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ABSTRACT

One of the most visible and persisting patterns of racial inequality in the U.S. is that of residential segregation between blacks and whites. Despite anti-discrimination legislation, an expanding black middle class, and a trend toward liberalization of white attitudes, blacks and whites continue to live in largely racially isolated communities. It is for this reason that past research has taken on the task of analyzing the role that residential segregation plays in perpetuating inequality. Some researchers argue that racial residential segregation is one of the key factors responsible for the perpetuation of racial inequality. Over the past two decades, a great deal of the research on segregation has focused on the negative impact of black segregated communities for African Americans. In their analysis of contemporary urban race relations, Galster and Hill present a model based on three interrelated concepts: place, power, and polarization. In this dissertation, I draw on their model by examining the interaction between place (communities and regions) and power (status attainment). More specifically, this analysis focuses on the impact of segregated residential places on three areas of status attainment for African Americans: labor force experience, socioeconomic status, and wealth.

This dissertation seeks to address four questions concerning residential segregation and African American status attainment. First, is integration beneficial for black status attainment? Secondly, does neighborhood class composition influence the relationship between segregation and status attainment? Thirdly, is the impact of segregation on black status attainment the same in both central city and suburban neighborhoods? Lastly, does regional context influence the relationship between segregation and black status attainment?

Using tract-level data from the 1990 U.S. Census Bureau, this dissertation examines two multiple regression models of status attainment for the metropolitan areas of Detroit, Boston, and
Atlanta. These regions were selected to represent three types of contextually different regions. These models include interactions between three neighborhood characteristics: percent black, class composition, and location in the central city or the suburbs. The measures of black status attainment include: rate of joblessness, high labor force participation, socioeconomic status as measured by educational and occupational status, rate of homeownership, and median home value.

The results indicate that as hypothesized, neighborhood racial composition does affect the measured outcomes of black status attainment differently across the metropolitan regions of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta. Further, the effect of racial composition on the outcome measures vary in direction and significance both within and among the three cities. Additionally, the interaction models reveal that the effect of racial composition is more often than not, dependent upon the class composition of the neighborhood and the location of the neighborhood in the central city or the suburbs. The findings highlight the importance of considering the effect of residential segregation on African Americans in the context of other neighborhood characteristics and in the context of each metropolitan region. In addition, the findings highlight the fact that segregation is a more important determinant of some measures of status attainment than others and in fact, neighborhood racial composition in some cases is inconsequential for black status attainment. The most consistent finding is that blacks are more likely to own homes in predominantly black neighborhoods. Also, the models explain the least amount of variance for all measures of black status attainment in metropolitan Boston.

The findings obtained from the regional approach conducted in this dissertation can be effectively used by policy-makers in reducing the disadvantages African Americans face. It is suggested that policies be developed at the national level which specifically target the issues that affect the three types of metropolitan areas used to guide this study.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION: RACIAL RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND AFRICAN AMERICAN STATUS ATTAINMENT

The purpose of this research is to gain a better understanding of the role that place of residence plays in determining African Americans status attainment. One of the most visible and persisting patterns of racial inequality in the U.S. is that of residential segregation between blacks and whites. Despite anti-discrimination legislation, an expanding black middle class, and a trend toward liberalization of white attitudes, blacks and whites continue to live in largely racially isolated communities (Massey and Denton 1993; Galster 1991). It is for this reason that past research has taken on the task of analyzing the role that residential segregation plays in perpetuating inequality. Some researchers argue that racial residential segregation is one of the key factors responsible for the perpetuation of racial inequality. Their analyses have indeed provided much needed insight into segregation's impact on African American social and economic well-being.

Over the past two decades, a great deal of the research on segregation has focused on the negative impact of black segregated communities for African Americans (Ihlanfeldt 1997; Massey and Denton 1993; Massey et al. 1991; Oliver and Shapiro 1995). The most commonly studied outcomes include: employment status, labor force participation, educational attainment, occupational status, and wealth. Black/white disparities among these outcomes play a major role in the socioeconomic powerlessness of African Americans and have been shown to be highly correlated with place of residence.

In their analysis of contemporary urban race relations, Galster and Hill (1992) present a model based on three interrelated concepts: place, power, and polarization. In this dissertation, I draw on their model by examining the interaction between place (communities and regions) and power (status attainment). More specifically, this analysis focuses on the impact of segregated residential places on the status attainment of African Americans.
There are four major weaknesses in the literature to date which limit our understanding of the impact of residential location on status attainment and thus limit the ability to create effective policies. First, the overwhelming majority of research on segregation advocates integration as a solution to its deleterious consequences (Massey and Denton 1993; Saltman 1991; Farley et al. 1994). Very little research has been done which has directly tested the outcomes of integration for blacks. The second limitation is that there is a focus in the literature on underclass communities (Devine and Wright 1993; Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987). This limitation ignores the effects of segregation on communities of other class compositions. Thirdly, much of the segregation literature focuses on blacks in central city communities (Lichter 1988; Neckerman and Kirschenman 1991; Wilson 1987; Wilson 1996). Since the 1980's, blacks have become increasingly suburbanized which has tended to be associated with socioeconomic mobility. While there are a few stable racially integrated communities, black suburbanization has occurred in a segregated manner just as in central cities (Galster 1991; Massey and Denton 1993). An important consideration must be how blacks are impacted by segregation in the suburbs as well as in central cities. Lastly, the negative consequences of segregation for blacks may depend partly on the regional context of the metropolitan area. Social, political, economic, and historical forces are significant factors which would impact the importance of segregation as a predictor of status attainment for blacks. However, the segregation literature tends to focus on the largest metropolitan areas in the U.S. with little regard for regional context. Thus, a major goal of this research will be to shed light on exactly how segregation impacts people and communities differently based on varying neighborhood characteristics and how that impact is influenced by the sociohistorical context of a region.

**Residential Segregation and African-American Status Attainment**

Previous studies have provided strong evidence of the link between residential segregation and racial inequality by examining variety of social outcomes including employment, occupation, education, and wealth (Massey, Condran, and Denton 1985; Lichter 1988; Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Braddock and McPartland 1987). In terms of employment, it has been found that residential segregation limits blacks' access to and knowledge of the job market (Braddock and McPartland 1987; Ihlanfeldt 1997; Wilson 1996). Theoretically, this makes sense, especially in explaining
contemporary employment inequality. With suburbanization came the movement of many industrial jobs away from central cities where blacks are highly concentrated and where transportation to suburban jobs is often nonexistent or inadequate (Wilson 1987). Additionally, employment opportunities are often shared through personal networks, displayed in storefront windows, or advertised in local newspapers. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect blacks to be less knowledgeable of jobs outside of their segregated communities. Further, blacks have suffered from the relocation and decline in manufacturing jobs once available in large central cities (Massey and Denton 1993; Neckerman and Kirschenman 1991; Wilson 1996). As a result, underemployment and unemployment have plagued many black communities.

Research has also shown that public schools in predominantly black, central city neighborhoods are consistently of lower quality in terms of test scores and facilities than other schools and that the dropout rate is higher (Massey, Condran, and Denton 1987; Rosenbaum, Kulieke, and Rubinowitz 1988). Blacks are usually concentrated in central cities with poor economies and it is the health of a city economy and the economic well-being of residents that in large part determines the quality of schools. In our high technology society, the ability to provide high quality educational services means having adequate resources which central city school districts often lack. Thus, the segregation of blacks in economically stagnant inner cities almost guarantees a disadvantaged educational environment. Poor school environments may well impede the educational attainment of blacks (Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991).

Segregation literature has also focused upon the occupational status of African Americans. The overwhelming concentration of blacks in central cities affects not only labor market participation rates but also how blacks are able to participate in the labor market. Research has shown that predominantly black central cities are less likely to contain residents with professional and managerial positions (Devine and Wright 1993; Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987). In fact, one of the most commonly cited explanations for the increase in poverty areas since the 1970's is Wilson's depopulation hypothesis. Wilson (1987) states that underclass communities have been created in large part due to the out-migration of middle-class black professionals from older central cities. Support has been found for Wilson's hypothesis in some metropolitan areas and these tend
to be those in which the largest concentrations of the black population are found (Greene 1991). Galster (1996) adds that those cities with the highest concentrations of blacks have experienced a dramatic increase in low-skilled service sector employment due to the transformation of the economy. Thus blacks in segregated areas are at a disadvantage in obtaining jobs in the professional and managerial categories as well as in obtaining jobs with advancement potential. Further, Neckerman and Kirschenman (1991) point out that in the Chicago area, employers are consistently using racially biased employment decisions about inner city black workers which affects not only hiring but may also affect the subjective process of promotion. Therefore, the persistent segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas serves to increase isolation from and knowledge of jobs in higher status occupational categories.

A more recent focus in segregation literature has been on its consequences for acquiring wealth, particularly in terms of homeownership and the value of homes owned by African Americans as compared to whites (Conley 1999; Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Shlay 1988; Yinger 1995). A link has been found between residential segregation and black wealth accumulation. First, predominantly black neighborhoods to which blacks are steered generally contain an older housing stock that is of lesser value than in other neighborhoods. Also, redlining and discriminatory practices of mortgage-lending in black neighborhoods continues to occur (Darden et al. 1987; Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Wyly and Holloway 1999; Yinger 1995). The discriminatory practices of banks diminished access to home mortgages and home repair loans in minority communities (Darden et al. 1987; Oliver and Shapiro 1995). As a result, blacks are less likely than whites to own homes and black-owned homes are typically of lesser value than white-owned homes (Horton 1992; Horton and Thomas 1998; Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991).

**Limitations of Past Research**

Despite the contribution of the literature which explains the role of segregation in perpetuating inequality, there are a four weaknesses that limit our understanding of the impact of segregation on black status attainment.

First, a major weakness of the segregation literature is that the most commonly advocated solution to the deleterious consequences attributed to residential segregation for African
Americans is integration but there is a lack of evidence that blacks benefit from integration (Farley et al. 1994; Massey and Denton 1993; Saltman 1991). While many authors have offered strategies for achieving integration, few mention or examine how beneficial integration actually is for black socioeconomic well-being. In fact, the results of some studies imply that forces other than segregation have contributed to racial inequality. For instance, Braddock and McPartland (1987) find that minorities' exclusion from equal employment opportunity occurs as a result of labor market and institutional barriers. Included in these barriers are statistical discrimination and segregated social networks both of which could occur regardless of where blacks live. Using Census data for three large metropolitan regions Hughes (1989) finds no support for the hypothesis that the dispersal of blacks from highly concentrated black neighborhoods would increase their economic status. He finds that wage discrimination regardless of the spatial distribution of jobs and residence has a much larger effect on the economic status of blacks than segregation. Ihlanfeldt (1997) finds that wage rates and job availability are higher in white suburban areas which implies that the racial composition and location of neighborhoods in either the central city or suburb act together to influence labor force experience. However, job availability and high wages in suburbs may matter little for blacks if wage and employment discrimination against blacks exists. In a rare study which directly tests the effect of integration on black socioeconomic status Rosenbaum et al. (1988) examined educational performance and school location. They found that when children from low-income black families move to middle-class white suburbs and attend middle class white schools, they achieve higher grades, have lower dropout rates, and have higher rates of college attendance than children from low-income black families who moved to central city black neighborhoods. The data for this study was taken from the Gautreaux desegregation program in Chicago. While this study is an important contribution to the literature, it is limited in that the program participants were all low-income tenants of public housing. In addition, the test groups moved to neighborhoods which comprised more than 90% of one racial group. While most U.S. neighborhoods are highly segregated, neighborhood racial composition does occur along a continuum more or less so depending on the metropolitan area. Also, any differences in the results for those who moved to black middle class neighborhoods was not discussed which is significant since central city black
neighborhoods are not socioeconomically homogeneous. As Conley (1999) argues, to better address the racial gap in wealth as well as other status attainment outcomes, it would be fruitful to study communities of various racial and class compositions to determine the relative effects of integration on life outcomes.

Second, there is an overemphasis on blacks in underclass communities. While it is important to recognize segregation's role in concentrating poverty, such an emphasis ignores the vast majority of segregated areas and ignores the differential effects of segregation on individuals and communities. Very little has been done to specifically address the impact of segregation on working and middle class minorities. The negative consequences attributed to segregation may differentially affect neighborhoods depending on class composition. For instance, Crane (1991) finds that neighborhood effects (class status) on teenage childbearing and dropping out of school become significant only in the worst neighborhoods. Similarly, Wilson (1996) describes how the loss of blue-collar jobs has had such a devastating impact on Chicago's inner-city poor black neighborhoods in terms of high rates of poverty and deteriorating family structure. What we do not know from such a study is whether or not the loss of blue-collar jobs has had the same impact for blacks in neighborhoods of other race/class compositions. In this research, I address this problem by examining the interaction between neighborhood class composition and racial composition on various status attainment outcomes for the African American population.

Third, there is an overemphasis on blacks in central city communities. Neckerman and Kirschenman (1991) find strong evidence of racial bias toward inner-city black workers being used in the hiring process of Chicago employers. They find that blacks are most hampered in the job interview stage and least hampered when skill tests are used in hiring. In a study of the racial differences in underemployment in U.S. central cities, Lichter (1988) finds that the significance of age, education, and race for underemployment has increased since 1970. He finds that young blacks in central cities experienced much higher rates of underemployment than young whites. While the spatial mismatch hypothesis is useful in understanding employment problems for central city blacks, research has ignored the large number of blacks who are now living in suburban areas. By focusing on central cities, these studies tell us little about the effect of segregation on creating labor market
disadvantage for blacks in suburban areas. It is possible that neighborhood segregation may have a different effect on the experience of blacks in the labor market in the suburbs than in the central city.

The last weakness in the literature exploring the consequences of segregation is a focus on either a single city, or an examination of the nation's largest metropolitan areas. An examination of the potentially different socioeconomic outcomes in different regional contexts is needed because social, political, economic, and historical forces are significant factors which would impact the relationship between segregation and black status attainment. In his analysis of contemporary race relations, Wilson (1978) differentiates between northern and southern patterns of economic development, political development and race relations. However, he does not explore how those regional differences have influenced the impact of segregation for blacks. Further, over the years it has become less meaningful to separate U.S. metropolitan areas into northern and southern categories. Regional variations now exist that have less to do with location in the north or the south. In his analysis of the concentration of poverty, Greene (1991) finds that economic and demographic transformations have played out unevenly across the U.S. resulting in regional differences in the growth of poverty areas. Similarly, Dijst and Van Kempen (1991) find that minority business development must be understood within the "economic, societal, and socio-spatial context" of a city. Examining the sociohistorical forces which have impacted the black community in a metropolitan area provides an essential tool in understanding contemporary patterns of inequality. Mollenkopf (1983) argues that there are striking patterns among U.S. cities in the economic sectors and the political forces which have dominated resulting in categorically different economic structures. Eisinger (1980) adds to the economic and political forces, the effect of a city's history of racial tension and demographic changes on contemporary patterns of racial inequality. Both Mollenkopf (1983) and Eisinger (1980) seek to classify cities based on these interacting sociohistorical forces. For instance, rustbelt cities such as Detroit that never managed to become administrative and service centers to the extent necessary to offset the loss of manufacturing functions have been most hurt by the transformation of the economy (Wilson 1996). Eisinger (1982a) provides another example of how differences in regional context influence black socioeconomic outcomes. He finds that the
percentage of blacks in the population of a sample of large cities is the most important indicator of black municipal employment and that black employment in general is highest in those cities with healthy economies. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that segregation would have a less negative impact on black socioeconomic outcomes when there is economic growth and black political power.

As Sugrue (1996) points out, "while racial inequality has been consistently present across U.S. metropolitan areas, the dimensions, significance, and very meaning of race and racial inequality have differed depending on the cultural, political, and economic context. Likewise, intergroup relations have taken myriad forms and had differing consequences."

**Research Design**

In light of the above limitations of past research, the goal of this dissertation is to examine how neighborhood characteristics impact African American status attainment and how the sociohistorical context of a region influences those relationships. The current research will seek to address these limitations by studying the effect of the racial composition, class composition, and location of a neighborhood in either the central city or the suburb on the educational and occupational status, labor force participation, employment rate, homeownership rate, and housing value for African Americans in those neighborhoods. These relationships will be explored separately for three contextually different metropolitan areas: Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta. This will allow for exploration of the impact of regional socioeconomic, political, and historical forces on the relationship between segregated neighborhoods and black status attainment.

Specifically, I first examine a basic regression model in assessing the impact of the racial composition, class composition, and urban vs. suburban location of a neighborhood on black employment, wealth, and status outcomes. I will then consider the interactive effects of the three neighborhood characteristics on the same outcomes. Both models will be applied to the data for each metropolitan region separately.

The three contextually different regions examined in this dissertation were chosen based on Mollenkopf's (1983) three-category typology of post-World War II cities. The first category consists of rustbelt cities of the North that never developed information and service sectors to offset the loss of manufacturing industries and as a result, were most hurt by the transformation of the
postindustrial economy. These cities also have a legacy of urban conflict and racial and ethnic tension. Cities like Detroit, Cleveland, and St. Louis would fall into this first category. Those cities differ in significant ways from the second category. While these mainly Northeastern cities are marked by a similar history of urban conflict and racial and ethnic tension, these cities differ in that they were industrial centers before 1930 but in later years, developed strong corporate, banking, and service sectors. Mollenkopf (1983) believes that these cities contain all the elements that define the postindustrial transformation of U.S. central cities. Examples of these cities would be Boston, Chicago, and New York. The third category consists of Sunbelt cities that have no industrial legacy but in recent years, developed economically as a result of their administrative, service, and high-technology activities. The pattern of race relations has also been quite different in these areas than in northeastern and midwestern areas. Atlanta, Phoenix, and San Antonio would be prime examples of these Sunbelt cities.

In the following three chapters I will explore the sociohistorical context of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta, three cities that fit the typology described by Mollenkopf (1983) in order to shed light on how the distinct histories of these cities has led to distinct contemporary consequences of residential segregation. In, The Declining Significance of Race (1978), Wilson argues that American society has experienced three historical periods of race relations: the pre-industrial (slavery era to the decade following the Civil War), industrial (1875 to the late 1930's), and the modern industrial (late 1930's to the 1970's). Each period is characterized by a different form of racial stratification structured by the specific arrangement of economic and political institutions. The unique arrangements in each of the three historical periods not only produced different contexts for both racial and ethnic interaction but also for racial and ethnic group access to rewards and privileges. Thus, for each historical period, Wilson examines how the state of the economy, politics, and race relations had differing impacts on African Americans. He also recognizes that in each period, racial stratification took different forms in the north and the south. Thus, his analysis highlights the importance of examining the influence of regional context on racial stratification. However, this dissertation will go beyond a simple division of the north and the south and take into account regional differences other than mere geography. Using Wilson's analysis as a model, the
sociohistorical analysis presented here of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta will be divided into three
historical periods. These periods are: the pre-industrial (pre-emancipation era to 1900), industrial
(1900 to 1945), and modern industrial (1945 to the 1980's). For each period I will explore issues
related to the emergence and development of the black community, the economy and the labor
market, politics, and neighborhood housing and schools. Within each of these areas, I will examine
any salient structural, political or, demographic dimensions as well as issues related to intergroup
relations. Ultimately, this analysis will seek to describe how regional sociohistorical context acts
to alter the impact of racial residential segregation as well as other important neighborhood
caracteristics in creating and perpetuating socioeconomic inequality.
CHAPTER 2
DETROIT: A SOCIOHISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Detroit in the Pre-Industrial Period

I begin this analysis with an examination of Detroit, Michigan during the pre-industrial period encompassing the pre-emancipation era to about 1900. Traditional historical approaches to the urban black experience in Detroit focus on ghetto formation and usually begin the story of the African American experience there sometime after World War II. But more recently, a few accounts have focused on the process of community building and as a result, these historical accounts begin much earlier. Although, Thomas (1992) begins his historical account of Detroit in 1915, he believes the seeds of community building were being planted during the pre-emancipation days of the 1800's. He believes that it was during this time that the emergence and development of the black community began. The black population at the time was small and transitory since many used Detroit as a stop on the way to Canada in the Underground Railroad. However, many did remain, especially after the abolition of slavery in Northern states during the early nineteenth century. Those who did remain organized to fight the Federal Fugitive Slave Law by forming organizations and increasing participation in the Underground Railroad. Similarly, after the Emancipation Proclamation, blacks organized to protect their communities in the midst of anti-black rioting of recent European immigrant groups which was characteristic of other northern cities after the Civil War (Geschwender 1977; Thomas 1992).

The formation of a class structure within the black community can also be seen prior to the 1900's. While Detroit was a haven for fugitive slaves, there was a small population of free blacks. The elite class of free blacks were often northern-born and of mixed racial ancestry. They consisted of educated professionals and business owners. They were also mainly interested in their own
integration with the larger white community (Thomas 1992). This created conflict with working class blacks who had fewer resources and were less able to assimilate.

The first institution in the black community during the pre-Civil War period was the church which was used for several institutional functions in which blacks were denied access to such as schooling and recreation (Thomas 1992). During that time mutual aid and cultural organizations developed to address concerns such as job competition and racism. These black institutions were mainly supported by working class blacks. Elite blacks were generally opposed to the formation of separate black community institutions.

Before the 1900's there was no key industry that dominated the Detroit economy. Like other northern cities, Detroit had a diversified industrial economy (Leggett 1968; Wilson 1978). It was within the labor market that most of the racial antagonism occurred. Prior to and just after the Civil War, blacks were concentrated in very menial unskilled and service jobs (Geschwender 1977). This concentration of black workers was in large part the result of efforts by recent European immigrants to keep blacks out of low-paying occupations with whom they were competing (Wilson 1978). The advent of the Civil War further heightened racial tensions. Detroit had a sizable working class Irish immigrant population which was made uneasy by the idea of an influx of blacks from the South who would compete with them for jobs (Geschwender 1977). As a result, white ethnic protest in the form of violence and riots ensued not only in Detroit but in other Midwest and Northeastern cities as well. This racial antagonism was often supported by native-born employers who preferred to give occupational advantages to the foreign-born (Geschwender 1977). Thus, Wilson uses the split labor market theory to explain the racial and ethnic stratification system in the antebellum North. While conflict was much more common among racial and ethnic groups, a small minority of white workers, guided by socialist theories, attempted solidarity among all workers to fight capitalist exploitation (Wilson 1978). Such cooperation was also evident prior to the Civil War among whites involved in anti-slavery movements. However, this cooperation was never strong enough to overcome the intense racial and ethnic conflict during the pre-industrial period.

The exclusion of blacks from economic opportunities during the pre-industrial period followed a similar pattern in the political arena. Although slavery was abolished in Michigan in
1837, blacks remained disenfranchised (Geschwender 1977; Thomas 1992). The Irish were strong supporters of laws which denied blacks legal and political rights. As Wilson (1978) points out, the efforts of the white working class to deny blacks social, economic, and political resources were made much easier by the small population of blacks that existed in northern cities before 1900.

The small size of the black population in Detroit also affected the racial composition of neighborhoods prior to 1900. In their analysis of the racial segregation and the formation of black urban ghettos, Massey and Denton (1993) argue that the urban spatial structure prior to 1900 was not conducive to high levels of class, ethnic, or racial segregation and the small populations of blacks in northern cities were not particularly segregated from whites. Although blacks were over-represented in the poorest housing, this was also true of other groups with the same economic status. Thus, there was substantial contact between blacks and whites in northern cities even in cities like Detroit which later developed large black ghettos. Most black-white contact though, occurred between whites and the black elite (Massey and Denton 1993). While neighborhoods were relatively integrated in Detroit prior to 1900, schools were not. Black children were not admitted to the Detroit public school system until 1869 and even then, a separate district was set up to accommodate them (Geschwender 1977; Thomas 1992). Schooling for black children at that time was extremely inferior to the public schooling for white children. This exclusion from the educational institutions in Detroit is reflective of other attempts by the white working class in Detroit to prevent blacks from achieving socioeconomic mobility. The efforts of the white working class during the pre-industrial period set the foundation for the institutionalized forms of exclusion that would affect the largest wave of black migrants in the next historical period.

**Detroit in the Industrial Period**

Detroit is a city that would be described by many historians as one of dramatic growth and dramatic decline. The industrial period is the one in which dramatic growth took place. Like other rustbelt cities, Detroit's economy depended on manufacturing industries. During the first two decades of the twentieth century, Detroit's economy became heavily dependent on one of these industries - the automotive industry and the employment generated from it. During the industrial period, the two major migration waves of blacks from the south occurred between 1916 and 1917 then later between
By 1926, eighty-five percent of the blacks in Detroit had come in one decade. These two waves were a direct result of the labor demands created by the growth of manufacturing industries, especially the automotive industry. This characteristic alone is considered to be so significant that some consider the black industrial working class to be the major catalyst in sustaining and transforming the larger black community (Sugrue 1996; Thomas 1992).

The rapid migration of blacks to Detroit went hand in hand with increasing urbanization, institutional and organizational development, and political empowerment (Thomas 1992). The Detroit Urban League (DUL), founded in 1916, played an important role in the community building process for new and old African American residents in Detroit and ultimately became a model for other social service agencies in the U.S. But the DUL was especially critical in its contribution to the stabilization and adjustment of southern black migrants. The organization found jobs, housing, and recreational activities for them. As black working class migrants assumed a more permanent role in the city, this in turn legitimized the role of the DUL and other agencies. The smaller yet persistent class of black professionals thrived off of the growing working class population by building churches, businesses, and fraternal orders (Thomas 1992).

During the industrial period, blacks established their place in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. These were the major growth sectors in the economy and their relatively high wages contributed to black progress and survival in Detroit (Thomas 1992). The automotive industry became the primary industry and by 1921, Ford Motor Company became the largest employer of blacks in Detroit. The growth of the automotive industry and the subsequent demand for black labor led to what historians have often described as the proletarianization of the black community.

While blacks increased their numbers in the semi-skilled and skilled industrial occupations, these increasing numbers did not usually lead to any substantial mobility for black workers within factories (Geschwender 1977). The dirtiest and most dangerous jobs were reserved for blacks. Regardless of skill, European immigrants were still favored over blacks in most factories (Sugrue 1996). The outbreak of World War I and postwar restrictions on immigration served to benefit blacks in gaining a foothold into positions once denied to them as a result of labor demands.
Company policies also helped blacks during economic downturns since employers often kept them on in case of strikes by white workers. Many believe that it was here in the industrial factories that the seeds of racial unrest were sown (Sugrue 1996; Wilson 1978). As Wilson (1978) explains, black movement into industry intensified the social and economic anxieties of working class whites and resulted in more pronounced racial antagonism. Overall, the shift from agricultural, domestic, and personal services to manufacturing and mechanical industries did represent socioeconomic advancement for the black community. However, black women remained trapped in domestic work which was the lowest paying sector of Detroit's economy (Sugrue 1996; Thomas 1992). But the role of black men in sustaining the vitality of the automotive industry became a crucial element in the development of community empowerment and political activism. A major step in this direction occurred when black industrial workers made the difficult choice of participating in industrial unionism (Meier and Rudwick 1979; Sugrue 1996). Ford Motor Company had literally become a hero in the black community during the earlier part of the industrial period. But as time passed, many began to believe that the corporation was not serving its interests. According to Thomas (1992), black participation in the United Automobile Workers (UAW) association represented a major shift away from corporate paternalism. Unionism also represented a step toward industrial cooperation between working class blacks and whites.

It was during the industrial period that most of the political organizing in the black community took place. Thomas (1992) notes that the generation of blacks born and raised in Detroit between 1915 and 1945, came to expect much more socially and politically than their migrant parents. A major factor in this developing political power was an awareness in the black community of their increasing numbers in certain electoral districts. It was during the industrial period that the first black was elected to the state legislature. Black self-help organizations and political activity became intertwined and was directed at challenging institutional racism. Protest began to be viewed as a viable form of social change (Sugrue 1996). For instance, the Detroit branch of the NAACP was founded in 1911 and it spawned a host of other civic rights organizations which protested discrimination in employment and housing. These issues became increasingly more important as a steady stream of migrants continued to flow into Detroit through the 1950's.
Although protest served as a vital asset to the black community and some progress was made politically during the pre-World War II years, it must be pointed out that all of this occurred in the midst of systematic exclusion by white-controlled political machines (Wilson 1978). Even increasing numbers of blacks in some districts was not enough for white politicians to disturb the racial status quo by reaching out for black votes. As a result, there was a huge gap between the political development of blacks and white ethnic groups in Detroit. Not only did white ethnic groups not face the institutional discrimination that blacks did, they also benefitted from having a longer history of being urbanized (Wilson 1978). When blacks were able to even slightly penetrate the political machines, it was usually limited to serving traditional elitist interests. It was not until the modern industrial period that the issues of the masses of industrial workers began to be heard and responded to.

A major problem with the influx of migrant laborers was a housing shortage. Not only was there limited housing for blacks but it was also difficult to find housing close to factories. The main cause of the housing problem for blacks at this time was not only the housing shortage in the city but also the racial restrictions that were placed on where blacks could live. Unlike the pre-industrial period when blacks were a small, stable minority in Detroit, the industrial period was the most rapid period of growth in the black population in Detroit's history. Whites, especially working class white ethnic group members viewed this rapid growth with hostility and fear. The defense of neighborhood territory by whites became of prime importance (Massey and Denton 1993).

The most common white defense tactic during the early industrial period was violence in the form of riots and bombings. Some of the worst rioting in Detroit's history occurred during the industrial period (Capeci 1984). In 1942, blacks and whites struggled over the Sojourner Truth Homes-federally built housing projects for black war workers. Although these projects were intended to be racially segregated, conflict immediately arose between blacks and nearby Polish Americans (Capeci 1984; Darden 1987). Polish residents, who represented the largest foreign-born ethnic group in Detroit, rallied to keep blacks out of these projects. They protested not to the housing project itself but to its location which was near the city of Hamtramack, an overwhelmingly Polish community. The conflict escalated to such a volatile level that nearly two thousand state and
local police troops were called in to protect black residents moving in. In contrast to this conflict was cooperation on the part of a coalition of white labor, religious, and civil organizations which supported the occupancy of blacks in the housing project (Capeci 1984).

However, once again this cooperation was outweighed by the emerging conflict between white ethnic groups, especially Polish Americans and an increasing black population. The resulting outcome was the 1943 riot which was one of the worst race riots in U.S. history (Geschwender 1977). The riot occurred as a result of a series of clashes during the early war years between blacks and white sailors stationed in Detroit. Much of the violence was instigated or ignored by white police officers who killed seventeen of the twenty-three blacks killed in the riots. This riot worsened already poor relations between blacks and the police. As many have noted, the Detroit riot of 1943 resulted from a combination of massive migration rates, housing shortages, and industrial strife that was characteristic of the period in industrial regions (Wilson 1978; Sugrue 1996).

Later, the development of neighborhood improvement associations, the use of restrictive covenants and discriminatory practices on the part of realtors such as blockbusting and redlining became the norm. The creation of man-made barriers was another tactic employed by white residents in cooperation with the Federal Housing Authority (FHA). The infamous "wailing wall" was a six-foot cement wall built between two adjoining black and white neighborhoods in northwest Detroit in the 1940's. As part of a deal between the FHA, and a housing developer wishing to build homes for white families, the wall was built for the purpose of FHA funding to meet the actuarial standards of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (Sugrue 1996).

Schools, like housing was another area of intense racial conflict in Detroit. As Darden et al. (1987) points out, a major reason for white opposition to neighborhood integration was that it would also mean school integration. And for working class white ethnic groups, schools represented territory and social status. School integration would further challenge their perceived proprietary right over this vital community institution. Thus, during the industrial period, white reaction to increasing black visibility was to retreat to whiter school districts. Blacks, who were limited in residential choices, remained trapped in overcrowded schools. It would not be until the modern
industrial period that blacks and whites would face serious conflict over school desegregation and the issue of bussing.

The result of these tactics was the spatial isolation of blacks in overcrowded, substandard housing in poorly maintained, high crime neighborhoods. Ironically, the small section on the east side of Detroit carved out for blacks was called, "Paradise Valley". This period, between 1900 and 1940, is what Massey and Denton (1993) describe as the creation of the ghetto. Indeed, this period of residential segregation in Detroit set the stage for what would later become a city with the highest population of African Americans in the U.S.

**Detroit in the Modern Industrial Period**

A major area of research for social scientists concerning rustbelt cities like Detroit, lies in understanding and discovering what led to the profound transformation of these areas from "urban heyday to urban crisis" (Sugrue 1996) after World War II. While the industrial period represented the era of dramatic growth for Detroit, the modern industrial period would be considered the era of dramatic decline. What many social scientists have come to agree on is that the contemporary state of urban crisis in Detroit is a result of the social, economic, and political forces of the previous two historical periods.

The high level of rural black migration spawned by economic growth during the industrial period continued well into the 1960's. Between 1940 and 1950, the black population doubled in size (Sugrue 1996). By this time, a distinct black class structure had emerged. As a result of the improved relationship between blacks and labor unions, industrial job opportunities during World War II, and federal fair employment legislation, a shift in the black occupational structure took place (Wilson, 1978). Of major importance for blacks in Detroit was employment in unionized industries which resulted in higher-paying skilled and semi-skilled blue-collar jobs. There was also an expansion of job opportunities in the government and corporate sectors for highly educated and trained blacks. All of these factors resulted in a major shift from black concentration in unskilled, domestic, and service jobs to an increasing representation in white-collar and skilled blue-collar jobs (Wilson 1978; Sugrue 1996). By the early part of the modern industrial period, a meaningful middle class could be observed in the black community.
While this occupational shift was an important achievement for the black community, the majority of blacks were still employed in the blue-collar manufacturing industries. The proletarianization of blacks in the previous era proved to be extremely problematic for many blacks in the modern industrial era. By the end of World War II, an institutionalized dual labor market was in place which severely limited black mobility (Darden et al. 1987). In addition, by the late 1960's, Detroit and other industrial centers were experiencing rapid de-industrialization. The steady loss of manufacturing jobs occurred at the same time that millions of blacks were continuing to migrate to Detroit from the rural South and other locations in search of job opportunities (Sugrue 1996). Consequently, many were added to the ranks of the poor. Black organizations such as the Detroit chapter of the NAACP, the Trade Union Leadership Conference (TULC), and the Detroit Urban League sought to address racial discrimination in the labor market and to increase mobility for middle and working class blacks. However, they failed to address structural changes in the economy which limited the opportunities of the poor and especially black youth who were becoming increasingly marginalized in the labor market (Darden et al. 1987; Sugrue 1996).

In addition to occupational shifts, an important point on which both Darden et al. (1987) and Sugrue (1996) emphasize is that Detroit's economic history also had a dramatic impact on employment patterns. It is in the modern industrial era in which we see Detroit transforming into a city which can be adequately placed in the typology suggested by Mollenkopf (1983). During this era, Detroit and other midwestern and northeastern industrial cities were most hurt by structural changes in the U.S. economy which resulted in a shift from the manufacturing sector to the information and service sectors. Across the country, this shift produced: a loss of well-paying manufacturing jobs (due to plant closures, automation, and plant relocations), increasingly segmented labor markets, and the decline of labor unions (Wilson 1978). What makes Detroit distinct is its dependence on manufacturing employment unlike other cities with more diverse economic bases like New York or Los Angeles. And what makes Detroit's African American population distinct is that it was so heavily dependent on employment in the manufacturing industry. As plants closed and relocated, poverty and income inequality in the city rose dramatically (Darden et al. 1987, Sugrue 1996). A major reason for this is that blacks lacked the geographic mobility
afforded whites in the city despite their growing numbers. All of this combined with persistent discrimination in hiring severely reduced black employment prospects especially for those who had not already established a connection with the labor market by the late 1970's.

While Darden (1987) believes Detroit fits within the category of the typology as a city which never managed to develop administrative and service functions to offset the loss of manufacturing functions, he believes this is only true if it applies to the central city as being divorced from the rest of the region. Viewed within a regional context, it would be accurate to describe the region of Detroit as uneven economic and political development. The administrative and service functions do take place but in the surrounding suburbs of the city of Detroit. This clarification highlights the importance of viewing socioeconomic outcomes within a regional context especially with regard to neighborhood racial composition. How evenly developed politically and economically a region is would have a direct effect on the impact of racial residential segregation, especially racial segregation by region.

In response to the extreme de-proletarianization, African Americans in Detroit and nationally did engage in various forms of militancy during this period which resulted in major political gains at the federal and local level. As Wilson (1978) points out, the modern industrial period represented one of extreme political autonomy for blacks in the form of civil rights laws and elected offices. However, for Sugrue (1996) the paradox lies in the fact that while these political gains were being made, they did not respond adequately to de-industrialization and discrimination which reduced the aggregate supply of jobs. As a result, this period also witnessed and has been overshadowed by violent resistance in the form of riots. Unlike riots of previous periods, the riot of 1967 had deep economic roots and was engaged in mainly by young black men who had little or no connection to the labor market (Sugrue 1996).

A significant aspect of the transformation of Detroit occurred in local politics which Eisenger (1980) terms "ethnoracial transition". By 1973, Detroit had elected its first African American mayor, Coleman Young. While this form of political change is viewed by Eisenger as a form of political power, it too can be viewed as a paradox in what it signified for race relations and the economy in the Detroit area. According to Sugrue (1996), there was a hardening of white racial prejudices in
the post war era as signified by white resistance to open housing and school funding in black neighborhoods. Ultimately, whites fled the city leaving behind a large black voting bloc making ethnoracial transition in politics possible and a metropolitan area characterized by political fragmentation and racial isolationism (Darden et al. 1987). What has also been left behind is a city which suffers from a declining tax base and a decline in spending by federal government. For Sugrue (1996), the most enduring legacy of the postwar period has been the growing marginalization of the city of Detroit in local, state, and national politics.
CHAPTER 3
BOSTON: A SOCIOHISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Boston in the Pre-industrial Period

The second city in this sociohistorical analysis is Boston, Massachusetts. Boston falls in the
category of cities Mollenkopf (1983) describes as having all of the elements that define the
postindustrial transformation of U.S. cities since 1930. These mainly northeastern cities were major
industrial centers before 1930 and in later years developed strong corporate, banking, and service
sectors. The cities in this category of Mollenkopf's typology also have a history of urban conflict
and racial-ethnic tension. Schnore and Knights (1969) pointed out in the late sixties that while there
was considerable interest in sociology on the city and the spatial distribution of ethnic groups, there
was a lack of historical perspective on the problems under consideration. This trend is still apparent
in more contemporary sociological literature. An examination of the history of the African
American community in Boston sheds much light on the similarities and differences between the
issues facing Boston blacks and blacks in other regions.

Boston is the site of one of the oldest black communities in the country and is unique in its
history and the nature of race relations. The first blacks arrived in 1638 as slaves from the West
Indies (Cromwell 1993; Horton and Horton 1979). However, slavery here was distinct from that in
the South and there were efforts to limit its practice as early as 1641 (Horton and Horton 1979). The
nature of northern slavery involved rapid acculturation and in colonial New England in particular,
the rights and legal protections accorded slaves, opened the door for slave activism (Horton and
Horton 1979; Stapp 1993). Slaves in Boston were allowed to own property, to receive trials, and to
sue in courts. Black Bostonians, such as the well-known Crispus Attucks, also actively participated
in the Revolutionary War. Stapp (1993) argues that because of these privileges, blacks in Boston
knew about and made use of limited power in the struggle for freedom and equality. Slavery was
abolished in Massachusetts in 1790. No other northern state passed as many civil rights laws as Massachusetts and it also avoided many racial restrictions that were common elsewhere (Pleck 1979).

Prior to the Revolutionary War, blacks made up 10 percent of the population in Boston but by 1790, this percentage dropped substantially largely due to high European immigration (Levesque 1994; Stapp 1993). During the early nineteenth century the black population in Massachusetts became increasingly more concentrated and urban with the largest numbers moving to Boston (Levesque 1994). Blacks became more densely concentrated in the city than whites however, but they never exceeded 3 percent of the population during the nineteenth century. In a comparative study of three northern cities in the late nineteenth century, Dubois (1969) concludes that Boston presented the most favorable situation for blacks. A major reason for this he believes is due to Boston’s demographic stability-its balanced sex ratio and relatively lower migration of blacks from the rural South. Compared to white Bostonians, the percentage of black children was very low due to a high infant mortality rate (Stapp 1993). The number of female-headed household was also disproportionately greater in the black community as a result of the interrelated effects of poverty, migrant labor, sickness, and sterility (Pleck 1979).

Although blacks made up a small proportion of the population in most major northern cities prior to the twentieth century, migration to and settlement in Boston was much lower. One reason for this was that Boston was not a major station in the underground railroad and those fugitive slaves that did stop there did not usually remain (Handlin 1975). The majority of blacks living in antebellum Boston were northern-born (Stapp 1994; Themstrom 1973). However, after emancipation, an increasing percentage of black Bostonians were southern-born. Waves of newcomers came from the rural South as freed slaves and as a result, the black population doubled between 1865 and 1880 (Handlin 1975; Themstrom 1973). One of the reasons for the increase is that the Freedman’s Bureaus of Washington D.C. and Virginia began to import ex-slaves for menial and domestic labor between 1864 and 1868 (Pleck 1979).

In their analysis of antebellum Boston, Horton and Horton (1979) point out that although the city was transient for many, important institutions developed in the black community to meet
basic survival needs and to provide a framework for social protest. Pleck (1979) argues that antebellum black Bostonians used their unique freedoms to develop a more highly developed community life than in other northern cities. Similarly, Cromwell (1994) notes that by the first half of the 1800's, the black community was complex enough to have its own leaders, institutions, mutual aid, and self-improvement organizations. According to Handlin (1975), only African Americans developed a group consciousness comparable to that of the Irish. Part of the community development of the black community was due to the forced residential segregation of blacks. Levesque (1994) argues that there was diversity in the black community regarding integration versus separation. The dominant theme among antebellum leaders was self-improvement for the purpose of integration. However, he notes that while some supported separation, both integration and separation were used as strategies for survival. In addition, some supported separation in one institution like the church but not in another such as schools. This suggests the desire for socioeconomic mobility and the recognition that integrated education was necessary for mobility. There was also a strong abolition movement in the black community which was supported by several white leaders. This cooperation between blacks and whites reflected the support among many Bostonians for the ideal of freedom and equality and also reflected the stable pattern of intergroup relations at the time (Cromwell 1994; Handlin 1975). However, the abolition movement was strongly objected to by the Irish in Boston who represented 60 percent of the Boston population just before the turn of the century. They feared competition from freed slaves who might invade Boston and the loss of security that came with having at least one social class below them. This perception among the Irish gained institutional support from the Catholic church which took the position that emancipation would erode the social fabric of society (Handlin 1975).

Although not as distinct until after the Civil War, there was a definite class structure. Cromwell's (1994) study of the black upper class finds many similarities between it and the white upper class. They were both primarily Boston-born, had similar political and religious affiliations, and had strong family-oriented values. Pleck (1979) finds that after emancipation, the blacks who migrated from the South were the cultural elite of the upper South and were therefore unrepresentative of the mass of freed slaves. Thus, they were more likely to have lighter skin tones,
to be literate, and to be urbanized than blacks from the South in general. There were of course, many limitations and variations for the black upper class on their expected status. The great majority of black Bostonians in the pre-industrial period were lower class. A major reason for this is directly related to the second condition for the lack of black settlement there which was the very narrow economic opportunities in Boston especially for blacks (Handlin 1975).

Cromwell (1993) notes that the economic position of antebellum free blacks in the North was actually quite unfavorable when compared to that of free blacks in the South. As Stapp (1993) explains, Boston was a commercial city with most capital resources used for outlying mill towns and therefore, had little to offer blue collar workers. This characteristic of Boston’s labor market was extremely limiting for blacks who were denied work in skilled occupations. Thus, most blacks were concentrated on the lower rungs of the occupational ladder. Most men were employed in low-paying, irregular jobs in Boston’s ports while many women worked as domestics which offered a stable income to families (Stapp 1993).

Antebellum Boston was characterized by relatively stable race relations between poor blacks and poor Irish but the Civil War heightened racial antagonism between blacks and the Irish (Pleck 1979). The Irish were against Boston’s involvement in the war and feared an influx of freed slaves from the South who they believed posed a threat to their jobs. They demanded the firing of blacks from even menial jobs and many went on strike to protest the hiring of blacks. Although they were often successful in their strikes, employers sometimes won over by hiring blacks to replace white workers which further increased racial hostility (Pleck 1979). There was also a certain socioeconomic equality which existed between poor blacks and poor Irish in antebellum Boston. However, in the thirty years before 1900, the gap between them widened mainly because socioeconomic conditions for the Irish, who by then constituted the majority in Boston, improved but remained the same for blacks (Pleck 1979).

Blacks, regardless of their skill, suffered in the labor market primarily because of racial discrimination. The two most common forms of discrimination were exclusion from semi-skilled and manufacturing jobs and unsuccessful competition for better paying jobs especially problematic for stable residents (Dubois 1969, Pleck 1979). Blacks were rarely promoted and more often
dismissed when they did secure better paying jobs. Employers were not interested in hiring available low-wage black labor for more skilled work because they were able to fill positions from the pool of white immigrants at a fixed rate and dismiss them when work was slack. While some were able to start businesses as grocers or barbers, business failures occurred at an alarming rate (Handlin 1975; Pleck 1979). In addition, property ownership was extremely limited in the black community.

During Reconstruction, some important changes occurred economically and politically. Black business began to achieve a competitive role and blacks in Massachusetts played a role in politics to a greater extent than in any other northern state (Cromwell 1994; Pleck 1979). Between 1866-1900, at least one or two black men a year were elected to the state legislature and at least one served on the City Council. In addition, the first black judge was elected in Boston in 1883. After Reconstruction, black office holding dwindled. Cromwell (1994) argues that the black upper class, who she refers to as "The Other Brahmins," were potentially able to wield some power but did not do so due to the group’s small size and scattered residence.

Prior to 1900, the black community in Boston could be found densely concentrated in a small area of the West End. This area was located on the northern slope of Beacon Hill and was known to white Bostonians as "Nigger Hill" (Handlin 1975; Pleck 1979). Horton and Horton (1979) describe antebellum Boston as a racially separated but not totally a segregated city. It paralleled many other nineteenth century cities in that there was no well-defined ghetto. In his study of New York, Philadelphia, and Boston in 1900, Dubois (1969) finds that contact with whites is broadest in Boston. By 1860 however, Boston was the most segregated northern city. But as Massey and Denton (1993) point out, the degree of segregation was moderate when compared with later historical periods. They also argue that in the nineteenth century, the disadvantaged residential condition of blacks had more to do with prejudice and discrimination in employment than in housing. This argument helps explain the geographic location of the black community. Since blacks were excluded from most skilled occupations, they were relegated to working in Boston’s ports as mariners and dock laborers (Stapp 1993). As Pleck (1979) explains, the black community grew where it did because it was bordered by the Charles River and thus located near major employers
of black labor. Small enclaves for middle-class blacks, whose residential choices were much less dependent on employment, developed outside the city limits in Cambridge and Chelsea.

Segregated housing inevitably contributed to racially divided schools. Schools became one of many separate institutions developed in the black community mainly out of necessity since blacks were excluded from the public schools. Even after a law was passed in 1855 allowing blacks in the public school system, school segregation continued de facto since school attendance areas were drawn according to neighborhood (Handlin 1975; Pleck 1979). Integrated schools became a major focus for protest groups and among black leadership.

**Boston in the Industrial Period**

By the early twentieth century, Boston’s black population had remained at a steady 3 percent of the population. Southern migration slowed considerably after the turn of the century and the black population grew very slowly during the depression years (Thernstrom 1973). With the expansion of streetcar railway service, the racial and class composition began to change. Following the Yankee elite, upper and middle class second-generation Irish were able to move out of Roxbury to newly developing suburban areas (Feagin 1974; Medoff and Sklar 1994). As they migrated, Jewish immigrants who were previously concentrated in working class enclaves replaced them. This pattern of racial transition continued as the predominantly black enclave in the West End had been pushed south. By 1930, the South End-Lower Roxbury area was almost completely black (Medoff and Sklar 1994; O’Connor 1993). There were black-owned businesses and two weekly newspapers that continued to thrive. A section of the neighborhood developed into an equivalent of a "Boston Harlem" with jazz clubs frequented by whites and blacks (O'Connor 1993). On the whole, the South End community was able to maintain an ethnic diversity for several decades.

Eisinger (1980) points out that like the Irish before the Civil War, urban blacks in the industrial period were concentrated in unskilled and marginal ranks of the labor market and were subject to severe discrimination in both employment and earnings. Thernstrom (1973) adds that there was virtually no improvement in the occupational position of black men in Boston between the late 19th century and the beginning of World War II. They remained heavily represented in menial labor and service positions. He also notes that blacks ranked far behind even the city’s first
generation immigrants as late as the 1930's and there was virtually no upward mobility in occupational status unlike immigrants and native-born whites.

As Boston began to fall behind larger cities like New York as a commercial center, it turned to manufacturing which was greatly facilitated by railway development (Edel, Sclar, and Luria; 1984). The development of the railway service also helped to produce an ethnically stratified city. Railway development facilitated landfill operations which expanded the land mass of Boston. This extra land was turned into suburban residential areas which enabled higher income people to move further out of the city (Edel et al. 1984; Medoff and Sklar 1994). Since most places of employment were still located within the core of the city, only the affluent were able to afford to commute on a daily basis. Poor white ethnic groups and blacks remained in the core of the city. Although Boston attempted to expand its borders through annexation, its failure to do so created a metropolis in which some jurisdictions grew at the expense of others (Edel et al. 1984). Beginning in the depression era of the 1930's, Boston experienced a decline in blue collar employment. This coupled with growing class segregated suburbanization took its toll on Boston as residential population declined, leaving a weaker economy and tax base behind (Medoff and Sklar 1994; Mollenkopf 1983). Areas with large black concentrations such as Roxbury and the South End were especially hard hit as manufacturing began to leave the area toward the end of the industrial period.

Before World War II, two distinct socio-political orientations had developed in the black community and reflected both class and regional differences (Jennings and King 1986). The two black newspapers reflected these two interests. One of these focused on the development of political influence for the purpose of patronage and consisted mainly of middle and working class southern migrants. One of the major areas of progress during this period was in politics. In the late 1930's, opportunity increased as a result of growing black electoral activism among individuals and leaders in this group. The South End-Roxbury area developed its own distinctive style of political organization. For instance, Shag Taylor, a prominent local pharmacist who ran for state representative was so influential in the black community that he was able to promise votes to the mayor in exchange for jobs, housing, and better municipal services (Jennings and King 1986; O'Connor 1993). Black voters in Massachusetts became the deciding factor in elections and used
this power to their advantage. The leadership was pluralistic though, with an array of organizations deciding the electoral direction of the community in an effort not to dilute the black vote. A historical first came in 1946 when the first black man in the twentieth century was elected to the Massachusetts state legislature (Jennings and King 1986).

The other group concentrated on a different kind of political activism organized around issues that affected blacks at the national level such as segregation in public places and the fight for anti-lynching laws. This group was essentially made up of middle and upper class northern born blacks who considered themselves "Black Bostonians." They provided a basis for the growth of organizations such as the NAACP and the Urban League. In terms of nativity, a third group in the black community was the West Indian population which supported both orientations.

While black political progress in the industrial period was significant, it is important to point out that in Boston, Irish Catholics were in control of the city. As a result of massive in-migration in the nineteenth century, they were in the majority by 1900 and used their electoral power to displace the new minority Yankee Protestant (Eisinger 1980). In 1884 they elected one of their own as mayor. These demographic and political transitions in Boston were significant for the black community because blacks and the Irish had a history of conflict that dated before the Civil War (Eisinger 1980; Formisano 1991). The Irish had long resented Yankee Protestant sympathies for black interests. Irish Catholic culture was also very tight-knit, personalist, and particular which carried over into the institutional and neighborhood structure (Formisano 1991).

Formisano (1991) characterizes New England and Boston in particular as tending to be more ethnicity-aware than other parts of the country. Boston's neighborhoods contained a high degree of localist pride and residents were highly conscious of turf. By the early 1900's, neighborhoods had become easily identifiable by ethnicity and class and often geographic markers which served as barriers for outsiders who in some neighborhoods were absolutely prohibited.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, Boston had more daily commuters entering its borders than New York and Chicago combined and was the forerunner of the suburbanization process (Edel et al. 1984). However, this suburbanization occurred strictly for the most affluent due in part to the cost of commuting. As a result, population growth occurred in the areas within two
miles of Boston’s City Hall. As living densities increased, the original city of Boston was transformed into slums. Blacks were more likely than any other group to be residentially confined to slums due to housing and employment discrimination (Medoff and Sklar 1994). They were limited to their South End-lower Roxbury neighborhoods. While most black Bostonians were excluded from the suburbanization process, the more affluent could be found in nearby Cambridge which was unique in that it was one of the least segregated cities in the U.S. by 1960.

Thernstrom (1973) argues that residential segregation did not have a causal effect on the occupational status of blacks because Russian-born Jewish immigrants, who were the second most segregated group, were better represented in white collar jobs than blacks. Similarly, Thernstrom (1973) notes that even though the black population had a low educational level during this period, this factor was not enough to account for the socioeconomic gap between them and other groups. In the early twentieth century, European immigrants were receiving substantially less education than blacks but were almost three times as likely to hold white collar jobs.

Throughout this period, the local organization of the black community and its leadership focused on education and housing location which were both seen as areas of exclusion (Edel et al. 1984). Black leaders fought for fair housing laws and integrated quality education - a struggle that would intensify in the modern industrial period.

**Boston in the Modern Industrial Period**

With the mechanization of southern agriculture and mining during the early 1950's, large numbers of African Americans migrated to northern cities like Boston. In 1940, blacks were only 3 percent of Boston’s population but this number steadily increased to 16 percent by 1970 and by 1980, the black population stood at 22 percent (Medoff and Sklar 1994). In comparison with other major cities, Boston did not experience a large absolute growth in the black population because it was not a magnet for blue-collar industry like other cities. Much of the growth was due to a decline in the white population in the city. Several neighborhoods experienced racial turnover during this period and the increased minority presence had the effect of elevating racial antagonism. From their study of black well-being in Boston, Blackwell and Hart (1982) find that since World War II, the city became increasingly perceived by many as not "livable" for blacks. They argue that the
manifestations of racism are evident in the lack of freedom of movement of blacks in the city. It was, in fact, during the modern industrial period that non-Bostonians became aware of the deep-seated ethnic separation and racial antagonism that had existed for many years but had not yet erupted. Similarly, Formisano (1991) argues that the influx of blacks into central cities, especially in Boston, aroused racial consciousness and helped make various white groups less conscious of their ethnic differences. Thus, white antagonism was diverted to blacks. However, just as in previous periods, black neighborhoods developed and maintained strong elements of community life such as churches and social clubs. This was true even though black neighborhoods were experiencing high concentrations of poverty and unemployment and by the 1960's had become the target of urban renewal planners (Blackwell and Hart 1982; Mollenkopf 1983). While these efforts presented many challenges for the black community, urban renewal of the 1960's also served to unify the community around a common goal of neighborhood preservation.

Mollenkopf (1983) characterizes Boston as a perfect example of the postindustrial transformation of an old industrial city. He explains that early on, the city was a center of trade and commerce which is why it later developed a strong banking and service center and became a site for corporate headquarters and, educational and medical institutions. During the industrial period Boston developed into a largely blue collar white ethnic city. But between the Depression-era of the 1930's and the late 1950's, blue-collar employment dropped dramatically, the city lost population and jobs to the suburbs, and the racial and ethnic composition of the city began to change as whites moved to developing suburbs. Boston did not recover economically from the Depression until the 1960's. Part of the recovery was the creation of Route 128 around Boston which became a suburban magnet for high-technology industries (Medoff and Sklar 1994). By the late 1970's, a large number of electronics and computer firms had moved into the Boston area and industrial parks were constructed, which fostered economic growth (Blackwell and Hart 1982). Education is also a big business in Boston. By the 1980's, there were almost seventy colleges and universities in the greater Boston area which employed thousands of workers who live in Boston and surrounding areas (Blackwell and Hart 1982). These educational institutions have contributed heavily to the economic growth of the city by attracting research funds and large numbers of students. Another major factor
in Boston's economic growth was that by 1960, economic and political leaders joined forces in a pro-growth political coalition (Mollenkopf 1983). This coalition decided that Boston's central business district and adjacent strategic neighborhoods would be used for redevelopment.

However, neighborhoods in which blacks were concentrated benefitted little as manufacturing industries left the area and residents became displaced due to redevelopment plans. By 1985, blacks were 22 percent of the Boston workforce but only 12 percent of the professional, technical, and managerial employees (Medoff and Sklar 1994). This suggests that blacks in Boston continued to be disadvantaged in the labor market. Blackwell and Hart (1982) find that in 1980, blacks in Boston had a skewed educational attainment from medium to low and that 53 percent had incomes below the poverty level. In addition, 25 percent were unemployed which was the highest rate among all five of the major urban areas they study (Cleveland, Houston, Boston, Atlanta, and Los Angeles).

Since the post-Civil War decades, Irish Catholics dominated Boston politics (Formisano 1991). This political culture was characterized by a high degree of patronage and Boston developed a strong tradition of machine politics (Eisinger 1980; Mollenkopf 1983). As the city began to experience economic decline following the Depression, the existing political structure was unwilling to respond. According to Mollenkopf (1983), certain conditions of the political structure impeded change: weak and fragmented patronage politics, lack of fiscal capacity, and a lack of powerful and independent development agency. All of these conditions began to change after 1958 when a pro-growth mayor was elected who was willing to enlist business support and who appointed like-minded redevelopment administrators. The 1960 election of a Democratic president and Congress willing to increase federal spending on urban renewal also had a major impact on the economic growth of Boston.

Urban renewal plans in Boston had the effect of unifying and empowering the black community in an effort to preserve their communities (Jennings and King 1986; Mollenkopf 1983). In their analysis of Boston politics, Jennings and King (1986) see three stages of black politics corresponding to each decade between 1950 and 1980: the service stage, the organization stage, and the institution building stage. During the organization stage of the 1960's, black activism against
urban renewal created a voice with which to contend with urban politicians for power. In the end, black community leaders experienced upward mobility and became integrated into local government and dominant institutions (Mollenkopf 1983). However, this integration was limited. Even though most urban renewal programs came to an end by the mid-1970's, neighborhood activism against renewal had created a polarization in politics between those in support of the "New Boston" and those who vowed to respond to the needs of neighborhoods against renewal. Kevin White won the mayoral election in 1968 by appealing to both business interests and to those who felt alienated from government and were against renewal which included many African Americans (Mollenkopf 1983). White served as mayor between 1968 and 1982 and exerted a great deal of control over city government. Jennings and King (1986) argue that White used several strategies to prevent black political leadership such as the hiring of highly visible but ineffective blacks in government positions. Between 1950 and 1982, the at-large electoral system in Boston did prevent black candidates from winning since the majority of the black community was concentrated in five adjacent wards. Until 1977, no blacks had served on the school committee which often served as a stepping stone for political office (Formisano 1991). In 1967, the first African American was elected to the city council and 1971 was the first year a black man was to run for mayor. In 1983, Boston did institute a district-based system for the election of city council and school committee members but the lines that were finally approved by the mayor put the black and Latino community at a disadvantage (Jennings and King 1986).

The modern industrial period was a time of great conflict and change for Boston's neighborhoods and schools. In an effort to respond to rising city expenses, increase tax revenues and reverse urban decline, Boston, like other major cities embarked upon massive urban renewal projects (Medoff and Sklar 1994). In 1960, a new head of the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) was appointed who, like the new mayor, was committed to urban renewal and the creation of a "New Boston."

The BRA approved the bulldozing of low-income neighborhoods near the central business district to make way for office and retail complexes, upscale housing and hotels (Mollenkopf 1983; Medoff and Sklar 1994). The South End Renewal Project became the first largest residential urban
renewal program in the 1960's. The official plan called for the demolishing of the most dilapidated structures which were located in the poorest sections of Boston (Mollenkopf 1983).

Blacks in Boston were disproportionately affected by urban renewal projects because they were more likely to live in low-income neighborhoods targeted for renewal and were more concentrated than other groups (Mollenkopf 1983). The high degree of residential segregation blacks experienced was the result of persistent housing discrimination in the form of redlining, blockbusting, and unfair lending practices. While tax money was subsidizing the building of segregated blue-collar suburbs, black neighborhoods were stripped of jobs, homes, and government services. Medoff and Sklar (1994) cite one example in which more than fifty years of Jewish settlement in three contiguous neighborhoods was overturned in a two-year period in the late 1960's as a result of blockbusting by realtors. The homes in these neighborhoods were then sold to blacks at inflated prices. And although generally denied by banks, for a short period of time blacks were granted home mortgage loans but only in these neighborhoods.

When the BRA agreed to demolish low-income minority neighborhoods, blacks were forced to find new housing. Mollenkopf (1983) argues that the South End Urban Renewal Plan had a basic objective of upgrading the area's physical composition rather than upgrading the quality of housing opportunities for its current residents. As a result of urban renewal, the remaining black community was crowded into public housing projects and subsidized housing clustered near the existing black ghetto. Thus, urban renewal actually increased racial segregation and poverty concentration. Edel et al. (1984) point out that even though Massachusetts has one of the strongest laws in the nation against housing discrimination, the overwhelming majority of blacks remained in the inner city neighborhoods of the South End, Roxbury, and Dorchester.

Discrimination in housing denied blacks the opportunity to move to affordable blue-collar suburbs. Whites who also could not afford to move or did not desire to move, remained in their ethnically homogeneous neighborhoods (Blackwell and Hart 1982; Formisano 1991).

In the 1970's, the national economic recession had hit the city of Boston with severity and affected both whites and blacks. Formisano (1991) characterizes Boston's public schools by the late 1960's as in poor physical condition and low educational quality with the majority of students
coming from low-income families. In addition, the high degree of racial residential segregation resulted in extremely segregated school districts.

Although 25% of the students in Boston’s public schools were black in 1965, only one in 200 teachers was black and there were no black principals. The Boston school committee had never had a black member. The educational environment for black students was even worse than for white students. The schools that black students attended were decayed, the books were extremely outdated and, like other educational materials, were in poor condition.

After the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education decision, the struggle for school integration began in the South. It was not until the mid-1960’s that the struggle moved to the North. The highly influential, all-white school committee in Boston was against integration and refused to enforce a state law outlawing racially imbalanced schools. Most city leaders including the mayor had very little involvement with the issue of school integration and allowed the school committee to make decisions without interfering. As in the two previous historical periods, the black community in Boston was highly concerned with educational opportunity as a means for achieving equality and socioeconomic mobility. The NAACP and other community activists became heavily involved in the struggle for integration. Parents organized school boycotts and ran candidates for the school committee but lost. Some activists even started their own parent-run, independent, Afrocentric schools. However, by 1972, black parents went a step further and under NAACP leadership, they filed a class action suit against the school committee in a federal district court. In 1974, a federal court found that the Boston school committee was guilty of consciously maintaining a racially imbalanced school system. The judge ordered immediate city-wide busing.

A major issue raised by social scientists who have studied busing in Boston is that it excluded intermunicipal busing and as a result, exempted white suburbs (Edel et al. 1984; Formisano 1991). Thus, desegregation involved mainly the black and white lower classes and the resulting conflict became not only a racial issue but also a class issue. The white upper class was insulated from integration and the suburban tax bases were off limits to reform efforts. The white lower class perceived their few resources, including their schools, as threatened. Since the beginning of the modern industrial period, the tax base in the city of Boston was on a steady decline. Nearly every
racial and ethnic group was hurt by Boston’s economic decline. Formisano (1991) notes that some social scientists have made a connection between the level of unemployment and the degree of anti-busing action in white neighborhoods. He argues that not only material resources were perceived as threatened but also a way of life for white Bostonians. In white lower class neighborhoods, "the high schools were cherished less as vehicles for upward mobility but more as community socializing agents" (Formisano 1991).

Less than a mile separated the two communities in which busing would occur. These communities - the predominantly black Roxbury and the predominantly white South Boston - were two of the poorest in Boston. On the first day of busing Roxbury was quiet. However, in South Boston, a city-wide school boycott was organized by whites resulting in over half of the white students staying home. White parents gathered outside schools to protest the busing. In some cases, the protesting turned violent. During the early days of busing, several violent protests in South Boston made the news around the world. Many non-Bostonians were shocked by this violent white resistance in a city known as the "Cradle of Liberty." Other forms of resistance included noncompliance of the court order for desegregation and abandonment of the city and school system. During the first two years of desegregation, almost one third of the white students had left the Boston public school system.

Formisano (1991) argues that anti-busing was strong in Boston because of its history and political culture. Some of the historical facts he notes are: black and Irish clashing before the Civil War, Yankee Protestant sympathies of black interests and their disdain for the Irish, the Irish revolt against the war and backlash against abolition. And even though after 1900, the political culture in Boston was dominated by the Irish Catholic, their political hegemony was not matched by a sense of socioeconomic security. Thus, any socioeconomic gains made by other racial and ethnic groups were viewed as threats and staunchly resisted.

What was ironic about the conflict over school desegregation was that busing was intended to improve the access and quality of education for black children but they were bused to schools in a poor white community with low quality run-down schools. In the fight for quality education, blacks in Boston would have to overcome other barriers such as housing discrimination and urban
decline. For black Bostonians, having a history of disadvantage and being in the minority has made their struggle even more difficult, even in a city that has been experiencing social and economic growth.
CHAPTER 4
ATLANTA: A SOCIOHISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Atlanta in the Pre-industrial Period

The third city in this analysis is Atlanta, Georgia. Unlike the two other cities in this study, Atlanta is a southern city with a long history of having a relatively large black population. Bayor (1996), who examines how race shaped the development of the city of Atlanta, notes that the way in which race affected various city elements and services was openly and frankly discussed in a way not evident in northern cities. This observation was more than likely quite typical of southern cities during the pre-industrial period. Thus, even though racially based policies in both Detroit and Boston were part of city development, Atlanta is unique in that from its beginning, race was a factor in all aspects of official policy.

In his analysis of race relations in the urban South during Reconstruction, Rabinowitz (1978) makes a point which illustrates the significance of studying Atlanta before and after emancipation. He notes that historians rarely discuss African Americans in the urban South and have viewed slavery and emancipation within a rural context. Although only 15 percent of southern blacks lived in cities in 1890, Atlanta’s black population soared to almost half in less than a decade after emancipation (Bayor 1996; Rabinowitz 1978).

Hunter (1997) explains that urban slavery had distinct advantages and disadvantages compared to rural slavery which also made the emergence and development of the black community unique when compared to the rural South. Among its advantages was that urban slavery allowed for more independence and autonomy of slaves and permitted casual contact between free and unfree people, and between blacks and whites. Many slaves had absentee slave owners who lived outside of the city. During the Civil War there was an increased demand for black labor which made it beneficial for many slave owners to hire out slaves. Others were forced to abandon slaves due to
financial strains. While pass systems and curfews were instituted to limit mobility, they were not strictly enforced. As a result, slaves were able to take part in a limited communal life which included socializing in markets, street corners, and churches. However, in many cases there was more isolation and overwork in urban slavery.

African Americans actively forged their own institutions, amenities, and a sense of place in the highly exclusionary city of Atlanta. Churches, mutual aid, and benevolent associations played a critical role in community development (Bayor 1996; Hunter 1997). Out of necessity, the religious, social, and political purposes of these organizations often overlapped.

It was during the tumultuous Civil War years that the black population in Atlanta truly began to expand. Fleeing embattled areas of the Confederacy, refugee slave holders arrived in Atlanta with their slaves (Hunter 1997). With the increased population, problems of social control soon became an issue in the city which did not exist in rural areas. As a result, slaves were often able to flee. Many slave owners were forced to abandon slaves due to financial reasons. When the war was over, many newly freed slaves remained in the city. Women made up the majority of the population increase and many journeyed on foot from rural areas after the war.

It was clear that survival and family reconstruction were the highest priorities of ex-slaves in the postwar period (Hunter 1997; Rabinowitz 1978). The existence of relatively small urban families had its benefits which allowed for shared living quarters and the pooling of resources. Both blacks and white New England missionaries built the institutions that fostered the development and growth of the black enclaves. By 1870, three major black enclaves were in place. Schools, colleges, and churches were built and along with the black press, all served to unify the black community. However, before the end of the war, blacks had already established a well-defined class structure consisting mainly of a small group of elites and a lower class. There were major divisions between these two groups concerning the direction and type of black progress and improvement (Rabinowitz 1978). This division was illustrated well when Booker T. Washington, delivered his famous "Atlanta Compromise" speech at the 1895 Cotton States and International Exposition (Bayor 1996). He encouraged the black community to emphasize self-help in their struggle for economic progress and supported the idea of racial separation in social matters. His accommodationist philosophy was
not well received by others in the black community, especially those with fewer resources to engage in self-help (Bayor 1996; Rabinowitz 1978). This class division in the black community was to continue and be of great significance throughout the industrial and modern industrial periods.

Because the city served as a railroad depot for neighboring farmers, in 1845 it was given the name "Atlanta" for the Western and Atlantic Railroads (Bullard and Thomas 1989). Atlanta was unique among cities of the antebellum South because of its absence of crop agriculture and city leaders engaged in the process of city-building touted Atlanta as progressively unique among southern cities (Hunter 1997). Even though the city was destroyed by Union forces during the Civil War, its geographic location proved vital to its growth with the expansion of the railroads. By 1880, it was rebuilt and city officials were promoting it as the "Gateway of the South" due to its increasing importance as a transportation and distribution center (Bullard and Thomas 1989). The city attracted young businessmen from the North and South who were interested in commerce and industry. And in 1895, it hosted the Cotton States and International Exposition which celebrated its rebirth.

During slavery, blacks in Atlanta performed domestic work in private homes, boarding houses and hotels. The proportion of the white population that owned slaves in the city was higher than in rural areas even though individual holdings were smaller (Hunter 1997). Even lower class whites in the city could at least afford to hire slaves as helpers. As a result, it was common for slaves to work for whites of nearly similar economic circumstances. After the Civil War, ex-slaves left rural areas of Georgia and migrated to Atlanta and joined those already residing in the city in search of employment opportunities. Occupational attainment was closely tied to training and schooling, and both were severely limited for blacks. Thus, black women had little choice other than to take work as domestics and black men were concentrated in unskilled labor (Bayor 1996). However, Rabinowitz (1978) argues that urban blacks were better educated and more prosperous than their rural counterparts. There was also a small black middle class consisting mainly of teachers and ministers and a few lawyers. Some were self-employed as barbers and grocers. Although black men earned more than black women, unemployment occurred frequently for male common laborers and the disproportionately high mortality rates among black men took its toll on black families (Hunter 1997).
While work for black women was mainly limited to working in the homes of white families, another form of domestic work was to become a laundress, an occupation which soon became the most common form of domestic work (Hunter 1997). Laundry work was an optimal choice because it could be done outside of the employers' home and thus, allowed for more autonomy. It was in the immediate postwar years that black women began negotiating new terms for their labor across the South. This situation presented a challenge for former slaves who were now employees and slave owners who were now employees. A severe economic depression in the 1870's affected workers across the nation which led to numerous strikes. In Atlanta, black laundresses protested in their attempt to secure autonomy, fair wages, and to protect their place in the labor market against Chinese immigrant launderers. The most infamous of these protests was the 1881 Washerwomen's Strike. Hunter (1997) argues that the strike illustrated the dialectic of repression and resistance. As part of their protest, laundry workers compiled lists of employees who engaged in unfair labor practices. In response, white women organized against the laundry workers to prevent them from working for other employees. The outcome of the strike was to raise the wages of some but more importantly, it increased the awareness of the laundry workers' role in the New South economy. The strike was also indicative of the increased political participation of blacks during the period.

It was, of course, not until emancipation that blacks were truly able to participate in Atlanta politics. As of 1868, blacks could legally vote in the South and hold office (Bayor 1996). In his study of Atlanta politics between 1868 and 1890, Watts (1974) argues that while blacks formed a large proportion of Atlanta's voters, and gained a limited voice in city affairs, political progress was largely an illusion for them. The reason for this lies in the fact that as soon as blacks became eligible to vote, city and state efforts to curtail that vote began. These efforts included: a municipal poll tax requirement to be paid in full before voting, stringent registration laws, a switch from ward-based to at-large elections of councilmen, and the institution of the white citizen's primary (Bayor 1996; Watts 1978). Since blacks were residentially segregated, the ward-based system of election was more beneficial. During a period of ward system elections, one African American was elected to the city council (Bayor 1996). However, the at-large system was brought back and Atlanta would not elect another African American to city office until 1953. Watts (1974) argues that during
Reconstruction, black candidates in Atlanta appeared only when whites were seriously divided and were willing to compete with each other for the black vote. As Hunter (1997) points out, the city, though progressive economically, resisted social and political change. Although the black community organized to eliminate restrictions on political participation, by the 1890's, black political activity declined dramatically (Watts 1974).

As noted previously, the ward system of elections in the city was beneficial for blacks because blacks became increasingly concentrated residentially after the Civil War. Immediately after the war, blacks were located in areas around the city's periphery, in alleys and in the rear servant's quarters of white homes which was typical of most of the South (Bayor 1996; Massey and Denton 1993). However, as the black population increased a decade after the war, concentrations evolved on land that whites did not want such as near cemeteries, flood zones, and low-lying areas. Hunter (1997) points out that by the late 1870's, signs of Jim Crow laws were already noticeable. City officials implemented policies which resulted in the uneven development of the city infrastructure. As part of the rebuilding of Atlanta after the war, city officials focused on upgrading the central business district (CBD) which is where wealthy whites lived (Bayor 1996). In the delivery of municipal services, black and poor neighborhoods were severely neglected.

While these policies were largely class-biased, areas in which blacks resided were most neglected by the city. It was during Reconstruction that a lasting change in race-based policies took place. After the Civil War, black neighborhoods and other aspects of black life in Atlanta and across the South were the product of exclusionary policies (Hunter 1997; Rabinowitz 1978). Gradually, segregation replaced exclusion as Jim Crow laws increased. By the 1890's, there was a clear pattern of black exclusion from the inner core and growing concentrations on the east, west, and south sides.

Hunter (1997) asserts that one of the highest priorities for ex-slaves in the postwar period was literacy and education as strategies for achieving economic self-sufficiency and political autonomy. There were secret schools across Georgia prior to emancipation. After the war, education was provided by northern missionaries, then later in 1872, state-supported public education was established by the Republican party (Rabinowitz 1978). Urban blacks had much greater access to education than those in rural areas and many left rural areas after the war because
of educational opportunities. However, these opportunities were limited still since the public education agreed upon in Georgia initially excluded blacks. Later, in 1890, the inclusion of blacks was approved but only with blacks and whites being strictly segregated. Although neither black nor white schools were well-funded, black schools like black neighborhoods were much worse. The black schools were overcrowded, the student-teacher ratio was extremely high and attempts were made to keep the curriculum strictly for vocational training (Bayor 1996).

In 1867, with donations from the American Missionary Society, Atlanta University was founded and became part of the consortium of six private black colleges that make up the Atlanta University Center (Bullard and Thomas 1989). The consortium includes Morehouse College and its sister school, Spelman College and has led the way in producing an educated black elite. In Atlanta, nearly all members of the black middle class have ties to the Atlanta University Center. Access to this educational institution thus became highly beneficial for blacks in Atlanta who were in a position to take advantage of it and beneficial also and for the progress of the black community. While the black elite made up only a small proportion of the black community during this period, its influence and connections became vital.

Although opportunities for and access to mobility were severely limited for most blacks in Atlanta, it can be argued that the black community used these limitations to increase their autonomy and collective power (Bayor 1996; Dittmer 1977). For instance, the black community organized to secure better schools while at the same time setting up their own private schools. Such grassroots organizing would prove vital for the challenges of the industrial period.

**Atlanta in the Industrial Period**

A decade before the turn of the century, the proportion of Atlanta's population that was black began to decline. In 1870, blacks made up nearly half of the city's population but by 1900 and throughout the industrial period, they made up only a third of the city's population (Bayor 1996; Eisinger 1980). Hunter (1997) argues that blacks were optimistic as they settled in the city after the Civil War, but they increasingly found it necessary to find ways of escaping mounting repression. Atlanta was the heart of the burgeoning New South and it was considered a progressive city economically but not in its race, gender, and labor relations. In a sense, the city was a paradox for
blacks in that it offered the hope of freedom and socioeconomic mobility but also the sad realization
that many rights and opportunities for them were severely limited and often denied.

The post-Civil War decades witnessed a broadening of the functions and institutional base
of the black community in part to accommodate the influx of displaced rural blacks. By the turn of
the century, there was also a clear trend toward a physical, social, and economic separation of black
and white communities (Hunter 1997). De facto segregation gave way to de jure segregation as Jim
Crow legislation increased. At the turn of the century, the streetcar had replaced the railroad as a
means of transportation and became one of the first institutions subjected to Jim Crow legislation.
In response, blacks protested by refusing to sit in the rear and boycotted the streetcars from 1892
to 1906. This was just one of many forms of resistance blacks engaged in during the early decades
of the twentieth century in Atlanta. The black community organized around other issues such as
police brutality and lack of representation on the police force, however, blacks were not hired until
1948 (Bayor 1996).

In response to the growth of black community institutions, increased political activism and
leverage, whites violently attacked blacks on the streets of Atlanta in 1906 (Silver and Moeser
1995). This incident became known as the "riot of 1906" and had lasting effects on the city's race
relations and the development of the black community. It became essential for blacks to develop
private institutions to substitute for the public services denied to them. Black businesses which had
existed before the riot were forced out of the central business district and relocated to the east side.

By 1920, thousands of blacks had left Atlanta and migrated out of the South all-together.
Prior to World War I, blacks migrated primarily to contiguous southern states, but after the war,
many began to move to northern industrial cities. As Hunter (1997) explains, economic conditions
were the major impetus for migration but other factors such as a rise in Ku Klux Klan activity, the
increasing popularity of anti-black media such as "The Birth of a Nation," and a general fear of
white violence also contributed. Across the South, labor agents from northern employers facilitated
migration north and black newspapers advertised jobs in the North. Friends and family members
who had already migrated, offered advice and support to others regarding jobs and housing. But
migration often became a class issue as those who could not afford to leave the South remained.
There was however, a well-established upper class within Atlanta's black community drawn from business and professional circles and most were linked by an affiliation with the Atlanta University Center which comprised six black educational institutions (Silver and Moeser 1995). In terms of its size and affluence in the South, the black upper class in Atlanta ranked second only to that in New Orleans. W.E.B. Du Bois became a professor at Atlanta University in 1897 and was known internationally for his work. Leading businesses centered on real estate, banking, and insurance. By 1940, the largest black-owned bank was founded in Atlanta. Dittmer (1977) argues that although Atlanta had no antebellum mulatto aristocracy as in other Georgia cities, it too was known for the skin tone stratification in the black community. Many in the black elite were lighter-skinned and were often accused of having more advantages.

This elite class did however, serve a number of functions such as creating self-help organizations for those in need. They also served as the black community's link with the white business and political elite which helped to secure much needed resources for the black community. This biracial coalition negotiated and compromised on several issues affecting the black community. One of the most significant of these issues was the direction in which black community growth would take. As black business grew between 1920 and 1940, so too did its separation from white Atlanta and the creation of a dual system of commerce. Silver and Moeser (1995) assert that the physical, social and economic separation of the black community represented a compromise in the face of racial tension. In many ways, the black community in the industrial period functioned like a separate city.

Significant commercial and industrial expansion took place in Atlanta during the first quarter of the twentieth century and the city's economy became more diversified (Bullard and Thomas 1989; Eisinger 1980). Although this was a period of rapid industrialization in the U.S., Atlanta did not become a manufacturing center but instead became a regional city for banking and finance. In 1914, the city was selected as one of twelve Federal Reserve Bank cities in the country. The city also further developed as a distribution and transportation center. In 1924, it leased land for a new municipal airport (Eisinger 1980). And in 1925, the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce launched its million dollar "Forward Atlanta" program to increase the city's industrial base (Bullard
The program was successful in adding industries, especially those doing business with the state government and as a result, soon became a government center. During the 1920's, most of the capital invested in Atlanta came from outside the southeastern region and went into office building. In 1930, air routes were established and the relocation in 1941 of Delta Airlines from Louisiana made the city a central air transfer point for the entire Southeast (Eisinger 1980).

For blacks in Atlanta, economic expansion meant little. Labor market choices remained severely limited for black men and women. It was mainly economic conditions that prompted black migration to northern industrial centers. This migration also coincided with the increase in the migration of unskilled white workers from rural parts of Georgia into Atlanta which increased competition for jobs (Bayor 1996; Dittmer 1977). A struggle began in many industries over what had been labeled "Negro jobs" and employers were pressured to replace black workers with whites. Blacks were also denied membership in most labor unions.

Although black men were primarily confined to unskilled manual labor, unlike black women, they were employed in a diversity of industrial, commercial, and public jobs (Hunter 1997). The percentage of black female workers performing domestic work declined slightly between 1900 and 1920 but, black women were still expected to engage in household labor and white women were willing to protect their position in the labor market (Bayor 1996). For example, just before the turn of the century, white female workers at a textile mill went on strike when black women were hired (Hunter 1997). Similarly, during World War I, manufacturing firms engaged in war production were not willing to hire black women which continued to limit their labor market choices to domestic work and facilitated the entry of white women into war production. The other kinds of work available to black women were as laundresses, seamstresses, dressmakers, and tailors.

Black opportunities in the labor market were restricted in various other ways. In 1930, faced with rising unemployment, some white Atlantans founded the Order of Black Shirts for the purpose of driving blacks out of even menial jobs (Stone 1989). Also, during the industrial period in the South, the need for a large supply of cheap labor led to state tactics likened to involuntary servitude (Dittmer 1977). For example, convicted criminals were often leased out for labor on chain gangs.
and blacks were disproportionately victimized by this system (Lichtenstein 1996). Also, blacks were more likely than whites to be convicted for minor offenses and to receive longer sentences.

In response to harsh treatment, blacks in Atlanta organized secret societies engaged in union organizing and utilized fraternal orders for employment information. The Atlanta Urban League played a vital role in helping blacks secure employment. But without political power, blacks had very little leverage at their disposal to alter their position.

During the industrial period, significant political changes occurred for blacks in Atlanta. The race riot of 1906 marked the beginning of that change. Hunter (1997) explains that the riot was precipitated primarily by the 1905 to 1906 gubernatorial campaign in which both candidates preyed on whites’ fear of competition from blacks for jobs at a time when rural white migration into the city was on the rise. The candidates vowed to defend white supremacy. The Atlanta press contributed to the racial tension by running stories of alleged rapes of white women by black men. On September 22, 1906, an angry mob of mainly young, lower class, white men began attacking blacks on the streets in addition to destroying black businesses (Dittmer 1977). The riot lasted four days and at least twenty blacks were killed. The riot marked a turning point in the institutionalization of Jim Crow laws.

Hunter (1997) further explains that the violence which erupted in 1906 had deeper roots in the anxiety of whites over such issues of power as: increased black political leverage, retaliatory campaigns by blacks against police brutality, the acquisition of property and the development of black social and educational institutions. The riot in Atlanta did not represent an isolated incident since over thirty similar incidents occurred throughout the South between 1898 and 1908. White southerners had become increasingly fearful of black advancements, especially political advancements. In 1908, a state law disfranchised most blacks by stipulating property ownership, literacy, and other special requirements for voting (Bayor 1996). The poll tax and the white primary remained firmly in place for several decades. As a result, between the first decade of the twentieth century and 1946, blacks were never more than 11 percent of registered voters in Atlanta. Blacks were also alienated from city government when in the 1920's the Ku Klux Klan was revived and was
significant in city elections, exhibited best when the city elected a Klansman as mayor in 1922 (Bayor 1996; Stone 1989).

However, black political activity was not completely diminished. Black leaders used the emergence of an NAACP chapter in 1917 to mobilize the black community politically. The NAACP lobbied with the government for better schools and city services, investigated lynching and other cases of racial injustice, and attempted to increase black registration (Bayor 1996; Dittmer 1977). In the 1930's, citizenship schools were started by black leaders to educate blacks about the political process and the black press continued to emphasize the significance of voting for political and economic mobility. These efforts paid off since blacks were allowed to vote in special-elections such as for bond referendums and recalls. In 1932, blacks were able to defeat a recall of mayor James Key who was sympathetic to the black community (Bayor 1996; Silver and Moeser 1995). The Atlanta Civic and Political League was formed in 1934 to encourage blacks to register by emphasizing the ability of the black community to defeat bond issues if funds were not designated for its use.

In the 1940's, black political influence was greatly increased as a result of state and federal rulings (Silver and Moeser 1995). The state repealed the poll tax in 1945 and a U.S. Supreme Court ruling abolished the white primary in 1946 which allowed blacks to vote in primary elections. Also beneficial was the election of mayor William Hartsfield in 1936, a racial moderate, who served almost a quarter of a century.

The political changes of the 1940's marked a permanent change in black political influence in Atlanta. Stone (1989) describes Atlanta's regime politics since the 1940's as deeply intertwined with race relations. Some actors within the system were able to overcome the divisive character of race well enough to achieve cooperation. And as Eisinger (1980) notes, once blacks were allowed to fully utilize their voting power, they did so in greater numbers than either lower or upper income whites. Thus, the black vote became very influential and was to serve as a silent voting bloc in the city's ruling coalition. With the help of Mayor Hartsfield, a biracial coalition was forged and maintained between the city's corporate elite and older, more conservative leaders of the black community well into the 1960's (Eisinger 1980; Silver and Moeser 1995). Increased political power
also led to the hiring of black police officers and the election of an African American to the Board of Education. In 1949, the black community organized the nonpartisan Atlanta Negro Voters League whose purpose was to mobilize the black community politically and prevent the splitting of the black vote (Bayor 1996). These efforts would prove to be extremely beneficial in the modern industrial period for turning black political access into power.

Black residential patterns in Atlanta during the industrial period were significantly impacted by the riot in 1906. While segregation existed previously, Silver and Moeser (1995) explain that the lines of demarcation between black and white neighborhoods ceased to be as fluid after the riot. Black residential expansion became a matter of public policy concern early on in the century as part of a larger movement in the South toward legally sanctioned housing segregation. Atlanta was the first Georgia city to attempt segregation by law and city zoning ordinances were established to limit expansion of black neighborhoods (Dittmer 1977). For instance, a 1913 ordinance assigned a racial designation to every city block based on the race of the majority of residents (Massey and Denton 1993; Stone 1989). In 1916, the NAACP filed a suit in federal court over a segregation law and a year later, the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional. However, the city also employed restrictive covenants and deed restrictions so that the city-wide dispersion of blacks became much less apparent and blacks were forced to move to areas whites no longer found desirable.

Residential segregation in the South developed at a much slower pace than in the North and in Atlanta, the process was slow but steady throughout the industrial period. In the 1920's, attempts at racial zoning were part of a metropolitan planning initiative which operated under the assumption that a controlled growth of black neighborhoods was necessary for a socially better city (Silver and Moeser 1995). This planning initiative determined that blacks would be confined to the west of the city and by 1940, more than one third of the city's black community lived on the west side of Atlanta. There were also census tracts surrounding the central business district in which blacks were heavily concentrated.

While the city was making plans for where blacks should live, Herman Perry, a black realtor and developer began purchasing land on the west side and used it to develop modern middle class housing for blacks (Bayor 1996; Dittmer 1977). Thus, while black residential expansion was being
limited, middle class blacks were able to live in middle class neighborhoods even though they were segregated. Silver and Moeser (1995) point out that although blacks had a much lower homeownership rate than whites in 1940, the most salient factor affecting black homeownership was not the degree of integration but rather residential location. The more affluent in the black community lived on the west side which is where the largest proportion of black owner-occupied households were located.

In the 1930's, low-income blacks who lived around the central business district were subject to the nation's first slum clearance project organized by a coalition of business leaders with downtown property (Stone 1989). Both business and population had begun moving away from the downtown area and in an attempt to protect property values, this coalition proposed public housing as a means by which slums could be replaced and redevelopment could take place. Urban renewal would become the trend in the modern industrial period and would seriously disadvantage blacks in poor neighborhoods.

While class could often determine the quality of one's neighborhood in Atlanta, race was the single most important factor in determining the quality of education received (Bayor 1996). Because schools were segregated, the allocation of funds was the major issue. Black schools suffered from overcrowding, lack of facilities, and extremely high teacher-student ratios. In 1941, Atlanta's school-aged population was nearly 40 percent black yet only 16 percent of school funds were used for black schools. The first black high school was built in 1921 as a result of black political mobilization. Through voter registration drives to increase black voting on bond referendums, blacks were able to win concessions for education (Dittmer 1977; Stone 1989). Blacks also responded to inequities in schooling by utilizing black colleges and churches which offered elementary and high school classes. The NAACP and other civic organizations continued to protest and petition the board of education for reform. However, a change would not come until school desegregation was truly challenged by the Supreme Court in the 1950's.
Atlanta in the Modern Industrial Period

By the 1950's, Atlanta was rapidly becoming one of the, if not the most important city in the southeastern U.S. The city's booming, progressive economy, and modern approach to race relations made it the epitome of a New South city. After World War II, there was a huge jump in metropolitan area population as a result of several factors. In 1952, under the Plan of Improvement, the city annexed several outlying suburbs and since the 1960's it has brought migrants from rustbelt cities and rural parts of the South, corporate developers, and immigrants from Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Eastern Europe (Rutheiser 1996; Stone 1989). By 1970, the central city made up only 35.8% of the SMSA population and by 1980 it had become the sixteenth largest SMSA in the nation. The rise in African American population within the city has been most dramatic. In 1960, blacks made up 38.3% of the population in the city of Atlanta but by 1980, they made up roughly 67% (Bayor 1996; Bullard and Thomas 1989). This increase was the result of both high rates of immigration of blacks from rustbelt cities and rural southern blacks who were deprived of work due to the mechanization of agriculture. The increase in black population within the city was also due to white migration to outlying suburbs (Smith 1981).

The diversity of people and origins that have come to exist in Atlanta during the modern industrial period occurred as part of a larger transformation of the sunbelt region. Since the 1960's, the black community and the city itself has undergone dramatic changes especially in the area of race relations. While the black community had always engaged in some form of activism, the national Civil Rights Movement occurring throughout the South beginning in the 1950's had a major impact on change in Atlanta. Harmon (1996) describes the city as the embodiment of the New South ideology. He says that whites in Atlanta wanted progress and modernity along with the civility and traditionalism of the Old South. Therefore, the Civil Rights Movement provided a challenge to the white establishment. The black community included a relatively large, well-established black middle and upper class who were politically sophisticated and leaders who were ready to take on the challenge of civil rights. Atlanta was unique among cities of the South because it had the public image of a city relatively free from the region's prejudices and had a reputation for a lack of overt racial conflict (Harmon 1996). City officials took pride in this image and corporate leaders sought
to protect that image in order to attract business. What resulted in Atlanta beginning in the 1940's was a biracial coalition between the city's business elite and black middle class leaders who were able to maintain the image of Atlanta as a progressive city, one which promoted itself as a city "too busy to hate" (Blackwell and Hart 1982; Stone 1989). However, while many black leaders publicly touted Atlanta as a city of opportunity, a two-class system of social and economic inequality developed in the black community and the governing coalition generally favored the interests of the black and white upper classes (Harmon 1996). While metropolitan growth in Atlanta has been positive in many ways, it has also been characterized as uneven with many areas of the central city left to decay around isolated enclaves of development in addition to its benefits being unevenly distributed across the various segments of the population (Bullard and Thomas 1989; Rutheiser 1996).

One of the manifestations of the uneven distribution of opportunities especially in the central city was the high prevalence of violent crime (Blackwell and Hart 1982). In identifying the major causes of the high crime rate, unemployment, inflation, and extensive drug traffic were placed at the top of the list. One of the most disturbing and nationally publicized incidents was the child murder crisis in which 28 black children disappeared and were later found murdered between 1979 and 1981. The situation was made worse when in the late 1970's the city experienced a shortage of police officers. The shortage occurred when a discrimination suit was filed by black police officers, followed by counter allegations by white officers of reverse discrimination in hiring and promotion resulting in a five-year hiring freeze within the police department. Ultimately, the crisis served to improve relations between the police and the black community but did little to improve the economic inequality within the city.

As part of the economic sunbelt since the 1940's, it became the commercial, financial, and cultural center of the southeastern corner of the U.S. (Abbott 1987; Smith 1981). In the modern industrial period, Atlanta built on its historical role as a center for distribution and transportation. With its already existing network of rail lines and three interstate highways, the construction of a massive airport in the 1970's increased Atlanta's regional importance. Without a large industrial sector, Atlanta's business elite saw an opportunity to move toward a service economy after World
War II (Stone 1989). The newly created Central Atlanta Improvement Association provided a means for property holders to work collectively at redeveloping the central business district (CBD). By the 1970's, the CBD became dominated by expensive hotels and convention facilities in addition to a newly built monorail rapid transit system. In 1952, the city-approved Plan of Improvement authorized a major annexation of land which dramatically increased metropolitan area and population (Smith 1981; Stone 1989). The airport became the second busiest in the nation and the largest employer in Georgia as well as home to regional, national, and international headquarters (Bullard and Thomas 1989).

As a result of such large commercial growth, Atlanta became predominantly a service-oriented and white-collar professional city. In 1972, 28% of the workforce was engaged in wholesale and retail activities which at the time was the largest proportion in these occupations of any of the top employment centers (Eisinger 1980). Between 1960 and 1972, Atlanta experienced an annual average increase of 23,000 jobs, most of which were professional and managerial.

Many social scientists are quick to point out that the economic growth and expansion has not benefitted all groups equally (Abbott 1987; Bullard and Thomas 1989; Eisinger 1980). As the core of a relatively impoverished state, metropolitan Atlanta has attracted a large group of low and semi-skilled, undereducated, white and black migrants from outlying areas looking for opportunities. The move toward a white-collar economy placed a strain on the city in providing jobs for this growing labor pool. As the largest group in the city, African Americans in particular were finding it difficult to find employment. According to Bullard and Thomas (1989), the facts do not support the popularized notion that blacks lived better in Atlanta than anywhere else, at least not in the central city. For several decades, the black unemployment rate in the city was three times the rate for whites and black workers continued to be concentrated in low-paying service jobs. While black businesses have grown since the 1970's and have been vital to the black community, they remained underrepresented in the business community. Thus, Atlanta has also been characterized as a city of extremes. Stone (1989) points out that among black majority cities with a population over 200,000, in 1980, Atlanta ranked second in number of poverty-level households but it also ranked second in proportion of households earning more than $50,000 as well as in the proportion of persons who
have completed college. Abbott (1987) maintains that Atlanta's varying rank on indicators of socioeconomic status illustrates the existence of a dual city. The city contains a large white middle class and a smaller but significant black middle class with ties to important black businesses and to the Atlanta university complex.

While a major component of the metropolitan inequality was racial, another major component was central city versus suburban residence. As Rutheiser (1996) points out, the city began to suffer from the effects of failed urban renewal of the 1950's and 1960's, a crumbling infrastructure, and a shrinking tax base. Unrestricted private investment in the central city created isolated pockets of development while other areas of the city were left to decay. The situation was quite different for the growing suburban communities. In 1980, 43.5% of blacks in the metropolitan area had white collar jobs but these jobs were mainly located outside the city limits. Blacks in the central city had a problem finding transportation to those jobs. Two of the fastest growing counties voted against becoming part of the bus-rail system which would have given them access to suburban jobs (Bullard and Thomas 1989). The widely different experiences of the black working and middle classes was just as apparent and often a result of the political process which excluded lower income groups.

Atlanta's political climate in the beginning of the modern industrial period deviated very little from the previous period. William Hartsfield continued on as mayor throughout the turbulent Civil Rights era. As Stone (1989) explains, a workable coalition existed between mayor Hartsfield, the business elite and the black middle class who were bound by their commitment to economic growth and racial moderation. While blacks were junior partners in this biracial coalition, the impact of their inclusion was to prevent openly racist whites from taking office and limiting racial violence. The mayor recognized the importance of maintaining an image of Atlanta as a racially progressive city and preventing outbreaks of violence as in other parts of the South in order to ensure the success of city business ventures and the annexation of white communities (Eisinger 1980; Silver and Moeser 1995). He managed to keep black voters content while continuing to set the political agenda.
During the activism of the 1960's, Atlanta did appear progressive when compared to other southern cities. As a "New South" city, Atlanta benefited from a large number of black political leaders, a high degree of black political mobilization especially in terms of voter registration and turnout, and more pluralistic and fluid power structures than "Old South" cities like Birmingham (Bayor 1996; Button 1989). But divisions in the black community erupted when Atlanta's sit-in movement, led largely by black students, received heavy criticism from the older black elite who saw these demands on white businesses as a threat to the biracial coalition and its ability to limit the power of white extremists. Bayor (1996) believes that black political empowerment was limited by such divisions in the black community as well as white economic control of the city.

It was not until the late 1960's that long-standing political arrangements in Atlanta began to change. By this time blacks made up the majority of the city's population and the political coalition became less of a necessity for black empowerment (Abbott 1987; Stone 1989). A major shift in political power came in 1969 when Sam Massell, a Jewish mayor, was elected. He appointed an African American, Maynard Jackson, as vice-mayor and five African Americans were elected to the city council (Eisinger 1980). This representation in city governance symbolized the increasing ability of the black middle class to effectively mobilize their political resources. While Massell had established himself as an ally of the black community, he used racist tactics to gain white support in his bid for re-election against Maynard Jackson. But in 1973, Jackson became the first African American mayor. Stone (1989) contends that the political shift of the 1970's created a challenge for existing power holders. The business elite originally resisted Jackson's leadership and conflict ensued when he took a stance on issues which appeared to threaten the power of the business community. For instance, Jackson insisted on the inclusion of minority firms in city contracting and demanded minority participation in the construction of the new airport (Bullard and Thomas 1989). Some of the policy changes were a direct result of federal civil rights legislation such as regulating hiring practices by businesses which received federal money. Jackson was re-elected to a second term in office with little opposition marking the transition to black rule. By this time a pattern of cooperation had been established between the mayor's office and the business community. In 1981, Andrew Young was elected as the second African American mayor with widespread support in the
city. Stone (1989) describes Young's mayoralty as successfully stabilizing a coalition between the black middle class and the white business elite. Electoral power was exchanged for a share of the city's economic growth. However, black political progress was marred by a sizeable portion of the city's black population in poverty. The city moved forward in development and expansion but mainly middle-class interests were served while issues such as housing and unemployment were neglected.

During the 1950's, Atlanta's desire for downtown redevelopment fueled urban renewal programs. Mayor Hartsfield created the Department of Urban Renewal and began tearing down central city neighborhoods to make way for highways and commercial development. Some have argued that renewal efforts had disastrous effects on the social structure of the city and resulted in increasing racial segregation (Eisinger 1980; Silver and Moeser 1995). Renewal did in fact destroy mainly low-income housing occupied by blacks and resulted in uprooting thousands of people. Because more housing was destroyed than built, the displaced population was forced to relocate to overcrowded areas or to substandard public housing that replaced low-income housing. One of these newly built highways was Interstate 20, which divided the metropolitan area in half. Bullard and Thomas (1989) explain that the highway created a dividing line in which whites were found to the north of it and blacks to the south. Ironically, the rapid job expansion, economic development, and population growth also occurred to the north in Gwinnett and Cobb counties which are about 95% white. And unlike the city of Atlanta, these counties were predominantly Republican. By 1960, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Ivan Allen, put into action, the Forward Atlanta program to raise funds for downtown development and to attract new business (Abbott 1987). Allen was able to raise money for large projects such as convention centers and stadiums. His projects were so influential that he garnered enough support to become mayor in 1961. However, the massive redevelopment in the city did not proceed without opposition. Neighborhood mobilization occurred as residents of deteriorated neighborhoods around the fringes of the downtown area became increasingly dissatisfied. In the 1970's, the neighborhood movement became a significant political force, assembling a sizeable bloc of votes and candidates (Stone 1989). But these movement organizers had to contend with powerful forces like Central Atlanta Progress (CAP) which was made
up of major property holders in the downtown area and had both economic resources and political influence. The city government's response to redevelopment resistance was to buy off residents with public housing and moderate positions on racial integration.

The pattern of racial segregation did not change dramatically even after civil rights legislation. The effect of slum clearance, population growth, and suburban development from the 1950's onward was to expand existing neighborhoods in a particular direction without significantly altering the racial composition of the neighborhood (Abbott 1987; Bullard and Thomas 1989). The older, mostly low-income black neighborhood east of the CBD began to spread rapidly eastward into DeKalb county while the middle class black neighborhoods on the west side grew southwestward in Fulton county. Suburban development in the northern metropolis was mainly reserved for whites. Orfield and Ashkinaze (1991) found that by 1980, black suburbanization was at an unusually high rate but segregation remained intact because blacks and whites moved out of the city in different directions which suggests different housing opportunities between these groups. In fact, blacks moving to the suburbs were much less likely than whites to live in areas with high or increasing housing value. In 1988, the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution* ran a Pulitzer Prize-winning series entitled, "The Color of Money" which reported on widespread discrimination against African Americans in mortgage-lending practices in Atlanta (Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991). This study found that housing and neighborhood choice remained severely limited for blacks in Atlanta regardless of income level.

School segregation reflected the well-established patterns of residential segregation. During the period of the Brown vs. Board of Education decision in 1954, metropolitan Atlanta found itself constantly at odds with a staunchly anti-desegregationist Georgia legislature (Silver and Moeser 1995). Led by a conservative reactionary governor, the state legislature issued policies which prevented desegregation of schools in Atlanta until 1961. Intent on maintaining its image as a progressive city of the South, city leaders organized a complicated yet carefully planned process for school integration along with a public relations campaign which resulted in widespread media attention and praise for its efforts. The process however, resulted in very little integration and was mainly symbolic. In the early 1970's, a biracial coalition of city and school board leaders decided
to negotiate a settlement to desegregation. During the negotiation process, neither large-scale busing nor any form of metropolitan-wide solution was agreed upon. Many black city leaders feared that busing would result in greater white flight out of the city and into the suburbs. Less than 5% of students in the metropolitan area were bused and all were black students bused to predominantly white suburban schools. The high rate of suburbanization of both middle-class black and white families resulted in a predominantly poor city school system. In the mid-1980's, more than 90% of students in the Atlanta city school district were black (Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991; Silver and Moeser 1995). The effects of a school system polarized along racial and class lines could be seen in test scores across the metropolitan area. Among high schools in 1987, the predominantly poor black city schools scored lower on standardized tests than all other schools (Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991). And even though Atlanta is home to several well-known historically black colleges and has one of the highest rates of black college completion, access to higher education for students from metro Atlanta declined in the 1980's. This trend suggests the effects of black in-migration which masks the severe educational disadvantages for native blacks in Atlanta.
CHAPTER 5
DETROIT, BOSTON, AND ATLANTA: A COMPARATIVE SOCIOHISTORICAL OVERVIEW

As stated previously, a major goal of this research is to shed light on exactly how segregation impacts people and communities differently and how that impact is influenced by the sociohistorical context of a region. Following Sugrue's (1996) line of reasoning, the three previous chapters have outlined the sociohistorical forces affecting African Americans in Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta in order to illustrate how the differences have affected the dimensions, significance, and consequences of racial inequality. Using Wilson's (1978) historical account of race relations in the U.S. as a guide, there were four regionally specific sociohistorical forces considered as having an impact on African Americans: the emergence and development of the black community, the economy and the labor market, the political history, and neighborhood housing and school patterns. Each was considered both generally within the metropolitan region and within the black community itself. In this chapter, these regional differences are compared and contrasted across the three historical periods used in the previous chapters: pre-industrial, industrial, and the modern industrial. Significant and striking differences as well as similarities can be found across the three regions which indeed suggest that regional context influences the relationship between neighborhood racial composition and black socioeconomic status.

Pre-Industrial Period

In Detroit and Boston the black population during the pre-industrial period was very small. In both cities, blacks made up 10 percent or less of the population but the nature of the black community's emergence and development was quite different (Levesque 1994; Thomas 1992). In Detroit, black settlement began in the early 19th century. The black community was small and transitory during the pre-industrial period (Katzman 1973). Fugitive slaves mainly used the city as a stop on the way to Canada in the Underground Railroad although some remained. The bulk of the
black community consisted of free blacks who had migrated from the upper South to escape racial restrictions. These early migrants and their descendants were largely middle and upper class (Thomas 1992). Many were educated professionals and business owners. A unified community began to develop as blacks organized to fight the Federal Fugitive Slave Law and to build institutions. As European immigration increased, blacks found themselves in the midst of anti-black protests from Irish settlers who feared competition for jobs (Geschwender 1977). These fears increased after the Emancipation Proclamation and blacks responded with greater activism to protect their communities. However, just as in Boston, the small and stable size of the black population in Detroit served to keep racial violence and intolerance to a minimum.

The black community in Boston began much earlier than in Detroit. Blacks arrived as early as 1638 and an early abolition of slavery in Massachusetts lifted many racial restrictions that existed elsewhere (Pleck 1979). As a result, a more highly developed black community evolved early on, even before southern emancipation, with its own leaders, institutions, and a strong group consciousness. In addition, Boston was known for its support of the ideals of freedom and equality which was reflected in its strong abolition movement and relatively stable pattern of race relations (Handlin 1975).

In contrast to Boston and Detroit, Atlanta has always had a relatively large black population mainly due to its location in the South. While the proportion of blacks was smaller than in rural parts of the South, it was larger than in northern cities and reached almost half after emancipation (Bayor 1996). As in Boston, the emergence of the black community began early in U.S. history. Since urban slavery allowed for more independence and autonomy, slaves in Atlanta began to form the communal life that would become even more necessary after the Civil War when the black population increased dramatically. Because of Atlanta's exclusionary racial policies, blacks were forced to build their own institutions and along with New England missionaries, they did so extensively (Hunter 1997). By 1870, schools, colleges, and churches had been built for blacks to attend which produced highly influential leaders. The small black elite and larger working class black population developed conflict early on over how blacks should proceed in their struggle for
progress. This became a similar pattern across all three cities as the black elite supported integration with whites while working class blacks often did not.

The northern location of Boston and Detroit resulted in a very similar labor market experience for blacks in the pre-industrial period. There was no key industry in either city and blacks were concentrated in either domestic work or other low-paying menial labor (Geschwender 1977; Stapp 1993). Wilson (1978) argues that the labor market experience for blacks in northern cities like Detroit and Boston can be explained using the split labor market theory. That is, there was a great deal of antagonism between the higher paid white working class and lower paid blacks fueled by white employers. There was a large population of white ethnic immigrants in both cities who were given preference over blacks as a source of secondary labor (Geschwender 1977; Pleck 1979). Any threats of a working class uprising were quelled by inducing fear of blacks who would work for less. Thus, blacks were severely limited in their ability to participate in early northern industrial growth. Prior to emancipation, most blacks in Atlanta were slaves. Because Atlanta was urban, slaves primarily performed domestic work in private homes, boarding houses, and hotels (Hunter 1997). Just as in Detroit and Boston, there was a small population of free blacks consisting of teachers, ministers, and a few self-employed grocers and barbers. After the Civil War, much remained the same for black occupational status in Atlanta and in fact bore many resemblances to black occupational status in the North. Although free, blacks remained limited to domestic and other unskilled labor. This did not stop migrants from rural parts of Georgia who sought less demanding work than field work.

The small population of blacks in Boston and Detroit did not, as one would reasonably expect, produce similar political outcomes. Even though slavery was abolished in Michigan in 1837, blacks remained disenfranchised (Thomas 1992). In Detroit, the growing numbers of Irish settlers were strong supporters of laws which denied blacks legal and political rights. During Reconstruction, blacks in Massachusetts played a role in politics to a greater extent than in any other northern state (Cromwell 1994; Pleck 1979). At least one or two black men served on the state legislature each year between 1866 and 1900. And in 1883, a black judge was elected in Boston. This greater participation among blacks reflected the support among Bostonians for the ideals of
freedom and equality. However, as was typical of gains made during Reconstruction, black political participation in Boston dwindled after 1900. In Atlanta, where blacks formed a large proportion of voters, blacks did gain a limited voice in city affairs during Reconstruction. But as was typical of the South, just as blacks were making political progress, efforts were under way to curtail that progress (Watts 1974). The city of Atlanta and the state of Georgia were committed to keeping blacks out of the political arena. Atlanta's use of the at-large system of election as opposed to the ward-based system effectively kept blacks from holding office.

As was common of northern cities prior to 1900, blacks in Boston and Detroit were residentially separated from whites but not totally segregated in ghettos as is common today (Massey and Denton 1993). There was substantial contact between blacks and whites of the same socioeconomic status. In fact, residential segregation had more to do with status and employment differences than with race. Schools however, were extremely segregated in both cities. Black children were not allowed in public schools until the latter half of the 19th century at which time special accommodations were made to keep them separated from white children (Geschwender 1977; Handlin 1975). Schooling for black children was inferior to that provided for white children of even the same class background in Detroit and Boston. Due to the nature of slavery, there was very little spatial separation between blacks and whites. Blacks resided in alleys and rear servants' quarters of white homes (Massey and Denton 1993). After the Civil War when the black population was increasing, residential concentrations for blacks evolved on land that was unwanted by whites (Hunter 1997). In addition, Jim Crow laws were on the rise in the South which negatively impacted both neighborhoods and schooling for blacks. Just as in Boston and Detroit, public education for blacks was not provided until the late 19th century and was strictly segregated (Rabinowitz 1978). And similar to northern schools, black schools in Atlanta were extremely inferior to white schools. What blacks in Atlanta had that blacks in Detroit and Boston lacked was the Atlanta University Center which was founded in 1867 with donations from the American Missionary Society (Bullard and Thomas 1989). Over the years it developed into a consortium of six private black colleges that served as a training ground for a black elite. Although small, this elite became highly influential and a voice for the black community.
Industrial Period

It was in the industrial period that more striking differences between Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta emerge. Detroit's black population rose dramatically in two separate waves in the early 20th century, with migrants coming primarily from the rural South to take advantage of employment opportunities. By 1926, 85 percent of all blacks in Detroit had come in one decade and the city easily made the list of the ten largest concentrations of blacks by 1930 (Sugrue 1996). This demographic shift called for greater institutional support for the black community. The Detroit Urban League, founded in 1916, played an influential role in the community building process as rural black migrants adjusted to life in an urban, industrial environment (Thomas 1992). The black population in Boston remained stable at around three percent throughout the industrial period (Thernstrom 1973). The community continued developing its own institutions such as newspapers and businesses and for the most part existed with little racial antagonism. By 1900, Atlanta's black population had declined and it made up only a third of the city's overall population (Bayor 1996). Hunter (1997) argues that black migrants were optimistic about their future following the Civil War but soon found repression in various forms. Jim Crow legislation increased and as well as white violence against blacks from random individuals to the Ku Klux Klan. As a result, many blacks left Atlanta to seek better conditions in the North. However, the established black elite in Atlanta grew in size and affluence in the South (Silver and Moeser 1995). This black elite also served vital functions for the larger working class black community and as a link to the white power structure.

Among the three cities, Detroit stands out in the industrial period primarily because of its economic growth and the impact it had on the black community. The automotive industry became the dominant industry and by 1921, the largest employer of blacks in the city (Thomas 1992). While the shift from agriculture to manufacturing was an improvement for blacks, very little mobility occurred for blacks in factories as discrimination persisted. Training and more skilled occupations were reserved for whites and blacks were generally denied union membership. But the demand for black labor and its role in sustaining the automotive industry empowered the black community and led to political activism. Black participation in the United Auto Workers (UAW) association was a major step in that direction (Meier and Rudwick 1979). In contrast, Boston lagged behind larger
cities in industrial growth especially during and after the Depression of the 1930's, which was a major factor in the slow growth of the already small black population during a time of high black migration to the North. Thernstrom (1973) notes that severe occupational discrimination did little to improve the status of blacks throughout the industrial period. Unlike blacks in Detroit, blacks in Boston lacked a growing population and a key industry in demand for black labor. Immediately following the Civil War, Atlanta began the task of rebuilding its physical and economic structure. Atlanta was unlike Detroit in that although commercial and industrial expansion took place, it did not become a manufacturing center but instead focused on banking, distribution, and transportation (Bullard and Thomas 1989; Eisinger 1980). With increasing competition for jobs from white rural migrants, labor market choices remained severely limited for blacks which is why northern migration increased.

For blacks in Boston and Detroit, limited but significant political organizing began to take place in the industrial period. In both places, blacks were constrained by the high degree of accommodation of white working class interests in the political arena (Jennings and King 1986; Wilson 1978). Even in Detroit where the proportion of blacks in some electoral districts was steadily increasing, battling white-run political machines was too difficult. Instead, blacks in Boston and Detroit used their limited political power to make small gains and to organize the community for activism. In Atlanta, black political activity was also severely limited but it was mainly due to racially motivated state laws limiting who could vote and the use of scare tactics in city elections. But by the 1940's, these state laws had been repealed and blacks were able to elect a racial moderate as mayor of Atlanta (Silver and Moeser 1995). Throughout the industrial period, the black elite in Atlanta diligently worked at educating the black community on the political process through leagues and associations such as the NAACP. Their significant numbers made the black community an important voting bloc which was negotiated through the leaders of the black community.

For all three cities, a common development during the industrial period was the residential concentration and segregation of blacks from whites. Increasing industrial expansion led to zoning laws which divided the urban terrain into commercial, industrial, and residential districts. Boston was the forerunner of this process of division and subsequent suburbanization (Edel et al. 1984).
In the early decades of the 20th century, most of Boston's affluent residents had already become suburbanized. After World War II, rapid suburbanization became the norm across the U.S. Living in a middle-class residential area soon became a central element in the collective sense of the "American dream" (Downs 1994; Massey and Denton 1993).

The federal government played a crucial role in perpetuating and sustaining segregation during the postwar years. Initiated in the 1930's followed by widespread use after the war, were federal policies and programs designed to increase homeownership (Massey and Denton 1993). However, the administration of these programs was from the beginning, racially biased. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and Veterans Administration (VA) became the primary vehicles for which families obtained home mortgages. Both of these agencies practiced redlining of neighborhoods and supported the use of racially restrictive covenants by white neighborhoods. The FHA favored loans for suburban homes but rejected loans for older central city home buying and remodeling. Thus, blacks who were already centered around the urban core in Boston and Detroit remained there regardless of class status. In both cities, private banks also utilized the racially biased practices of the government and coupled with mass commercial disinvestment, the spiral of decline in central cities began.

The residential situation for blacks in Detroit was much worse because a steady stream of southern migrants was entering the city just as racial restrictions on housing were increasing (Sugrue 1996). The densely concentrated black enclaves, housing shortage, and poverty of the residents ensured the process of black ghettoization. Any attempts at residential mobility on the part of blacks were violently resisted by working class white ethnic groups (Capeci 1984). The small population of blacks in Boston created less density in black neighborhoods and as a result the push toward white residential areas was less likely to occur. In both cities though, the high residential segregation went hand in hand with extremely high school segregation. Most blacks were confined to overcrowded, inadequately funded schools. In Atlanta, black segregated residential patterns developed somewhat differently. Blacks were concentrated in several areas throughout the city and these areas were clearly marked by class differences in the black community. While middle class blacks were segregated from whites and limited in their expansion, the quality of the residential area they
inhabited remained relatively high (Bayor 1996). For poor blacks, who were located around the downtown area, the same process of ghettoization occurred as it did in Boston and Detroit. Since blacks and whites in the South were not as isolated from one another during the pre-industrial period, residential segregation developed at a much slower pace than in the North (Silver and Moeser 1995). Although more gradual, residential segregation in Atlanta became firmly established as a result of city zoning ordinances designed to limit the expansion of black neighborhoods, restrictive covenants. But like Boston and Detroit, blacks in Atlanta suffered from a racially discriminatory allocation of public school funds (Stone 1989). However, the significant size of the black voting bloc in Atlanta proved useful in winning concessions for education.

**Modern Industrial Period**

The changes that took place between the industrial period and the modern industrial period in Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta reflect the differences that Mollenkopf (1983) identifies in his typology of post-WWII cities in the U.S. These changes occurred most dramatically in the economic and political arena although the evolution of the black community and neighborhood changes were significant as well.

A high level of black in-migration to Detroit from the South and from urban areas of the North continued throughout the 1960's. This trend coupled with the increasing "white flight" to outer suburbs resulted in blacks becoming an overwhelming majority in the city by 1980 (Darden 1987). In Boston, the black population began to show signs of growth during this period mainly due to the mechanization of agriculture in the South. Between 1940 and 1970, the black population increased from three percent to sixteen percent, which although still small in comparison to other major cities, this increase was perceived by many as an influx (Medoff and Sklar 1994). Even though the issues of concern changed, the importance of black community institutions remained the same. In both cities, racial tensions between blacks and white ethnic groups increased. Racial restrictions were being challenged by blacks more aggressively during this period resulting in conflicts over housing, education, and employment.

In the South, racial tensions were being played out more directly during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950's and 60's. With its relatively large number of influential black leaders and
socially conscious black college students, Atlanta became a center of attention during the movement. Unlike other southern cities, Atlanta had a reputation for a lack of overt racial conflict which was strategically protected during the Civil Rights Movement (Harmon 1996). City officials and the corporate elite were intent on making Atlanta a progressive city which would be attractive to new business. Therefore, they formed a coalition with black leadership to negotiate a smooth transition to integration. In comparison with Boston and Detroit which did not successfully engage in coalition building between blacks and whites, Atlanta's biracial coalition between white government and business elite and the city's black leadership proved to be essential to black economic and political gains.

The economic changes that occurred during the modern industrial period were dramatic and varied across the cities. In Detroit, black and white blue-collar workers both enjoyed the benefits of high-wage manufacturing jobs as a result of the growth of the automotive industry and other unionized industries. But by the 1970's, these jobs were on the decline as a result of the transformation of the postindustrial economy (Mollenkopf 1983; Wilson 1978). The movement of factories from central cities to outlying suburbs and overseas resulted in large-scale unemployment among unskilled and semi-skilled workers. Blacks in Detroit were hit the hardest when these changes began to occur for several reasons: blacks were highly segregated in the declining central city, black urbanization occurred later than for whites resulting in less seniority and time with which to accumulate wealth, and just as the economy began to decline, a steady stream of black migrants was still coming into the city (Darden et al. 1987; Sugrue 1996). Within the city, new industry did not replace the loss of manufacturing jobs which produced a high concentration of poverty among blacks in Detroit who by the 1970's made up the majority of the population in the city. There was also an increase in racial and class polarization as less-educated blacks were disadvantaged by the relocation and transformation of job opportunities and highly educated and trained blacks were able to take advantage of equal opportunity legislation and move into white-collar positions (Wilson 1978). As contemporary scholars have pointed out, the spatial isolation from and knowledge of jobs has acted to concentrate poverty among central city blacks in rustbelt cities (Braddock and McPartland 1987; Wilson 1996). While the city of Detroit can adequately be placed in Mollenkopf's
Darden et al. (1987) argue that because of the extremely uneven economic development across metropolitan Detroit, the central city and other areas like the downriver area have been severely disadvantaged while other areas have experienced expansion and growth. Because blacks in the metropolitan area are overwhelmingly concentrated in the central city, they are extremely isolated from economic opportunities.

Just the opposite occurred in Boston where manufacturing growth occurred during the late 19th and early 20th century but began to decline during and well after the Depression of the 1930's (Medoff and Sklar 1994). It was during the modern industrial period that Boston began to recover but this time growth occurred in the high technology, banking, and service industries. These white-collar industries are largely reserved for the highly educated which include the small black middle and upper class. While the majority of blacks in Boston remain in the lower rung of the class structure, less-educated black workers have been able to take advantage of the growth in service sector employment in the health and education industries (Blackwell and Hart 1982). Unlike in Detroit, blacks in Boston have been able to take advantage of these service sector opportunities since the spatial pattern of development has not isolated them from it.

During the modern industrial period, Atlanta clearly developed into the third type of city in which Mollenkopf (1983) describes as a part of the economic sunbelt. Since the 1940's, Atlanta has built on its role as a center for transportation and distribution in the southeastern portion of the U.S. (Abbott 1987; Stone 1989). In the 1970's one of the largest airports in the country was built in Atlanta which soon became the largest employer in Georgia. The business elite and city officials saw their careful planning pay off as commercial growth soared and the metropolitan area became home to regional, national, and international headquarters (Bullard and Thomas 1989). As a result, Atlanta's economy became dominated by service-oriented and white-collar professional industries. Much of the job growth occurred for professional and managerial positions. Atlanta's economic prosperity quickly spread across the nation and like other sunbelt areas, experienced high rates of in-migration (Abbott 1987; Bullard and Thomas 1989). However, many of the job seekers Atlanta attracted were low and semi-skilled, less-educated migrants from outlying areas of Atlanta and
rustbelt cities like Detroit with declining economies. By the 1970's African Americans were the largest group in the city and with the city's economic prosperity, a notion that became popularized was that Atlanta was the "Black Mecca" (Blackwell and Hart 1982; Bullard and Thomas 1989). While this may have been true for highly educated, professional blacks, many blacks were living in poverty. Stone (1989) argues that the city can be characterized as one of extremes with a growing racial and class polarization. By 1980, jobs were increasingly moving outside of the city which isolated poor and working class blacks.

Another dramatic change in the modern industrial period was the increase in political power for blacks in both Detroit and Atlanta. Both cities had elected their first black mayor by 1973 as well as electing blacks to other significant city offices. But as Eisinger (1980) points out, this form of ethnopolitical transition of power occurred differently in both cities and thus had differing consequences. In Atlanta, the beginning of the modern industrial period was marked by the Civil Rights movement. Attempts by political leaders and city officials to carefully direct its development paid off as Atlanta became known for its lack of violence, progressive politics, and as a leader of the "New South" (Button 1989; Harmon 1996). The large black voting bloc in Atlanta had been successful in maintaining a racial moderate as mayor for many years whose main goal was protecting the image of the city for business ventures as well as for the annexation of outlying white communities (Silver and Moeser 1995). This goal proved beneficial for blacks in Atlanta because the mayor was keenly aware of the need to nurture the biracial coalition of black leaders and the business elite which had been formed during the industrial period. While black political power was limited, blacks were gradually included in city affairs and by 1973 and every election since then, a black mayor has been elected. The business elite and other power holders initially resisted this transition to black power but eventually the desire for economic growth overruled and a pattern of cooperation was established (Stone 1989). The relatively smooth transition to black political power in Atlanta was largely the result of the long-standing coalition between white and black leaders. Unlike in Detroit, the new black political leadership in Atlanta also benefitted from a healthy economy in its efforts to create opportunities and advancement for the black population. However, some have argued that black political power has primarily served the interests of the black middle
class while neglecting the needs of the large black lower class (Bullard and Thomas 1989; Stone 1989). For instance, the new political power structure with the help of civil rights legislation was able to insist on fair hiring practices and regulations and the inclusion of minority firms in city contracting. Many of these initiatives were only useful for workers with skill and education. But as Halpern (1995) points out, the Civil Rights movement did not have "the means to address the already profound isolation of ghetto neighborhoods." Similarly, black political leaders and a healthy economy were not enough to address the problem of poverty in Atlanta's poor neighborhoods.

The transition to black political power in Detroit occurred around the same time as in Atlanta. By 1973 Detroit had elected its first black mayor and soon after a predominantly black city council. Unlike in Atlanta, this victory came only after massive white flight to the suburbs in the postwar years and a major riot in the 1960's which further precipitated white exodus to the suburbs and a hardening of racial prejudices (Sugrue 1996). The large black voting bloc in Detroit made the election of a black mayor possible but unlike Atlanta, there was never a coalition between the white power structure and the black community. The growing black population had been perceived as a threat to white working class interests and the response was to retreat to the outlying suburban municipalities with their own governance (Darden et al. 1987; Galster 1996). In an analysis of redevelopment in Detroit, Thomas (1997) notes how regional disparity and fragmentation can devastate regional economic health. While some parts of metropolitan Detroit have grown in the postwar years, compared to other regions, it has lost population and business.

Unlike Detroit, Atlanta has been able to create stronger ties between the central city and the larger metropolitan community with its ability to annex more prosperous areas. Atlanta's metropolitan area went from comprising five counties in 1970 to eighteen in 1990 (Rutheiser 1996). In contrast, during the postwar years Detroit became increasingly characterized by extreme jurisdictional fragmentation and central city isolation from the metropolitan area. The declining economy, shrinking tax base, and increasing concentration of poverty made the new black political leadership much more limited than in Atlanta in its ability to convert power into opportunities for the poor. Regional fragmentation in Detroit during the modern industrial period coincided with an increasing national conservatism. Edsall and Edsall (1991) point out that white working class
communities like those in Detroit had been crucial to the election of Republican presidents since the 1980's as symbolic racism increased. These voters came to associate problems in the nation from crime to high taxes with poor inner city blacks. Some have argued that support for conservative national policies between 1980 and 1992 have been critical to the growth of racial and class polarization in the U.S. (Devine and Wright 1993; Edsall and Edsall 1991; Jargowsky 1998).

But as Eisinger (1982a) finds, a significant benefit of black political power has been to increase the level of black employment in municipal jobs in the central city. And with the help of civil rights legislation, skilled and semi-skilled workers have been able to take advantage of city jobs which has offset some of the loss in manufacturing jobs and increased black representation in formerly underrepresented areas such as the police force. But while this form of political power has been useful, Eisinger (1982b) also shows that the cities in which blacks have achieved the highest levels of public employment relative to their population are cities with healthy economies which would suggest that black political power in Atlanta would have a more significant impact on black employment in municipal jobs.

In contrast to Detroit and Atlanta, Boston never experienced a transition to black political power during the modern industrial period largely because of the much smaller size of the black population in Boston. The change that did occur was the shift from its long tradition of machine politics to pro-growth politics in 1958 with the election of a mayor who forged a coalition with the business community and appointed administrators primarily interested in redevelopment and the creation of a "New Boston" (Mollenkopf 1983; O'Connor 1993). Due to the high degree of concentration and centralization of black neighborhoods around the core of the city, blacks were disproportionately affected by the urban renewal programs of the 1960's which were aimed at turning the central business district into a modern commercial and residential space. In response, blacks used their limited political power to organize against urban renewal politics (Jennings and King 1986; Medoff and Sklar 1994). But by the mid-1970's, black community activism came to be identified with opposition to the mainstream political goal of economic growth. As a result, some have argued that black community leaders became even further isolated from mainstream politics (Halpern 1995; Jennings and King 1986). Further, the at-large system of elections which existed.
until 1983, prevented the election of black candidates. Given the spatial concentration of black neighborhoods, a district-based electoral system would have been more beneficial but when it was finally instituted, city officials drew up district lines which still put blacks at a disadvantage (Jennings and King 1986).

In their analysis of contemporary residential segregation, Massey and Denton (1993) reveal that the pattern of high black/white segregation found during the industrial period has persisted through the modern industrial period. In both northern and southern metropolitan areas, which had previously exhibited some differences, a high level of segregation has stabilized despite efforts to reduce it. As many have argued, one would have expected decreases in segregation in the post-civil rights era with fair housing laws, an increase in the black middle class and black suburbanization, as well as an overall shift in white attitudes toward open housing (Farley et al. 1994; Galster 1991; Massey and Denton 1993).

Many of the same factors contributed to the stabilization of segregation across the three cities examined in this research. Urban renewal programs of the 1960's in Boston and Atlanta served to segregate low-income blacks in public housing around the fringes of the CBD (Eisinger 1980; Silver and Moeser 1995). In Detroit, black segregation was already solidly in place by the 1960's as white flight to the suburbs continued at a rapid pace. The difference between these cities lies in the spatial pattern of segregation which can have differing consequences. Blacks in Boston experience a high level of concentration in five adjacent wards and high centralization around the core of the city (Edel et al. 1984). The smaller size of the black population in Boston has not created the impetus for massive white flight as in Detroit. Instead, blacks and whites occupy extremely isolated, homogeneous neighborhoods. Blacks in Detroit are highly segregated on all dimensions of segregation identified by Massey and Denton (1993) which coupled with its majority population has created an almost completely black city as whites have continued to move further and further away from the central city. In Atlanta, as is typical of southern areas, blacks are scattered more widely around the metropolitan area and therefore do not form one large black city/enclave as in Detroit. However, black isolation within these neighborhoods is just as high. Black expansion into white neighborhoods continued to be restricted as existing black neighborhoods in Atlanta expanded.
in directions which did not alter the racial composition of the neighborhoods. Also, the construction of Interstate 20 divided metropolitan Atlanta in half creating a man-made barrier in which whites were located to the north and blacks to the south of the highway (Bullard and Thomas 1989). Population growth, job expansion, and economic development subsequently occurred north of the highway.

High levels of segregation have persisted in suburban areas as well as in central cities. Black suburbanization in Atlanta, like the south in general, has been higher than in northern areas like Boston and Detroit due to the historic presence of blacks in outlying rural areas that became suburbs as a result of urbanization (Massey and Denton 1993). During the widespread suburbanization across the U.S. in the postwar years, blacks and whites in Atlanta moved in different directions with the more prosperous northern suburbs becoming almost exclusively white which is suggestive of restrictive housing choices for blacks (Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991). The very small percentage of blacks in Boston suburbs has led to lower levels of segregation in the suburbs than the average level of segregation in northern areas. In Detroit, the general pattern of black suburbanization has been the typical pattern of racial turnover of adjacent suburban communities and the creation of a suburban black enclave (Galster 1991; Wood and Lee 1991). Although one of the goals of fair housing laws has been to increase residential integration and economic opportunities for blacks, exactly where blacks suburbanize would make all the difference. The uneven economic development in Detroit for instance, would make black suburbanization in downriver communities and adjacent working class suburbs economically meaningless (Darden 1987). Like the city of Detroit, these areas have also suffered from the transformation of the economy. Suburban communities across the nation have become increasingly segregated by class and race. In Atlanta, northern Gwinnett County is one of the fastest growing suburban jurisdictions in the country and is highly affluent, Republican, as well as more than 90% white (Edsall and Edsall 1991).

Despite the passage of school desegregation laws, blacks in all three cities have remained in separate and unequal schools throughout the modern industrial period. Strategies for school integration such as busing were met with fierce resistance especially in Boston where busing became a race and class issue (Edel et al. 1984; Formisano 1991). In analyzing the failure to achieve school
integration, critics have pointed to the need for intermunicipal busing as opposed to city-wide busing (Formisano 1991; Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991; Silver and Moeser 1995). Intermunicipal busing would have taken the burden of integration off of the white lower class and would have addressed the reality that many cities like Detroit and Atlanta were predominantly black. Instead, city-wide busing resulted in further white flight and the issue of school quality in black neighborhoods was never adequately addressed.

Persistent discrimination in the housing market and by lending institutions has been well documented as a leading cause of residential segregation across the U.S. (Conley 1999; Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Yinger 1995). This trend would indicate that black homeownership and home values would be negatively impacted by not only individual-level discrimination but also at the neighborhood level based on racial composition. Given the differences in the spatial distribution of blacks across Boston, Detroit, and Atlanta, it would be reasonable to expect differences in rates of homeownership and home values across the three cities. In 1988, an Atlanta newspaper story revealed that blacks in Atlanta continue to be discriminated against in mortgage-lending practices for buying and repairing homes and although illegal, redlining of black neighborhoods still occurs (Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991; Wyley and Holloway 1999). In Boston, exclusionary housing practices such as blockbusting continued through the 1960's and have continued to be restricted to housing choices in a separate market from whites (Medoff and Sklar 1994; Themstrom 1973). Darden et al. (1987) note that although the Michigan Anti-Redlining Act prohibits discrimination in the making of home mortgage and improvement loans, these loans are unequally distributed across neighborhoods of various racial compositions in metropolitan Detroit. He finds that mortgage loans in census tracts with moderate to high minority populations were denied at a much higher rate than in low-minority tracts despite a lack of evidence for risk differentials. Additionally, blacks in metropolitan Detroit are less likely than whites to own their homes. Farley et al. (1994) find that even in 1992, despite fair housing laws, white racial prejudice in the Detroit area is linked to white preferences for segregated houses which leads to discriminatory real estate practices. Thus, black Detroiterers continue to be confined to economically depressed areas with declining housing values. And in terms of housing quality, black in Boston and Detroit are disproportionately located in the
central city which has meant that blacks are more likely than whites to reside in older, overcrowded housing. While greater black suburbanization in Atlanta could translate into greater housing quality and value, Orfield and Ashkinaze (1991) point out that blacks are less likely than whites to move to areas of high or increasing housing value.

Conclusion

The residential location of blacks in metropolitan areas has far-reaching social and economic consequences as place has become increasingly associated over the years with political, social, and economic differences. Galster and Hill (1992) show that place, power, and polarization have become inextricably bound with each other and with race in the modern industrial period. The negative impact of residential segregation for blacks in the last twenty years has been studied in various ways and most have implied that residential integration is the key to reducing socioeconomic inequality between blacks and whites (Galster 1996; Massey and Denton 1993; Massey et al. 1991; Saltman 1991). But most of these studies are limited in their ability to explain the contextual nature of segregation's impact as well as whether integration is socioeconomically beneficial for blacks. In light of the distinct histories of each city as outlined in this chapter, I believe that the effect of the residential location of blacks on their labor market experience, wealth accumulation, and socioeconomic status as measured by educational and occupational level will also be distinct. The comparative sociohistorical overview presented above leads to the hypotheses below.

General Hypotheses

1. The percentage of African Americans in a neighborhood will affect black socioeconomic status differently in Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta.
   a. Percent black in a neighborhood will be a more important determinant of black socioeconomic status in Detroit than in Boston or Atlanta.
   b. In all 3 cities, the effect of percent black in a neighborhood will vary in direction and significance by socioeconomic status indicator.

2. In all cities, the class composition of a neighborhood will have a positive affect on black socioeconomic status.

3. The effect of city versus suburban residence will be different in Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta.
a. City versus suburban residence will be a more important indicator of black socioeconomic status in Detroit than in Boston or Atlanta.

b. In all 3 cities, the effect of city versus suburban residence will vary in direction and significance by socioeconomic status indicator.

Interaction Effects

4. The effect of percent black in a neighborhood on black socioeconomic status will vary by neighborhood class composition.

5. The effect of percent black in a neighborhood on black socioeconomic status will be different in the city than in the suburbs.

6. The effect of neighborhood class composition on black socioeconomic status will be different in the city than in the suburbs.

Regionally-Specific Hypotheses

Detroit Metropolitan Area

The percentage of African Americans in a neighborhood is positively related to:
1. Employment status

negatively related to:
1. Home value
2. Educational attainment

The percentage of African Americans in a neighborhood interacts with neighborhood class composition and suburban residence and is positively related to:
1. Labor Force Experience
2. Educational attainment
3. Occupational prestige
4. Homeownership

Boston Metropolitan Area

The percentage of African Americans in a neighborhood is negatively related to:
1. Labor Force Experience
2. Educational Attainment
3. Home Value
4. Occupational Prestige

Suburban residence is positively related to all SES variables.

Class composition is positively related to all SES variables.

Atlanta Metropolitan Area

In suburban areas the percentage of African Americans in a neighborhood and class composition is positively related to all SES variables.

In urban areas, the percentage of African Americans in a neighborhood is negatively related to labor force participation, joblessness, and home values.
As the hypotheses above suggest, I expect to find very general patterns between the regions and across status attainment outcomes. I also expect to find distinct differences across the three metropolitan regions. These distinct differences are based on the preceding comparative sociohistorical analysis which clearly reveals how and why these regions are distinctly different in the modern industrial period. The distinct social, political, and economic forces have acted to influence residential segregation's impact on African American status attainment in uniquely different ways. Using 1990 U.S. Census data, neighborhoods in these three regions will be analyzed separately to test the relationship between segregation and black status attainment as measured by: labor force experience, wealth, and socioeconomic status as measured by educational and occupational status.
CHAPTER 6

DATA AND METHODS

DATA SOURCE

Examining the hypotheses presented above requires data collected at the neighborhood level for both African Americans specifically, and the total population for the metropolitan areas of Detroit, MI; Boston, MA; and Atlanta, GA. The data used are from the 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 4A (STF4A) and Summary Tape File 3A (STF3A). Together these summary tape files provide a rich source of demographic and socioeconomic data that is both race-specific and for the total population for census tracts in each U.S. metropolitan area. As in prior analyses of residential segregation, I use census tracts as a geographic approximation of neighborhoods (South and Crowder 1998; Jargowsky 1998). As of 1990, the U.S. Census Bureau defined three kinds of metropolitan areas: metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSAs) which are larger MSAs containing identifiable component areas, and primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs) which are the component areas of CMSAs. The census tracts used in this analysis for Detroit are from the Detroit PMSA which comprises a seven-county area. For Boston, the census tracts used are from the Boston PMSA. New England PMSAs are composed of cities and towns rather than counties. Thus, the Boston PMSA is composed of cities and towns located in seven different Massachusetts counties. The census tracts for Atlanta are from the Atlanta MSA, comprising an eighteen-county area. The Census Bureau uses the collective term, "metropolitan area" (MA) to refer to CMSAs, PMSAs, and MSAs. Thus, in this dissertation all three areas will be referred to as MAs for simplicity.
Sample

The outcome measures in this dissertation are specifically for African Americans at least 16 years of age. The census tracts included in this analysis are those that contain at least thirty African Americans within the age range of 25-64 years old and those with at least one African American household. Tracts were limited in this way to eliminate places with too few African Americans in age ranges relevant for the central dependent variables. Following previous research (Krivo and Peterson 1996), census tracts were excluded if 40% or more of the population was either institutionalized, living in group quarters, or living on an Indian Reservation. This exclusion eliminates tracts dominated by non-residential population. Tracts of this type comprised less than 1% of all tracts in each MA. As a result of all of these tract selections, one county in both the Detroit and the Atlanta MAs was eliminated from the analysis. Most tracts were excluded because they had very small black populations. While these limitations significantly reduced the number of tracts available for analysis, more than enough remained in order to produce valid statistical results. The final sample includes 560 tracts in Detroit, 424 tracts in Atlanta, and 353 tracts in Boston.

DEPENDENT MEASURES

Five measures of socioeconomic status are considered as dependent variables in the analyses that follow: joblessness, high labor force participation, an education and occupation index, home ownership, and median home value. These measures represent traditional outcomes of residential segregation considered in previous literature (Braddock and McPartland 1987; Massey et al., 1987; Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Wilson 1996). Descriptive statistics for each measure are summarized by city in Tables 6.1 to 6.3. The specific operationalizations of measures are reported in Table 6.4.

Joblessness and High Labor Force Participation

In an effort to capture the neighborhood labor force experience, two complementary measures were considered: joblessness and high labor force participation. Following previous research, joblessness is measured as the percent of black civilian noninstitutionalized males and females age 16 to 64 who were either unemployed or not in the labor force (Conley 1999; Krivo and Peterson 1996). Persons over age 64 were not included in the measure so as not to confound lack of labor force participation with retirement. In Detroit, the average joblessness rate for African American
Americans in a tract was 38%, the highest of the three cities, followed by Boston at 26%, and Atlanta at 23%.

High labor force participation is measured as the percent of black males and females age 16 and over who worked 35 or more hours per week, for 40-52 weeks in 1989. For this measure, the census data is not coded in a way that would allow for the exclusion of persons of retirement age. On average, 62% of African Americans in Detroit tracts had high labor force participation, followed by Boston with 65%, and the highest percentage in Atlanta with 69%.

**Socioeconomic Status: An Education and Occupation Index**

Three of the most commonly used measures of socioeconomic status are education, occupation, and income (Massey et al. 1987; Crane 1991). To reduce the number of dependent measures in the analysis that indicate the same general concept, exploratory factor analysis was conducted in order to create an overall index of socioeconomic status. Results demonstrate that the measures for education and occupation load heavily with one another while income does not. Thus, only education and occupation are included in an index. Educational attainment is measured as the percent of African American males and females age 25 years and over with at least a bachelor's degree. Occupational status is measured as the percent of employed African American males and females age 16 and over who are employed in professional and managerial occupations. The index is created by averaging the z-scores for educational attainment and occupational status. Higher scores on this index represent high educational and occupational status. The average value of this index is slightly greater than zero in all three cities. The descriptive statistics reveal that African Americans in Boston have higher levels of educational and occupational status. On average, 27% of African Americans in Boston tracts have at least a bachelor's degree and 30% are employed in professional and managerial positions. These figures are 20% and 19% for Atlanta and 16% and 21% for Detroit.

**Wealth: Home Ownership and Median Home Value**

To test the hypothesis that residential segregation has negative consequences for African American wealth accumulation, two indirect measures of wealth are considered. The first is the percent of African American owner-occupied housing units in the tract. The average tract home
ownership rate is highest in metropolitan Detroit at 48% followed by Atlanta at 44% and 30% in Boston.

The second wealth measure is median home value which is measured in dollars for all specified African American owner-occupied housing units. The Census Bureau defines 'specified' as one-family houses on fewer than 10 acres without a business or medical office on the property. This definition excludes mobile homes and multi-unit buildings. Since differences in property values are more meaningful by thousands of dollars rather than dollars, median home value is converted to thousands of dollars in the statistical analyses. Following previous research, this measure is used to test the hypothesis that predominantly black neighborhoods are plagued by low property values (Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Conley 1999). To test the hypothesis using this measure, a subset of the tracts with at least ten African American homeowners is analyzed. This selection process resulted in half the number of previous tracts in Boston but in Detroit and Atlanta, 85% of the tracts remained. The data reveal that African American home values are highest in metropolitan Boston and lowest in metropolitan Detroit. On average, the median African American home value in a Boston tract is about $180,000 compared to about $53,000 in Detroit. Atlanta lies in the middle with an average of about $78,000.

INDEPENDENT MEASURES

The independent variables in the analyses that follow are all measures of neighborhood characteristics: racial composition, class composition, and location of the neighborhood either in the central city or the suburban ring. The specific operationalizations of all independent measures are reported in Table 6.4. Descriptive statistics for each measure are summarized by city in Tables 6.1 to 6.3.

Neighborhood Racial Composition

Following previous literature which analyzes the residential segregation of African Americans, the racial composition of the tract is measured as the percent of the tract population that is black (Wood and Lee 1991; South and Crowder 1998). Thus, this measure can also be considered as the level of black segregation within a neighborhood. However, unlike other studies, I use a ratio level measure of racial composition as opposed to an ordinal level measure which categorizes
neighborhoods by racial composition (Massey et al. 1987; Jargowsky 1998; South and Crowder 1998). While it is true that the distribution of neighborhood percentage that is black is basically bimodal, analyses using a categorical measure of neighborhood racial composition revealed a linear pattern of results mirroring the results using a continuous measure. Thus, using a continuous measure is more methodologically sound in this research. Since only tracts with at least thirty African Americans between the ages of 25 and 64 are included in the analyses, percent black is never zero.

In Detroit where blacks make up 46% of the metropolitan area (MA), the average tract is 51% black. However, the value for the mean is highly skewed by the fact that 84.5% of all blacks in the Detroit MA live in tracts that are predominantly black (over 60%). In addition, 91% of all blacks live in only one county (Wayne), revealing a hyper-segregated pattern of residential segregation (Massey and Denton 1993). In the Atlanta MA, blacks make up 28% of the population and the average tract is 33% black. Here, 60% of blacks live in predominantly black tracts and the majority of blacks in the MA live in two adjacent counties (Fulton and DeKalb). A somewhat different picture is revealed in Boston where only 12% of the MA is black and the average tract is 15% black. Blacks here are more widely dispersed across the MA than in Detroit or Atlanta. Slightly less than half live in predominantly black tracts while 37% live in tracts that can be considered integrated and 15% live in predominantly white tracts. However, like the two other cities, the majority of blacks live in just one county (Suffolk). The percentage black within a tract ranges from less than 1% to 100% in Detroit and Atlanta and from 1% to 97% in Boston.

Neighborhood Class Composition

Previous research which considers the effects of a neighborhood's economic or class status has generally used some measure based on income (Krivo and Peterson 1996; Crane 1991). In this research, neighborhood class composition is measured as the median household income of the total tract population in dollars. Since socioeconomic changes are more likely to occur for every thousand dollar income change rather than a dollar income change, median household income is converted to thousands of dollars for the statistical analyses. Like the independent variable percentage black, all tracts have a value for this variable that is greater than zero. On average, the median household
income in Detroit is lower than the national median which is about $30,000. But on average, the median household income in Boston ($37,485) and Atlanta ($34,089) is higher than the national median.

**Neighborhood Location: Central City vs. Suburb**

Another neighborhood characteristic often considered important in determining socioeconomic outcomes is the neighborhood's location in either the central city or in the suburban ring (Neckerman and Kirschenman 1991; Lichter 1988; Wilson 1987). To test the hypothesis that central city neighborhoods are at a socioeconomic disadvantage compared to suburban neighborhoods, a dummy variable is used to represent tracts in an MA's central city (1) versus those in the suburban ring (0). Central city tracts are defined as those with at least 90% of its African American population within the central city boundary and are coded as 1. All other tracts are defined as suburban and are coded as 0. In both the Boston and Detroit MA, the overwhelming majority of blacks in the sample live in the central city (72% and 83% respectively). Only 34% of blacks in the Atlanta MA sample live in the central city which indicates a higher rate of black suburbanization.

**COMPARATIVE MEASURES FOR BLACKS AND WHITES**

Although whites were not included in the empirical analyses, some descriptive statistics for whites and blacks are reported in Table 6.5. The data in Table 6.5 were found by calculating the proportion of people in the metropolitan area with each characteristic while the data in Tables 6.1 to 6.3 were found by averaging the proportions for each tract. Thus, the black/white comparisons are made at the individual level while the empirical analyses were conducted at the tract level. Also, the areas used for the data in Table 6.5 are larger areas than those used in the empirical analyses. The areas for Detroit and Boston are the CMSAs which are larger areas than the PMSA and while the data for Atlanta area is the MSA, it was not subjected to tract exclusions as in the empirical analyses. Although limited in their ability to make direct connections to the data used in this study, the selected statistics were included to provide a means for discussing black status attainment relative to whites. The three descriptive statistics for whites and blacks in each metropolitan area are: the population percentage of the racial group, the percentage of persons 25 years and older with a bachelor's degree, the percentage of persons 16 years old and older who are either unemployed or
not in the labor force (jobless), and the percentage of homeowners in each racial group. The information in Table 6.5 will be further explored in the discussion of results in Chapter 7.

**ANalytic Procedures**

The analyses I conduct consist of a series of ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression analyses. The analytic procedures described below are conducted separately for each of the three metropolitan areas in order to capture the contextual differences of each region. Preliminary tests of regional significance were performed to determine possible differences in the dependent variables across the three metropolitan areas. Therefore, two dummy variables were created for Atlanta and Boston, and Detroit was used as the reference group. These tests revealed that the values of all dependent measures for Atlanta and Boston, except high labor force participation, were significantly different from the values for Detroit. The regression model for high labor force participation resulted in a value for Boston which was not significantly different from the value for Detroit. These preliminary tests provided ample evidence that the dependent measures differed significantly across the three areas which would support conducting separate analyses.

I begin with a baseline model using as independent variables the tract characteristics: percent black, median income, and the dummy variable for central city versus suburban residence. Percent black and median income are both centered around their means. The dependent variables are the five socioeconomic outcomes described above: joblessness, high labor force participation, the education and occupation index, home ownership, and median home value. The baseline model is run separately for each outcome.

The dependent variables are then regressed on the same independent variables in the baseline model plus three interaction terms. In this model the interaction terms are: percent black by median income, percent black by central city versus suburban residence, and median income by central city versus suburban residence. This interaction model tests whether the effects of any one of the neighborhood characteristics differ significantly for neighborhoods of varying racial and class compositions and for central cities and suburbs. The use of the interactions is designed to reflect the following contemporary residential patterns in U.S. metropolitan areas: blacks and whites are largely segregated from one another in neighborhoods that differ substantially by class, blacks are
more likely to live in central cities, central cities differ substantially from the suburbs in levels of
disadvantage (Jargowsky 1998; Massey and Denton 1993; Wilson 1987). As with the baseline
model, the interaction model is run separately for each of the five socioeconomic outcomes.
## DETROIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract Averages for Blacks*</th>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Median Income (all households)</td>
<td>$27,538</td>
<td>$19,388</td>
<td>$37,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Jobless</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High Labor Force Participation</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value*</td>
<td>$52,494</td>
<td>$26,489</td>
<td>$94,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tracts</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Blacks</td>
<td>930,212</td>
<td>776,186</td>
<td>154,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All tract averages are for the black population only, except the average for total median income which is for all people in the tract.

*Averages for median home value were obtained from a subset of the tracts which were included only if they contained at least 10 homeowners, n = 470.

Table 6.1: Descriptive statistics for all independent and dependent measures for tracts in the Detroit Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area.
### BOSTON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract Averages for Blacks*</th>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Median Income</td>
<td>$37,485</td>
<td>$27,626</td>
<td>$41,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all households)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Jobless</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High Labor Force</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value*</td>
<td>$183,754</td>
<td>$159,417</td>
<td>$195,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tracts</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Blacks</td>
<td>196,477</td>
<td>142,141</td>
<td>54,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All tract averages are for the black population only, except the average for total median income which is for all people in the tract.

*Averages for median home value were obtained from a subset of the tracts which were included only if they contained at least 10 owners, n = 179.

Table 6.2: Descriptive statistics for all independent and dependent measures for tracts in the Boston Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area.
### Table 6.3: Descriptive statistics for all independent and dependent measures for tracts in the Atlanta Metropolitan Statistical Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract Averages for Blacks*</th>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Median Income (all households)</td>
<td>$34,089</td>
<td>$21,767</td>
<td>$38,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Jobless</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High Labor Force Participation</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Valuea</td>
<td>$78,067</td>
<td>$56,486</td>
<td>$84,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tracts</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Blacks</td>
<td>722,017</td>
<td>248,891</td>
<td>473,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All tract averages are for the black population only, except the average for total median income which is for all people in the tract.

aAverages for median home value were obtained from a subset of the tracts which were included only if they contained at least 10 homeowners, n = 367.
### VARIABLE OPERATIONALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>OPERATIONALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td>All variables refer to blacks only, and are taken from the 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 4A. Unit of measurement is the census tract. Only tracts with at least 30 blacks between 25 and 64 years old were included in the analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>Universe: Civilian Noninstitutionalized Males and Females, 16-64 years old. Percentage of blacks who were either unemployed or not in the labor force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Labor Force Participation</td>
<td>Universe: Males and Females, 16 years and over. Percentage of blacks who worked in 1989 and usually worked 35 or more hours per week, at least 40-52 weeks in the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status (SES)</td>
<td>An index made up of occupational status (universe: employed males and females 16 years and over) and educational attainment (universe: males and females 25 years and over). Occupational status was defined as the percentage of blacks with a professional or managerial position and educational attainment was defined as the percentage of blacks with a bachelor's degree. Index created by averaging the z-scores for both measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>Universe: Occupied Housing Units. Percentage of black owner-occupied housing units in a tract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>Universe: Specified Owner-occupied Housing Units. Measured in thousands of dollars for all specified black owner-occupied housing units. Census Bureau defines specified as one-family homes on fewer than 10 acres without a business or medical office on the property which excludes mobile homes and multi-unit buildings. The analyses using this measure includes only tracts with at least 10 homeowners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)

Table 6.4: Operationalizations of Dependent and Independent Variables
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**Independent Variables**

All variables refer to blacks only, except tract median income which is the median income for all people in the tract. Variables are taken from the 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 4A and Summary Tape File 3A for median income. Only tracts with at least 30 blacks between 25 and 64 years old were included in the analyses. Unit of measurement is the census tract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Universe</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Percentage of black population in the tract. Used to measure neighborhood racial composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Median income of all households within a tract. Used to measure neighborhood class composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>All tracts in the metropolitan area. Dummy variable: Central City tracts (1) = tracts with at least 90% of its population in a central city tract. Suburban tracts (0) = all non-central city tracts and central city tracts with less than 90% of its population in the central city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 (Continued): Operationalizations of Dependent and Independent Variables.
Table 6.5: Selected descriptive statistics for whites and blacks in the Detroit CMSA, Boston CMSA, and Atlanta MSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages for Whites</th>
<th>Detroit CMSA</th>
<th>Boston CMSA</th>
<th>Atlanta MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Jobless</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages for Blacks</th>
<th>Detroit CMSA</th>
<th>Boston CMSA</th>
<th>Atlanta MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Jobless</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Detroit CMSA is the consolidated metropolitan statistical area for the Detroit area designated by the U.S. Census Bureau and comprises a larger area than the PMSA used in the empirical analyses.

*The Boston CMSA is the consolidated metropolitan statistical area for the Boston area designated by the U.S. Census Bureau and comprises a larger area than the PMSA used in the empirical analyses.
CHAPTER 7

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS AS PREDICTORS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STATUS ATTAINMENT

In this analysis, two models were estimated in predicting five status attainment outcomes for African Americans: joblessness, high labor force participation, homeownership, median home value, and an index of education and occupation. Each dependent variable was first regressed on three main predictor variables: neighborhood racial composition measured as percent of tract population that is black, neighborhood class composition measured as median income of the tract, and a dichotomous variable indicating location of the neighborhood in the central city or suburb. This model will be referred to as the baseline model for all analyses of outcome measures. Next, three interaction terms were added to the baseline model: percent black by median tract income, percent black by central city/suburban residence, and median income by central city/suburban residence. This model will be referred to as the interaction model for all analyses of outcome measures.

In this chapter, labor force experience is indicated by both joblessness and high labor force participation. Although operationally defined somewhat differently, these two measures provide complementary information regarding labor force experience. It would be expected that these variables would yield similar results but with coefficients in opposite directions. As discussed below, the models explain less of the variance in high labor force participation than in joblessness across cities, but there is relative consistency in the significance of effects between the two variables for each city.
LABOR FORCE EXPERIENCE

Detroit

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 report that in metropolitan Detroit, the baseline model explains 50% of the variance in joblessness. Similar to Atlanta, percent black, income, and central city/suburban residence are all significant predictors of joblessness and these effects are in the expected directions. Living in the central city and percent black are both positively related to joblessness while income is inversely related to this outcome. This model explains much less variation in high labor force participation (22%). Only percent black and income are significant, as expected, these two variables having the opposite effect on labor force participation as on joblessness.

With the addition of the three interaction terms in the interaction model, nearly 60% of the variance in joblessness is explained. The three main effects remain significant and two of the interaction terms are significant and negative (percent black by central city/suburban residence and income by central city/suburban residence). These two interaction terms indicate that living in the central city lessens the positive effect of percent black on joblessness and increases the negative effect of income on joblessness. Conversely, as percent black in a neighborhood increases, the effect of living in the central city has less of a positive effect on increasing joblessness. And as neighborhood class composition improves, living in the central city has less of a positive effect on joblessness. Similar to joblessness, the interaction model reports that the interactions, percent black by city/suburban residence and income by city/suburban residence are both significant, but in this case positive, for labor force participation. Again, the model explains significantly less variation in labor force participation than it does for joblessness (26%). These findings indicate that as percent black increases, the effect of living in the central city increases for high labor force participation. And as income increases, the effect of living in the central city increases for high labor force participation. Thus, predominantly black neighborhoods are less likely to suffer negative labor force consequences in the city. And living in a wealthier neighborhood reduces the negative labor force consequences of living in the central city.

The findings from the baseline model imply that in metropolitan Detroit, predominantly black neighborhoods and those in the central city are more likely to suffer negative employment
consequences. This makes theoretical sense given that Detroit is one of the "rustbelt" cities most devastated by job losses and urban decay as a result of shifts in the economy, declines in low-skilled jobs, factory relocations to suburbs, and central city poverty concentration (Darden 1987; Wilson 1996). However, the findings from the interaction model reveal that when central city is interacted with percent black the positive association between negative employment consequences and living in the central city decreases. When central city is interacted with income, the positive association between living in the central city and joblessness decreases. As the percent black in a neighborhood increases, at some point there is no significant difference in labor force experience between the city and suburbs. And as income increases, the negative labor force consequences of living in the central city decrease. Predominantly black neighborhoods suffer negative labor force consequences in the city and to some degree in the suburbs but as the class composition of the neighborhood improves, blacks are less likely to suffer negative labor force consequences in both the city and suburbs with this effect being stronger in the suburbs. It should be noted though that in metropolitan Detroit, 84% of blacks live in tracts that are more than 60% black and 83% live in the central city.

**Boston**

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 indicate that the baseline model explains only 15% of the variance in joblessness and only 1.6% of the variance in high labor force participation. Percent black is significant and has a positive effect on joblessness while income is significant but has a negative effect on joblessness. Income is the only significant predictor of high labor force participation and as expected, has a positive effect.

The interaction model adds little to the explanation of joblessness and labor force participation. While this model explains slightly more of the variance in both variables (17% and 2.3%), only income is a significant predictor (positive) of joblessness and none of the main effects nor the interaction terms are significant predictors of labor force participation.

These findings suggest that the neighborhood characteristics specified here are weak predictors of labor force outcomes for African Americans in metropolitan Boston. Central city/suburban residence is not significant for high labor force participation or joblessness and only neighborhood class composition is significant for high labor force participation. This could be due
to the fact that blacks in Boston are more residentially dispersed across neighborhoods of varying racial compositions. In addition, economic growth in the form of high technology and service industries has occurred both inside and outside of the city limits (Downs 1994; Mollenkopf 1983).

**Atlanta**

The findings for Atlanta suggest that in black segregated neighborhoods in metropolitan Atlanta, class composition plays a more crucial role in determining labor force outcomes than in neighborhoods of other racial compositions. Tables 7.1 and 7.2 report the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression coefficients for joblessness. In metropolitan Atlanta, the baseline model explains 32% of the variance in joblessness. All three predictors are significant. Percent black has a positive effect on joblessness while income has a negative effect. Living in the central city is positively related to joblessness. This model explains slightly less of the variance in high labor force participation (28%). It would be expected that similar results would be found for this measure as for joblessness. For this outcome however, percent black is not significant. But as expected, income and suburban residence are both significant and positively related to labor force participation. These findings are partially consistent with residential segregation and poverty literature which shows negative labor force consequences for predominantly black neighborhoods and central city neighborhoods.

The interaction model includes the three interaction terms that were hypothesized to have a significant effect on each outcome. The amount of variance explained increases for both joblessness and labor force participation. As expected, the results for both outcomes are nearly identical except for direction of effect. The interaction between percent black and median income is significant and negative for joblessness while significant and positive for labor force participation. As described by McClendon (1994), the inclusion of these interaction terms means that the effect of a unit increase in each of the main effects of the independent variables are now dependent on the value of the other variable in the product term. Therefore, the effect of median income is now determined by not only its own coefficient but also the addition of percent black multiplied by the coefficient of the interaction term. A negative interaction indicates that as percent black increases, the effect of neighborhood class composition on joblessness becomes more negative and thus the
effect increases. And as percent black increases, the effect of neighborhood class composition on high labor force participation becomes also increases. These findings imply that in predominantly black neighborhoods, class composition has a larger effect in effect in reducing negative labor force consequences (joblessness) and a significantly larger effect in increasing beneficial labor force outcomes (high levels of participation).

Summary

The results of Tables 7.1 and 7.2 indicate striking contrasts of the degree to which neighborhood characteristics influence the labor force experience of African Americans across the metropolitan areas of Atlanta, Detroit, and Boston, particularly when the explanatory model becomes more complex. First, both models explain a great deal more of the variance in joblessness for Detroit than in the other two cities. This is most likely attributable to the extremely uneven pattern of economic growth and decline across metropolitan Detroit neighborhoods coupled with its legacy of racial segregation. When joblessness is regressed on only the three main effects, the results for Detroit and Atlanta are nearly identical. Living in black segregated neighborhoods in Detroit and Atlanta increases black joblessness. However, when the three interaction terms are added, very different results are produced. It is here that differences in Detroit and Atlanta are revealed. The only two significant variables in Atlanta are income and percent black by income indicating that as percent black increases, neighborhood class composition increases its differentiating effect on joblessness. This suggests that black segregated neighborhoods in Atlanta are less likely to have a negative impact on black joblessness when the income level of the neighborhood improves. In Detroit, the neighborhood characteristic which stands out most in influencing labor force experience is central city/suburban residence. Both neighborhood racial and class composition are dependent on this particular factor. Living in the city reduces the differentiating effect of neighborhood racial composition but increases the differentiating effect of income on labor force experience. These findings point to the nature of Detroit and cities like it which have experienced dramatic central city economic decline and high black concentrations in the central city. The vast majority of tracts in the city of Detroit are predominantly black and economic decline has been severe throughout the central city. Table 6.5 provides further evidence of Detroit's
distinctiveness in that it is here that the largest black/white gap in joblessness occurs. However, black joblessness is higher than that for whites in all three regions. Metropolitan Boston stands out in that neither neighborhood racial composition nor city/suburban residence are significant predictors of African American labor force experience. There are probably several factors working together to account for the weakness of the models in Boston. One is the relatively small African American population (11.6%) as compared to Detroit and Atlanta. The black population is also more widely distributed across neighborhood types which lessens the likelihood of socioeconomic isolation. And most important, Boston's economic growth with industries that accommodate both high and low-skilled workers has not been limited to suburban areas only. The findings for labor force experience illustrate the importance of more complex models in explaining the consequences of segregation for African Americans and the need to make regional distinctions.

**SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS: EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION**

**Detroit**

As reported in Table 7.3, the baseline model explains 49% of the variance in SES in metropolitan Detroit. Here, only median income is significantly related to SES. Thus, higher income neighborhoods are more likely to contain a higher percentage of college educated professional African Americans. However, neither the racial composition nor the location of the neighborhood in either the central city or suburbs is a significant predictor of SES which does not support previous research pointing to the negative consequences of living in the central city for African Americans and Wilson's black middle-class migration hypothesis (Jargowsky 1998; Wilson 1987). The interaction model explains 50% of the variance in SES but none of the interaction effects are significant. Thus, in Detroit the effects of the neighborhood characteristics presented here do not differ significantly for neighborhoods of varying racial and class compositions nor in the central city versus the suburbs. Most likely, these findings can be attributed to the heavy concentration of African Americans in predominantly black neighborhoods both within the city of Detroit and in adjacent suburbs regardless of neighborhood class composition.
**Boston**

Table 7.3 reports that the baseline model explains 29% of the variance in SES. Percent black is significant and negatively related to SES while median income is significant and positive. These findings support traditional ideas about black segregated neighborhoods having negative socioeconomic consequences for African Americans (Massey et al. 1987). However, neighborhood location is not a significant predictor of black SES as hypothesized, suggesting that reducing segregation and living in higher income neighborhoods in either central city or suburban neighborhoods would be beneficial for black SES. The interaction model explains slightly more of the variance in SES but none of the interactions are significant. Thus, in Boston, the effects of percent black and median income do not differ significantly for neighborhoods of varying racial and class compositions nor in the central city versus the suburbs.

**Atlanta**

As described previously, socioeconomic status (SES) is measured by an index which combines the percent of African Americans with at least a bachelor's degree and those in professional occupations. Table 7.3 reports that the baseline model explains 47.5% of the variance in SES. Both tract income and central city residence are significant and positively related to SES. It should be noted that because these data are cross-sectional, SES is unique in that the results can be reasonably explained in two ways. First, as the hypothesized direction would imply, the results could mean that higher status neighborhoods with higher quality resources and amenities create an environment which promotes higher education and professional careers. Secondly, as Massey et al. (1987) point out, with rising social status, blacks like other groups attempt to improve their spatial position by selecting higher status neighborhoods. In this case that would mean blacks with high SES selecting neighborhoods with high median incomes which would be the opposite direction of that hypothesized. The positive effect of central city residence on SES contradicts Wilson's (1987) black middle class migration hypothesis. While higher income tracts are more likely to contain higher educated, professional blacks, these tracts are more likely to be located in the central city. This could very well reflect the young, black, urban, professional migration to Atlanta in recent years coupled with central city development and growth.
The interaction model explains 49% of the variance in SES, slightly more than the baseline model. All three main effects are significant and positive and two of the interactions are significant and negative. As hypothesized, the effects of racial and class composition do vary between the central city and suburbs. The negative coefficient for percent black by central city/suburban residence indicates that living in the city reduces the positive effect of percent black on SES to zero so that in the city, there is no effect of racial composition on SES. The negative coefficient for median income by central city/suburban residence indicates that in the city, the positive effect of median income is significantly less in the suburbs. Thus, the positive effects of living in a predominantly black and higher income neighborhoods on SES are significantly less for African Americans when these neighborhoods are located in the central city. It is clear then that examining the main effects alone do not provide a complete picture of how the neighborhood characteristics influence SES. The interaction term also indicates that the positive effect of living in the central city on SES is dependent upon the class and racial composition of the neighborhood. When a neighborhood becomes either predominantly black or better off financially, the positive effect of living in the city on black SES decreases. For example, when a neighborhood is 60% black and the median income is only $10,000, the effect of central city location is 1.31 compared to 1.09 when the neighborhood is still 60% black but the median income is $34,000 which is about the average for metropolitan Atlanta. The effect of living in the city on black SES becomes smaller when blacks live in higher income neighborhoods suggesting that in higher income neighborhoods, black SES is not influenced by the location of the neighborhood.

Summary
The results of the baseline model for SES, as measured by high educational and occupational status, reveal that median income is a significant positive predictor across all three cities as hypothesized. However, regional differences appear when it comes to neighborhood racial composition and central city versus suburban location. Only in Boston does racial composition have a significant effect on SES. As percent black increases in Boston neighborhoods, African American SES declines. Thus, previous research on the negative consequences of black segregated neighborhoods on African Americans is supported but only in Boston. In neither Detroit nor Boston
is central city location an important determinant of black SES. In Atlanta, neighborhood location in the central city is positively related to black SES. These findings are contrary to previous research which cites central city location as a hindrance to African American SES. But, while neighborhood racial composition is not significantly related to the proportion of blacks with high SES in Detroit and Atlanta, a case could be made for reversing the causal order. High SES blacks could be choosing to live in higher income neighborhoods regardless of the racial composition.

The interaction model, which explores the baseline findings in more detail reveals that in Detroit and Boston, the neighborhood effects do not vary across racial and class composition or between the central city and suburban areas. In Detroit, black SES in a neighborhood appears to be simply a function of neighborhood class composition. Therefore, across neighborhoods of varying racial compositions, in the city and the suburbs, blacks in Detroit are able to attain high levels of SES when neighborhood class composition improves. In Boston, black SES is affected by both neighborhood racial and class composition.

It is only in Atlanta that more complex neighborhood variations appear to influence SES. The interaction model reveals that in the city, percent black has no effect on SES but has a positive effect in the suburbs. Obviously, there are some high SES black suburban neighborhoods in metropolitan Atlanta. Also, there are aspects to living in the city which appear to mute the effects of median income in improving SES. This result could reflect gentrification in Atlanta which according to Orfield and Ashkinaze (1991) occurred on a larger scale than in many other cities. Beginning in the mid-1970's, middle and upper-income white households were attracted to the housing opportunities available in upscale, close-in Atlanta neighborhoods and coupled with the growth in professional and service employment inside the city, increased the affluence of the city's white population. The city's black population grew slowly and became poorer after 1970 while black suburban growth was rapid. The positive effect of central city on black SES which is also contrary to previous research is shown to be dependent upon the racial and class composition of the neighborhood. Living in a higher income neighborhood decreases the difference in the city/suburban effect on SES. But living in a predominantly black neighborhood, increases the
difference in the city/suburban effect on SES to the extent that racial composition only matters in the suburbs.

These findings most likely reflect the unique socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of blacks in Atlanta. First, unlike Boston and Detroit, only 34% of blacks in this sample of metropolitan Atlanta neighborhoods live in the central city which means that a relatively large proportion of blacks are suburbanized and thus less likely to experience low levels of SES found in the central city. Secondly, the city has the largest concentration of historically black colleges in the country. And since the mid-1970's, the metropolitan area has undergone rapid industrial and commercial business growth which has resulted in a large migratory flow of blacks into the area, many of whom are well-educated and professional (Blackwell and Hart 1982). In addition, the city has a high degree of political leadership and activism among African Americans. Taken together, all of these things have allowed well off, predominantly black suburbs to emerge in Atlanta and thus makes Atlanta unique in how racial residential segregation affects African American socioeconomic status. However, the black/white gap in educational attainment is apparent given the data in Table 6.5. Compared to whites in the Atlanta MSA, blacks are less likely to have a bachelor's degree which is consistently true across metropolitan areas.

**WEALTH: HOMEOWNERSHIP AND HOME VALUE**

**Detroit**

Table 7.4 reports that the baseline model explains 35% of the variance in homeownership in Detroit. Percent black and median income are significant and positively related to homeownership. Black homeownership is not found to differ significantly between the central city and the suburbs. The baseline model explains 70% of variance for black median home value, substantially more than for homeownership (Table 7.5). In this model, median income is significant and positively related to home value while central city location is negatively related to home value. The findings for these models indicate that blacks are more likely to own homes in higher income neighborhoods as well as homes with higher values only when these homes are located in the suburbs. Living in a predominantly black neighborhood appears to benefit black homeownership.
rates but is not a significant predictor of home values. However, central city residence significantly lowers home values and in Detroit, blacks represent more than 80% of central city residents.

The interaction model explains only 36% of the variance in homeownership but 78% of the variance in median home value. None of the interaction terms are significant for homeownership. Thus, the effects found in the baseline model do not differ significantly across neighborhoods of varying racial and class compositions and between the city and the suburbs. However, the interaction percent black by median income has a significant effect on median home value. The negative coefficient indicates that as percent black increases, the positive effect of median income on home value decreases. Thus, in black segregated neighborhoods, the differentiating effect of class composition on home value declines indicating the importance of neighborhood racial composition in determining black wealth in Detroit.

**Boston**

Table 7.4 reports that the baseline model explains 38.4% of the variance in homeownership and 23% of the variance in median home value as shown in Table 7.5. All three main effects are significantly related to homeownership. Percent black and median income are positively related while central city is negatively related. Thus, blacks are more likely to own homes in neighborhoods with larger black populations and higher incomes located in the suburbs. Only median income is significantly related to home value indicating that by improving the class composition of their neighborhood, blacks in Boston are able to increase the value of their homes.

The interaction model explains 39.4% of the variance in homeownership and 23.9% of the variance in median home value. While none of the interaction terms are significant for home value, the interaction of median income and central city/suburban residence is significantly related to homeownership. The negative coefficient indicates that in the city, the positive effect of median income on black homeownership decreases. The city effect is mainly dependent on income. As income increases in neighborhoods, the negative effect of central city location on black homeownership becomes even more negative. But as income decreases in , the negative city effect increases and eventually reaches zero, at which point neighborhood location no longer has an impact on black homeownership. Therefore, blacks in Boston are more likely to own homes in higher
income neighborhoods when they are located in the suburbs but the value of their homes are primarily dependent on the class composition of the neighborhood.

Atlanta

As described previously, wealth is measured by homeownership and median home value. Table 7.4 shows that the baseline model explains 25.3% of the variance in black homeownership. All three main effects are significant. Both percent black and median income are positively related to homeownership while central city residence is negatively related. Blacks are more likely to own homes in black segregated neighborhoods which could suggest either preferences or housing discrimination. Table 7.5 reports that the baseline model explains 46% of the variance in median home value for blacks. Percent black is not a significant predictor of median home value but median income and central city residence are significant and positively related to black home value. These findings indicate that blacks are more likely to own homes in predominantly black, higher income, suburban neighborhoods but that black home values are greater in higher income central city neighborhoods.

The interaction model explains slightly more of the variance in homeownership and median home value (33% and 48.5%). The two significant interactions are percent black by income and percent black by central city/suburban residence. Both are positively related to homeownership but negatively related to home value. As percent black increases, the positive effect of median income on homeownership also increases but decreases for median home value. Thus, in more segregated black neighborhoods, income increases the rate of black homeownership more than in areas with fewer blacks but lowers the value of these homes. Living in the city increases the positive effect of percent black on homeownership but decreases the positive effect of percent black on median home value. In fact, in neighborhoods with higher income levels, the effect of percent black on median income becomes negative. The city effect on homeownership is mainly dependent upon the racial composition of the neighborhood. In black neighborhoods, regardless of class composition, the negative effect of central city location on homeownership decreases, meaning that the central city/suburban difference in black homeownership decreases in predominantly black neighborhoods. The city effect on median home value is very similar. The central city/suburban difference in black
median home values decreases in predominantly black neighborhoods. In their study of Atlanta, Orfield and Ashkinaze (1991) explain that although levels of black homeownership in the 1980's were higher than in many northern cities, it could simply be a result of declining housing prices in areas undergoing racial transition. The racial transition of neighborhoods occurred in both the city and the suburbs as black suburbanization occurred in areas adjacent to the city while whites mainly moved to northern suburbs which perpetuated the segregation existing in the city.

Summary

In sum, according to results of the baseline model, it appears that for African Americans, median income of a neighborhood is a positive predictor of both wealth measures, homeownership and median home value across all three metropolitan areas. Another consistency is that percent black is a positive predictor of homeownership but not a significant predictor of median home value in all three areas. These findings appear contrary to research which finds black segregated neighborhoods to have negative effects on outcomes such as home value (Massey and Denton 1993; Oliver and Shapiro 1995). However, the findings also reveal that regardless of region, blacks are more likely to own homes in neighborhoods where their numbers are greater and that living in integrated or predominantly white neighborhoods reduces homeownership possibilities. This supports previous research which finds that blacks of all class levels remain limited in their housing choices as a result of discrimination in the real estate and mortgage lending markets (Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Yinger 1995). Table 6.5 reveals that when compared to whites, blacks are less likely to own homes in all three metropolitan regions. Thus, not only are blacks limited to homeownership in predominantly blacks neighborhoods where housing values tend to be lower, they are also less likely than whites to own homes.

In terms of neighborhood location, living in the city decreases black homeownership rates in Boston and Atlanta but has no effect in Detroit. This effect along with that of percent black suggests that the suburban neighborhoods blacks reside in are probably highly segregated, indicating that moving to the suburbs does not change the relative location of blacks and whites. The value of homes owned by blacks are greater in the city of Atlanta and no difference exists between Boston city and suburban homes. In Detroit, homes owned by blacks are worth less in the city. Thus, the
ideal "American dream" of owning a home in the suburbs is attainable for blacks in contemporary times but homes owned by them are either low in value or no different in the city or in the suburbs. For instance, in Atlanta where the majority of blacks are suburbanized, living in the suburbs increases black homeownership rates but the homes are worth less in the suburbs. In Detroit, blacks are as likely to own homes in the city as they are in the suburbs but homes are worth less in the city where the vast majority live. And in Boston, blacks are more likely to own homes in the suburbs but black home values do not vary significantly between the city and the suburbs.

The interaction model reveals strikingly different regional variations in the effects found from the baseline model where there appeared to be consistency. In Atlanta, as percent black increases, the positive effect of median income on homeownership increases but the positive effect of median income on home value decreases. Thus, while African Americans in black segregated Atlanta neighborhoods are more likely to own homes in middle class neighborhoods, they are unable to take advantage of the differentiating effects of class when it comes to the value of their home. Also, black suburbanization in Atlanta does not improve rates of homeownership or home values over what occurs in the central city when the neighborhoods are predominantly black. Thus, as the literature would predict, black segregated neighborhoods mute the benefits of living in the suburbs. In Detroit, as the income of the neighborhood increases, the negative effect of percent black on median home value increases to a point where racial composition no longer influences black home values. In Boston, living in the city decreases the positive effect of income on black homeownership but has no effect on black home values.

It is clear that metropolitan spatial patterns disadvantage blacks when it comes to wealth as measured by homeownership rates and the value of their homes. But there are exceptions to and variations on the severity of this inequity depending on region. The interaction model reveals that blacks in Boston are primarily disadvantaged as a result of the class composition of their neighborhood and its location within the central city. This finding is positive in that improving neighborhood class composition and changing location from city to suburb have historically proven to be much easier to do than reducing residential segregation and racial discrimination in the housing
market. However, because race, class, and central city residence are so closely related, closing the residential wealth gap is inevitably a difficult task.

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

The nature of residential segregation's influence on all of the measures of status attainment, as stated above, is highly dependent upon the two other neighborhood characteristics used in this study. Both neighborhood class composition and neighborhood location in the central city or the suburbs influence how segregation impacts black status attainment but in different ways across the metropolitan regions of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta.

A key issue which guided the analyses in this study was the extent to which neighborhood class composition influences the effect of segregation on black status attainment. The influence of class composition on segregation's effect was found to vary across measures of status attainment and across regions.

The effect of residential segregation on both measures of labor force participation in Atlanta varies by neighborhood class composition. Living in a black segregated neighborhood in Atlanta is less likely to have a negative impact on the labor force experience of blacks when they live in middle and upper income neighborhoods. In Atlanta, the effect of residential segregation on both wealth measures also varies by neighborhood class composition. In predominantly black neighborhoods, blacks are more likely to own homes in middle and upper income neighborhoods but the positive influence of neighborhood class composition on home values decreases in these neighborhoods. Thus, when blacks in Atlanta live in predominantly black neighborhoods, they are unable to take advantage of the wealth benefits that generally accompany residence in middle and upper income neighborhoods. In terms of home value, this is not true in Detroit where improvements in neighborhood class composition eliminates the negative influence of living in a predominantly black neighborhood. In none of the three regions does the effect of residential segregation on SES vary by neighborhood class composition. As stated above, the limitations of this study may account for the insignificant effects of interactions between the neighborhood characteristics on SES.
Another key issue which guided the analyses in this study was whether the effect of segregation on black status attainment differed in the central city and the suburbs of metropolitan Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta. The influence of central city versus suburban location on segregation's effect was also found to vary across measures of attainment and across regions.

The effect of residential segregation on the measures of black status attainment varies by central city/suburban location only in Atlanta and Detroit and in each region, the effect varies for different measures. In Detroit, the importance of central city versus suburban residence for labor force outcomes is revealed. Living in the city reduces the impact of residential segregation on labor force experience. A reasonable explanation for this finding would be that the vast majority of neighborhoods in the city of Detroit are predominantly black and thus, there is little variation in racial composition. In Atlanta, residential segregation's effect on SES varies by neighborhood location. Living in a predominantly black neighborhood has a positive effect on black SES in the suburbs. In this case, Wilson's depopulation hypothesis is supported, however, blacks with high SES remain segregated even in the suburbs. In Atlanta, it is the effect of neighborhood location in the central city or the suburbs on wealth which varies by levels of segregation. Living in a predominantly black neighborhood in Atlanta reduces the central city/suburban difference in rates of homeownership and home values.

The last combination of neighborhood characteristics tested for their influence on black status attainment were neighborhood class composition and the location of the neighborhood in the central city versus the suburbs. Two of the main arguments in this research are that black status attainment differs in the central city and the suburbs and is influenced by the class composition of neighborhoods in which blacks reside. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that the influence of neighborhood class composition on black status attainment will be different in the central city and in the suburbs. The interaction between these two neighborhood characteristics is significant in all three regions but for different measures of status attainment.

In Detroit, the effect of class composition on both measures of labor force experience is different in the central city and in the suburbs. Neighborhood class composition is more important in the city of Detroit than in the suburbs for labor force outcomes. This finding makes sense
considering that job losses have been so severe in rustbelt cities like Detroit. Most likely, blacks who reside in middle and upper income neighborhoods have little problem finding employment due to higher levels of skill and education and thus, are less likely to be affected by lack of job opportunities in the city. In Atlanta, as class composition of the neighborhood improves, the difference between black SES in the city and suburbs declines to zero. Thus, for blacks in middle and upper income neighborhoods, black SES does not differ in central city or suburban neighborhoods in Atlanta. In Boston, living in the city reduces the benefits of higher income neighborhoods on homeownership. It could very well be that blacks who are not able to purchase a home are more likely to live in the city of Boston and as a result, median income of the neighborhood becomes a less significant factor.

An important point to consider in summarizing these results, which has been briefly mentioned in this chapter, is how blacks are faring socioeconomically in comparison with whites. Table 6.5 provides some insights into this issue. For instance, based on the empirical evidence discussed above, it appears that living in a predominantly black suburb of Atlanta has a positive impact on black educational and occupational attainment. However, this is true only relative to other blacks in Atlanta. Historically, black affluence has not meant the same as white affluence in terms of income, wealth, and other measures of status attainment (Galster and Hill 1992; Massey and Denton 1993; Oliver and Shapiro 1995). Table 6.5 shows that living in metropolitan Atlanta may be more beneficial for black educational attainment than living in Detroit since 12% of blacks in Atlanta have at least a bachelor's degree compared to only 6% in Detroit. But in the context of black/white inequality, narrowing the gap between blacks and whites may not be happening in Atlanta any more than in other metropolitan areas given that Table 6.5 also illustrates that whites are twice as likely as blacks to have a bachelor's degree in all three metropolitan areas. Blacks in Atlanta are also less likely than whites to be homeowners and more than likely than whites to be jobless. This is true for Boston and Detroit. Thus, as a cautionary note, it should be kept in mind that the empirical results of this dissertation are not able to explain how neighborhood characteristics influence black status attainment relative to whites. The results do however, shed light on how neighborhood characteristics such as segregation either constrain or enhance status attainment.
among blacks. In addition, the results shed light on whether blacks in predominantly white neighborhoods are actually doing better than blacks in predominantly black neighborhoods, which has not been fully explored in prior research.
### Panel A: Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>.070* (.023)</td>
<td>.103* (.043)</td>
<td>.101* (.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>-.513* (.041)</td>
<td>-.346* (.065)</td>
<td>-.228* (.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>9.223 (1.792)</td>
<td>-5.95 (2.235)</td>
<td>5.140 (1.596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>32.592</td>
<td>26.002</td>
<td>22.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Panel B: Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>.198* (.037)</td>
<td>.125 (.159)</td>
<td>.014 (.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>-.295* (.097)</td>
<td>-.331* (.096)</td>
<td>-.437* (.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>5.453 (1.995)</td>
<td>-2.471 (2.949)</td>
<td>-6.31 (1.648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black *</td>
<td>-.001 (.002)</td>
<td>-.004 (.005)</td>
<td>-.011* (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>-.199* (.044)</td>
<td>-.106 (.161)</td>
<td>.013 (.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black *</td>
<td>-.710* (.161)</td>
<td>-.266 (.246)</td>
<td>.110 (.115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Suburban Tract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Suburb Tract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>33.972</td>
<td>25.804</td>
<td>19.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Entries are in thousands of dollars.

Entries are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

* p < .05

Table 7.1: Regression of Joblessness Rate on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics (Panel A) and on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics with Interactions (Panel B)
### Panel A: Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>-.048*</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income*</td>
<td>.325*</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.347*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>-1.094</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>-3.258*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.763)</td>
<td>(2.674)</td>
<td>(1.544)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>62.350</td>
<td>64.922</td>
<td>69.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Panel B: Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>-.106*</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.191)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income*</td>
<td>.246*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.460*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.056)</td>
<td>(3.544)</td>
<td>(1.693)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black * Tract Median Income</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black * City/Suburban Tract</td>
<td>.104*</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td>(0.193)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income * City/Suburb Tract</td>
<td>.374*</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.166)</td>
<td>(0.295)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>62.249</td>
<td>64.059</td>
<td>70.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Entries are in thousands of dollars.

* Entries are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

* * p < .05

Table 7.2: Regression of High Labor Force Participation on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics (Panel A) and on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics with Interactions (Panel B)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel A: Baseline</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.009 *</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
<td>(.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median</td>
<td>.074 *</td>
<td>.065 *</td>
<td>.100 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income *</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>(.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.916 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.169)</td>
<td>(.232)</td>
<td>(.192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel B: Interaction</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.011 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.004)</td>
<td>(.016)</td>
<td>(.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median</td>
<td>.078 *</td>
<td>.059 *</td>
<td>.107 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income *</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1.095 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.202)</td>
<td>(.306)</td>
<td>(.212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black *</td>
<td>-.980E-04</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.815E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black *</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.019 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Suburban Tract</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
<td>(.017)</td>
<td>(.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.030 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* City/Suburb Tract</td>
<td>(.016)</td>
<td>(.025)</td>
<td>(.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>-.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Entries are in thousands of dollars.

Entries are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

$ p < .05$

Table 7.3: Regression of SES (Education and Occupation) on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics (Panel A) and on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics with Interactions (Panel B)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel A: Baseline</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>.315*</td>
<td>.327*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.039)</td>
<td>(.068)</td>
<td>(.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income*</td>
<td>1.193*</td>
<td>1.355*</td>
<td>1.127*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.070)</td>
<td>(.104)</td>
<td>(.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>-9.304*</td>
<td>-18.325*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.043)</td>
<td>(3.551)</td>
<td>(3.779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>46.408</td>
<td>33.017*</td>
<td>48.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel B: Interaction</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black</td>
<td>.352*</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.189*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.067)</td>
<td>(.252)</td>
<td>(.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income*</td>
<td>1.197*</td>
<td>1.516*</td>
<td>1.524*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.175)</td>
<td>(.152)</td>
<td>(.153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City or Suburban Tract</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>-13.489*</td>
<td>-21.583*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.613)</td>
<td>(4.685)</td>
<td>(4.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black *</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Percent Black *</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Suburban Tract</td>
<td>(.079)</td>
<td>(.255)</td>
<td>(.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Median Income*</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.819*</td>
<td>-.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Suburb Tract</td>
<td>(.292)</td>
<td>(.391)</td>
<td>(.280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>50.011</td>
<td>32.203</td>
<td>48.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Entries are in thousands of dollars.

b Entries are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

p < .05

Table 7.4: Regression of Homeownership on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics (Panel A) and on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics with Interactions (Panel B)
### Panel A: Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Percent Black</strong></td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.064)</td>
<td>(.250)</td>
<td>(.088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Median Income</strong></td>
<td>2.695*</td>
<td>2.143*</td>
<td>2.730*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.110)</td>
<td>(.374)</td>
<td>(.188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City or Suburban Tract</strong></td>
<td>-14.036*</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>22.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.822)</td>
<td>(15.517)</td>
<td>(6.730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>61.125</td>
<td>182.497</td>
<td>73.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Panel B: Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Percent Black</strong></td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.093)</td>
<td>(.847)</td>
<td>(.100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Median Income</strong></td>
<td>2.132*</td>
<td>2.046*</td>
<td>2.101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.261)</td>
<td>(.746)</td>
<td>(.264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City or Suburban Tract</strong></td>
<td>-10.429*</td>
<td>-4.141</td>
<td>25.690*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.777)</td>
<td>(24.056)</td>
<td>(8.504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Percent Black * Tract Median Income</strong></td>
<td>-.025*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.032)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Percent Black * City/Suburban Tract</strong></td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-1.166</td>
<td>-.443*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.112)</td>
<td>(.860)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tract Median Income * City/Suburb Tract</strong></td>
<td>-.635</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.393)</td>
<td>(2.167)</td>
<td>(.700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>46.096</td>
<td>193.250</td>
<td>69.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Entries are in thousands of dollars.
* Entries are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.
* p < .05

Table 7.5: Regression of Median Home Value on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics (Panel A) and on Neighborhood Tract Characteristics with Interactions (Panel B). Sample includes only tracts with at least ten homeowners.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In their analysis of contemporary patterns of inequality between blacks and whites in urban America, Galster and Hill (1992) present a theoretical model in which place, power, and polarization interact, producing distinctly different outcomes for individuals and communities. Focusing on the place and power aspect of their model, the purpose of this dissertation has been to gain a better understanding of how place (neighborhoods and regions) interacts with and impacts the degree of power (status attainment) available to African Americans. More specifically, the major concern in this research is with the contextual nature of the relationship between racially segregated neighborhoods and status attainment outcomes for African Americans.

The analyses conducted in this dissertation were guided by several key questions which have not been adequately addressed by prior research on residential segregation. First, what effect does residential integration have on black status attainment? Second, how does the class composition of a neighborhood influence the relationship between neighborhood racial composition and black status attainment? Third, does the effect of residential segregation on black status attainment differ in the central city and the suburbs of a metropolitan area? Lastly, does the relationship between residential segregation and black status attainment differ across metropolitan areas which have been affected by distinctly different social, political, economic, and historical forces? Addressing these questions sheds light on the contentions of Mollenkopf (1983) and Sugrue (1996) that while racial inequalities resulting from patterns such as residential segregation have been consistent across the U.S., the dimensions, significance, and consequences of these have differed across urban contexts.

In order to address the research questions above, neighborhood characteristics in metropolitan Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta were analyzed for their effect on black status attainment.
The choice of these three metropolitan regions was based on the three-category typology of metropolitan regions developed by Mollenkopf (1983). The empirical analyses were guided by a sociohistorical analysis of each region similar to that of Wilson's (1978) analysis of northern and southern differences in the historical transformation of race relations. The neighborhood characteristics used to predict black status attainment were: racial composition, class composition, and the location of the neighborhood in the central city or the suburbs. The dimensions of status attainment examined were: educational and occupational status, labor force experience measured by the unemployment rate and high labor force participation, and wealth which was measured by homeownership and median home value. The empirical results were obtained by estimating two models separately for each region: a basic model estimating the individual effects of each neighborhood characteristic and an interaction model estimating the effect of the three possible two-way interactions between the neighborhood characteristics.

**SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS**

Two general conclusions can be drawn from the empirical findings. First, as hypothesized, neighborhood racial composition does affect the measured outcomes of black status attainment differently across the metropolitan regions of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta. Further, the effect of racial composition on the outcome measures vary in direction and significance both within and among the three cities. Second, the interaction models reveal that the effect of racial composition is more often than not, dependent upon the class composition of the neighborhood and the location of the neighborhood in the central city or the suburbs. The findings highlight the importance of considering the effect of racial segregation on African Americans in the context of other neighborhood characteristics and in the context of each metropolitan region. In addition, the findings highlight the fact that segregation is a more important determinant of some measures of status attainment than others and in fact, neighborhood racial composition in some cases is inconsequential for black status attainment. The remainder of this chapter will summarize how the empirical findings have answered the key questions stated above and describe what the findings tell us about segregation's impact on black status attainment in each city. Lastly, I discuss the implications of the current findings for policy and future research.
Residential Segregation and Black Status Attainment

In all three metropolitan regions, residential location in black segregated neighborhoods negatively influences black labor force experience when it is measured by the rate of joblessness. This is not the case when the measure is high labor force participation. Considering that joblessness is a better reflection of employment opportunities in an area, rather than other factors affecting labor force experience, it makes sense that residential segregation would show a consistently negative influence across regions. Research has shown that black segregated areas, especially in the modern industrial period, suffer from a lack of employment opportunities (Ihlanfeldt 1997; Massey et al. 1991; Wilson 1987). When it comes to SES, which is measured by high educational and occupational status, neighborhood racial composition is only significant in Boston, where living in a black segregated neighborhood has a negative impact on black SES. Neighborhood class composition is more influential in determining high SES across all three regions. The findings for SES suggest that in Detroit and Atlanta, blacks with high SES live in neighborhoods of all racial compositions but these neighborhoods tend to be middle and upper income neighborhoods. Given the large black populations in Detroit and Atlanta as compared to Boston, there would reasonably be a greater number of higher income neighborhoods that vary in racial composition from predominantly white to predominantly black. Although neighborhood racial composition is not significantly related to SES, several limitations of the current study which inhibits the ability to draw conclusions about SES should be pointed out.

First, one of the main arguments regarding residential segregation's effect on SES stems from Wilson's depopulation hypothesis which states that the black middle class have moved out of predominantly black central city neighborhoods. The depopulation hypothesis is supported in Boston. But, while neighborhood racial composition is not significantly related to the proportion of blacks with high SES in Detroit and Atlanta, a case could be made for reversing the causal order. High SES blacks could be choosing to live in higher income neighborhoods regardless of the racial composition.

Secondly, I argue that the quality of schools in black segregated neighborhoods tends to be low due to a lack of resources and facilities. A major problem with testing this argument is that the
movement of people in and out of neighborhoods cannot be determined from the current study. Future research could instead use rates of college enrollment as a measure of SES or a more direct measures of school quality like the ones used in the article by Massey, Condran, and Denton (1987). The use of such measures would of course require the use of additional sources of data to accompany Census data such as the city and state departments of education in each region.

Lastly, evidence has shown that there is a lack of available professional jobs requiring a college degree in black segregated neighborhoods which would result in lower rates of high SES. This too is difficult to determine from the findings since individuals commonly commute to jobs outside of their own neighborhood. As Farley, Danziger, and Holzer (2000) point out about Detroit, a large proportion of central city blacks work in the suburbs while many suburban whites work in the central city. To make up for this limitation, future research could include a measure of distance traveled to work.

The findings for wealth reveal that across all three regions, residential segregation exerts a strong influence on black homeownership rates but not on median home values across all three regions. Blacks are more likely to own homes in predominantly black neighborhoods as well as in higher income neighborhoods. The value of homes owned by blacks are higher in higher income neighborhoods as expected. But when neighborhood income is at the mean for the each region, racial composition has no impact on the value of homes owned by blacks which is contrary to prior research (Horton and Thomas 1998; Oliver and Shapiro 1995).

However, the nature of residential segregation's influence on all of the measures of status attainment, as stated above, is highly dependent upon the two other neighborhood characteristics used in this study. Both neighborhood class composition and neighborhood location in the central city or the suburbs influence how segregation impacts black status attainment but in different ways across the metropolitan regions of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta.

*Residential Segregation and Black Status Attainment: The Influence of Neighborhood Class Composition*

Neighborhood class composition influences the effect of segregation on black status attainment primarily in Atlanta and for all measures of black status attainment in Atlanta except
SES. When blacks in Atlanta live in middle and upper income neighborhoods that are also predominantly black, they are less likely to experience negative labor force outcomes that are associated with black segregated neighborhoods. The findings for class composition and wealth though, show contradictory results for blacks in Atlanta. While blacks in Atlanta are more likely to own homes in predominantly black, middle and upper class neighborhoods, the differentiating effect of neighborhood class composition does not operate when it comes to the value of these homes when they are located in predominantly black neighborhoods. Thus, as research on housing discrimination in Atlanta has revealed, blacks continue to be disadvantaged in the housing market which has led to wide disparities in wealth between blacks and whites (Oliver and Shapiro 1995; Orfield and Ashkinaze 1991; Wyly and Holloway 1999). The wealth and neighborhood class composition finding for Atlanta does not hold true in Detroit at least for median home value. Blacks living in predominantly black neighborhoods in Detroit apparently benefit from improvements in the class composition of their neighborhoods when it comes to the value of their homes. This may be a positive finding for blacks in Detroit given the racial divisiveness which makes integration unlikely. That is, black Detroiters can at least count on residential mobility to come with expected financial gain. However, it could be that these home values are only greater in higher income black neighborhoods because those in lower income black neighborhoods are extremely low. As a result, residential mobility to a predominantly black neighborhood probably does little to narrow the gap in wealth between blacks and whites in metropolitan Detroit. Therefore, future research should include both blacks and whites in order to assess relative and absolute outcomes for blacks in various neighborhood settings.

Residential Segregation and Black Status Attainment: The Influence of Neighborhood Location in the Central City vs. the Suburbs

In reviewing the above results in Chapter 7, it becomes clear that Detroit and Atlanta are divided along status attainment measures in how segregation's impact is influenced by central city versus suburban location. In Detroit, it is segregation's impact on the labor force experience of blacks which is mediated by central city versus suburban residential location. But what is found truly speaks to the extreme racial divide between Detroit's central city and suburbs. The racial
composition of neighborhoods in the city of Detroit has little impact on labor force outcomes because of the consistently high proportion of blacks in all central city neighborhoods. Thus, only in the suburbs does the racial composition of neighborhoods impact labor force outcomes because only in the suburbs is there actually any real variation in racial composition. What is found in the suburbs of Detroit is that living in a predominantly black neighborhood is associated with negative labor force outcomes. This finding reflects the nature of race and job opportunities in metropolitan Detroit. Economic growth and jobs have historically followed the movement of whites who have consistently moved further out into the suburban ring as black suburbanization has increased since the 1970's. As a result of the invasion-succession process in suburban Detroit, blacks are often segregated in the suburbs just as they are in the central city and thus, still isolated from job opportunities.

In Atlanta, segregation's effect on SES and wealth vary in the central city and the suburbs. On a positive note, which supports the image of Atlanta as a "Black Mecca," living in a predominantly black suburban neighborhood has a positive impact on black SES. However, in terms of wealth, when blacks do live in predominantly black neighborhoods in Atlanta, there is no difference between the city and the suburbs in terms of homeownership rates and home values. Thus, blacks in high SES, black suburban neighborhoods in Atlanta, who have achieved residential and socioeconomic mobility, do not have any wealth benefits over those who live in central city, lower income black neighborhoods. This finding again suggests that blacks in Atlanta are at a disadvantage in the housing market.

*Black Status Attainment: The Influence of Neighborhood Class Composition and Central City vs. Suburban Residence*

The above findings about the interaction between neighborhood class composition and central city versus suburban residence reveal important and distinct characteristics about the context of each region. The Detroit metropolitan region has experienced extremely uneven patterns of economic development especially in the labor market. As Farley et al. (2000) point out, between 1960 and 1990, employment in the city of Detroit was cut nearly in half and its share of metropolitan employment declined from 57% to 21%. Thus, blacks in lower income neighborhoods in Detroit,
who are more likely to be low income themselves, are at a greater disadvantage than blacks in middle and upper class neighborhoods, but this is more true in the central city than in the suburbs where job opportunities are greater regardless of neighborhood income level. The findings for Detroit point out the need for future research to analyze the effect of segregation on black status attainment for blacks of different class levels.

In Atlanta, neighborhood class composition serves to decrease differences between black SES in the central city and in the suburbs. Thus, just as was found with neighborhood racial composition, as the income of the neighborhood increases, the benefits of living in the central city over the suburbs for black SES declines. These findings about the effects of neighborhood racial composition and central city/suburban location being highly mediated by the income level of the neighborhood help to explain what Sjoquist (2000) describes as a paradox in Atlanta. Most research on segregation has found that blacks are negatively impacted by living in a segregated neighborhood and even more so when these neighborhoods are located in the central city of a metropolitan area (Fainstein 1993; Massey et al. 1987; Wilson 1987). However, these neighborhood characteristics become inconsequential for black status attainment in Atlanta when blacks live in middle and upper income neighborhoods. This is most likely a reflection of the economic development in and around Atlanta as well as the influx of middle and upper income blacks to the Atlanta area. Living in a higher income neighborhood in the city of Atlanta does more for black status attainment than living in a higher income neighborhood in the city of Detroit where economic decline has been so severe. Similarly, predominantly black neighborhoods in Detroit regardless of income level are very likely to be in or near economically depressed areas within the metropolis which is not as true for Atlanta.

In Boston, the only significant interaction is between neighborhood class composition and central city versus suburban location and this exists only for black homeownership rates. What is revealed about Boston is that in the city, the positive impact of neighborhood class composition on black homeownership rates declines. Thus, blacks living in Boston's suburban neighborhoods benefit from residential mobility in terms of owning a home. Bluestone and Stevenson (2000) point out that housing costs in metropolitan Boston have soared so high in recent years that in 1990, it was the second costliest place to live, and relative to other large metropolitan areas, the price of homes
was over twice as much as the national median. As a result, homeownership in Boston is very low. Given that the price of homes is even greater in the city of Boston than in the surrounding communities, it could very well be that blacks in the city are less likely to own homes in the city of Boston than in the smaller towns and cities of Greater Boston. Thus, neighborhood income levels in the city may matter less in predicting black homeownership rates than they do in the suburbs because blacks in the city may not be able to afford to buy a home regardless of the neighborhood in which they live.

**REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE: A TALE OF THREE CITIES**

The findings in this dissertation provide strong evidence to support the hypothesis that the relationship between black residential segregation and black status attainment varies by region and that these variations are a reflection of the demographic, economic, and political changes that have played out unevenly across U.S. metropolitan regions. As Galster (1996) points out, metropolitan structures can operate to either enhance or constrain opportunities for status attainment depending on one's place of residence. As described in Chapter 5, the metropolitan structures of Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta have operated to enhance or constrain black status attainment dramatically differently within each historical period. The findings of this dissertation clearly illustrate that opportunities for status attainment are indeed dependent on the characteristics of where blacks reside in the metropolis, especially in terms of the level of segregation.

**Atlanta: Black Mecca or Urban Paradox?**

The popular and academic press in recent years have described the experience of blacks in Atlanta in contradictory terms. Atlanta has been described as a "Black Mecca" of opportunity, a dual city, and an urban paradox (Bullard and Thomas 1989; Sjoquist 2000; Stone 1989). The reason for this inconsistency stems from the economic growth and expansion that has taken place in Atlanta during the modern industrial period which has unevenly helped blacks in the region. Much of the disparity results from differences in where blacks live. Ihlanfeldt (1997) finds that the residential segregation of blacks accounts for the disadvantaged position of less educated black workers in the job market relative to whites. While the current analysis does not include whites, it does reveal that living in a high income Atlanta neighborhood lessens the chances for negative labor force outcomes.
when blacks are residentially segregated and that when blacks are segregated in the suburbs, they are more likely to have high levels of education and prestigious occupations than blacks in the central city. Living in a high income neighborhood also decreases the socioeconomic differences between blacks in the central city and suburbs. The growth of jobs for people without a college degree has occurred in the northern suburbs of metropolitan Atlanta, which are predominantly white and where neighborhood income levels tend to be higher than the rest of the region. And whether by choice or because of housing discrimination, the movement of blacks and whites to the suburbs has occurred on opposite sides of the metropolitan region. While whites have moved to northern suburbs, blacks have moved south of the central city. The persistent residential segregation in Atlanta coupled with the lack of job opportunities in low income neighborhoods has led to negative labor force outcomes for many blacks in Atlanta. For blacks in segregated suburban neighborhoods, this is less likely to be true. In the modern industrial period, many black professionals and entrepreneurs flocked to Atlanta's suburbs and with the rise in black middle class suburbanization during this same period, suburban black enclaves were able to thrive. However, many native blacks and lower skilled, less educated newcomers have remained concentrated in the central city where job opportunities for them are few, which explains the paradox of high poverty in the face of an economic boom.

Another issue revealed in this research is that the racial composition of neighborhoods in Atlanta plays a crucial role in the experience of blacks in the housing market. The fact that blacks are more likely to own homes in predominantly black neighborhoods suggests the persistence of one or both historical patterns: racial steering and the willingness of lending institutions to extend home mortgage loans to blacks only in predominantly black neighborhoods. Further, the home values of blacks in predominantly black neighborhoods do not improve when blacks live in high income neighborhoods. Horton and Thomas (1998) find that blacks own homes of lower value than whites regardless of their socioeconomic status and that the negative effect of race is even greater for blacks of higher status. This appears to hold true in Atlanta in terms of race of neighborhood. The wealth benefits of living in a high income neighborhood do not accrue to blacks in segregated
neighborhoods. Thus, describing Atlanta as a "Black Mecca" is only partly true for some and it is certainly not a Mecca of black wealth accumulation.

**Detroit: Forever Separate and Unequal?**

While there may be uncertainty as to how Atlanta should be characterized, both journalists and academics alike seem to agree on how Detroit should be characterized. This agreement reflects the extreme racial, geographic, and economic polarization and inequality that is so readily apparent in metropolitan Detroit to even the casual observer. Sugrue (1996) has described the city of Detroit as going from a magnet of opportunity to a reservation for the poor. And the metropolitan region itself is described by Darden (1987) as one of extreme uneven development with only a few suburban areas experiencing growth rather than decline since the 1970's.

For sure, what has made Detroit stand out among large cities around the world has always been its economy. During the twentieth century, Detroit went from being the manufacturing capital of the world with some of the highest paid workers in the industry to a symbol of decline, abandonment, and poverty as a result of the transformation of the economy in the modern industrial period. The continuing influx of blacks to the city just as the transformation was taking place, white flight to the suburbs, housing discrimination, and commercial disinvestment has left a huge poor black population in the central city. These patterns help to explain why negative labor force outcomes are consistent across neighborhoods in the city where racial composition varies little. Apparently, blacks are less likely to experience negative labor force outcomes when they live in suburban neighborhoods where they are the minority. The catch is that even in the suburbs, blacks are usually segregated. In the city, where blacks are almost always in the majority within a neighborhood, living in a high income neighborhood does improve labor force outcomes and the value of homes. This finding illustrates that although Detroit has experienced extreme economic decline in some industries, middle class blacks have found success, a fact that is obvious from the numerous, relatively enduring middle class enclaves such as Rosedale Park and Palmer Park. However, some scholars emphasize that there are negative consequences for middle class people when they live in places where the poverty rate is as high as in the city of Detroit (Darden 1987; Farley et al. 1994; Massey et al. 1987). And given the persistence of racial discrimination in the
housing market, it could be that many middle class blacks in the city would rather be living in suburban communities with greater access to resources and amenities but are not able to do so.

**Boston: Post-industrial Model City?**

In contrast to Detroit, metropolitan Boston in the twentieth century has been transformed from a distressed region to one of growth and prosperity. While racial hostility and segregation have been historically constant in Boston, the city has never had a large black presence as Atlanta and Detroit and blacks and whites are not as separated from one another as in these large metropolitan areas. As a result, blacks in Boston may be benefitting from being smaller in number as they do not appear to be isolated from the job opportunities and resources the region has to offer. The findings of this study reveal that in Boston, the neighborhood characteristics of race, class, and central city/suburban location, do not nearly explain black status attainment as well as they do in Detroit and Atlanta. The lack of explanatory power of the models could very well be due to the fact that there is much less variation in the independent variables in Boston than in Detroit or Atlanta. What is also probably going on in Boston is that other neighborhood characteristics which were not specified by the models in this study or individual characteristics are more important in predicting black status attainment. Also, the effect of segregation on these status attainment outcomes does not vary by neighborhood class composition nor does it differ in the central city and suburbs. The only significant interactive finding is that black homeownership is mediated by neighborhood income only in the suburbs. Bluestone and Stevenson (2000) find that in the past twenty years, Boston has rapidly increased in minority population, including blacks, who make up at least 10 percent of many communities in the central city and the suburbs. Importantly, these communities are relatively dispersed across the metropolitan region. What this means is that blacks in Boston are less likely to be spatially concentrated and thus isolated from economic opportunity as many are in Detroit and Atlanta. Job opportunities exist in the region even for less educated black workers. This pattern helps to explain why the only consistently significant predictor of black status attainment is neighborhood class composition. While there is reason to be optimistic about Boston and its benefits for black status attainment, wage disparities between blacks and whites and the occupational segregation of blacks in lower status, low wage jobs must be addressed. Further, high
technology industrial growth will leave less educated black workers behind in the labor market. Only in Boston was it found that predominantly black neighborhoods have a negative impact on black SES. Given that 48% of blacks in metropolitan Boston reside in neighborhoods that are at least 60% black, pinpointing what it is about segregated neighborhoods which produces lower levels of black SES in Boston is crucial.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

While the research reported in this dissertation has contributed to our knowledge of how residential segregation impacts black status attainment, there are several limitations of this study already mentioned briefly above, which could help inform future research. Thus, the remainder of this chapter will discuss these limitations, directions for future research, and the implications of the current research for policy decisions.

First, the measure of socioeconomic status (SES) used here does not fully allow for the impact of neighborhood characteristics to be determined. The SES of blacks in a neighborhood was defined as the combined proportions of those with a bachelor’s degree and those with professional or managerial jobs. It is now clear that by defining SES in this way, a case could be made for reversing the causal order since choosing a neighborhood is often influenced by one’s socioeconomic status characteristics such as level of education and occupational status. Also, given the highly mobile nature of U.S. society, the movement of people into and out of neighborhoods most likely occurs quite frequently in some neighborhoods more than others. Thus, it becomes impossible to determine what influence the neighborhood has on obtaining a college degree or being employed professionally when using cross-sectional data. Lastly, the issue of whether or not professional and managerial jobs are available in a neighborhood, which would influence the proportion of blacks in these occupations, cannot adequately be addressed. The common practice of commuting to work cuts across SES levels and makes determining a neighborhood’s influence on occupational status difficult without the inclusion of other factors in the analysis.

The limitations with regard to the measure of SES outlined above can be addressed in future research by making a few methodological changes. In order to determine the degree to which certain neighborhoods suffer from a loss of stable, middle class, professional people, (i.e. Wilson's
The role of neighborhood school quality in producing different proportions of college-educated people across metropolitan regions could be addressed by using a variable such as college acceptance rates for high school students. Or, a more direct measure of school quality could be obtained from city and state records. In addition, in order to determine the presence of professional and managerial jobs within a neighborhood, future research could include a measure of distance traveled to work.

Another issue for future research to consider is how residential segregation impacts African Americans of different levels of SES. For example, do lower and middle income blacks have the same access to job opportunities? Addressing this kind of question would provide a better understanding of the mechanisms which operate to hinder or enhance opportunities for status attainment. And similarly, adding whites to the analysis would shed light on the relative and absolute disadvantages blacks face as a result of their neighborhood location.

While the discussion above clearly points to the need for future research, the findings of this dissertation do provide useful information for policy initiatives. The overall guiding objective of this study was to address the dominant discourse about residential segregation which says that segregated neighborhoods negatively impact African Americans and that integration is the solution. While several negative outcomes for blacks in segregated environments have been well documented, many of these studies have been too broad in focus by not considering neighborhood and regional contexts or have tended to focus on only underclass neighborhoods (Massey et al. 1991; Wilson 1987). Also, large-scale integration of blacks and whites as a policy solution in the near future is unlikely and may be ineffective for several reasons. Among these are: the inevitability of neighborhood racial succession, black/white differences in definitions of integrated, and employment and wage discrimination regardless of where one lives (Braddock and McPartland 1987; Saltman 1991; Schuman et al. 1988; Wood and Lee 1991). Therefore, the research focus became determining the where, when, and how of residential segregation's impact on black status attainment which might then lead to more effective policies. The findings of this study have revealed that there are both distinct differences and similarities across the metropolitan regions of
Detroit, Boston, and Atlanta which point to the need for some general policies to address issues facing blacks in segregated neighborhoods as well as regionally-specific policies that could be implemented at the national level.

First, the most consistent finding across all three regions was segregation's influence on wealth. The fact that blacks are more likely to own homes in predominantly black neighborhoods suggests either preferences for these neighborhoods or the persistence of discriminatory housing practices. Evidence has shown that housing discriminatory is more likely than preferences in the perpetuation of segregation. Research has consistently shown that blacks would prefer to live in integrated neighborhoods and that whites' negative stereotypes about blacks leads to discriminatory real estate practices (Farley et al. 1991; Massey and Denton 1993; Smith 1993). The findings for Detroit and Atlanta provide support for research evidence that shows black home values in predominantly black neighborhoods are lower than those in other neighborhoods even for middle class blacks. Thus, greater efforts need to be made to open up the housing market to blacks by vigorously enforcing anti-discrimination practices among real estate agents and mortgage lenders. To address racial disparities in home values, community development and reinvestment have proven to be effective strategies for creating stable neighborhoods and preventing the spiral of disinvestment and decline that is all too common in blacks neighborhoods (Squires 1992; Thomas 1997).

The cities used in this dissertation were representative of a typology of cities based on the social, political, and economic context of their regions. This typology could serve as a way to simplify the policy initiatives developed by government and business leaders to address racial inequality and urban decline in the U.S. The findings for each city reveal that some specific policies could be implemented in each metropolitan area as well as in areas that are of similar type as described by Mollenkopf (1983).

In Mollenkopf's typology, Atlanta represents a sunbelt city with little industrial history prior to WWII and has since developed into an economically successful postindustrial metropolitan region. Other areas like Atlanta are Phoenix and parts of Texas. But for blacks in Atlanta, a major issue other than wealth is that of access to jobs among blacks in lower income neighborhoods. As Ihlanfeldt (1997) points out about Atlanta, less educated blacks have less knowledge about possible
job opportunities because of their segregation in the central city and areas just south of the city away from northern suburbs where these jobs are located. This demographic and economic pattern is typical of southwestern and southeastern sunbelt areas and affects blacks and Latinos. City officials and employers could join forces to increase knowledge of these jobs and provide adequate access to them. Improving access to jobs, especially in predominantly white suburbs, would also involve addressing employment discrimination by employers who either fear customer disapproval or who have negative attitudes about black workers. A worthwhile policy measure suggested by Sjoquist (2000) would be to conduct fair employment audits similar to fair housing audits. Also, a development strategy for low-income neighborhoods would be beneficial for the entire metropolitan region. In addition to implementing programs such as Empowerment Zones located near residential areas with high unemployment, strategies to revitalize low-income neighborhoods should be made a priority. These strategies would not be simple to implement but might be possible with the cooperation of business leaders, government, private charity, local media, and neighborhood residents.

In Detroit, the main impact of segregation was also found to be on labor force experience but the issue is primarily residential location in the central city versus the suburbs. Detroit is typical of a rustbelt city with a high degree of economic decline and uneven development across its metropolitan region similar to Cleveland and Gary, Indiana. The high degree of divisiveness between blacks and whites and their isolation from each other in the central city and suburbs would require a more aggressive commitment to a development strategy. Unlike cities such as Atlanta, rustbelt regions generally do not have a history of interracial coalition-building which is crucial to central city development. Economic development of distressed central cities would require fostering the belief that the fate of the central city is tied to the entire metropolitan region. In a recent study of Detroit, Farley et al. (2000) have expressed the belief that Detroit is recovering economically. Proof of this recovery can be seen in the relocation of the General Motors headquarters to the city, the movement of the professional football team back to the city, and the building of a new stadium and several casinos. Obviously, major transformations of cities are possible given that this has already occurred in all three regions at one time or another.
Boston represents a prime example of successful adjustment to demographic and economic decline. Chicago would fall into the same category as Boston because these are cities which have bounced back from industrial decline and made the necessary transformation to a commercial and service-oriented economy serving white collar industries. However, the concentration of high technology industries and the accompanying jobs which require high levels of skill and education will undoubtedly require taking steps to improve low-income black access to the employment being generated in these areas. This can be done through training programs, improvements in the quality of schools, and programs which promote college attendance and graduation.

A less advocated, but more reasonable solution to racial inequality than integration is the redevelopment of decaying and neglected areas across the U.S. in general. As Jakle and Wilson (1992) explain, the continued suburban growth but abandonment and decline of older central cities will only result in further development of derelict landscapes and a wasting of the built environment. While I do not suggest that integration should be abandoned as a policy goal, I do argue that the route to integration and the purpose for it should be redirected. However, a goal of creating policy measures that promote an equitable distribution of resources across communities regardless of racial composition along with community development and reinvestment will likely result in the creation of neighborhoods that all groups would find desirable. A commitment to such goals could very well result in achieving racially integrated neighborhoods in the long run.
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