englewood” (Englewood 2015). The foundation of R.A.G.E has had a large impact on the Englewood community. The organization was founded and run by residents of the neighborhood, and is predominantly aimed at ending the perpetuation of stereotypes regarding the residents and livelihood of Englewood by external individuals. Ways that R.A.G.E plans to achieve this is by facilitating community meetings, events, and forums to residents and to actively hold leaders in the community accountable for their actions. Other community organizations within the neighborhood, such as Teamwork Englewood (est. 2003), Imagine Englewood If, and Englewood’s Political Task Force have similar missions.

Since 2010, R.A.G.E has become one of the largest community organizations in Englewood, and has led a number of initiatives within the community, such as the green land plot program as a part of the Greater Health Neighborhoods (GHN) plan, and largely acts as a brokerage service in connecting residents to additional resources (and residents) for assistance. This is an essential function of many nonprofits in poor neighborhoods (Small 2006). These sources attempt to improve the prosperity of the neighborhood and lift individuals out of poverty by way of providing them access to resources such as childcare, bill assistance, affordable healthcare, etc. GHN is a plan that is currently being implemented in Chicago’s Southside neighborhoods by the city of Chicago to increase access to healthier food options and improve the relationship residents have with their environment. As a part of the program, residents may purchase a lot of city land for $1 so long as they follow the regulations outlined by the city. These include purposes of housing, gardens, and city/neighborhood beautification.

**Growing Home**

Growing Home –which is a largely white run organization- was established in 2002 in Mundelein, Illinois, a northwest suburb of Chicago. In 2006, the organization
was invited by Teamwork Englewood (a local community-based organization), as a part of the Quality of Life Plan, to begin operations in the greater Englewood neighborhood. The long-term goal of Growing Home is to help those in their program to find sustainable careers and to relieve high unemployment and poverty within the area. One of their secondary goals is to provide affordable access to fresh produce in the Englewood community – a neighborhood that had been a food desert (without a full grocery store) since before 2006 and up until 2011 following the first election of Mayor Rahm Emmanuel.

The organization is now located on Wood Street just beyond the main intersection of the neighborhood (63rd and S. Halsted St.), and just off of a main road (S. Ashland Ave). The area immediately surrounding Growing Home (within a two-block radius) was well maintained. There is very little, if any, garbage and the pavement of the streets was decent; this largely contrasted with the rest of the neighborhood. For example, in the streets near the main plaza the amount of litter was substantial– although the plaza itself, where a new Whole Foods is located, was clean.

In 2015, Growing Home decided to close its northern farm and operate solely in Southside Chicago. In the same year, Growing Home began a partnership with Cabrini Green’s Legal Air to help their production assistants clear their criminal records. This was done to make it easier for assistants to access jobs, housing assistance, child custody, and several other civil pursuits. Growing Home’s mission is to provide job experience and job-readiness training in addition to providing support to workers trying to reobtain their full civil liberties. I chose to research Growing Home because they are an obvious outsider group (a predominately white organization within a predominantly black community) to the Englewood neighborhood. Also, given the amount of time that they have been established in Englewood, I believed that there would have been enough
community engagement and established social networks to get expansive data.

**Ecology of Empowerment**

There are a number of nonprofit community organizations available to the Englewood community; however, membership is often unequal among them. To understand why, we must first look at why individuals decide to participate in community organizations more broadly. Citizen participation in grassroots organizations is vital not only to the success of community organizations but also to community empowerment (Perkins, Brown, and Taylor 1996). Community empowerment is defined as the community’s belief in its ability to effect social and political change, often for the betterment of its members. To date, academics still debate whether community empowerment is the cause of citizen participation or if it is the effect of it. Perkins, Brown, and Taylor (1996) utilize the term ecology to refer to the “sensitivity to measuring the phenomena of interest at multiple levels of analysis over time and by focusing on its multifaceted environment” (Perkins, Brown, and Taylor 1996, 87). My definition of the term will derive from this and will be defined as the way in which one’s environment affects how individuals perceive their community, its members, and the area surrounding them. With respect to Englewood, this definition will help to explore how members of the community interpret action or inaction taken within it.

Physical environments that increase isolation among residents tend to produce decreased participation within community organizing. Environmental features that encourage social interaction increases the sense of community among residents (Perkins, Brown, and Taylor 1996, Rankin and Quane 2000). One factor that increases community participation is physical signs of disorder or “incivilities,” such as graffiti. The desire to reduce the amount of such disorder encourages communities to become involved in neighborhood improvement organizations. In the area surrounding Growing Home,
examples of disorder were not readily noticeable. However, Englewood residents do participate in an annual Unity Day as a part of Chicago’s city-wide clean up initiative and have been informed of such initiatives through community based organizations such as R.A.G.E. (Resident Association of Greater Englewood).

Scholars have found that economic investments within the neighborhood (such as owning a home or a business) increases the likelihood that an individual will participate in community initiative based organizations (Chaskin 2001). The opposite effect can be seen within low-income communities with high rental rates. To date, there are still large numbers of abandoned buildings in Englewood and poverty remains rampant. It is often within these communities that grassroots organizations have the most difficulty gaining and maintaining neighborhood participation (Perkins, Brown, and Taylor 1996). Other factors that influence individual involvement in community organizations include community behaviors to produce trust, cognition, and physical environments that encourage group participation.

There is often a misconception that American ghettos are largely neglected by the community. However, research has shown that African-Americans, who tend to be the largest demographic in these areas, participate in grassroots organization more than white Americans at corresponding income levels (Perkins, Brown, and Taylor 1996). Such associations are necessary within communities of high minority demographics due to increased events of discrimination that occur to both the community and its members and fewer connections to persons in power. Perkins, Brown, and Taylor (1996) argue that other factors that may influence individual participation in community associations include length of residency, which is thought to create stronger ties to the neighborhood and thus may predict increased involvement in initiatives to maintain features of the neighborhood due to increased feelings of solidarity. Further, communities that engage in
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more “neighboring”, which is described as the act of assisting members of one’s neighborhood, are more likely to engage in community organizing and grassroots organizations (Perkins, Brown, and Taylor 1996). With respect to Englewood, I would expect that intra-communal trust produces increased neighboring activities and thus increases individual participation within community associations. However, I would not expect that this trust is readily available to actual or perceived outsiders; specifically, majority white (an obvious sign of being an outsider in a majority African American neighborhood) organizations which embed themselves into disenfranchised communities.

**Trust**

Grassroots (community-based) organizations have been described as “urban sanctuaries” (McLaughlin and Irby 1994). Their purpose is often to mobilize and enhance participation in social and economic development within a given region; this definition is appropriate to describe Englewood’s Growing Home Urban Farming project. Many scholars have attempted to understand how and why these organizations become successful and in doing so often look to intra-organizational factors, such as employee relationships with management and among peers (Van de Bunt, Wittek, and de Klepper 2005). However, many fail to stress the importance of factors originating from within the organization specifically when these organizations are based in or attempt to conduct outreach within communities comprised mostly of minority residents. Community relations issues include the formation and maintenance of trust.

Trust is complex, and plays a large role in the development of communities and grassroots organizations. According to La Porte and Metlay, “we trust [others] to take our interests into account, even in situations in which we are unable to recognize, evaluate or thwart potentially negative courses of action on their part” (Thomas 1998). In other words, trust is the faith or belief that others will prioritize another’s wellbeing over their
own self-interests and will do everything within their power to ensure the well-being of another. The more that individuals act in this manner towards us the more they are worthy of our trust (Thomas 1998). Trust must be distinguished from cooperation and researchers must take caution not to confuse the two. When trust is established and maintained it encourages individuals to cooperate with one another, however cooperation does not necessarily entail trust (Thomas 1998). In fact, the decision to cooperate may be made of other factors such as mutual benefit for the individuals involved or social obligations (or even coercion) that require actors to cooperate with one another. Making such distinction between trust and cooperation, thus distinguishes simple cooperation from relationships rooted in trust.

Government agencies rely on a degree of trust from the public in order to function and uphold civil service. While government organizations and grassroots organization are different, the ways that they may establish trust with the communities they are servicing have parallels. Therefore, I will use previous research on government agencies as a model for understanding the establishment of trust between communities and grassroots organizations. Craig Thomas (1998) examines the types of trust that are necessary between communities and government agencies in order to fulfill their purpose. These are: fiduciary trust, mutual trust, and social trust.

Three Primary Types of Trust

Fiduciary trust is based on the components of representative relationships. In these relationships, one social actor is authorized to interact with actors outside of the social group on their behalf. A common example of this is with city council members, mayors, and aldermen. In this relationship, the representative is held accountable by the social group, but accountability is not reciprocal. This is the basis of how most government and community organizations function. Similarly, fiduciary trust is defined
as when “an individual places trust in another to act in his or her capacity” (Thomas 1998, 170). An issue with both representative relationships is that often the constituents involved are not able to directly monitor how their representative conducts business, thus making citizens vulnerable. Thomas notes that “in fiduciary relationships, individuals are trusted to carry out their duties in regard to others while not taking excessive personal advantage of their privileged position” (Thomas 1998, 170). Once fiduciary trust is established it is assumed that such officials will act in accordance with their organizational roles rather than their individual interest while also giving the expectation that the organization is looking out for the community’s best interest and thus are treating them “fairly.” When these expectations are not met, it produces disruptions in trust which may lead to distrust when such disruptions become expected in future interactions.

In contrast to fiduciary trust, mutual trust is more symmetric between social actors/units and is most common within accountability based relationships. In these relationships, each actor is responsible for specific activities, is able to hold the other accountable for completing those activities, and is able to know about the other’s actions. Among community members and organizations, mutual trust which is interpersonal in nature, is established by “street-level bureaucrats” (Thomas 1998). These “bureaucrats” act as middle-men between the community and the agency they represent, and their involvement within the community establishes behaviors and subsequent trust toward the organization. For example, high levels of mutual trust between a parent and a teacher, produces a greater amount of trust for the public-school system. When properly maintained, mutual trust establishes expectations that community members will come to expect trust from other members of the agency and from similar and/or related agencies. Given Englewood’s history with public agencies, distrust of perceived outsiders may prove to be the biggest challenge to overcome with respect to implementation of
community initiatives and the overall success of Growing Home and the like. Grassroots organizations may be able to overcome mistrust and restore trust within the community by way of establishing and maintaining mutual trust.

Finally, social trust (also known as generalized trust) acts like accountable based relationships, however social trust differs in how it may be extended to other social actors. Social trust is gradually accumulated within a society through micro-level interactions between individuals which others can then utilize (Thomas 1998). In other words, social trust occurs when a limited number of social actors within a group establish trust amongst themselves first. This trust then has a rippling effect and leads members of the social group to believe that on average, most people within the larger group can be trusted. For example, individuals may establish trust with their neighbors; when generalized trust is established, it will lead social actors to trust most other actors within their neighborhood. Outsiders, such as a non-profit organization, who then come into the group’s social sphere can then benefit from easier means of gaining trust. For example, Growing Home would potentially benefit from increased access to strong social networks which act as resource brokerages. These networks would also provide Growing Home with expanded means of outreach to enhance membership, community support, and use of Growing Home’s offered services.

How Trust is Produced?

To better understand these complexities, it is necessary to understand how trust is established. Lynne Zuker (1986) identifies three ways in which trust is produced; these include characteristic-based trust and process-based trust. Characteristic-based trust is linked to personal identities, for example gender, race, familial systems, all of which “signals membership in a common cultural system” (Zucker 1986, 15). These ideas are congruent with the belief that individuals tend to trust at higher rates within one’s own
race. Racial-based trust however, is superficial in nature and is not the only complex aspect of trust. That being said, race is the most obvious indicator of insider and outsider groups within racially homogenous neighborhoods such as Englewood.

Process-based trust is trust that has been established over time and is characterized by a series of exchanges that may be economic in nature. Such exchanges may be the exchange of goods such as information for some other material, food, security, etc. Trust can also be established through the exchange of symbolic goods or social exchanges. For example, inviting someone over for dinner, a drink, or inviting them to a formal event such as a graduation. The amount of trust that this may generate on the inviting end of these exchanges varies with the increased value of one’s time for the person being asked. For example, an official’s time is stretched thin and often they have very little of it to give to constituents thus, the official’s time is of high value. Contrastingly, I have an abundance of “free” time to give to individuals and given this reality my time is of less value. Likewise, if a constituent were to invite me and a local official to dinner, it would be appreciated that I came, but the official’s attendance communicates how much they care for said constituent given that they “made” time for them. As such, while my attendance does increase the likeliness that the host will trust me to be courteous in future situations, the amount of trust that it generates is significantly smaller than the trust that would be generated for the official. Similarly, engaging in this form of trust with residents would prove to establish greater levels of trust between Growing Home and the residents of Englewood. Further, refusal to accept social and symbolic exchanges may indicate that the person in question does not wish to enter into an exchange relationship and may generate a disruption in trust. Process-based trust may also be established by way of “tenure longevity” (Thomas 1998). Tenure longevity is based on the idea that the more time an individual spends with another or
with a community of individuals the more likely they are to trust each other. Within an organizational setting this trust may become disrupted or limited by employee turnover. With respect to Growing Home or other grassroots organizations, it is within their best interest to have fewer to no transitions of power so as to avoid abrupt and frequent disruption of trust systems already in place.

How Trust Is Lost?

Maintaining trust, or understanding how trust may be lost, should always be at the forefront of grassroots organizations’ mindset when making decisions that may have an impact on the communities they are involved with; Thomas (1998) outlines the events that allow for the erosion of trust. Over-utilization of contracts as a means for establishing of trust (and future securities) between individuals often leads to the erosion of trust. The use of contracts to outline every plausible responsibility of the individuals involved erodes trust because “their purpose is to specify obligations and future returns” (Thomas 1998, 184). What contracts imply is that the parties involved do not trust one another to fulfill obligations, therefore creating a need to legally document when and where returns will be produced and given. With respect to Growing Home and other grassroots organizations, this means that it would be more effective to not over use verbal or contractual agreements with other organizations or residents.

Trust is also disrupted when there is organizational disruption or when the norms and role behaviors are in a transitional phase. For example, when small companies are absorbed by a larger one and rules and guidelines have not yet been established. This “flux” period lacks clear expectations, despite the expectation that organization actors still fulfill certain obligations and responsibilities. It would serve Growing Home well to maintain the established relationships between Englewood residents and current Growing Home staff members as much as possible. One of the more notorious ways in which trust
can be lost is by lying and misuse of one’s power. Examples of this would be lies of omission, such as having secret projects whose details are not disclosed to the public, or later revealed laundering scandals. Finally, trust may be lost through the incompetence of individuals leading the organization. For example, if an organization’s leaders mismanage funds meant to go back to the community, as has been the case in a number of institutions within Chicago.

When considering how grassroots organizations should function in order to ensure community participation and overall success, establishing trust should serve as the foundation of their efforts because it is the premise of successful community mobilization. Trust may be established by attending as many community events as possible, aligning with local community leaders/ organizations, and quickly and consistently responding to community needs. Further, it would serve in Growing Home’s best interest to disclose as much information with the public regarding what they are doing; as much as they are able to. In addition, great effort should be placed on establishing mutual trust and for organization officials to engage in social exchanges whenever possible.
**Inconsistencies within institutions**

Increasing distrust may also be the result of institutional inconsistencies and lack of discretionary use of power. Sudhir Venkatesh (2006) examined the lives of individuals who are a part of the underground economy located in a low-income, predominately black neighborhood in Chicago ("Maquis Park"). As a part of the underground economy residents have to rely on services from one another as a way of earning enough income to provide for their families, and in part ensuring the sustainability of their neighborhoods. These services can entail things such as brokerage, prostitution, renting out one’s business or house, selling food in the local park, or protection from other gangs. One example given is “Eunice,” a 53 year-old woman and longtime resident of the area; given her low income, Eunice had supplemented her welfare payments with under-the-table money. As described in more detail:

In the late seventies, she began working full-time for her uncle’s janitorial firm. She earned several hundred dollars per month under the table to supplement her welfare benefits. In 1991, she was caught by a government caseworker and became ineligible for public assistance income. (Venkatesh 2006, 24)

While Eunice was caught by the state and punished for her illicit activities, Venkatesh (2006) notes that within Maquis Park there are also police officers that may turn a blind eye to some illicit activity within the community or engage in it themselves. For instance consider, James Arleander, a local mechanic in Maquis Park who runs a shop illegally. In Arleander’s case there are police officers who have formed relationships with community members to allow them to continue their underground dealings, sometimes as an exchange for other goods, such as information. The two
different responses to the underground market by local officials may serve to assist in understanding some of the complexities of trust within Southside communities of Chicago. In one response, the message conveyed may be that local government will look out for residents’ best interests or alternatively that local government is “shady.” Contrastingly, the other message sent by the government case worker is that you can’t trust local government to understand (or care about for that matter) the problems of the poor. The two different responses reveal a troublesome dichotomy; residents need the cooperation and assistance of local officials to ensure their livelihood but then must also be wary of those who may make them targets of exposure. The result is increased wariness of outsiders.

The effects that inconsistencies in such situations have on the levels of trust pervade racial and ethnic identification. In recent years, inconsistencies within governmental institutions have led to decreasing amounts of trust within the United States. For example, if we look at increasing incarceration rates, the American perspectives on mass incarceration reveal perceptions parallel to views of the criminal justice system more broadly. From 1970 to 2010, imprisonment within the United States has increased by 400 percent thus presenting instability in the rate of incarceration; the majority of which are among African-American and Latino men (Muller and Schrage 2014). A consequence of the increasing incarceration rates, is decreased goodwill of the American people (Stuntz 2011). Stunz (2011) notes that with noticeable and dramatic negative fluctuations to democratic systems (such as the court system), this creates decreased confidence in the system itself, and thus deteriorates the trust the public has in the institution to act fairly. Further, systems most vulnerable to these shifts in perceptions are likely to be seen at the local level, particularly in the public’s interactions with law enforcement. This may result in increased crime rates and decreased community
participation in enforcement measures to diminishing criminal activity.

Many scholars have theorized that the perceived legitimacy of laws is a primary determinant of law abiding behavior, not the fear of punishment (Muller and Schrage 2014). In other words, citizens obey laws on the premise that they are created with the mindset of creating equality and increasing overall well being of the public. Muller and Schrage (2014) also infer that when laws violate this premise (even by covert means) it diminishes trust that the institution will protect its constituents. When laws are seen as illegitimate individuals are more likely to break them, and in doing so, increase crime. As crime increases it decreases the trust that enforcement officers have in the community they serve and thus increases enforcement of the illegitimate law, and increased crime sets precedent for the creation of more illegitimate laws (Muller and Schrage 2014). Even more, this breakdown of trust could produce a trickle-down effect where citizens then no longer trust representatives of that institution, for example the individuals that help to enforce the law (e.g. police officers). Additionally, this could result in no longer trusting individuals that “blindly benefit” or support the law (i.e. historically white, middle-upper class citizens). Laws however, do not solely cause distrust; distrust may be the result of perceived threats of another’s sense of stability by means of re-zoning/ redistricting, fluctuating requirements to receive financial support, and mistreatment or discrimination by those meant to protect them. As will be shown later, historically African-Americans have been made to adjust to the majority of disruptive policies and political actions; this is the main cause of higher levels of mistrust among African Americans compared to other races.
Definitions of trust and how one is deemed to be trustworthy is not universal across ethnic groups, race, class and socioeconomic status. The demographics of Englewood, a majority low income African American community, impact the trust processes. Additionally, historical components of both the African American plight and the disenfranchisement of Englewood provide context and understanding to communities facing similar patterns.

Race is relevant in understanding how individuals develop trust as it, “affects how they are perceived to behave, where they are reputed to act in a given time period, and how much they are predicted to harm others or not” (Nunnally 2012, 25). How race influences socialization is still being researched, therefore much literature is incomplete in its analysis of ethnic differences in trust. An important aspect to note here is also that trust is not simply how one perceives others, but is also the expectation of how others may perceive you. This idea is very similar to that of W.E.B Du Bois’ (1903) double consciousness, in which African Americans are forced to view themselves through the lenses of white people – or the larger American society. Understanding the influence of social roles and double consciousness would assist in explaining the hesitation many African Americans feel in a variety of social situations. For example, consider the situation in which a group of white cisgender individuals originating from middle class neighborhoods enter into a low-income minority community for missionary work.

I bring up this example in particular because first, it is a narrative that is frequently seen in urban environments – the two parties involved are removed from one another with respect to status. Second, missionary work in particular has historically been problematic and was implemented to “civilize” native individuals and to spread the word of Christianity, which emphasizes differences in status. Over time however, the
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missionary mentality has morphed into “white savior mentality.” While mission groups
(which aimed at converting “uncivilized” groups to Christianity) have decreased,
volutourism and “savior” activities remain rampant.

Although white savior complex does not have the religious purpose of missionary
groups, its ideology still reflects the idea that people of color need righteous white people
to save them from themselves. White saviors are thus tasked with helping to bring
minorities out of poverty, misery, and teach them the right ways of life. The white savior
mentality is problematic firstly because these “do-gooder” actions are often imposed
upon persons of color rather than developed collaboratively. Secondly it plays upon the
stereotype that individuals of color cannot sustainably care for themselves. Finally, it
entertains the idea that white is representative of “good” and morally advanced.

Likewise, this mentality depicts African Americans as helpless and morally
faulty. Within this context, it is understandable for African Americans to be skeptical of
individuals that prescribe to this false narrative and impose themselves upon minority
groups. White saviors may then be received as trying to enforce power over these
communities; especially because of their status as middle class white Americans.
Finally, the behavioral patterns of white saviors may foster mistrust from African
Americans (and other minority groups) towards all obvious outsiders who task
themselves with assisting and embedding themselves within minority communities.

Considering what Nunnally (2012) has pointed out – that trust in a system,
organization, or person is also affected by the expectation of how others will perceive
you – and having this understanding of the “white savior complex” and the historical
connotations associated with it, it may be revealed that in communities similar to
Englewood the establishment of community organizations by “outsiders” may invoke
initial hesitations and skepticism of one's intentions. Or more simply, the attitudes of
white saviors – that people of color need whites to overcome hardship and moral
deficiencies – may be projected upon outsiders or outsider organizations (not community
initiated) that embed themselves within communities as aides. Such skepticism may be
applicable to all outsiders – however that term is defined – and may simply be more
pronounced with differences in race.
While political and social trusts build upon one another, in order to understand the role of Growing Home and other community development organization – because their purposes are so intertwined in both social and political realms – it is best to analyze these types of trust and the relationships African Americans have within these two concepts as separate entities first.

First, research has shown that both political and social trust has declined within recent years among all races (Doherty et al. 2015, Putnam 1995). Therefore, it would be incorrect to assume that African Americans are alone in distrust. Recent research does however, show that between African Americans and White Americans, African Americans tend to trust less (Taylor, Funk, and Clark 2007, Putnam 1995). Trust declines for different reasons. Thus, there is in fact a racial component to trust.

According to research, political trust has been shown to strongly correlate with the state of our nation (Nunnally 2012). For example, political trust was at its lowest during the Vietnam War, following the Watergate scandal, during former President Bill Clinton’s first term (possibly linked to the 1993 World Trade Center Bombing), following the September 11th terrorist attacks, shortly following the 2008 Great Recession, and has been on a steady decline since then. The PEW Research Center found that in April 2017 only 20 percent of Americans said that they trusted the American government to do what is right most of the time (PEW 2017).

Scholars have found that political trust has declined among all Americans (White, Latino, Black, etc.) mostly because they feel that the “government expends money inefficiently and on the wrong things, special interests overly influence government decision making, and that politicians lack integrity” (as cited in Nunnally 2012, 27). It was also found that in 2010 African Americans reported that their biggest issue with the
United States government was “its interference in people’s lives” (Nunnally 2012, 29). Studies have also shown that Americans’ degree of trust changes with the level of government to which they are referring.

We know that Americans generally tend to a higher degree of trust on the state level than to the federal government in protection of the economy and individuals’ civil rights. However, for African Americans the opposite holds true. This is caused by African Americans’ political history and reliance on the federal government to end actions of oppression often enacted and enforced at the state level (Uslaner 2002, 2001).

Nunnally (2012) also infers that the difference in opinion between blacks and whites regarding the trustworthiness of the federal government is the result of different understandings of what is “threatening” to one’s rights. The most drastic difference in the interpretations of risk lies in one’s perceptions of public policy. Whites’ political trust in government also vary depending on the perceived costs of enforcing public policy and whether or not the benefits from them are redistributive compared to distributive (Hetherington and Globetti 2002, Rudolph and Evans 2005). In other words, when there are more redistributive systems where white Americans benefit, white people are more likely to support the policy and believe the government is adequately protecting them.

These differences in trust have generated ideas of increasing “descriptive representation.” Descriptive representation is based on the idea that African American communities trust more and that their overall perceptions of government are more positive when the person advocating for them looks like them. There is little evidence of this; however, Nunnally (2012) points out that studies show that African Americans have greater trust of institutions that have more blacks in office.

Fixing black distrust in political institutions is not as simple as increasing the number of black representatives. Racial discrimination has played a crucial role in the
African American understanding of and interaction with government. Studies conducted by James Avery (2009) have found that African Americans distrust of government is greatest in three situations or categories. These include among those who believe that their economic status is the result of systems of racism, among those who believe that their community faces a large amount of discrimination, and finally perceptions of current and potential ongoing racial discrimination. As outlined earlier, Englewood befits this description.

Nunnally (2012) also warns against falling naïve to a unidimensional depiction or interpretation of African American distrust – the idea that all blacks don’t trust because of historic discrimination. While yes, racial discrimination has had a significant role in shaping African American communities and the perception of being discriminated against significantly decreases the amount of trust or perceived trustworthiness among African Americans, the rationale of why to trust and who to trust are much more complex. While much of current literature is specific to Americans and their relationship with the national government, these theories may provide fundamental insight to perceptions and hesitations of non-governmental organizations within similar communities.

**Promotion of Mistrust.**

Some scholars have misrepresented racial socialization as “promotion of mistrust”. Further, we know that African American parents encouraged their children to be wary of the intentions of their white counterparts (Hughes et al. 2006). Promotion of mistrust is defined as the “practices that emphasize the need for wariness and distrust in interracial interactions” (Hughes et al. 2006, 757). Hughes et al. (2006) point out that open promotions of mistrust were rarely mentioned in open-ended questions, or in surveys conducted by other researchers. However, the promotion of mistrust was found in qualitative studies. For example, in some interviews with African American parents there
were messages of defensive protocols that children must use when dealing with those outside of their own race (Coard, Wallace, Stevenson, and Brotman 2004). The difference between promotion of mistrust and bias preparation is that bias preparation provides a coping mechanism whereas the promotion of mistrust simply teaches fear. In bias preparation, parents simply warn children of historical discriminatory practices – typically seen at the hands of institutions. For example, parents may warn young black males of where not to be at a particular time of day out a fear of harassment by white police officers. Promotion of mistrust on the other hand, states very directly that African Americans should trust not members of a particular race, group, etc. While few researchers focus on distrust among interracial interactions, that method may in fact be misguided. As opposed to warning children specifically of interracial interactions, parents may instead warn children of the systemically racist systems and those who run them. These institutions happen to be predominately white run, historically. The promotion of mistrust may also be used as a method of protection in situations in which “coping” with racial bias simply is not enough and offers no solution to the issue at hand.
**Racial Socialization**

Racial socialization has relevance in shaping individual’s understanding of their role or place within the context of American society. As indicated by many scholars, racial socialization may have value in understanding racial disparities in trust. Scholars use a variety of terminology – most prevalently racial vs. ethnic socialization – to describe the process in which individuals learn about their racial and cultural identity. While the two terms are similar, I will be using the term racial socialization to refer to the process of becoming racially aware while also bearing in mind that these processes may vary across ethnic groups. This is different from cultural socialization, because racial socialization focuses on how the macro culture views a racial group. Cultural/ethnic variances may be recognized in analyses of racial socialization because in American society, race has influenced sub-cultures.

Research has shown that racial socialization is considered to be one of the most important aspects of child rearing within the United States among parents. A study by the National Survey of Black Americans conducted in 1997 found “approximately 40 percent of African American adults…mentioned themes of racial pride and heritage in response to open ended questions about their ethnic-racial socialization practices” (as cited in Hughes et al. 2006, 756). While it cannot be said that these are generalized practice, it does provide insight into the importance of such practices within the African American community. Additionally, racial socialization is not limited to the African American experience. Studies have shown that among other racial groups, racial socialization occurs at a rate ranging between 66 to 85 percent (Phinney and Chavira 1995, Hughes 2003), although African Americans tend to show the highest rates.

A part of racial socialization also includes preparing children for bias and discrimination. Studies have overwhelmingly focused on bias preparation within African
American communities compared to others, however this experience is not unique to one race. According to Chen (1998) relatively few studies have shown that, among African American parents, spontaneous discussion with children about discrimination or racial barriers occur – rates ranged from 10-15 percent in these studies (Hughes et al. 2006). This being said, a study conducted by Sanders Thompson (1994) found that 48-58 percent of African American adults could recall race-related discussions that they had with their parents during their upbringing (Hughes et al. 2006, Thompson 1994). Additionally, “in the National Survey of Black Americans 63.6 percent of black American adults reported transmitting racial socialization messages to their children” (Nunnally 2012, 58). Further, Hughes (2006) points out that in studies that utilized in-depth interviews it was found that black parents did in fact discuss the realities and prevalence of discrimination with youth.

Nunnally (2012) tells a personal anecdote of racial socialization that she experienced when she was younger, in which her grandmother told her “to get a bag from the store clerk whenever [she] made a purchase” (page 57). Nunnally’s grandmother was attempting to make a statement about the wider held perceptions of African Americans within America; that they are more likely to steal. In teaching her granddaughter to protect herself from external doubts of black trustworthiness, Nunnally’s grandmother also conveyed a powerful message regarding black status in the United States. Nunnally writes that, to this day she still makes sure she gets a bag from the clerk or carries her receipt, and notes that other black people have shared similar stories of lessons they had received from their own relatives. This action reveals the impact these lessons may have within the life of an African Americans. Further, these “lessons” showcase the level of uncertainty that many African Americans feel in their daily interaction with others outside of their racial group. As stated earlier, this narrative is not specific to the African
American experience, we know that similar conversations occur among Latino communities (Ayon, Marsiglia, and Bermudez-Parsai 2010). Understanding of these conversations as simply promoting mistrust disregards the complexities of racial socialization.

Ward (1991) found that preparation for bias among African American families was commonplace and this preparation does affect cross-racial relationships. However, Ward deems this to be “indigenous” and in doing so he diminishes the complexity of African American trust (as it relates to continued histories of discrimination) and bias preparation methods. First, to assume that the discussion of racial discrimination is inherent as a part of African American child-rearing has racist undertones and assumes that these strategies occur instinctively or impulsively and universally among African Americans. Often parents had these discussions as a reaction to assisting their children to cope with discrimination of either themselves or others that they had experienced (Ayon, Marsiglia, and Bermudez-Parsai 2010). These studies show that African Americans (or any other ethnic groups) generally do not impulsively decide to discuss discrimination preparation with their children. Instead, discussions about racial bias occur as reaction to experienced or observed discrimination and are used as a method of explaining others behavior. Further, while research has heavily focused on the preparation aspect, more attention should be paid to the coping strategies.

Why is racial socialization important?

Racial socialization plays a fundamental role in helping individuals understand their place in society. To date there is much debate as to whether this knowledge aides or hinders individuals later in life. Racial differences have historically had a home in American culture and continues to be seen within ideologies such as racial nationalism. The research has shown that the children of parents, who have racially socialized their
children by means of preparing them for discrimination/bias, may develop more effective coping mechanisms when faced with it when it occurs later in life. Further, research suggests that lack of racial socialization may also negatively affect later adulthood mental health and academic success (Hughes et al. 2006).

These ideas are consistent with research that observed the tendency of African Americans and other racially/ethnic minority students to perform poorly compared to members of the dominant culture. Some researchers argue that educational institutions (although this model can be applied to a number of both public and non-public institutions) need to do more to understand the cultural forces that impede students’ ability to perform well (Ogbu 1992). These forces include: minority perceptions of U. S society and schooling, the cultural standing of the group, and the degree of trust these groups have for U.S. institutions.

Ogbu (1992) states, that African Americans exemplify oppositional or ambivalent cultural frames of reference. Oppositional cultural frames are defined as “[cultural] differences that arose after a group has become a minority” (Ogbu 1992, 289). These are the cultural practices and language that arise out of the process of othering and forced subordination of a group by the majority group. For example, slave spiritual songs continue to be sung in predominately black churches and are arguably a cultural staple within the African American community. Blacks, most notably Southern blacks, created their own cultures and group identities as a result of being told- and shown- by the American macro culture that they were oppositional.

Secondly, the research shows that cultural acclimation differ among group identities. Ogbu (1992) describes African Americans as non-immigrant/ -involuntary minorities. What sets African Americans apart from other minority groups that Ogbu (1992) outlines, such as autonomous and immigrant minorities, is that involuntary
minorities are present within the culture by choice. Immigrant minorities however, are minorities that migrate in hopes of a better life/ positive expectations; autonomous minorities on the other hand are minorities that do not drastically differ from the macro-culture, an example of this in the United States is white females or white individuals who differ in sexual orientation. Studies have shown that involuntary minorities tend to disproportionately struggle academically, and are more skeptical that education alone will assist them in being successful within the American culture. Ogbu (1992) infers that this is because, “involuntary minorities tend to distrust school personnel and white people (or their minority representatives) who control other societal institutions” (291). This suggests that the underlying cause is mnemonic associations between teaching staff and other government personnel (e.g. the police).

The research has shown that high levels of social network support (especially that of the family) paired with messages of racial socialization increase African American resilience to adversity (Brown 2008). Ogbu’s (1992) findings are also consistent with that of other researchers who found that racial socialization increased African American adolescents sense of personal efficacy/confidence (Bowman and Howard 1985) and mental health (Fischer and Shaw 1999, Constantine and Blackmon 2002). It has also been suggested that students whose parents explain racial barriers perform at higher rates than those who do not. This being noted, research regarding the positive and negative effects of racial socialization have been largely inconsistent which may be the result of the length of these discussions (Harris-Britt et al. 2007). Little research has explored how much mnemonic associations are linked to racial socialization and how they may impact African American’s interactions with institutions and ‘outside’ groups.
Historical Examples of Inequality

Inconsistent or unequal use of the law degrades its legitimacy. Perceived illegitimacy of the law and the institutions that uphold them then lose the trust of the public because fiduciary trust has been eroded (Muller and Schrage 2014). Outlined below are recent examples of how African Americans have experienced such inequality. These examples, and continued practices like them, may provide insight into issues of trust between Englewood residents and historically white institutions.

Decommissioning of “the projects”

In the late 1990s, when the City of Chicago government began closing down public housing buildings across the city, many of the former residents were moved into Southside neighborhoods which were notoriously dangerous at the time. Between 1999 to 2002, more than 2,500 people were killed in Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) housing units, and a significant number of them occurred in the South and West Sides of Chicago; among them was the Englewood neighborhood. Upon being relocated, some families including that of Nicole Wright, were wary of their new surroundings and the gang members that “looked at them with suspicion” (Turner and Rogal 2004).

Shortly after moving to the new neighborhood, Wright’s son Kemp killed by a shot in the back while in a local park. In response to her son’s death, Wright stated “my child was more protected in the projects” (Turner and Rogal 2004). Wright later said that she believed being in an unfamiliar environment with rival gang members and unfamiliarity with those involved was the ultimate cause of the death of her son. CHA, a local government agency tasked with providing “affordable, decent, safe and stable housing to help communities thrive and low-income families, increase their potential for long-term economic success and sustained high quality of life” (CHA 2018) – had refused to acknowledge whether or not they considered some of the social consequences
of their Plan for Transformation. However, we do know that former U.S Attorney Thomas P. Sullivan, CHA’s former independent monitor for the relocation process, warned CHA officials that they were placing residents in danger. Some of these conflicts included territorial disputes between established gangs of the neighborhood and public housing residents also in the drug market, although the way gangs responded to being pushed into the same neighborhoods varied by location. Further, CPD refused to disclose any plan (if any existed) regarding how they would address crime in neighborhoods where CHA residents were being relocated. According to Dee (one of Kemp’s childhood friends), Kemp was involved in the occasional drug trade but it is not clear that he was a part of any official gang.

The killing of Kemp Wright shows a fundamental issue that CHA overlooked, William Hull, Kemp’s killer, was a member of the same gang that operated in the projects that the Wrights had just left. However, the Robert Taylor Home residents did not abide by the same rules or social boundaries Englewood members did, which eventually produced clashing between gang cells and increased violence. Whether intended or not, CHA sent a very clear message to residents; either they did not care enough about their concerns, or they did not care enough to heed warnings that they were given regarding the relocation of their residents into neighborhoods with high crime.

This kind of treatment is verified and unfortunately common among other assistance programs and has been noted by individuals within them, particularly among those who live on the south and west sides of Chicago. Studies show the linkage of stigmatization of poor blacks as being a factor in these situations. This stigmatization often leads to the production of areas of concentrated low socioeconomic status. Public assistance recipients point to harsh interrogative treatment that they receive from caseworkers who often treated them as lazy and dirty (Jarrett 1996, Edin 1991,
McCormick, Joseph, and Chaskin 2012). In doing so, many government institutions participate in reinforcing the stigma of the “undeserving” poor. AFDC (a federal public assistance program) recipients also note enrolling in school and looking for well-paying employment to decrease their dependency on public welfare (and end their stigmatization). However, they are often deterred from such initiatives by the requirements that their assistance mandates – or due to familial duties (Jarrett 1996). This often stymies if not increases their dependency on welfare.

The relationship between assistance recipients and public institutions is also strained by bureaucratic rules and lack of effective communication between these two parties, which often erodes trust. For example, public assistance recipients are expected to notify the appropriate authorities when they receive supplemental income—which is often necessary to pay bills and maintain familial normality. This can include money from friends, family members, working on and off the books, etc. Many individuals chose to withhold this information because social services will then deduct from the already meager subsidized income they do receive; many of the recipients see these actions as “cheating” (Edin 1991). Although not explicitly stated, it is implied that the recipients view these institutions as untrustworthy.

In the case of public housing, research has shown that officials at both the national and local levels had intentionally created concentrations of crime and isolation within poor black neighborhoods (Venkatesh 2006). Further, after deconcentrating measures began in the 1990s under the federal HOPE VI mandate, Chicago officials still attempted to socially isolate public housing individuals. The intent to isolate is evident in the placement of these individuals in equally poor and crime ridden neighborhoods with no regard to the social impacts. Today, some of the residents have moved into mixed income housing units. In order to gain access to these safe housing developments CHA
residents were required follow a number of stringent rules mandated by CHA and to go through a series of orientation sessions. These rules include items regarding personal garbage maintenance, group meeting regulations (i.e. what is considered loitering), attendance at “life readiness workshops”, etc. According to a Chicago Park District official, this relocation “[required] that social services [teach] public housing residents to be better role models to their children and better citizens” (McCormick, Joseph, and Chaskin 2012, 298). This comment stigmatizes low-income individuals as having no morals and as unfit citizens. The Chicago Park District official’s comment reveals the role that these stigmas play in how governmental bodies interact with them. While some CHA residents are now living in safer neighborhoods, the inequality of treatment that they receive by city officials remains more or less the same and they are given less access to institutional decision making and stakeholders who privilege wealthier individuals (McCormick, Joseph, and Chaskin 2012, Chaskin 2013).

While the majority of research outlined focuses on specific minority groups, the image that public assistance and intergovernmental institutions display is that poor African American individuals are not a priority, and are not worthy of dutiful care. The relationship that recipients have with these institutions likely shapes their perceptions and relationships with local government. Therefore, it is expected that there is a high level of distrust towards other governmental institutions and those that are aligned with institutions deemed to be untrustworthy or unfair to the disenfranchised poor.

**Mistrust and The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiments: African American mistrust of medical fields**

The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiments began in 1932 (and lasted for 40 years) when the Public Health Service began a study aimed at recording the natural progression of the sexually transmitted disease within African American men. According to the Center for
Disease Control, these men were not informed what the study was about and were instead told “they were being treated for bad blood” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2015). Those who allowed themselves to be “treated” were told they would receive free medical exams, meals, and burial insurance from the Tuskegee Institute. Further, it was found that once a cure for syphilis was found (penicillin at the time) patients who participated in the study were not given the treatment. Following a class action lawsuit which was filed in 1973, participants and their families were paid a $10 million settlement and lifetime medical benefits and burial services for all living participants. Since 1974, these benefits have expanded to include immediate family members. While there has been a legal resolution to this instance of systemic racism within the medical field, the study has had long-lasting impacts on the African American community.

First, individuals’ lives were being threatened when they exemplified generalized trust for the institutions experimenting on them. The realization that trust in a government institution failed them may not be resolved with traditional coping mechanisms. Further, the fact that such an ethical atrocity was carried out by individuals whose duty it is to assist the public made it that much a deeper wound. The events of Tuskegee “[have] come to symbolize racism in medicine, misconduct in human research, the arrogance of physicians, and government abuse of black people” (Gamble 1997, 1773). This has been a large proponent of African American need to keep one’s distance from institutional sources of “trouble.”

While the Tuskegee experiments are arguably one of the most notorious, and recent, instances of racism toward African Americans in the medical field, it was neither the first nor the last. Black distrust of medical practitioners can be seen as early as the antebellum period when both slaves and freed Black people were used as subjects by white physicians for dissection and other medical experiments (Gamble 1997). During
this time period, individuals were also refused the right to exit the experiment. Therefore, it is understandable that some individuals feel as if medical practices and task force missions (i.e. ending the HIV epidemic within communities) are means set in place to encourage a system of modern day slavery – an idea also explored by African American folklore.

Little is known about the role of African American participation (including those forced) in the advancement of medical knowledge in the years following the Civil War, however there is indication that there may have been. African American folklore terminology, such as “night doctors,” to describe those who stole cadavers and used/sold bodies (both living and dead) for medical research (Gamble 1997). Whether these stories were true or simply folklore, the fear that African Americans felt was real. Further, there are verifiable stories of black bodies being used and sold for medical purposes that likely contributed to this fear. For example, in the late 19th century there was a ring of grave robberies in Philadelphia – these bodies were used by medical students for examination (Gamble 1997). Additionally, in the early 20th century, black medical leaders publicly spoke out about and against the traditional use of African Americans as test subjects (guinea pigs) by white medical professionals. The culmination of black fear and increasing racial tension eventually led to the proposal for exclusively African American run hospitals.

During this time “some black newspapers even warned that white southerners wanted command of the hospital as part of a racist plot to kill and sterilize African American men and to establish an ‘experiment station’ for mediocre white physicians” (Gamble 1997, 1775). It is important to note that the fear of ethnic cleansing did not end with the creation of a black run hospital or increased numbers of African Americans in the medical field. In the 1990s during the height of the AIDS crisis that affected African
Americans and gay men disproportionately, the possibility of a genocide was called into question (Gamble 1997). Presently, there continues to be instances where the African American community has called into question the integrity of, specifically, white medical professionals. For example, studies have shown the disproportionate rates of black mothers dying following complications during childbirth compared to their white counterparts. Coverage of the topic by NPR also revealed that this difference in mother/childbirth deaths even accounted for issues such as economic status, access to healthcare, familial support, etc. (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2015).

Considering this disparity, many within the black community have called out the continued racial bias that physicians show toward African Americans. The persistent distrust of the medical field reveals is that, for one, African Americans have felt and continue to feel that their lives have little significance or value within the broader idea of American society. Second, it also reveals African American fear of the volatile enforcement of anti-discriminatory and ethical practice laws as they relate to their community. These ideas are reinforced and supported by patterns seen in other sectors and professional fields such as the police force.

**African American relationship with the Law Enforcement**

Since approximately 1992, outcries against police brutality and abuse of power (particularly against unarmed black men) have become a central point of debate and anger within the United States especially within the last decade. Since 2000, the most notorious of cases include that of: Trayvon Martin, a 17 years-old black male, not killed by a police officer but self-proclaimed neighborhood watch officer of a gated community who had connections with the local police department; Philando Castile (32 years-old), Eric Garner (43 years-old), Michael Brown (18 years-old), and Freddie Gray (25 years-old). In all of these cases, the police officers, or citizens in the case of Trayvon Martin,
involved in the death of these men were either not charged or were acquitted of manslaughter, which sparked outrage within the black community. The reaction to the most recent cases of police brutality exemplify growing frustrations of African Americans with the continued profiling and readiness to use violent protocol when confronting black persons. Further, as was seen with medical professionals, these deaths signify the lack of respect and care for black lives by many members of law enforcement; however, these perceptions are far from new and have been a longstanding source of tension within the African American community.

A brief overview of contemporary policing

Contemporary policing practices are thought to have begun in the 1830s, derived out of a watch system utilized during the American Revolution. In the South however, southern police officers were first originally called the “Slave Patrol” which began in 1704. The Slave Patrol’s original functions were to: (1) chase down, apprehend, and return runaway slaves to their owners; (2) provide a form of organized terror to deter slave revolts; and (3) maintain a form of discipline for slave-workers who were subject to summary justice, outside of the law, if they violated plantation rules (Gary 2017). By the 1880s, their primary goal was then to enforce and maintain Jim Crow laws in the South. The modern police systems of both the north and south were a response to the growing need for order within fast growing urban areas and the insurance of a stable and orderly work force and environment for commercial elites (Potter 2017). Thus, their purpose became social order of the masses, while what was to be considered “disorderly” was subjective. During the rise of the police order, there were also increased tensions within the community regarding increased inequality and the exploitation of workers, and dangerous working conditions. The combination of these injustices encouraged working class citizens to strike against employers, which was thus termed “rioting” by the upper
classes. Police officers were effectively able to maintain order during these “riots” by equating this political act with criminal activity, by categorizing it as activity of the “dangerous classes”.

The term “dangerous classes”, was introduced by Charles Loring Brace in the late 19th century and was based on the idea that the heart of social deviance could be found within the lower classes of society. Deviance included but was not limited to drunkenness, prostitution, and rioting, and as Potter states, “were the products of a biologically inferior, morally intemperate, unskilled and uneducated underclass” (Potter 2017). The only reasonable solution was, as explained by Brace, to cut off the sources of crime (e.g. alcohol, brothels, etc.) and establish a centralized organization of individuals installed to maintain order and decrease public evils. Today, it is still debated among sociologists – predominately – if police officers are presently taught to use these same ideologies. While it is noted that African Americans have had a long and complicated relationship with the law enforcement, I will focus primarily on the 1990s into the present as a way of understanding that relationship. This time period focuses on the current state of affairs and provides insight to the cultural response of shared or mnemonic histories.

LA Riots: 1992

During the 1990s, the most profound case of police brutality was the incident involving Rodney King. In March 1991, Rodney King was stopped by police officers after sending them on a high-speed chase throughout the Los Angeles area. King was ordered to get out of the car, and when he did officers repeatedly kicked him and beat him with batons for 15 minutes, while other officers stood by; some commenting on the beating. The incident was filmed by a bystander and was later broadcasted on national television. The beating of King resulted in skull fractures, broken bones and teeth, and permanent brain damage. This incident would have a long-lasting impact within the
African American community. The main four officers who engaged in the beating of King were charged with excessive use of force, but all four were found to be not guilty. Later, two police officers served time in prison and all four were removed from the force. The King vs. LAPD verdict was not well received by the African American community and led to massive civil unrest which would later be known as the LA riots. LA residents began setting fire to and looting from local stores and restaurants. Further, fair complexion motorists were pulled out of their cars in retaliation. Increasing tensions in the neighborhood due to high unemployment rates (estimated to be about 50 percent), the “crack” cocaine epidemic, and increasing gang and violent crime made the riots especially dangerous (Sastry and Grisby Bates 2017). Additionally, within the same month as the Rodney King case, a 15-year-old African American girl, Latasha Harlins, was shot and killed by a local Korean shop owner after he accused her of trying to steal a container of orange juice. The shop owner was given a $500 fine and probation; it was later found that Latasha had intended to pay for the juice and money in her hands for it at the time that she was killed. These incidents were not, unfortunately, the only reasons for the devastating riots, African Americans living in South LA, reported having felt neglected and harassed by police prior to the verdict.

Additionally, Connie Rice (civil Rights activist and lawyer) stated, “LAPD didn’t even feel it was necessary to distinguish between pruning out a suspected criminal where they had probable cause to stop and just stopping African American judges and senators and prominent athletes and celebrities simply because they were driving nice cars” (Sastry and Grisby Bates 2017). Incidents such as this make it more evident that African Americans were the targets of police domination. Witness accounts and scholarly interpretations of the events state that during the riots actions taken by LAPD to prevent further violence amounted to little to nothing; some LA residents reported that police
passed by them seeing injuries and violence and kept going (Sastry and Grisby Bates 2017). The LA riots would come to be known as a turning point in many black empowerment and social justice movements, and has been referred to by some scholars as ‘The Great Uprising’. However, in the years to come, cases of police brutality and abuse of power would increasingly come under the public eye. During the 21st century, the Chicago Police Department came under increased scrutiny following a number of incidents including robbery, shooting unarmed civilians, and inciting civilians. Current research underestimates the role that these incidents, and the frequency at which they happen, in instilling African American mistrust of government institutions.

In March 2000, a civilian police board fired three officers involved in the death of LaTanya Haggerty and Robert Russ. In the case of Haggerty, Officer Daniels states she shot Haggerty after she raised a silver padlock, which Daniels mistook for a gun. Later in court Daniels, and other officers, stated that the driver of the car was responsible for Haggerty’s death. According to the police officers’ testimonies, Smith (the driver of the vehicle) “tried to run them over, fled from them, and ignored their repeated requests that he stop the car and step out” (Blackman 2000). The board did find Smith at fault for these actions. The ruling met with a backlash from some city officials; Joseph Roddy – the officers lawyer – stated that the board’s decision was “politically motivated and gutless” (Blackman 2000). Further, William Nolan, the president of the Fraternal Order of Police accused the board of attempting to appease Mayor Daley’s request to avoid street protests.

In September of 2017, former Sgt. Eddie C. Hicks was arrested for drug conspiracy charges dating back to 2001. Hicks had been a fugitive for 15 years and was accused of running a “crew of rogue officers who robbed drug dealers, pocketed the illicit cash and sold the stolen drugs to other pushers” (Meisner 2017). In referring to these
groups of officers as a “crew”, the Chicago Tribune highlights a key piece of systemic inconsistency that is very visible to the public. Under other circumstances, especially those of individual marginalized communities and those who hold little authority, Hicks and his fellow officers would have likely been considered a gang. It is because of Hicks’s former station that affords them this euphemism. The federal charges against Hicks accuse him of using fake search warrants to rob drug houses. Hicks also supposedly stole drugs and cash from drug dealers during traffic stops; this occurred for nearly a decade. Hicks’s actions would have warranted significant distrust in law enforcement, because it would have exemplified to those affected by his actions that what Hicks was doing was suddenly legitimate – compared to them – because of the authority that officers held over them.

Worse yet, was the case of Jon Burge, a Chicago Police commander who reportedly tortured up to 120 black male suspects between the 1980s to the early 1990s – although his abuse of civilians may have begun prior to the 1980s. According to former suspects, Burge would attach their handcuffed ankles to a small electrocution crank box, place a plastic bag over the suspect’s head, and then electrocute them. This is a method that Burge utilized in gaining false confessions and convictions. By 2006, while prosecutors had found evidence against Burge, he was not taken to trial because the statute of limitations had passed (Miller 2015). Burge’s atrocities however had become a permanent stain in Chicago and American history. As some scholars have pointed out, the Burge torture cases, reflect “how pain helps to constitute a mode of historical consciousness” (Ralph 2013, 115). These unobservable effects of pain, impact the daily lives of those that it affects, influences their understanding of society and how they are viewed by the institutions within them.
In 1993, Burge was fired from the force due to multiple allegations asserting torture, however he was allowed to keep his pension. In 2002, in response to public demand for an indictment, Edward J. Egan was assigned to investigate the allegations against Burge. Elgan’s final report did not recommend bringing Burge to trial; it wasn’t until 2010 that Burge was sentenced to 4 ½ years in jail due to perjury charges. By October of the same year, Burges was allowed to relocate from his cell to a halfway house in Florida, despite some of his victims remaining behind bars.

Much research focuses on issues of legitimacy. I offer that issues of legitimacy extend to injustices as a whole (such as police theft/robbery, and other forms of corruption) that often go acquitted or unequivocally convicted. These injustices have longstanding effects because they openly convey that some are favored by or are above the law – or they are free to inconsistent use of discretionary power. This in turn, allows a breakdown in trust in the belief that the system truly works equally for everyone. Further, it creates cultural consciousness that holds distrust towards institutions that engage in those behaviors (in the outlined cases, this is the judiciary and enforcement systems). Within poor minority communities, where inconsistent use of discretionary power and penalties are particularly prevalent, the legitimacy of institutions of authority is called into question (Duck 2017). The consequences are then an erosion of communication between those institutions and the community (for example, an issue that many in law enforcement cite as being a cause of ineffective policing), the generation of mistrust and direct deviance of conformity. Researchers have found that the public’s evaluation of police legitimacy impacts willingness to cooperate and assist those institutions (Sunshine and Tyler 2003). Non-conformity thus increases hyper-surveillance and enforcement of even small infractions, often disregarding the larger problems within the neighborhood and increased stigmatization by governmental institutions. Further, although these issues
are most often discussed with respect to law enforcement, other institutions are subject to the same criticisms and scrutiny.

Research from previous studies indicates that key aspects of racial socialization influence African American trust. However, few researchers explore whether decreased generalized trust among African Americans is an issue of generalized trust or is based on distrust of other ethnic groups or of institutions run by them. It is hypothesized that among African American members of the Englewood community trust will be higher towards organizations and institutions that are black run, organizations that are not affiliated with historically distrustful institutions, and that ethnicity is a minor determinant of trust.
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Methods

Interview Process

My research focuses on the Englewood neighborhood and the staff members of Growing Home. I chose to conduct research on Englewood because it is a predominately African American neighborhood located with a long history of disinvestment and injustice (e.g. food desertification, exaggerated gang activity, and high levels of poverty). I also chose to use Growing Home as a case study because of their relatively long established history within Englewood and also because they are a predominately white organization within a predominately African American neighborhood. Further, the goal of my research was to gain understanding about the relationship that African Americans had with predominately white run organizations. I conducted interviews with four residents of Englewood and three staff members of Growing Home. These interviews were conducted either in person or over the phone. I decided that interviews were the best methods available to capture the complexities of trust and race relations. Most interviews were conducted individually for purposes of privacy, and in a location of the participants choosing. One interview, among Growing Home staff, was conducted as a group interview due to scheduling constraints. Additionally, all of the participants were given pseudonyms for confidentiality purposes. A list of questions that were used during the interview are provided in Appendices A and B.

Interviews with Growing Home Staff

Interviews with Growing Home were mainly intended to obtain data on their perceptions of residents’ trust of the organization. Further, the goal of interviews with staff members was to understand how race plays a role in their daily operations. Finally,
the interview process also attempted to address ways in which Growing Home was addressing the needs of the community, as well as being an active member of the Englewood Community. Finally, these interviews were intended to measure the level of internal consistency of organizational goals with actions taken by the staff.

**Interviews with residents**

The goal of interviews conducted with residents was to gain residents' perspectives on trust as it related to the culture of the Englewood neighborhood and their relationship with Growing Home. Residents were asked about their relationship with Growing Home and other community organizations for three reasons. Firstly, to gain knowledge regarding resident’s honest perceptions of Growing Home. Secondly, the interviews sought to understand resident relationships with other community organizations (the bulk of which are community originated) compared to organizations that were formed by non-community members. Lastly, the intention was to understand the level of success Growing Home has had generating and maintaining membership among Greater Englewood residents. This was done by asking if residents knew about Growing Home and why residents were or were not involved if they did know about the organization. It was important to distinguish between those residents who knew and those who did not know about Growing Home because it is difficult to explain the resident complexity of trust towards an organization if they do not know that it exists to begin with. This being noted, several questions also addressed generalized trust and neighborhood climate to analyze broader issues of trust that may be at play within Englewood. Since research has shown that African Americans tend to have lower levels of generalized trust, I asked Englewood residents about how race relates to their sense of trust as well as their perception of racial climate within the country and the Chicago area. Additionally, to better understand the role of politics in the establishment of trust
residents were asked whether they trusted local and national political figures. Each interview lasted approximately one hour.

**Sample**

The sample was obtained by a number of methods, including a snowball sample. I began by seeking help in recruiting participants from a number of community organizations, the most notable being Teamwork Englewood and R.A.G.E. There were some members of these organizations with whom I conducted interviews. Additionally, these organizations assisted in connecting me with other community groups that may have been of help. I also asked individuals in public settings within the neighborhood (e.g. a library or Starbucks) if they would be willing to speak with me. Finally, I asked the HR department and some co-workers at my internship with the Chicago Department of Aviation if they knew of anyone who lived in the neighborhood.

My sample consisted of four Englewood residents and three staff members of Growing Home. All of the Englewood participants were African American. Of my participants from Growing Home, two were white females and one was African American (and also formally a resident of Englewood). At the end of each of my interviews with Englewood residents, I asked each participant if they knew of anyone that would likely be willing to do the interview. The majority of individuals were hesitant, and I allowed them time to ask permission to forward their contact information. The sample also disproportionately consisted of individuals involved in the organization Teamwork Englewood and individuals between the ages of 22-35. Gaining access to this sample proved to be difficult because I am not originally from the Englewood or living in the community. Further, I am a well-educated middle-class African American female. While my socioeconomic and educational status made me an obvious outsider (e.g. in the way that I conduct myself), my race also provided me with an advantage in obtaining
access to residents. Additionally, although many residents stated that race would not affect whether they trusted someone, Rosemary stated that “random” white girls doing research in the neighborhood were less likely to get answers to questions. Therefore, my own race placed me at a higher advantage in conducting my research.

Interviews were audio recorded whenever possible and with the participant’s informed consent. In addition to audio recording, notes were taken during all interviews (including those not recorded) to ensure accuracy. I transcribed all audio recorded interviews and performed a content analysis of the transcription. I also performed a content analysis on all handwritten data from the interviews. My content analysis was done by coding participants’ responses into several overarching categories. These included: issues of economic prosperity (jobs, poverty), race relations, education, police enforcement, reasons to trust, reasons to distrust, and miscellaneous commentary.
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Findings

Understandings of Community

The lack of successful use of snowball sampling among participants indicates that the residents of Englewood may have weak social networks. The small snowball sample may also indicate that residents were hesitant to pass names along (possibly because of my role as a researcher). Although there is indication of weak social networks, most of the participants agreed that the residents of Englewood and the dedication that they have to making it a better place was one of the things that they liked about their neighborhood. One of the participants Jack Thorton said:

These people that make up this neighborhood still have hope, they work hard every day, they have a lot of love in their heart, they care for each other, they look out for each other, and they ultimately want the best for the community.

Of all of the community interviewees, Jack was the only participant that had an in-depth understanding of Growing Home’s initiatives. This was mostly because of his employment at Teamwork Englewood. Additionally, all of the other community interviewees, indicated that they had not had much interaction with Growing Home because their programs had not been advertised to them, or they had never seen or heard of the organization. When I informed one participant, Forest, of where the organization was located he commented that their location was also an inhibiting factor for his participation.

Going up around there, you ain’t really gonna go through the blocks like that unless you stay on the blocks because you don’t want to get jumped or shot – It’ll have to be like out on the main street. And then there would need to be something over there to get some type of attention.

Given the lack of interaction with or even knowledge of Growing Home, all the
participants (including Jack Thorton) stated that they could not discern whether they trusted it or not. However, most of the participants believed that Growing Home was doing something to benefit the neighborhood and they implied an appreciation of their efforts.

When I asked about other community organizations that the participants trusted, the most frequent responses were Teamwork Englewood, R.A.G.E., Voices of Englewood, and Imagine Englewood If. All of these are community-led organizations. Residents’ reasons for trusting these organizations were because of the seemingly “pure” intentions of the leaders and their active engagement in the community. Tiffany, who joined Teamwork Englewood due to her relationship with Rosemary (a longtime resident and staff member of Teamwork Englewood), stated that she trusted the organization because:

I’ve seen … I’ve been with her [Rosemary] actually doing different things for the community from cleaning up to going door to door doing certain [thing] so pretty much hands on things, and then I know her heart and she’s really for the people so she represents the organizations as a whole.

Two residents, Forest and Mary, however stated that they did not know of any community organizations in the neighborhood doing good work. Mary stated that this contrasted to the community “back in the day”, when “you would be able to have conversations with people.

Race and Trust

In a separate interview, Rosemary pointed to the relevancy of race with respect to her trust for community organizations:
I mean, they’re all doing the work… and it addresses a specific population within the community… so long that they are achieving those, I mean it’s … black people addressing black people issues. Of course, there are resources that are given from like government agencies and non-black people but, you know…it is what it is.

Rosemary’s interpretation of community organizations and her trust for them was highly intertwined with the idea of African Americans within Englewood being able uplift and resolve issues within their own community. Rosemary’s views indicate that she has more trust in African Americans solutions to issues facing their community at a hyperlocal level compared to other outsider groups, organizations and institutions.

Four residents believed that they were not more inclined to trusting someone or a community organization because of the race. I did however notice a level of discomfort when I asked most of the participants about their relationship with and trust for local shop owners— who are mostly Arab or Asian. Forest and Tiffany noted having had or seen tense relations with shop owners. Forest describes the lack of trust between the two groups:

I hear all these stores are owned by Asians or Arab but they can’t stand us. And then I think they don’t trust us either because … well you probably notice it too. I mean how many stores you been in and you saw one of them working the register, or one of their female family members in the store? You don’t. They don’t want their females associated with blacks they don’t want us around them. But, in my neighborhood I watch them and they mess around with the black girls (inaudible). But you demean our women but you don’t want your women around us. So, they don’t trust us, they don’t like us so, I’m starting to have a problem with a lot of things I’m looking at.

These findings indicate that there may be a sense of racially based tension between local shop owners and residents. Additionally, Tiffany inferred that these shop owners do not make any attempt to become more of an active member within the community (e.g. they do not provide donations for community functions). Shop owner
disengagement with and distrust of the community may be a key component in potential distrust between community members and perceived and obvious outsiders.

Mary also noted some issues of race within educational institutions, such as her five year old grandson’s school (which is majority white), where he was suspended for acting out. This being said, Mary stated that it was hard to trust anyone these days and that race did not make her more inclined to trust someone or an organization. Mary did however state that this was different from “back in the day” when she knew of black people who did acknowledge race distinctions and taught youth to be wary of whites.

Mary’s experience with the schooling system provides insight into how African Americans may feel institutions (and specifically historically white institutions), view African Americans and African American adolescents. Additionally, Mary implies that Englewood has lost a sense of community over generations.

Relationships with City Personnel and Local Government

My content analysis also revealed that among the participants, crime/ police engagement (e.g. stricter control of drug exchange, police officers assisting in neighborhood) and jobs/ options for economic prosperity (e.g. the hiring of more Englewood residents in neighborhood services, decreasing unemployment) were considered the most important issues that needed to be addressed within Englewood. Environmental issues and access to affordable grocery stores, one aspect of Growing Home’s work, were consistently stated as being the least important issue among participants. Further, although Growing Home does have weekly farm stands during their harvest season, none of the participants cited it as an option for a source of affordable groceries. This is likely because all of the participants stated not being aware of Growing Home’s offered programs and services. With respect to environmental issues, most of the participants cited air pollution as being a concern due to the historic industrial practices in
the area or future industrial use. However, this was not an overwhelming concern for any of the participants. The most notable environmental concern among residents was the cleanliness of their neighborhoods. Cleanliness concerns ranged from visible litter throughout the neighborhood, to construction garbage/abandoned buildings. Two of the participants, Forest and Rosemary, were particularly upset about the lack of care their neighborhood is shown. For Forest, the issue of cleanliness was a result of residents accepting poor treatment by the city administration:

I can put it in a – garbage don’t get picked up. You may have two or three people call over there “what’s going on”. But…if… I remember, we was over there not last but two summers ago, there were just rats everywhere. Everywhere in that building, people complain about rats but do we call … if I call street sanitation about the rats in our neighborhood… “Oh well we haven’t gotten any complaints about it”. Like, I know you gotta get complaints about this. I pull up coming home from work at night time, and that’s all you see, them running around on the (inaudible) … the street I mean … but I found out it was just us, it was everywhere but it got taken care of in other neighborhoods first because we don’t complain about stuff.

Rosemary, challenged that cleanliness around the neighborhood was the result of city personnel not caring enough about the neighborhood to prevent it in the first place:

So a month and a half ago they were cutting down branches from a tree that was obstructing a building and they left like all the branches on the sidewalk and on the line and it poses as a hazard because you have branches, little sticks, but you have have really big ones that are you know, in the walkway, the public way, so they just sat there. I’m like when are they gonna pick it up, when are they gonna pick it up? And I had kept forgetting and I had finally called 311 on Monday and they came and picked it up the next morning. A few years ago, the building next to mine was being demolished and you know, there was debris everywhere and they had debris all on our porch next door, the walkway and everything, like big pieces of stuff like brick and stuff like that, and they told my uncle like ‘Oh we’ll get it tomorrow’ and I called them, I called 311, and I told them that was unacceptable for you to just leave this on my private property. So, I called 311 and I put up a sign, I made a huge sign … I made three of them and posted it around the gate and by the time I got home the next day it was cleaned up it was like that … that …you knew it was there you should have cleaned it up when it happened.

Rosemary’s sentiments were confirmed by that of Mary who indicated that she
has seen an increased level of neglect of Englewood since the 1960s, and after the projects in the surrounding neighborhoods were torn down.

Rosemary, Mary, and Forest’s experience also speaks to residents’ relationships with city personnel. Contrary to my expectations, the majority of the individuals I interviewed said that they were indifferent in trust of the police. Often my participants cited examples of police officers that they personally knew and had good relationships. These relationships made them feel positively towards the police. Residents did also note the select “bad seeds” that prompted negative views of the police. Jack pointed to the long-lasting impact the shooting of LaQuan McDonald had on black Chicagoans. Forest however, often stated his frustration with police abuse of power and inconsistent enforcement of the law:

So, the police feel that … ok I gotta show that I’m in charge, (inaudible). But, half the time I feel like if it’s a white person, it’s a different reaction. If they say “well just let me walk”, police is gonna let them walk. It’s different things. It’s like I say, even back during the white president. You just got white privileges, and we don’t have no privilege… but these young kids they just don’t like … well like ok like you’ll say ok we gotta do it this way, first thing they say is “nah, imma do this”. That don’t work … we should see by now that ain’t working. That video, oh yeah um…it’s a black girl coming out the mall, the sticker was out like last time I seen it… the um … something happened, she got into it with somebody about a phone and somebody had taken her phone. So technically, the injustice was on her. When the police got there, they talked to her and the first thing they were sayin’… and they slammed her on the ground, they were punching her like she’s some damn dude, and it’s like…that shit just turns my stomach. I feel as though, somebody needs to go to his house at night; shoot his ass dead. Because …and then it’s like, nothing was done to the police officer, nada. And then you look at … like look at Barack Obama, I know you done saw that video. If I’m the president, I’m like – I’m right there where it happened and I’m finna have your ass locked up, because regardless of who she was what you did was unacceptable … while wearing their uniform? And then they wonder why we don’t trust the police. This is why. It’s just…I hate when they pull me … I can’t stand when they ride behind me, it just irk me. Sometimes they – I pull over, I pull over and wait for them to get the fuck around me. I mean because, I’m not doin’ nothing. So why are you following me? You not supposed to be running my plate unless I did something wrong. But it’s like now they just ride behind you, and run your plate for any reason. You can …You can tell, you see ‘em do this, you know what they’re doin’. So, everything ya’ll doin’ is illegal but you’re always talking about “Well what they did was wrong”, what you did was wrong. Two wrongs don’t
never make a right. But we got a Police Commissioner that’s gonna stick up for them. It’s just – and then we got a black police commissioner, sticking up for they ass…so that’s another way to turn the community against each other. So, there you go, another person in power that could do something but I haven’t once seen him speak out about you know stuff that was going on.

Jack on the other hand, stated that he did trust the Englewood police department and that he believes that many of the police officers want to help Englewood change and transform for the better.

Most of the residents noted that they do not have much trust for their representatives (e.g. Alderman, Mayor, Senator, and President). Although, I did notice that on the national level all of the participants stated that they trusted democratic leaders – specifically, former president Barack Obama. When I inquired about the participants’ trust toward their alderman, most stated that they did not trust the Englewood Aldermen; Forest for example, stated:

But now we have an alderman now… I called him because…what did I call. I think I called this one when we had a problem with those rats and he gave me the runaround and he didn't have no answers. Just told me….told me well maybe I need to clean up this that and the other. And I’m sitting there like [sucks teeth] man fuck you. So I don’t think too many people got faith in their alderman. Once most of them get in office, it’s only one person in general they worried about.

Forest (and Jack) stated that there were some aldermen no longer serving that he thought he could trust. This sentiment was repeated in other interviews, and participants were often frustrated by aldermen who often over-promised and then under-delivered once they were in office as noted by Tiffany with respects to her alderman:

Because uh…when she first ran for office, you know, she came around…she came around and was askin’ for volunteers for people to come and get her in office and everything and we were talking about the things that she was going to do for the community and whatever and it was like after she got into office-- the office, you know, nothing was ever done. You know, and I don’t see her doing anything or whatever. She may be doing things in the background but as far as what I see, no.
Within my content analysis, I also noted that one of the most vocal supports of Growing Home (and also Tiffany’s alderman) was one of the least trusted Aldermen among the interviewees. Jack pointed out that he believed that the community distrust of her may be because of her questionable intentions:

I think individuals in the community question her allegiance and then also she’s not really accessible to her residents, as she should be. So, I think that’s a big critique piece of her but then also that’s…[her].

With respect to Mayor Rahm Emmanuel and Mayor Daley, most of the participants stated that they did not trust either of them. For many participants, this distrust arose because of mismanagement of funds (most notably during Daley’s term), undelivered promises, and unequal treatment of the black community. Residents stated that under Mayor Emmanuel they have seen a little change. Residents however pointed to continued issues such as high costs of living, a lack of support of black business, and the lack of prioritizing Southside children’s education. Both Tiffany and Forest indicated disappointment by the lack of care the city had shown for the schools; the most recent plan to close down several schools in the Englewood community and the poor learning conditions that students were forced to endure (i.e. badly worn to no school supplies). Finally, at the highest level of state government, most the participants said that they did not trust Governor Bruce Rauner because of issues with the Illinois budget:

This man held the budget of our state hostage for two years, if you think of it that just…that’s just fundamentally dysfunctional and insane to me and so… no I really don’t.

Relationships with Federal Government

On the federal level of government, participants did show a likelihood of trust. For example, all participants stated that they trusted President Obama. However, many of
them also added that they found it hard to trust any politician. With respect to Obama’s presidency, Rosemary added:

Like I don’t … remember what Obama did, you know, I know what he didn’t do. It’s all about a matter of…it’s when you put it in the light of…what he would have been able to do being the first black president and how he got there, he owed a lot of favors, he entrenched himself within white progressives and neo liberals and that’s how he got …that’s what …that’s what his base was and so you have to placate the people who got you there so as simple as that.

This aside, some participants also stated that they trusted democratic President Bill Clinton. Forest concludes that this was because of the economic prosperity that he saw during his time. I also noted that most of the people I interviewed were too young to state definitively that they trusted or distrusted Clinton. Further, many participants stated that they were not very engaged in politics during the time of George W Bush, but noted the “economic nose dive” during his term as a possible reason for distrust.

Other public institutions

To observe the impact of historical inequality and abuse of power among numerous public institutions, I also asked participants whether they trusted hospital personnel. I found that between participants there was no definitive answer and many responded that they trusted some hospital personnel, but not all. Tiffany, who is a nursing student, stated, “being in the medical field it comes to mind that there’s a lot of underhanded things going on so…I would say it’s – it depends on the hospital and the person that you run into but uh, the whole system? No.”

Further, Rosemary indicated that her trust of hospital personnel was influenced by both the historical and current context:

It depends like it really depends…I’m gonna go on the no because even … I mean, historically no black people and medical practitioners and situations hasn’t been the best experience and I mean even recently my brother in law he has op—like they opened his skull to take a mass off his brain and they found out that they could have just treated it with steroids so…and then they were just like ‘Oh my
bad’ and he had a life threatening surgery and even just last year they came out with that study where in the ER they …physicians make a split second judgement about you and the pain that you have an will prescribe lower pain meds and meds to black people, because they didn't believe they were in as much pain as they said they were.

From my interviews, I found central themes as it relates to how the residents of Englewood decide who to trust, and ways in which trust is lost. Among all residents, trustworthy people were stated to have ‘a pure heart” – meaning pure intentions, following through, and a good character. Central themes that I noticed regarding how all forms of trust was diminished or lost was through lying, not keeping promises, and abuse of one’s position. I found that amongst individuals and organizations that engage in these behaviors all forms of trust were severely eroded.

Interviews with Growing Home Staff

For my interviews with staff of Growing Home I coded each of them into categories of goals for the neighborhood, issues of race and, building mutual trust.

In its operations Growing Home aims to assist and become valuable community members of Englewood by providing job training opportunities, food justice (as it relates access to healthy foods) and exposure to the environment and to where their food comes from. Elizabeth, a white staff member of Growing Home stated:

The mission of Growing Home is healthy communities, and sort of healthy…good jobs and good food for everyone so…we do that through our job training program as well as through organic farming and selling vegetables. And then in terms of like our community engagement team we have more specific goals of you know, reaching… this past year for 2017, we wanted to do five different pop up markets across the city so having different access points for our vegetables.

After Growing Home was invited to Englewood via the Quality of Life Plan they began to tailor their program. Amelie, who has been with the organization since 2013,
stated that much of the program as it stands today, was “based on stated needs of [the] neighborhood”, and that one of their current initiatives is to “get food into Englewood” and “job training from all over Chicago”. Further, Growing Home “[tries] to help organizations build their own gardens” and “try to tailor [their services] to what residents are asking for and using most.” Growing Home staff also try to engage in the community by donating to local soup kitchens, being heavily involved in the Quality of Life Plan, as well as collaborating with other community organizations such as R.A.G.E, Grow Chicago, local churches, and otherwise participating in a number of local events.

Despite most of my participants stating that race does not influence their trust of community organizations, staff at Growing Home inferred otherwise. Elizabeth and Amelie, who are both white females, described feeling a sense of hesitance from members of the community because of their race. Elizabeth recalled an account at a community event:

Last week we went to an event where someone was saying, you know, they were going to start a store because you know, there are all these urban farms within the neighborhood that are from people from outside the community coming in and making money off of the community, and you know getting funding but you know.

Elizabeth’s feelings of being “an obvious outsider” are reinforced by those of Amelie, who stated “you can feel it in the room” and that she occasionally “hears perceptions of Growing Home based on staff diversity” which is lacking due to being a predominantly white staff.

Occasionally, members of the community show that they are less than welcoming to the organization. Amelie believes that this is due to some “false impressions based on race,” however she also feels that most of the community is welcoming to the organization. Despite some apprehensions, Julie - a black staff member and former
resident of Englewood – commented on the role that other organizations play in promoting distrust and also indicated frustration in the unwillingness to have a conversation before jumping to conclusions:

I would say it’s more so other organizations passing judgement more than the residents are I think…or because this is how you feel as an organization, so everyone under your rim has that same side eye thing going on because of that perception and it’s like if you just asked, you know.

When I asked the Growing Home staff if they thought the community trusted them, the consensus was that there is “room for improvement.” Julie however, did state that she felt trusted by community members that come to the farm:

I feel like our customers that come to the farm stand and engage with us on a regular basis, like their opinion will be totally different from, probably, one of the neighbors across the street. Even though, we knock on doors, we invite you to things, we tell you what we are, you know the contact is just not there but the ones that come to the farm stand, 99 percent of the time they’re always pleasant… they have questions, we answer every question… like there’s always smiles. We try to make sure no one walks away disappointed.

To further explore the issue of trust, I also asked Elizabeth and Julie if they felt pressured to do more outreach because of Growing Home’s outsider status. Both women expressed a sentiment of wanting to be able to do those things but often finding that they can’t due to their limited resources:

Like in reality it’s like with an outreach staff that has been just one person like that’s just not feasible with all the things that are on our plate to do. You know, with two of us now it’s still difficult, there are still appointments that I’m like ohhhh I really want to go to that but—it—I can’t. So, we can really only stretch ourselves so far I think but as we grow as an organization I think it would become easier, so it’s more so if we knew that they were open to express everything that was needed and not just assume that we have all the answers because we don’t and that’s the whole thing.

Additionally, in order to combat (and maintain their trust within the community) all of the Growing Home staff stated that their primary focus is “being at the table for
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collaborative things” and “being a part of community events”, even when it isn’t well received, as well as “responding to feedback from the community”; Julie further articulated:

I would say one way like to build trust is to like I said have integrity period, like giving a quality program not… yeah basically just keeping our word and doing exactly what we say and respecting the people that are in the program doing the process.

Keeping these efforts in mind, the staff stated that obstacles to building trust include board diversity of the organization, as well as figuring out who they are as an organization and how they can become more grassroots focused.
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

Conclusion:

My results showed that only one of the interviewees even knew about Growing Home, and had little interaction with the organizations. Further, the results showed that four of the residents felt some level of racial discrimination towards their neighborhood. This was evident in resident interaction with some police officers, lack of responsiveness from city personnel, or at the hyper-local level in their interactions with local shop owners. Interviews with residents also revealed some possible feelings of neglect at the hands of Chicago city officials, as was shown in resident interpretation of how Englewood youth education is treated by Mayor Rahm Emmanuel. All of this data implies to low levels of fiduciary trust, specifically between residents and high-ranking city personnel. Additionally, some residents’ trust toward community led organizations such as RAGE and Imagine Englewood If indicate that there may be more mutual trust among residents compared to the lower levels of fiduciary trust. Further, as indicated by some residents’ connections with community organizations and three participants stating that they trusted these organizations, residents may trust community organizations more than local officials. Given the small sample size I could not determine if social trust was strong among the community members. However, three of my participants did state that they knew trustworthy people committed to helping the community in their neighborhood.

While from my perspective, Englewood neighborhood appeared to have open communal spaces, among residents there seemed to be some indications of isolation. This was present in two residents stating that they did not feel safe in parts of the neighborhood that had more foot traffic. These participants were also not very engaged in the community. Further, Forest also indicated that he (and felt that others acted similarly)
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stayed away from side streets because of gang activity. This behavior supports findings that show how increased signs of disorder/ incivilities decreases a sense of community and in turn, community engagement. Due to the small sample size however, I cannot draw definitive conclusions from my own findings other than where residents are located within Englewood may have an effect on their willingness to engage in neighboring behavior, community engagement, and sense of social trust. Gaining further knowledge on this information may be useful in developing ways to increase a sense of community within the neighborhood.

I understand and acknowledge that my role as researcher and as an outsider may have had an influence on the responses I received during my interview process. Additionally, social desirability and some of the residents’ involvement as staff members of community organizations may have influenced the interviews. Here I assert social desirability to mean: answering questions regarding race and trust of others based on socially accepted values, this may be the case particularly in Englewood because of the negative media portrayals of the neighborhood by local and national outlets.

Earlier I noted that of the participants I interviewed, I was not able to do a large snowball sample, and that this may be due to weak social networks in Englewood. These weak networks may be the result of a number of Southside residents, particularly middle class black families, having moved outside of the neighborhood since 2011 due to high crime (Little and Mihalopoulos 2011). However, they also indicate low levels of social (or communal) trust, which concurs with previous research on the effects of physical isolation. Contrastingly, my weak sample is likely the result of mistrust of me as a researcher and/or as an outsider of the community.

From my results, keeping one’s promises, communicating one’s intentions and maintaining good character appear to be the most important components of organizations
gaining mutual trust among residents of Englewood. This being said, my results are inconclusive and this study would require future research to validate these limited opinions. The results that I found are inconclusive because of the small sample size that I was able to obtain. Additionally, all of the individuals that I spoke to had limited interaction with Growing Home. Therefore, I was not able to gain a holistic understanding of the relationship between residents and Growing Home or how residents interact with predominately white non-profit organizations.

Growing Home and the residents of Englewood appear to have congruent understanding of trust and how that mutual trust may be eroded. As mentioned earlier, among my small sample of Englewood residents, the most frequent causes for distrust were lying, unfulfilled promises, and abuse of one’s status or power. My data shows that contrary to prior research, if promotion of mistrust of other races does occur (there was little indication that this is currently practiced) it likely has little influence on African American trust of other individuals. This was evidenced by my participant’s rebuttal of these notions, their support of Bill Clinton, and their lack in willingness to say that they fully distrusted George W. Bush. This being noted, although some residents had the most extensive critiques of Obama, he was trusted the most. Given the sample size, I cannot conclude that race has no influence on trust. Further, while a number of participants stated that race had no bearing on their trust towards other individuals and “outsider”, organizations this seemed to contradict Growing Home white staff members’ feelings of being an “obvious outsider” and experiences as it relates to race and trust. Additionally, the results show that among my resident participants there was some increased levels of trust toward predominately black community based organizations. Given the demographics of Englewood, I caution against making any assertion that this is because of race.
This is not to say that race is not important. The data showed either a wariness and or open distrust among all participants towards institutions that are historically white (such as hospitals, high levels of the federal and local government). This being said, hesitations and blatant distrust appeared to be aimed solely at institutions or individuals that were thought to have engaged in a history of injustices. Although, accounts by Growing Home staff – and some residents – do indicate discontent with “outsider” groups. Given Growing Home’s predominately white staff they are likely to be seen as an obvious outsider group, however further research needs to be done in the neighborhood to understand degrees of othering and the role determining who is an outsider. Additionally, although participants indicated that race had little influence on their willingness to trust others, trust must be observed within the context of the racialized nature of American society. While race may not directly affect trust, the racialized aspects of American culture (e.g. our policies, laws, etc.) may.

Growing Home's largest obstacles are community engagement and the organization's relationship with some of the aldermen of Englewood. Overall, the community participants stated that they did not have strong relationships with local officials and their trust of them was largely diminished. Further, as noted earlier, Jack indicated that the neighborhood questioned one of the alderman's allegiances to the community. This same alderman has also openly endorsed Growing Home which, as has been discussed, is seen as an outsider group. Therefore, I recommend that Growing Home continue to reach out to and collaborate with more community leaders as opposed to political leaders of Englewood. I also believe that it would serve in their best interest to increase staff wherever possible so that they are able to be present at more community events. Another option would be to utilize volunteers in this fashion.
Within any organization, there are efforts that can and should be made to increase group participation according to the Midwest Academy’s six basic steps to organizing. Based on my data, although Growing Home does host and collaborate in large events, there is little consistent community engagement. Therefore, I recommend that these steps be used to assist with the maintenance and continued growth of the organization. These steps are listed below.

1. Identify problems of the neighborhood
2. Make problems specific and concrete issues, prioritize issues
3. Stand behind the argument/effort that is winnable
4. Develop a flexible strategy and specific tactics
5. Involve a sufficient number of people for the strategy
6. Look for a reaction to the strategy
7. Build on that reaction to maintain and increase participation

I should state that Growing Home has already incorporated and is taking measures to address all of these steps. Growing Home has identified high unemployment as one of the social ills of Englewood and is addressing the issue of a lack of job training services within the neighborhood. Growing Home's current tactics are partnering with other notable community organizations within their neighborhood as well as providing weekly farm-stands during harvest seasons (which address points 3 and 4). Based on participation in these events and feedback from residents, Growing Home has incorporated cooking demonstrations for their produce and has expanded the hours of their farm-stand. My recommendations are based on the expansion of their existing strategies for addressing neighborhood issues.
During my interviews, all of the participants stated that unemployment was a problem in Englewood. Offhand this appears to be a simple issue to solve by adding more jobs and more job training. However, some participants discussed not only adult employment but also youth employment and job training. These participants believed that if Englewood’s youth were given something to work towards and were shown that there is reason to have hope for a better life, it would result in reduction of crime – this was an inference to selling drugs which increases chances of encountering violence either by gangs or by the police. Increased youth employment could come in the form of summer jobs, internships, or youth volunteer opportunities.

Additionally, and ideally for that matter, Growing Home could also expand the type of training they provide so that it incorporates more "high-level" business management duties. This could be done by training individuals to manage the farm-stand during harvest season, given its currently limited hours. Another method would be to train someone on how to market their products to other outlet sources to maximize the revenue brought back to the farm. This generated revenue will be useful in expanding programs and services. Lastly, as mentioned earlier, mutual trust may become eroded by frequent shifts in organization structure (e.g. new directors, program leaders) and the process of establishing mutual trust must be restarted with every shift. This may become particularly detrimental to community organizations such as Growing Home which largely relies on collaboration with other community organizations. Therefore, I also recommend that Growing Home prevent drastic changes within organizational staff whenever possible. This is not to say that changes to the organization’s structure are completely off limits, but it is to say that when these changes are made they should be done gradually to prevent large erosions of mutual trust between the organization and the community. This research could assist ‘outsider led’ community organizations to begin to
understand the role that anecdotal/historical discrimination has in the distribution and attainment of trust. Further, these results may assist city personnel in their relations with community members. This research would be most useful to aldermen in Englewood given the indications of low fiduciary trust. This research may be expanded to investigate other local institutions, such as the relationship between residents and public assistance organizations. Additionally, future research questions should discuss if and how racial socialization occurs within Southside African American households – in other words, how does racial socialization affect adulthood perceptions of trust among African Americans? These directions for future research would assist in filling in gaps and expanding on concepts not fully addressed within this research.
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Appendix A
Interview Questions for Growing Home Personnel

Questions for Growing Home staff

1. How many years have you been with the Growing Home Project as an employee?
2. What are the goals of Growing Home in Englewood?
   a. Does Growing Home focus on environmental issues?
   b. Do environmental concerns inspire or inform your work at Growing Home?
3. How did Growing Home determine that this type of program was what was needed and that it should be in Englewood?
   a. In what ways, if any, is the program here specific to or tailored to Englewood?
4. In what ways has Growing Home been active participants within the Englewood Community?
5. Do you think your relationship with the community through Growing Home is impacted by being a white person working in a predominantly black neighborhood? If so how? If not, why not?
   a. Does the Growing Home programming specifically address issues of race in any way?
6. Do you feel that residents are welcoming towards the organization?
   a. Why/ Why not?
7. Do you feel that the community has a high level of trust for
Growing Home?

a. Why/ why not?

8. In what ways has growing home worked with the community to build trust?

a. What were some of the obstacles that the organization encountered?
Appendix B

Interview questions for residents

1. How long have you lived in the Southside of Chicago? How long have you lived in Englewood?

2. What are the positive aspects about living in Englewood? What do you like about the community?

3. In your opinion, what are the most pressing issues that need to be addressed in your neighborhood? (Any others?)
   a. How much of a problem is unemployment in Englewood?
   b. Are there any environmental issues in Englewood that you are concerned about?
   c. Is getting access to an affordable grocery store a problem in Englewood?
   d. If you had to prioritize the problems of Englewood, where would unemployment, environmental issues, and access to fresh produce rank? (ask each separately)

4. How would you describe the state of race relations here in Chicago? In the U.S.?

5. Do you know of any organizations that are working to improve the community?

6. Which of those organizations do you trust? Why do you trust them?

7. Are you involved with any of these organizations as a member, a volunteer, a participant in their programs, meetings, or activities? Why or why
If participant mentions Growing Home:

a. In what way are you involved with Growing Home?

b. How did you hear about Growing Home?

c. Why did you decide to get involved with the project? Did you have any initial hesitations? Why/ what were they?

d. How much do you trust Growing Home to be a good member of the community?

e. Have you ever had a community organization break your trust? Why did you stop trusting them?

If they do NOT mention Growing Home:

f. Have you ever heard of Growing Home, the urban farm here in Englewood?

g. Do you know what programs they offer? (if not explain)

h. Have you ever bought food from them? Attended a workshop? Why or why not?

i. Do you think this is a good program for this community?

8. Would you say that you know a lot of trust worthy people in your neighborhood?

9. Do you think someone’s race would make you more likely to trust them?

10. Does the race of the people running a community organization influence whether or not you trust the organization?