

**UCLA**

**Volume IV. 1988-89 - Conference on Comparative Ethnicity: The  
Conference Papers, June 1988**

**Title**

Blacks and Other Racial Minorities: The Significance of Color in Inequality

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5c83023b>

**Author**

Darden, Joe T.

**Publication Date**

1988-06-01

## Notice:

This working paper was printed by the Institute as a means for disseminating the research findings of Institute and University-related scholars. The text is provided in order to facilitate academic discourse and is free to use for personal academic purposes utilizing proper citation. Copyright of the information contained within lies with the authors, and requests for use other than personal research purposes must be directed to the authors.

BLACKS AND OTHER RACIAL MINORITIES:  
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COLOR IN INEQUALITY

JOE T. DARDEN  
Michigan State University

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR...

Joe T. Darden is a Professor of Geography and Dean of the Urban Affairs Program at Michigan State University. Professor Darden is a recognized expert in the field of urban residential segregation. Pouch of his research has dealt with the denial of equal access to housing in metropolitan areas of Michigan. Professor Darden's most recent work is a co-authored book: Detroit: Race and Uneven Development, published in 1987 by Temple University Press.

A version of this paper was prepared for the UCLA CONFERENCE ON COMPARATIVE ETHNICITY, June 1988. The Conference was coordinated by Institute for Social Science Research and sponsored by The President's Office, Chancellor's Office, College of Letters and Science, Institute of American Cultures, Center for Afro-American Studies, and Department of Geography and Sociology, UCLA; and by the Division of Social Sciences and Communication, the Los Angeles Project and Department of Geography and Political Science, USC.

## INTRODUCTION

Why is it that certain racial/ethnic minority groups (i.e., Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans) have achieved a higher socioeconomic status than Blacks? The answer to this question has both academic as well as political importance.

A similar question was raised in 1968 by the Kerner Commission (see Report of the National Advisory Commission 1968, p. 143-146) and in 1980 by Stanley Lieberson (Lieberson 1980). Both studies, however, compared Blacks with White European ethnic groups, and both studies cited discrimination against Blacks as a major factor in explaining why Blacks have not achieved equal socioeconomic status with White ethnics of Eastern, Central, and

Southern European origin.

According to the Kerner Commission, racial discrimination is a major reason why Blacks have not been able to escape from poverty and the ghetto as the European immigrants have done. Discrimination has persistently narrowed the opportunities for Blacks. European immigrants also suffered from discrimination, but it was never so pervasive as the color-based prejudice that has formed a barrier to advancement unlike any other (Report of the National Advisory Commission 1968, p. 144).

Lieberson (1980, p. 2) argues that external forces placed upon Blacks by society put Blacks at a greater disadvantage. Among these forces were the following:

1. Racism, which was faced by Blacks but not by the White ethnics
2. Discrimination, which was greater against Blacks institutions ranging from courts to unions to schools
3. Differential preferences, which resulted in the nonethnic White population giving preference to White ethnics over Blacks
4. Declining opportunities for Black advancement by the time Blacks moved from the rural South to the urban North.

According to Lieberson (1980, p. 30), there was clearly a desirability continuum which was manifest in the fact that although all groups were viewed as inferior by the native-born White population, the conception was not an absolute one. The White ethnic groups were viewed as less inferior than Orientals, and the latter were seen as more desirable than Blacks (Lieberson 1980, p. 30). It is clear that the factor of Black skin color resulted in more pervasive discrimination unlike that against any other group. The discrimination factor was significant when Blacks were compared with White ethnic groups, and it remains a significant factor today in explaining Black socioeconomic inequality in comparison with other racial/ethnic minority groups (Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans).

The major thesis of this paper is that the lower socioeconomic status of Blacks compared to Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans is due primarily to greater racial' discrimination against Blacks in housing. A critical result of this housing discrimination is reduced employment opportunities. Discrimination by Whites against the four racial/ethnic minority groups occurs along a continuum. Asians experience the least housing discrimination and as a consequence have greater employment opportunities. The level of discrimination increases from Asian to Hispanic[1] to Native American to Black.

The effect of such discrimination in housing is manifest in the varying degrees of minority group residential segregation and suburbanization. The differential patterns of residential segregation and suburbanization are related to the educational and employment opportunities available. These differential opportunities result in differential levels of income, education, and occupation.

#### MINORITY GROUP RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND SUBURBANIZATION

Examination of the residential segregation of each racial/ethnic minority group from the White majority population clearly shows that Blacks are the most residentially segregated. The extent of Black-White residential segregation compared with that of other minority groups is demonstrated using census tracts and the index of dissimilarity[2] for 10 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) in th North Central Region (Table 1). The mean level of Black-White segregation (80.5 percent) was more than twice the mean level of Asian-White segregation (34.8 percent). Whites were

much less segregated from Hispanics (43.3 percent) and Native Americans (43.9 percent) than from Blacks.

These findings are consistent with a previous study of 12 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas within the state of Michigan (Darden 1986, p. 118). The mean level of Black-White segregation was 66.8 percent, compared with an Asian-White level of only 27 percent. The levels for Hispanics and Native Americans were 36.9 and 34.8 percent, respectively.

The continuum pattern of majority-minority group residential segregation is also supported by other studies (Farley 1986a, p. 18; Woolbright and Hartmann 1987, p. 145; Massey and Denton 1987).

Farley, for example, used census tracts and the index of dissimilarity to examine residential segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians in the nation's 11 metropolitan areas of 2.5 million or more. He found that the average level of Black-White segregation was 79 percent compared with an average Asian-White level of only 45 percent. The average index comparing non-Hispanic Whites from Hispanics was 51 percent.

Woolbright and Hartmann (1987) examined patterns of residential segregation in seven SMSAs (San Diego, Phoenix, Miami, Los Angeles, Houston, Denver, and Chicago) using the index of dissimilarity. They concluded that Black-White segregation was highest and Asian-White segregation was lowest in each of the SMSAs except for San Diego, where Hispanic-White segregation was slightly lower (41.5 percent) than Asian-White segregation (45.5 percent).

Massey and Denton (1987) used the index of dissimilarity to analyze the extent of Black, Asian, and Hispanic residential segregation in 60 SMSAs in the United States in 1980. The authors found that Black-White segregation had the highest average level (69.4 percent), and the lowest average level was between Asians and Whites (34.2 percent). Indeed, Black-White segregation was more than twice the level of Asian-White segregation. Hispanic-White segregation at 43.4 percent ranged between the two extremes found for Asians and Blacks.

The color continuum pattern of residential segregation is duplicated in the pattern of suburbanization. Data on the percentage of each racial/ethnic group's population residing in the suburbs in 1980 are presented in Tables 2 and 3. In the selected metropolitan areas of the North Central region and in the nation as a whole, Blacks are the least suburbanized. In the nation as a whole, less than a third of Blacks in SMSAs live in suburbs compared with approximately half of the Asian population.

According to Massey and Denton (1987), the differential levels of minority group residential segregation and suburbanization can be explained by examining the process of racial and ethnic integration in postwar America, a process which links residential integration with suburbanization. To the extent that suburban residence may be precluded for some minority groups because of discriminatory housing practices, an important avenue of residential integration may be closed off (Massey and Denton 1987, p. 818).

Such a situation applies to Blacks but much less to Asians and Hispanics.[3] Several studies have indicated that the underrepresentation of Blacks in the suburbs is not due to the level of Black socioeconomic status (Langendorf 1969; Hermalin and Farley 1973; Logan and Stearns 1981; Clark 1987). On the other hand, both Asian and Hispanic residential segregation and the degree of suburbanization are highly related to socioeconomic status (Massey and Denton 1987, p. 819). As the socioeconomic status of these groups rises, residential segregation decreases and suburbanization increases. For Asians and Hispanics, suburbanization is a key step in the larger process of spatial assimilation, a process that is largely closed to

Blacks. The level of Black segregation has not been found to be strongly related to socioeconomic status, and the socioeconomic status of Blacks is not strongly related to Black suburbanization (Massey and Denton 1987, p. 823). Regardless of socioeconomic status, most Blacks remain highly segregated in central cities of metropolitan areas.

#### THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF BLACK CONCENTRATION IN CENTRAL CITIES

The fact that 71 percent of the Black population of the nation's SMSAs reside in central cities (a level higher than that for any other racial/ethnic group) has serious social and economic consequences. Jobs and other economic opportunities have been shifting to the suburbs and to nonmetropolitan areas. Since 1948, suburban areas have received over 80 percent of the new employment in manufacturing, retail and wholesale trade, and selected services (Gold 1972). Thus, newer and better job opportunities are locating further away from the places of Black residence, forcing Black families to spend more time and money commuting to work or looking for work (Darden 1986, p. 112).

Given that Blacks have more restricted residential location choices than other racial minority groups, the cost associated with distance will reduce access to some jobs. The net effect of these imposed travel costs is to reduce the effective wage which Black central-city workers receive relative to suburban residents. Still another cost imposed by the spatial separation of jobs and residences includes the higher expenditures Blacks face in searching for suburban employment, particularly in view of the limited information available about potential job opportunities. In addition, there is a tendency for employers to hire workers who reflect the racial character of the area in which they are located -- i.e., there may often also be an indirect effect of housing segregation on employment opportunities (McDonald 1981, p. 28; Kain 1968).

The problems of Black residents of central cities are intensified by the fact that employment opportunities in blue-collar, semi-skilled, and low-skilled jobs are moving to the suburbs so rapidly that a surplus of labor in these categories has developed in the central city (McDonald 1981, p. 29). In other words, there has been a substantial shift in the occupational mix of jobs in central cities (Christian 1975; Fremon 1970; Gold 1972; Kasarda 1976; Wilson 1979). There has been a decline in craftsman, operative, and laborer categories in central cities, while professional, sales, clerical, and service employment has increased proportionally in central cities (Wilson 1979).

The decline of jobs in central cities has been most pronounced in certain cities of the North Central Region. Postwar employment trends in various sectors of the Detroit economy indicate the magnitude of employment decline in the central city. Between the late 1940s and early 1980s, Detroit's share of the metropolitan region's manufacturing employment dropped from 60.3 percent to 25 percent, retail trade from 72.6 percent to 15.4 percent, services from 75.3 percent (in 1958) to 23.6 percent, and wholesale trade from 90.1 to 29.6 percent (Vernon 1966; Darden, Hill, Thomas, J. and Thomas R. 1987, p. 22-23). Between 1958 and 1982, Detroit lost 187,100 jobs, mostly in manufacturing and retail trade where Blacks were disproportionately concentrated (Darden, Hill, J. Thomas, and R. Thomas 1987, p. 22).

Postwar employment trends in various sectors of the Chicago metropolitan area reveal a similar pattern of decline. In 1947, Chicago accounted for 70.6 percent of the total manufacturing employment in the metropolitan region. By 1982, its share had eroded to 34.2 percent. Between 1947 and

1982, factory employment in Chicago dropped from a twentieth-century high of 688,000 to 277,000 jobs -- a decline of 59 percent (Squires, Bennett, McCourt and Nyden 1987, p. 27). At the same time, suburban Cook County manufacturing jobs increased from 121,000 to 279,000 (a 131 percent increase), and factory jobs in the other SMSA counties jumped from 64,000 to 189,000 (a 195 percent increase) (Squires et. al. 1987, p. 27). Since 1947, the record is one of almost continuous decline of manufacturing employment in the city. The only exception was a slight increase in jobs during the national industrial boom period from 1963 to 1967 (McDonald 1984, p. 11).

Black workers have borne much of the brunt of Chicago's job losses. For example, between 1963 and 1977, while the city as a whole was experiencing a 29 percent decline in jobs, available factory jobs in predominantly Black West Central and near South Side neighborhoods dropped by 45 and 47 percent respectively (McDonald 1984, p. 12). In the United States as a whole, nearly a third of all Black men working in durable goods manufacturing lost their jobs between 1979 and 1984, and that figure rose to 45 percent in Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and Milwaukee (Hill and Negrey 1988, p. 17).

Within durable goods manufacturing, the workers hardest hit by the industrial slump were Black male operatives and laborers -- i.e., production workers where nearly 50 percent lost their jobs between 1979 and 1984 in the five cities noted above (Hill and Negrey 1988, p 17).

The primary reason why Blacks have been impacted more severely economically is segregation, both occupationally and residentially. Black workers tend to be concentrated in production jobs, and that is where the biggest industrial losses have occurred. Black production workers tend to be concentrated in older industrial plants, and those are the ones most frequently closed. Finally, Blacks tend to be concentrated in older, central-city neighborhoods, and that is where plants and production jobs are disappearing the fastest (Hill and Negrey 1988, p. 21).

The declining employment situation for Blacks has had significant cost for the Black population and for society at large. Black family incomes have declined and poverty rates have increased. Blacks in every income level, from the poorest to the most affluent, lost ground and had less disposable income (after adjusting for inflation) in 1984 than in 1980 (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities 1984, p. 1). Also disturbing is the fact that since 1980, the gap between Black poverty and White poverty--always large to begin with--has widened further. Of those Americans who fell into poverty since 1980, 22 percent were Black -- even though Blacks make up only 12 percent of the U.S. population. Since 1980, Blacks have been nearly twice as likely as other Americans to become poor (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities 1984, p. 4).

There is increasing evidence that the increase in poverty among Blacks is related to the increase in Black female-headed households. Poverty rates have traditionally been high and income levels low in families headed by women. In 1984, for example, 52 percent of the Black families with women as head-of-household were below the poverty line, compared with 15 percent of the Black married-couple families (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1985a, Tables 1 and 15). While similar trends are occurring in White families, there has been a sharper increase in the proportion of Blacks living in these female-maintained families which have high poverty rates (Farley 1986, p. 17).

The number of Black families with children under 18 headed by a female increased from 1,063,000 in 1970 to 2,265,000 in 1984 -- a rise of 113 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1985b).

While the evidence is clear that the number of Black female-headed families has increased rapidly in recent years, the reasons for such an

increase continue to puzzle researchers. Wilson and Neckerman (1984, p. 15) have addressed the question in the form of three general hypotheses:

1. The increase in extramarital fertility is related to the increasing difficulty that Black women have in finding a marital partner with stable employment.
2. There have been changes in social values regarding out-of-wedlock births.
3. Increased economic independence has been afforded women by the availability of income-transfer payments.

With respect to these three hypotheses, the most credible evidence suggests that the increasing difficulty Black women have in finding a Black marital partner with stable employment is the most important factor contributing to the increase in Black female-headed families (Wilson 1987, p. 83). O'Hare (1988) analyzed data from 1970 and 1980 censuses of population for 47 SMSAs with at least 100,000 Blacks in 1980. About 75 percent of all Blacks in the country reside in these 47 SMSAs. O'Hare tested empirically each of the three hypotheses. He concluded (using regression analyses) that of all the independent variables, the change in Black male labor force status shows the highest correlation with the dependent variable, indicating that a decline in Black male labor force status is related to high rates of growth in the number of Black female-headed families. This factor was the most important determinant of the increase in rates of Black female headship in the 47 SMSAs examined. moreover, when the factor of joblessness is combined with high Black-male mortality and incarceration rates, the proportion of Black men in stable economic situations is even lower than that conveyed in the current unemployment and labor force figures (Wilson 1987, p. 83).

The evidence suggests that due to the greater economic stress and hardship placed upon Black families (resulting in part from a decline in Black male labor force status), there is a higher percentage of Black female-headed households compared with the percentages of female-headed households in other minority groups. As indicated in Table 4, the percentage of Black female households as a percentage of all Black families was 37.2 in 1980 compared to 22.7 for Native Americans, 19.4 for Hispanics, and 10.8 for Asians. The percentage of Asian female-headed households was equal to that of Whites.

A consistent pattern of racial/ethnic stratification along a color continuum is found as one examines other social and economic indicators. The percentage of Blacks below poverty in 1980 was twice that of Asians in central cities, and the gap was even greater in the suburbs (Table 5). The Black unemployment rate was the highest of any racial/ethnic group (12.8). Indeed, it was almost three times higher than the rate for Asians in 1980 in central cities (4.8). Asians had the lowest rate of unemployment of any racial minority group. Furthermore, the rate was even lower than the rate for Whites (Table 6).

It is well known that civilian unemployment rates vary substantially among the Asian-American population. Japanese, for example, with a high percentage of native-born, had an unemployment rate of only 3 percent. The Vietnamese, on the other hand, with a high percentage of recent arrivals to the United States, had a rate of 8 percent. The important fact, however, is that none of the Asian-American subgroups had unemployment rates as high as those for Blacks (Gardner and Smith 1985, p. 33).

The color continuum pattern of racial/ethnic stratification is also evident in figures on self-employment. Blacks are the most underrepresented

among all minority groups in terms of the Black share of minority-owned businesses compared with the percentage of Blacks among the minority population. Asians are the most overrepresented in terms of the Asian share of minority-owned businesses compared to the percentage of Asians among the minority population (Table 7).

In sum, the residential segregation of Blacks in central cities has had severe social and economic consequences contributing to a lower level of social and economic mobility compared with other racial/ethnic minority groups.

#### EDUCATION: AN IMPORTANT KEY TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

One of the major avenues traditionally used in America to improve social and economic mobility has been education. The quality of educational opportunities, however, are often related to place of residence. Clear disparities exist between the quality of education available in central city schools and schools in the suburbs. As indicated in Table 8, students in the Detroit public schools experience inequities in several areas. All objective education indicators, from local revenue per pupil to achievement scores, show that the suburbs on the average have a more favorable performance than does Detroit. Also, the gap between Detroit and the suburbs has widened over time. In 1970-71, for example, the difference in local revenue per pupil was \$152. By 1980, the gap had widened to \$1,002. The gap in K-12 total instructional expenses per pupil increased from \$6 to \$49 and the gap in current operating expenses per pupil widened from \$10 to \$90. In the meantime, at grade levels four, seven, and ten, the mean achievement scores of the suburban school districts were higher than those in Detroit. Such disparities in the public schools have an impact on the number and percentage of high school dropouts. The dropout rate among all racial/ethnic groups is higher in the central city schools and lower in the suburbs (Table 9).

It appears that residency in the central city lowers the probability that a student will receive an equal educational opportunity compared with students in suburban public schools. Thus, the chances for improving one's social and economic mobility are reduced. Since Blacks (more than any other group) are concentrated in central cities, the prospects for enhancing Black social and economic mobility through education will continue to be problematic.

#### CONCLUSION

The major objective of this paper was to investigate why certain racial/ethnic minority groups (i.e., Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans) have achieved a higher socioeconomic status than Blacks. The evidence from census reports and past studies of racial and ethnic groups suggests that Blacks experience greater discrimination in housing, as demonstrated by the high level of Black residential segregation and the low level of Black suburbanization. Both factors serve to reduce the employment and educational opportunities available to Blacks compared with other racial/ethnic minority groups. This lack of employment and educational opportunities results in a lower level of socioeconomic status.

The opportunities for social, economic, and spatial mobility available to minority groups occur along a continuum. Asians experience the least amount of residential segregation from Whites, have the highest level of suburbanization, and are provided the greatest opportunity for social, economic, and spatial mobility. Blacks, on the other hand, experience the greatest amount of residential segregation, the lowest level of



suburbanization, and the least opportunity for social, economic, and spatial mobility of all racial/ethnic minority groups.

The White majority population appears to use two sets of criteria in evaluating members of the four racial/ethnic minority groups (Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asians). The evidence suggests that Asians and White Hispanics are evaluated according to the criterion of ethnicity. This circumstance leads to greater spatial assimilation for Asians and White Hispanics. As social and economic mobility increases, a reduction occurs in residential segregation and an increase in suburbanization. In this sense, the position of Asians and of White Hispanics is similar to that of White ethnic groups from Eastern, Central, and Southern Europe (Massey and Denton 1987).

On the other hand, Blacks (including Black Hispanics) are evaluated according to a racial criterion, a situation in which spatial assimilation is not strongly related to socioeconomic status (Massey and Mullan 1985). Due to persistent discrimination in housing based on color, Blacks are residentially segregated and largely excluded from the suburbs, regardless of their level of education, income, and occupation. Thus, future improvements in the social and economic status of Blacks will not necessarily lead to residential integration and greater suburbanization. Such a pattern differs from that of any other minority group and reinforces the significance of color -- i.e., Black color -- in explaining the unequal status of Blacks compared with the other minority groups. Color, unlike ethnicity, is a perceived difference based on kind rather than degree. Therefore, Blacks continue to experience more discrimination, segregation, and less suburbanization than other groups. It is the continuing significance of color, more than any other factor, that explains why Blacks have not achieved equal socioeconomic status with the other racial minority groups.

1. Since Hispanics may be of any race, the degree of discrimination will vary, depending on racial characteristics. For example, Black Hispanics experience more discrimination than White Hispanics and may even experience as much discrimination as non-Hispanic Blacks (see U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 1979, p. 3). Furthermore, the patterns of segregation involving White and Black Hispanics closely follow the patterns of segregation observed for non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks generally. White Hispanics are highly segregated from Blacks and from Black Hispanics. On the other hand, White Hispanics are only moderately segregated from non-Hispanic Whites (see Massey and Mullan 1985, p. 396-397). Apparently, color is more significant than ethnicity since Black Hispanics are more segregated from White Hispanics than they are from non-Hispanic Blacks.

2. The index ranges from "0" which indicates no residential segregation to "100" which indicates complete segregation (for computation of the index, see Darden and Tabachneck 1980).

3. There is some evidence that the situation also applies less to Native Americans, but further research is needed (see Darden 1983).

#### REFERENCES

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. 1984. Falling Behind: A Report on How Blacks Have Fared Under the Reagan Policies. Washington, D.C.

- Christian, Charles. 1975. "Emerging Patterns of Industrial Activity Within Large Metropolitan Areas and Their Impact on the Central City Work Force." *The Social Economy of Cities*, edited by G. Gappert and H. M. Rose. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Clark, Thomas. 1987. "The Suburbanization Process and Residential Segregation." Pp. 115-137 in *Divided Neighborhoods*, edited by Gary Tobin. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Darden, Joe T. and Arthur Tabachneck. 1980. "Algorithm 8: Graphic and Mathematical Descriptions of Inequality, Dissimilarity, Segregation, or Concentration." *Environment and Planning A* 12:227-234.
- Darden, Joe T. 1983. "The Residential Segregation of Native Americans in Cities and Suburbs of Michigan." *East Lakes Geographer* 18:25-37.
- Darden, Joe T. 1986. "Accessibility to Housing: Differential Residential Segregation for Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and Asians." Pp. 109-126 in *Race, Ethnicity and Minority Housing in the United States*, edited by Jamshid Momeni. Westport: Greenwood.
- Darden, Joe T., Richard Child Hill, June Thomas, and Richard Thomas. 1987. *Detroit: Race and Uneven Development*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Farley, Reynolds. 1986a. "Assessing Black Progress: Voting and Citizenship Rights, Residency and Housing, Education." *Economic Outlook USA* 13:16-19.
- Farley, Reynolds. 1986b. "Assessing Black Progress: Employment, Occupation, Earnings, Income, Poverty." *Economic Outlook USA*, 13: 14-19 (Third quarter).
- Fremon, Charlotte. 1970. *The Occupational Patterns in Urban Employment Change, 1965-1967*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Gardner, Robert W. and Peter C. Smith. 1985. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America. Boston, MA: March 28.
- Gold, Neil. 1972. "The Mismatch of Jobs and Low-Income People in Metropolitan Areas and Its Implications for the Central City Poor." Pp. 443-486 in *Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Hermalin, Albert and Reynolds Farley. 1973. "The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy." *American Sociological Review* 38:595-610.

- Hill, Richard and Cynthia Negrey, 1988. "Deindustrialization and Racial Minorities in the Great Lakes Region, USA." Discussion Paper Series. East Lansing: Urban Affairs Programs, MSU, 2: Winter.
- Kain, John. 1968. "Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 88:513-519.
- Kasarda, J.D. 1976. "The Changing Occupational Structure of the American metropolis: Apropos the Urban Problem." *The Changing Face of the Suburbs*, edited by 8. Schwartz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langendorf, Richard. 1969. "Residential Desegregation Potential." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35:90-95.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Logan, John R. and Linda B. Stearns. 1981. "Suburban Racial Segregation as a Non-Ecological Process." *Social Forces* 60:61-73.
- Massey, Douglas and Nancy A. Denton. 1987. "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: 1970-1980." *American Sociological Review* 52:802-825.
- Massey, Douglas and Brendan P. Mullan. 1985. "Commentary and Debate: Reply to Goldstein and White." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:396-399.
- McDonald, John F. 1981. "The Direct and Indirect Effects of Housing Segregation on Employment Opportunities for Blacks." *Annals of Regional Science* 15:27-38.
1984. *Employment Location and Industrial Land Use in Metropolitan Chicago*. Champaign: Stipes.
- O'Hare, William. 1988. "An Evaluation of Three Theories Regarding the Growth of Black Female-Headed Families." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 10:2.
- National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. 1968. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Squires, Gregory, Larry Bennett, Kathleen McCourt, and Philip Nyden. 1987. *Chicago: Race, Class, and the Response to Urban Decline*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1985a. *Current Population Reports. Series P-60, No. 149*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 1985b. "Household and Family Characteristics: March 1984." *Current Population Reports. Series P-20, No. 398*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 1979. *Discrimination Against Chicanos in the Dallas Rental Housing Market*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Vernon, Raymond. 1966. "The Changing Economic Function of the Central City." Pp. 6-15 in *Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy*, edited by James Wilson. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Wilson, Franklin D. 1979. Residential Consumption, Economic Opportunity and Race. New York: Academic Press.

Wilson, William J. 1987. The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, William J. and Katherine M. Neckerman. 1984. Poverty and Family Structure: The Widening Gap Between Evidence and Public Policy Issues. Paper presented at the Conference on Poverty and Policy: Retrospect and Prospects, December. Williamsburg, VA.

Woolbright, Louie A. and David J. Hartmann. 1987. "The New Segregation: Asians and Hispanics." Pp. 138-157 in Divided Neighborhoods, edited by Gary Tobin. Beverly Hills: Sage.

TABLE 2

Percentage of Each Racial Group's Population Living in the Suburbs in Selected Metropolitan Areas of the North Central Region, 1980

Suburbs of SMSAs	% of Total					% of SMSA Suburbanized Population
	Whites	Asians	Nat. Am. Indians	Hispanics	Blacks	
St. Louis	87.4*	86.6*	80.4	75.2	49.4	80.8
Cincinnati	79.4*	63.8	64.4	62.1	24.9	72.5
Detroit	87.7*	80.1*	72.6*	59.5	14.8	72.4
Cleveland	79.8*	74.3*	45.7	31.4	27.3	69.8
minneapolis	71.8*	65.5	28.1	43.7	16.6	69.7
Flint	79.3*	69.6	67.8	53.1	16.2	69.4
Kansas City	72.2*	58.4	65.1	53.8	29.2	66.2
Chicago	71.4*	51.0	43.3	27.3	16.2	57.7
Milwaukee	61.6*	52.8	23.2	24.0	2.5	54.5
Indianapolis	45.9*	30.3	33.1	30.5	2.9	39.9
AVERAGE	73.7	63.2	52.4	46.1	20.0	65.3

Source: Compiled by the author from data obtained from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Advance Reports, various states.

\* Higher than the percentage of the total SMSA population that is living in the suburbs.

TABLE 3

The Percentage of Each Racial Group's Population Living in Central Cities and Suburbs of metropolitan Areas in the U.S. in 1980

Area	% of Total				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Native Am.	Asian
Central City	34.1	71.3	57.4	42.5	50.8

Suburb                    65.9            28.7            42.6            57.5            49.2

Source: Computed by the author from data obtained from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. General Social and Economic Characteristics. U.S. Summary, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

TABLE 4  
Percentage of Female-Headed Households by Race, 1980

Black female-headed households as percentage of all black families:....37.2  
Native American female-headed households as percentage of all  
Native American families:.....22.7  
Hispanic female-headed households as percentage of all Hispanic  
families .....19.4  
Asian female-headed households as percentage of all Asian families:....10.8  
White female-headed households as percentage of all white families:....10.8

Source: Computed by the author from data obtained from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. General Social and Economic Characteristics. U.S. Summary, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

TABLE 5  
Percentage of Families Below Poverty  
in Central Cities and Suburbs by Race, 1979

Racial/Ethnic Group	Percentage Below Poverty Level	
	Central Cities	Suburbs
Blacks	26.1	19.3
Native Americans	21.5	16.0
Hispanics	24.9	14.3
Asians	13.0	8.0
Whites	7.7	5.2

Source: Computed by the author from data obtained from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. General Social and Economic Characteristics. U.S. Summary, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

TABLE 6  
Percentage Unemployed by Race in Central Cities and Suburbs, 1980

Racial/Ethnic Group	Unemployment Rate	
	Central Cities	Suburbs
Blacks	12.8	9.6
Native Americans	12.3	11.0
Hispanics	9.3	8.3
Whites	5.7	5.4
Asians	4.8	4.5

Source: Computed by the author from data obtained from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. General Social and Economic Characteristics. U.S. Summary, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

TABLE 7

Minority-Owned Businesses and Minority Populations:  
The Extent of Representation

Racial/Ethnic Group	# of		Population		Represent- ation
	Businesses in 1982	%	in 1980	%	
Black	339,239	42.1	26,495,025	57.6	-15.5
Hispanic	248,141	30.8	14,608,673	31.7	-0.9
Asian	204,212	25.3	3,500,439	7.6	17.7
Native American	14,844	1.8	1,420,400	3.1	-1.3
TOTAL	806,436	100.0	46,024,537	100.0	

Source: Computed by the author from data obtained from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. General Population Characteristics. U.S. Summary, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980; U.S. Department of Commerce. 1982 Survey of Minority-Owned Business Enterprises. Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, and Other Minorities, MB82-1, MB8-2, MB82-3. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.

TABLE 8

Comparison of Education Indicators in Detroit and its Suburbs

Indicators	Suburban Mean	# of		Difference
		Suburban Districts	Detroit	
Local Revenue per pupil,	\$593	31	\$441	\$152

1970-71

Local Revenue per pupil, 1980-81	\$1,821	31	\$819	\$1,002
K-12 Total Instructional Expenses per pupil, 1970-71	\$692	31	\$686	\$6
K-12 Total Instructional Expenses per pupil, 1980-81	\$1,542	31	\$1,493	\$49
Current Operating Expenses per pupil, 1970-71	\$905	31	\$895	\$10
Current Operating Expenses per pupil, 1980-81	\$2,576	31	\$2,486	\$90
School Dropout Rate, 1970-71	5.7	31	13.7	8.0
School Dropout Rate, 1980-81	6.5	31	19.4	12.9
Michigan Educational Assessment Mean Composite Achievement Score (7th Grade) 1971-72	50.8	36	42.8	8.0
Michigan Educational Assessment Mean Math Achievement Score (4th Grade) 1981-82	74.7	32	60.7	14
Michigan Educational Assessment Mean Reading Achievement Score (4th Grade) 1981-82	72.9	32	50.9	22
Michigan Educational Assessment Mean Math Achievement Score (7th Grade) 1981-82	59.1	32	34.4	24.7
Michigan Educational Assessment Reading Achievement Score (7th Grade) 1981-82	74.3	32	52.5	21.8
Michigan Educational Assessment Math Achievement Score (10th Grade) 1981-82	55.8	32	30.5	25.3
Michigan Educational Assessment Mean Reading Achievement Score (10th Grade) 1981-82	74.5	32	55.1	19.4

Source: Michigan Department of Education. Local District Results, 4th Report of the 1971-72 Michigan Education Assessment Program, September, 1972; Local District Results, 1981-82 of the Michigan Education Assessment Program, 1982.

TABLE 9

The Dropout Rate in Metropolitan Detroit by  
Racial/Ethnic Group, 1985-86

## Counties of

Group	Macomb		Oakland		Wayne		Detroit City	
	N	R	N	R	N	R	N	R
Black	65	9.6	286	5.9	6,954	14.1	6,631	14.8
Native Am.	8	2.2	22	8.6	26	6.0	24	23.5
Hispanic	14	6.3	64	9.5	216	16.2	168	20.7
Asian	7	1.9	5	.6	42	6.4	23	10.9
White	1,760	4.6	2,250	4.8	3,182	5.9	691	23.4
TOTAL	1,854	4.7	2,627	4.9	10,420	9.9	7,537	15.4

Source: Michigan Department of Education. Office of Research and Information. Dropout Report 2: Michigan Public High School Dropouts by Racial-Ethnic Group, 1985-86 (Grades 9-12). June 29, 1987.

N = Number of Dropouts

R = Dropout Rate

-----

Requests for ordering copies of this paper should be submitted to:

Working Papers  
Institute for Social Science Research  
UCLA  
Box 951484  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1484

or email: [issr@issr.ucla.edu](mailto:issr@issr.ucla.edu)