

Augustus Anderson
Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class
Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

TITLE

“Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010”

ABSTRACT

Using confidential Decennial Census 1970-2000 and American Community Survey 2006-2010 data, this research tests the spatial assimilation, place-stratification, and minority culture of mobility models to determine which model better explains the of locational attainment of Blacks into Black middle-class neighborhoods. The study also compares the results of locational attainment for Blacks, as compared to Whites, living in metropolitan areas in the U.S. The present study makes three key findings. First, for Whites, there are distinct differences between locational attainment into White neighborhoods compared to White middle-class neighborhoods. White middle-class neighborhood as a more desirable neighborhood condition implies the necessary use of neighborhood indicators that intersect both race and class characteristics. Second, although individual socioeconomic status matters in locational attainment for both Black and White movers, metropolitan conditions better explain divergent locational attainment between the groups. Third, an increasing metropolitan Black middle-class is a strong determinant of Black access into Black middle-class neighborhoods. This study finds that neither the spatial assimilation model nor the place-stratification perspective can explain locational attainment of Black movers into Black middle-class neighborhoods. In lieu of these theoretical frameworks, the minority culture of mobility model provides the best fitting explanation of movement into Black middle-class neighborhoods.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Black middle-class neighborhood continues to be ignored as a representation of neighborhood quality for Blacks in the United States. The dominant theoretical frameworks in the spatial assimilation model and place stratification perspective do not conceptualize Black middle-class neighborhoods as spaces of neighborhood quality. Moreover, although the minority culture of mobility model, which is a fairly recently constructed theoretical framework, provides the best conceptualization of Black middle-class neighborhoods as places of locational attainment, it still lacks empirical testing. The present study provides an empirical test of the minority culture of mobility model, in addition to the spatial assimilation and place stratification models, in order to broaden the understanding of Black locational attainment in a changing U.S. To date, locational attainment studies have yet to examine the conditions that promote Black access to Black middle-class neighborhoods in light of the growing Black middle-class in the U.S.

since 1970. This study asks, what metropolitan factors explain Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods in the post-Civil Rights era? Do the same factors that explain locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods also explain locational attainment into White neighborhoods?

The present study advances the research of locational attainment in three key ways. First, to my knowledge, most demographic studies have not yet drawn on confidential Census micro-data for their investigations. And most investigations of locational attainment, due to the lack of available data, have not focused on locational attainment in the post-Civil Rights era (Freeman 2008). The present study utilizes confidential micro-data from the Decennial Census 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 and the American Community Survey (ACS) 2006-2010 to take a comprehensive look at locational attainment for the Black population in the U.S. This study uses micro-data at the individual level to examine mobility and locational attainment and examines a host of individual- and metropolitan-level predictors.

Second, prior locational attainment studies have used the key neighborhood indicator of the percent White population to represent spatial assimilation of minority populations. Scholars have argued that although middle-class Blacks do integrate more with Whites than do impoverished Blacks, the socioeconomic status of the Whites that they integrate with are on average lower than that of middle-class Whites (Adelman 2004, 2005; Alba et al 2000; Friedman et al 2014). Key studies have shown that Asians and Hispanics are accessing quality neighborhoods while bypassing "whiter" neighborhoods (Adelman et al. 2001). And although Blacks have yet to show the same outcome, Blacks' desire to move into White neighborhoods might be on the decline in the post-Civil Rights era, and questions have arisen as to whether this indicator of neighborhood quality is meaningful for this group (Freeman 2008). To address this issue, I construct a middle-class neighborhood indicator using the confidential micro-data to examine the conditions that might promote Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods. This variable interacts both class and racial characteristics in its representation of a new meaningful locational attainment variable.

Third, we still know little about the extent to which Blacks with socioeconomic resources select Black middle-class neighborhoods (Anderson forthcoming, 1) because alternative frameworks of neighborhood selection, outside of the influence of residential segregation, are rarely tested (Neckerman et al 1999). In using the neighborhood proportion of the Black middle-class as a neighborhood quality indicator, this study offers a direct test of the effects of individual- and metropolitan-predictors on a neighborhood predictor which intersects race and class. In addition to testing individual and metropolitan variable predictors of location into Black middle-class neighborhoods, this study tests whether or not Blacks, in their selection of Black middle-class neighborhoods, do so when there exists a sizable presence of Black middle-class

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class
Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

members in the greater metropolitan area. I also analyze Whites under the same conditions as a point of comparison. Generally, the use of alternative neighborhood quality definitions has not been examined previously due to the lack of available individual-level data. For instance, it is this data that allows for the construction of neighborhood definitions that interest both race and class characteristics.

The paper will begin with a background on locational attainment and Black middle-class neighborhoods. It will then follow with a discussion of the following theoretical frameworks: the spatial assimilation model, the place-stratification perspective, and the minority culture of mobility model. It will provide an explanation of the confidential Census data and outline the methods used to conduct the study's research. And the final sections will present the results of the analysis and provide a discussion and conclusion of its major findings.

II. BACKGROUND

For Alba and Logan's early use of locational attainment, they measured neighborhood quality in two ways—suburban residence and the percentage White population. Measures of neighborhood quality are generally measured as a neighborhood advantage or a neighborhood disadvantage. Neighborhood advantage measures include suburban residence (Alba and Logan 1991; Alba and Logan 1993), proportion White population or racially integrated neighborhood (Alba and Logan 1993; Alba, Logan and Stults 2000; Logan, Alba, McNulty, and Fisher 1996; Woldoff 2008; Freeman 2008; Holloway, Ellis and Wright 2013; Pais et al 2012), median household income or average family income (Alba, Logan, and Stults 2000; Logan, Alba, McNulty, and Fisher 1996; Woldoff 2008; Pais et al 2012) or education level (Adelman, Tsao, Tolnay and Crowder 2001). Other advantage measures have included property values (Harris 1999; Woldoff and Ovadia 2009; Freeman 2008) and homeownership rates (Alba and Logan, 1992; Flippen 2001).

In contrast, some scholars have relied on neighborhood disadvantage as their locational attainment measure. These measures include the use of crime rates (Alba et al 1994; Crowder et al 2001), percent of female-headed households (Adelman, Tsao, Tolnay and Crowder 2001; Crowder et al 2001), poverty rates (Adelman, Tsao, Tolnay and Crowder 2001; Freeman 2008; Swisher et al 2013) and percent of Black males unemployed (Crowder et al 2001). Rosenbaum and Friedman (2001) relied on alternative disadvantaged measures in their study of the assimilation of immigrant households in New York City utilizing the juvenile detention rate, teenager fertility rate, percentage of students in local public elementary schools who score below

grade level in math, and the percentage of persons receiving AFDC¹.

The locational attainment approach began with Alba and Logan's (1992) case study of the NY metropolitan area. They examined the relationship between individual characteristics in access to more racially integrated neighborhoods. Since then scholars have examined a wide range of U.S. metropolitan areas, while considering the importance of both individual- and metropolitan-level characteristics (Pais et al 2012; South et al 2011; Iceland 2013; Timberlake and Iceland 2007). The locational attainment approach remains important in understanding how individual members of society have been able to convert their individual socioeconomic resources into access to better neighborhoods.

Although the neighborhood White percentage has been used an indicator of minority access to resources, it is not clear that living in a White neighborhood is desired by minority group members. Scholars generally find the association between Black individual SES and access to quality neighborhoods, as measured by the proportion of Whites in the neighborhood, to be weak or non-existent. The question is whether or not the neighborhood White proportion as an indicator of neighborhood quality has a meaningful return for minority groups? In fact, it has been determined that Asians and Hispanics are bypassing "whiter" neighborhoods for quality neighborhoods among co-ethnics (Alba, Logan and Stults 2000). Freeman (2008) argues that Blacks' desire to integrate with Whites may be on the decline since 1970. Further, he suggests that the rise in quality Black neighborhoods in this post-Civil Rights era may encourage Blacks to self-select alternative neighborhoods that are higher quality and not majority White. For Blacks, with the growth of the Black middle-class, new alternative neighborhoods may be desired in the form of Black middle-class neighborhoods (Freeman 2008; Lacy 2007; Neckerman et al 1999; Sharkey 2014).

There have been a variety of definitions used to investigate the middle-class that have typically focused on at least one of the following: occupation, income, and education. As it relates to occupation, Landry distinguishes professionals, managers, and small business owners as the upper middle-class (1987). Lacy (2007) also makes a similar distinction between the Black upper or stable middle-class and the lower middle-class. However, she also includes in her definition college education, household income of a \$100k, and homeownership. Oliver and Shapiro (1995) define the middle-class using white-collar jobs along with college education and income between \$25k and \$50k. Wilson (1978) uses a broader definition of middle-class that captures both white- and blue-collar workers. The present study relies on a conservative measure of middle-class based on the aforementioned studies to best define a Black middle-class neighborhood. This middle-class variable construction uses income, education, and occupation measures and will be described in more detail in the Data and Methods section.

¹ Aid to Families with Dependent Children

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class
Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The two major theoretical frameworks, spatial assimilation and place stratification, have offered explanations for the differences in locational attainment for racial and ethnic groups. The spatial assimilation model provides explanation for the relationship between individual resources and residential outcomes (Park 1925; Guest 1980; Alba and Logan 1991; Massey 1985). It contends that as an individual's socioeconomic resources—education, income (Alba and Logan 1991, 1993; Woldoff 2008), wealth (Crowder et al 2006, Woldoff 2008), and cultural assimilation (Portes and Zhou 1993) increases, so will one's access to better neighborhoods. Thus, higher socioeconomic status will lead to residence into better quality neighborhoods. From this perspective, socioeconomic status is more influential to residential access than race or ethnic make-up. Generally, only Asians and Hispanics have been found to follow the tenets of the spatial assimilation model (Alba, Logan and Stults 2000), although within White racial groups there has been recent evidence that darker skinned immigrants are less able to spatially assimilate (Kasinitz et al 2008).

The place stratification perspective is a competing framework to the spatial assimilation model and suggests that race affects residential access as racial and ethnic minorities are less likely than Whites to translate socioeconomic status to neighborhood quality (Alba and Logan 1991). Thus, even when controlling for socioeconomic status, minorities live in lower quality neighborhoods than Whites. Individual and institutional racism continue to act as obstacles to Black access to quality neighborhoods (Pais et al 2012; Swisher et al 2013). There are two versions of the place stratification perspective. The first is the strong version of place stratification, which states that Blacks are less able than Whites to translate socioeconomic resources into locational attainment, and those Blacks that do move into better quality neighborhoods live in worse neighborhoods than their White counterparts (Logan and Alba 1993). The second is the weak version of place stratification that implies that minorities expend more socioeconomic resources to live in similar neighborhoods as Whites, due to higher costs of entry.

Alba and Logan (1991, 1992, 1993) proposed the locational attainment model approach in a series of papers to test the spatial assimilation model (Park 1925) against the newly developed place-stratification perspective (Alba and Logan 1991). Borne out of the spatial assimilation model, the locational attainment model assumes that individuals translate their socioeconomic resources into access into better neighborhoods. Specifically, the model relies on individual-level predictors as independent variables to understand an aggregate-level output as the dependent variable. Alba and Logan's (1991) first locational attainment study used Public

Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data to predict the probability of suburbanization in the U.S. They found that family status, socioeconomic status, and cultural assimilation were significant predictors of suburbanization. Later, Alba and Logan (1992) described a method for producing locational attainment studies that recognized the difficulty of finding appropriate individual- and aggregate-level data sets. Furthermore, these scholars examined spatial assimilation for Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics compared to Whites within the New York City suburban areas finding that while spatial assimilation explained locational attainment for Asians and Hispanics, it did not do so for Whites and Blacks (Alba and Logan 1993). Instead, the place stratification model better explained locational attainment for Whites and Blacks.

A third competing theoretical framework is the minority culture of mobility (MCM) model that states "there are a set of culture elements that is associated with a minority group, and that provides strategies for managing economic mobility in the context of discrimination and group disadvantage" (Neckerman et al 1999). And these strategies are used specifically for problems that arise at the intersection of being both middle-class and minority, such as interracial confrontation and interclass interactions. For Blacks, the MCM framework helps to explain the use of socioeconomic resources to access Black middle-class neighborhoods; yet, there is still limited empirical support of its theoretical advances. The MCM model argues that Blacks may choose Black middle-class neighborhoods when available in response to conditions of racism and discrimination.

Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) argue that in-group preference could be a symptom of existing prejudices of other groups and should not necessarily be equated with the absence of individual or institutional discrimination in the housing market. Scholars have illustrated that Blacks are the least desired potential neighbors of Whites, Asians and Hispanics (Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996; Charles 2000; Clark 2002), which significantly impacts their neighborhood outcomes. Preference outcomes are typically tested using data on neighborhood attitudes. The preference framework generally argues that individuals seek to locate into neighborhoods with a strong in-group presence. And preferences as an extension of ethnocentric social preference have been used as an explanation for the continued residential segregation between racial and ethnic groups (Clark 1986, 1992, 2002). The anti-out group affect argues that anti-Black stereotypes continue to drive a desire of non-Black groups to avoid areas with Black neighbors (Farley et al. 1978, 1994). Preference has been used to maintain relative status advantages in income, occupation, and life-style of non-Black groups over Blacks (Bobo and Zubrinsky 1996).

Neckerman and colleagues (1999) also make a clear distinction between the culture of the Black middle-class and the White middle-class and Black lower and working classes. They state the problems that the Black middle-class individual faces are unique because they are more likely than lower class Blacks to interact in White neighborhoods and experience more discrimination

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

in these neighborhoods. They also have to contend with a distinct set of class-related issues, such as feelings of social isolation when living in White neighborhoods. This may induce middle-class Blacks to seek protection from discrimination and social isolation by living in same-race middle-class neighborhoods. Although the present study cannot test neighborhood preference, it does provide insight into the micro- and macro-level conditions conducive to Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods.

IV. DATA AND METHODS

To test the MCM model, I draw on multiple sources of data, including restricted Decennial Census and American Community Survey microdata. The confidential Census micro-data is a rich source of information that provides individual-level data of the U.S. population at the census-tract level of aggregation. The resource is similar to the Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample (IPUMS) that provides individual-level information at the PUMA level of aggregation whose boundaries include approximately 100,000 residents. All individuals that participated in the Decennial Census long-form and the American Community Surveys are included in the confidential microdata between 1970 and 2010.

For this study, I selected all non-Hispanic Black and non-Hispanic White over the age of 25 years who completed a long-form survey during Decennial Census periods 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 and ACS period 2006-2010. I further narrow the sample to only individuals that moved to focus the examination on the mobile population. Given the study's focus on metropolitan influences in the U.S., I only examine individuals that resided in a U.S. metropolitan area in any given time period. This selection criteria resulted in a robust sample over the full-range of census-defined metropolitan areas that are as large as nine hundred thousand cases for Blacks in 2000 and six million cases for Whites in 1990. In order to compare locational attainment of these groups over time, I analyze each of the five time periods independently. This sample differs from a previous study that explored locational attainment of White and Black non-South to South migrants in the post-Civil Rights period (Anderson forthcoming, 2). However, the expanded data sample used for this study, although it sacrifices nuances across type of mover, is able to speak to larger trends of Black locational attainment in U.S. during the same period.

The data was structured to connect individual socioeconomic and sociodemographic indicators to respective neighborhood characteristics. The census tract is used to proxy for the neighborhood due to its widespread use in the locational attainment literature (e.g., Pais et al 2012), and is preferred in maximizing the richness of the Census microdata. Access to data resources that provide individual-level information at the neighborhood-level has proven

difficult in the study of locational attainment (Alba and Logan 1992) making its use in the present study is a valuable addition to the literature. In order to construct consistent metropolitan areas across the study period, I construct metropolitan areas from the counties that comprise them. Although census tracts may change between Decennial time periods, county boundaries do not.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: OPERATIONALIZING MIDDLE-CLASS

Previous research has relied on the use of multiple independent neighborhood quality measures, including the percentage White population, median household income or suburban residence. Some scholars have at best used single variables to capture neighborhood quality. The neighborhood percentage White variable has traditionally acted as a proxy to represent access to greater neighborhood resources for minorities (Alba and Logan 1993). Woldoff and Ovadia (2009) recently argued that their use of housing values as a neighborhood quality indicator captures several neighborhood quality elements simultaneously. Still, most measures have been unable to simultaneously capture both race and class due to the lack of available data at the individual-level to construct such a variable. In the present study, I construct a variable that captures the size of the same-race middle-class proportion in a given neighborhood in order to test the minority culture of mobility model. This middle-class measure moves beyond previously used locational attainment indicators, and its innovation is the result of access to individual-level Census micro-data at the tract-level.

Furthermore, the percentage of the White population has been used as measure of neighborhood quality. Although access to a more integrated space is associated with access to more neighborhood resources when compared to segregated spaces, this variable does not account for the class status of its residents. Generally, middle-class Blacks have been found to live in neighborhoods with a larger proportion of Whites; however, the White residents that middle-class live among have been found to be less affluent than those residing in middle-class White neighborhoods (Adelman 2004, 2005; Alba et al 2000; Friedman et al 2014).

In order to account for varying class attributes in a single neighborhood quality indicator, the present study first defines middle-class residents as those individuals who attained a college education, live in a household with income greater than \$50,000, or are employed in a professional, management, and technical occupation. The study takes a conservative approach by characterizing as middle-class those individuals who exhibit any one of the aforementioned characteristics. The neighborhood percentage of middle-class individuals (over 25 years of age) constitutes the neighborhood middle-class variable. Additionally, the White middle-class and Black middle class variables are the percentages of White middle-class residents or of Black middle-class residents in a neighborhood, respectively.

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

Table 1 shows the percentage of individuals in each category that comprise the study's middle-class variable including college education, PMT occupation, and household income of \$50k or higher for 1970 and 2010 decadal periods, and the change therein. It also provides the percentage of individuals who meet the criteria at one or more of these three categories. According to Table 1, the percentage of Blacks who attained a college degree has more than tripled between 1970 and 2010. Also, between 1970 and 2010, the proportion of Blacks who hold a PMT position and the proportion that live in households with an income of \$50k or more has more than doubled. These growth rates for Blacks are sizeable in light of the respective growth rates for Whites during the same time period. Still, the relative percentages of Whites compared to Blacks are greater across socioeconomic characteristics although that gap has shrunk over time.

<Insert Table 1>

The second set of variables in Table 1 illustrates the number of individuals who exhibit two or more of the three middle-class attributes. When compared to Blacks, Whites are more likely to exhibit two or more attributes across any given time period. For example, in 2010, 40% of Whites held both a PMT occupation and lived in a household that earned more than \$50k a year. In contrast, only 25% of Blacks in the same year exhibited both of the attributes. The third variable set captures individuals that met all three middle-class attributes. Almost 1 in 4 (23%) Whites exhibited all three middle-class attributes in 2010 compared to approximately 1 in 10 (9%) in 1970. In contrast, only a little over 1 in 10 (12%) Blacks exhibited all three middle-class attributes in 2010 in contrast to 1 in 33 (3%) in 1970. This table generally illustrates that Whites are more firmly supplanted in the middle-class than their Black counterparts.

The present study however is specifically interested the proportion of individuals by race who exhibit at least one of three middle-class attributes. According to in Table 1, Blacks have experienced a large amount of growth in final category between, 1970 and 2010. In 1970, less than 1 in 2 Blacks exhibited at least one middle-class attribute but by 2010 approximately 2 in 3 Blacks did so. Black access to the middle-class has grown considerably, reducing the gap between themselves and Whites. Whites have experienced less growth than Blacks but probably because of relatively high percentages across all time periods. For instance, more than 7 out of 10 Whites exhibited a middle-class attribute between 1970 and 2010.

Measuring the dependent variables. The study's analysis explores the influence of individual-level and metropolitan-level characteristics on two proxies of locational attainment. The first dependent variable is the percentage White population in a census tract. This indicator has

been used to proxy the availability of resources within a neighborhood (Alba and Logan 1991; 1993) and the avoidance of the deleterious effects of racial residential segregation (Massey and Denton 1993). Neighborhoods with a larger proportion of White residents represent better-integrated neighborhoods for minority residents and this has been tied to their access to greater resources when compared to segregated neighborhoods. In this case, the larger the percentage of White residents, the greater the minority access to neighborhood resources and the better they are able to avoid the negative effects of segregation.

The second dependent variable is the percentage of same-race middle-class residents for Blacks and Whites in the census-tract. The middle-class variable is based on three specific individual attributes: attaining a college education, being employed in the PMT sector, or residing in a household where the household income is above \$50k annually. The number of individuals with any of the three characteristics is summed to create a neighborhood middle-class variable to produce two variables: middle-class Black neighborhood and middle-class White neighborhood.

Measuring the independent variables. The individual- and metropolitan-level indicators selected are those identified to affect locational attainment. The primary measures of individual socioeconomic status include individual educational attainment, measured by completed years of schooling, household income in 2010 dollars, and occupation, including the professional, management and technical occupation, service occupation, and manufacturing occupation. It also includes positions in the public sector and participation in the military. Individual age is measured as a continuous variable, and sex is measured as a dichotomous variable with a 1 for males. Marital status is measured as a dichotomous variable. I also include a variable to capture regional differences across the U.S. The regions include the Northeast, Midwest, West and South with the South as the reference group.

My analysis captures the metropolitan context by including three sets of metropolitan-level characteristics that measure economic context; race, ethnicity and space; and same-race middle-class presence. These are variables that have been shown to impact neighborhood access and quality (Anderson forthcoming, 1; Crowder et al 2012; Iceland et al 2013). The metropolitan economic context includes measures of poverty, unemployment, percent manufacturing sector, percent professional, management and technical (PMT) sector, percent public sector, and percent military sector. The metropolitan racial and ethnic character includes the percentages of non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, non-Hispanic Asians and Hispanics. It also includes the metropolitan area's dissimilarity index, which is a measure of the level of racial residential segregation between Whites and Blacks. The metropolitan area's diversity is also included and this measure captures the racial/ethnic proportion of the population. The maximum value of 1 occurs when all racial and ethnic groups are of equal size, while a 0 represents complete racial homogeneity. Finally, the same-race middle-class variables

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class
Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

include measures that capture the strength of the middle-class for Blacks and Whites in a given metropolitan area. These measures are the percentages of the same-race college educated population and the same-race high-income populations measured by households with incomes above \$50k annually. The percentage of the same-race PMT sector population was not included as an additional middle-class measure because it is highly correlated with the same-race high-income population measure. The analysis also included metropolitan level control variables that include: population size, new housing construction, which is the percentage housing built in the last 10 years, percentage retirement-aged population, and the percentage homeownership.

Analytic strategy. Following previous research on locational attainment, I include individual-level variables to predict a neighborhood-level characteristic (Alba and Logan 1993). In addition, I include metropolitan-level variables to control for macro-level characteristics (South 2011b).

I use a hierarchical linear model (HLM) using random effects regression for movers of each racial group included in the study for the two proxies for locational attainment. The use of a HLM model is essential in capturing between and within metropolitan effects across the U.S., as well as being able to disaggregate the effects of individual- and metropolitan-level characteristics on neighborhood patterns. The following model represents the full model used in this study:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1ij} + \beta_2 X_{2ij} + \beta_3 X_{3ij} + \beta_4 X_{4ij} + \beta_5 X_{5ij} + a_{ij} + e_{ij} + u_{ij}$$

Y_{ij} is the neighborhood outcome represented by the two proxies for locational attainment (i.e. percentage non-Hispanic Whites and percentage same-race middle-class residents for individual i in metropolitan area j). Additionally, the set of middle-class measures include two distinct variables specifically White middle-class for Whites and Black middle-class for Blacks. X_1 represents included individual-level characteristics, X_2 represents included metropolitan-level characteristics, while X_3 , X_4 , and X_5 are dummy variables for three U.S. regions—Northeast, Midwest and West respectively; the South is excluded and used as the reference group. All model coefficients have been standardized for ease of interpretation.

Limitations. A noted limitation of this study is the inability to make a direct comparison between the Decennial Census survey and the American Community Survey. The present-study relies on the migration question to capture individual mobility patterns for a given decade. The Decennial Census has historically asked the question, "Where did this person live five years ago?" In contrast, the ACS asked the question, "Where did this person live one year ago?" Due to the change in this specific question, comparing the effects of migrant related questions may be unreliable. The reader should use caution in interpreting results that employ

the ACS data.

V. RESULTS

Locational Attainment of Black and White Movers in the U.S.

Table 2 describes the average neighborhood experienced for Black and White movers between 1970 and 2010 across neighborhood quality indicators of percentage White, percentage middle-class and percentage same-race middle-class. In order to illustrate locational attainment differences by class, Table 2 also differentiates between the non-middle class and the middle-class. For example, Table 2, for comparative purposes, distinguishes individuals that have attained a college degree from those who have not.

According to Table 2, in general, middle-class residents experience greater locational attainment than non-middle-class residents across all neighborhood types—White, middle-class, and same-race middle-class neighborhoods. For Whites, although the overall White percentage remains high, access to White neighborhoods has generally declined for both middle-class and non-middle-class residents. Yet, it appears that Whites are able to access White neighborhoods regardless of their middle-class stature. Whites have also experienced limited growth across both middle-class neighborhood types between 1970 and 2010. However, it is clear that the White middle-class achieve greater locational attainment than the White non-middle-class. In light of differences observed between the White non-middle class and middle-class in accessing middle-class neighborhoods, the White neighborhood variable appears to disguise class differences.

<Insert Table 2>

Middle-class and non-middle-class Blacks have experienced greater access to White neighborhoods over time. Their overall access to White neighborhoods however remain well behind that of Whites. Thus, it is clear that across all neighborhood indicators that the Black and White middle-class consistently live in better neighborhoods than those who are not middle-class. Black middle-class neighborhoods have experienced strong growth between 1970 and 2010, and the ability of Blacks to generally access these neighborhoods has increased. When compared to Whites, Blacks have seen much greater growth across all locational attainment types, and especially middle-class ones. Black middle-class movers have experienced greater overall locational attainment than Black non-middle-class movers into middle-class neighborhoods over time. One can conclude that although Whites have experienced relatively stronger quality neighborhoods, Blacks have experienced greater growth between 1970 and 2010.

Regression Analysis - Comparing Black and White Movers into White Neighborhoods

Table 3 includes two sets of random effects regression models for Black and White movers that

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

estimate the effects of individual- and metropolitan-level characteristics on locational attainment into White neighborhoods. Only coefficients with a p-value of less than .10 will be discussed in the current and subsequent sections. The models in this section have overall r^2 values that range from .101 to .328 (for Whites) and .183 to .262 (for Blacks); the between metropolitan area r^2 values range from .822 to .971 (for Whites) and .722 to .875 (for Blacks); and the within metropolitan area r^2 values range from .0388 to .0454 (for Whites) and .0568 to .111 (for Blacks). According to Table 3, individual socioeconomic status, including college education, household income and professional occupation, is a consistent significant positive predictor of access to White neighborhoods for Black and White movers. Of these three key variables, college education is the strongest predictor of locational attainment. In line with the spatial assimilation model, individual socioeconomic status matters for both groups of movers, Blacks and Whites, in their access of White neighborhoods.

<Insert Table 3>

The metropolitan-level variables show a much more differentiated effect between Blacks' and Whites' access to White neighborhoods. Blacks are generally less likely to access White neighborhoods in metropolitan areas with large populations, while the opposite is true for Whites. In addition, the size of the metropolitan Black population is a negative predictor of Black locational attainment into White neighborhoods while Whites are more likely to move into White neighborhoods with an increasing metropolitan White population. These observations reveal that both metropolitan size and racial composition matter in locational attainment for Black and White movers.

The metropolitan economic character displays different effects for Black and White movers in their ability to access White neighborhoods. For Whites, there is a negative effect between the size of the metropolitan PMT sector and accessing White neighborhoods, while this effect is positive for Blacks. In contrast, the size of the manufacturing and service sectors are positive in White access of White neighborhoods while Blacks either display mixed or negative effects. In the post-Civil Rights era, if the PMT sector represents a growing metropolitan economy while the manufacturing and service industries embody negative ones, then Blacks are only likely to achieve locational attainment into White neighborhoods in an ascending metropolitan area.

For Blacks, the size of Black-White racial residential segregation has a negative effect on Black access to White neighborhoods. Accordingly metropolitan areas with increasing diversity make it difficult for Blacks to access White neighborhoods. In contrast, Whites are more likely to move into White neighborhoods in metropolitan areas with greater segregation. And, Whites

show an early negative relationship between increasing diversity and White neighborhood access that has disappeared in latter two decades.

The size of the same-race middle-class population has divergent results for Blacks and Whites. For Whites, the metropolitan White college educated population is positively related to White neighborhood locational attainment while the White high-income population is generally negatively related. Blacks, in contrast, generally show a negative or no relationship between the sizes of both their middle-class populations and accessing White neighborhoods. In other words, a Black middle-class presence has no bearing on their locational attainment into White neighborhoods.

Together these findings illustrate that individual socioeconomic status are consistently significant predictors of locational attainment for both Black and White movers. This suggests that for Black and White movers, they are able to translate their human capital into better neighborhoods and there are not substantial racial differences. When metropolitan characteristics are considered, there are quite a number of differences in how the metropolitan context shapes locational attainment for Blacks compared to Whites. If White neighborhoods remain an important measure of locational attainment for Blacks, then Black locational attainment appears bleak not because individual socioeconomic status does not matter, but because larger metropolitan structures may act as greater obstacles to access to White neighborhoods. The following section will continue its exploration by focusing on Black and White locational attainment into same-race middle-class neighborhoods.

Regression Analysis - Comparing Black and White Movers into Same-Race Middle-Class Neighborhoods

Table 4 describes locational attainment for Black and White movers into same-race middle-class neighborhoods—Black middle-class and White middle-class neighborhoods. The models in this section have overall R² values that range from .267 to .356 (for Whites) and .263 to .381 (for Blacks); the between metropolitan area R² values range from .644 to .954 (for Whites) and .428 to .688 (for Blacks); and the within metropolitan area R² values range from .104 to .163 (for Whites) and .162 to .195 (for Blacks). According to Table 4, like White neighborhoods, locational attainment into same-race middle-class neighborhoods is strongly correlated with individual socioeconomic status. College education, median household income and professional occupation are all significantly associated with access to same-race middle-class neighborhoods. And, similar to White neighborhood locational attainment, same-race middle-class neighborhoods are strongly impacted by the metropolitan context.

<Insert Table 4>

The size of the metropolitan population has different effects on Black and White access to

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

same-race middle-class neighborhoods. Blacks, for example, are more likely to move into Black middle-class neighborhoods in large metropolitan areas which is in contrast to the negative effect shown in their ability to access White neighborhoods. For Whites, the effect of metropolitan population size fluctuates over time in their access of White middle-class neighborhoods. This is in contrast to the findings discussed above in which there was a consistent positive effect of metropolitan population size and access to White neighborhoods. Furthermore, the size of the metropolitan Black population is not consistent in predicting Black access to Black middle-class neighborhoods. The size of the metropolitan White population is generally negative in predicting access to White middle-class neighborhoods. This effect is opposite in explaining White access to White neighborhoods. The metropolitan population and the composition of that population show important effects in explaining locational attainment of Black and White movers into same-race middle-class neighborhoods. And interestingly, it is clear that the conditions that explain Black and White access to same race middle-class neighborhoods differ from access to White neighborhoods. For Blacks, although population size hinders the locational attainment into White neighborhoods, it supports locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods. Whites, in contrast, are more likely to move into White neighborhoods as the sizes of total population and White population increase, and become less likely to move into White middle-class neighborhoods under these same conditions.

The size of the PMT sector is instrumental in positively predicting locational attainment of both Blacks and Whites into same-race middle-class neighborhoods. This effect is the same for Blacks in explaining their access to White neighborhoods, but produces an opposite effect for Whites into White neighborhoods. The size of the public sector also has a positive effect on Black access to Black middle-class neighborhoods, but shows no consistent effect for Whites. Increased rates of poverty have a negative effect on Black and White locational attainment into middle-class neighborhoods. The effect of poverty is also a stronger negative predictor in explaining access to middle-class neighborhoods compared to White neighborhoods.

These findings give some insight into the benefits of an increasing PMT sector in accessing middle-class neighborhoods. For Whites, the difference in effect on the PMT sector in accessing middle-class neighborhoods (positive) compared to White neighborhoods (negative) confirms that economically strong metropolitan areas are important in their locational attainment into middle-class neighborhoods but not White ones. Whites are able to access White neighborhoods regardless of the metropolitan growing economic context. Blacks in contrast are only able to access quality neighborhoods whether White or middle-class in metropolitan areas with a growing economic context.

Racial residential segregation shows some positive effects for Whites in their locational attainment into White middle-class neighborhoods, which is consistent with effects shown for White neighborhoods. Although residential segregation negatively impacts Blacks' access to White neighborhoods, there is no effect on their access to Black middle-class neighborhoods. Yet, diversity has a negative effect on Black access into Black middle-class neighborhoods between 1980 and 2000, but it is generally positive for Whites. Although residential segregation does not impact Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods, it appears that diverse metropolitan areas do somewhat mitigate this access. In contrast, both residential segregation and diversity facilitate White locational attainment into White middle-class neighborhoods. Together these observations suggest that access to Black middle-class neighborhoods is not a consequence of racial segregation and that diversity may facilitate Black access into alternative neighborhoods and away from Black middle-class neighborhoods. White locational attainment into White middle-class neighborhoods, in contrast, is supported by racial segregation, and it appears that Whites increasingly seek out White middle-class neighborhoods as diversity increases.

The size of the metropolitan White high-income population is a strong positive predictor of White locational attainment into White middle-class neighborhoods while the size of the metropolitan White college-educated population is a negative predictor. This effect is opposite of what was observed for White neighborhoods. This suggests that Whites are better able to convert their high-income population into exclusive middle-class neighborhoods while they are not able to do the same with a strong college-educated population. And unlike locational attainment into White middle-class neighborhoods, an increasing metropolitan college-educated population explains access into White neighborhoods.

For Blacks, both the size of the metropolitan Black college educated and Black high-income population are generally positive predictors of locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods. This effect is also similar in predicting Black access into general middle-class neighborhoods (analysis not shown). These observations are in stark contrast to the metropolitan Black middle-class populations having a negative or no effect in predicting access into White neighborhoods. Blacks benefit largely from the size of the Black middle-class population in their ability to access middle-class or Black middle-class neighborhoods but not in their ability to access White neighborhoods.

VI. DISCUSSION

The majority of locational studies use the percent White neighborhood population as a key indicator in an effort to best capture locational attainment for Blacks. It is this variable that measures the ability of Blacks to transform socioeconomic status into both access to mainstream neighborhoods and avoidance of racial residential segregation and its consequences (Alba and

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

Logan 1991; Massey and Denton 1993). And while locational attainment studies use the spatial assimilation model and place stratification perspective to explain Black locational attainment or the lack thereof, very little is known about the effect of the growing Black middle-class population in their ability to create and access alternative neighborhoods of quality, specifically Black middle-class neighborhoods. Although the minority culture of mobility model posited over a decade ago that Blacks with socioeconomic resource are likely to bypass White neighborhoods in an effort to avoid individual- and institutional racism when Black middle-class neighborhoods are available (Neckerman et al 1999), very little has been done empirically to test this theoretical framework. Further, Freeman (2008) argues that Black desire to locate into White neighborhoods has declined in the post-Civil Rights era, but still little exploration has been done to uncover the potential affect of this change on Black locational attainment. Altogether, in the midst of developing theoretical frameworks in the MCM model and changing attitudes of Blacks toward quality neighborhoods, it is unclear which individual socioeconomic indicators or metropolitan-level conditions would explain, if at all, Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods.

The present study's exploration of Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods presents three major findings. First, there are distinct differences between White locational attainment into White neighborhoods when compared to White middle-class neighborhoods that should not be overlooked by the locational attainment literature. Generally, Whites do distinguish between the two neighborhood types with White middle-class neighborhoods being more desirable. Thus, operationalizing locational attainment as an entry into a White neighborhood is not an accurate measure of neighborhood quality for Whites or other groups. Second, individual socioeconomic status provides a consistent effect for both Black and White movers, while the metropolitan context explains any divergent effects in the locational attainment of these groups. The metropolitan racial/ethnic character, economic context and same-race middle-class population explains the divergence in locational attainment experienced between Black and White movers.

Third, an increasing metropolitan Black middle-class is a strong determinant of Black access into Black middle-class neighborhoods. Neither the spatial assimilation model nor the place-stratification perspective explains locational attainment of Black movers into Black middle-class neighborhoods. Although it is true that higher SES predicts locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods, the aforementioned theoretical frameworks have yet to consider Black middle-class neighborhoods and neighborhoods of advantage for Blacks. The minority culture of mobility model provides the best fitting explanation of Black access to

alternative quality Black middle-class neighborhoods as it is the only theoretical framework that considers Black middle-class neighborhoods as a neighborhood of advantage. And the MCM model will become increasingly important as the Black middle-class becomes more salient in the U.S.

Generally, individual socioeconomic resources are important in explaining White access to both White and White middle-class neighborhoods. However, the metropolitan economic context does not seem to play the type of role one would expect in explaining White locational attainment into White neighborhoods compared to White middle-class ones. White locational attainment into White neighborhoods is strong and positively correlated to the size of the manufacturing and service industries. Generally, since 1970, these industries have been in decline in the U.S. so their ability to support White locational attainment is puzzling. Yet, this observation suggests, that in the case of the White neighborhood context, racial status is most important in explaining locational attainment, and that White neighborhoods are not the highest form of locational attainment available in metropolitan areas. Although individual SES is consistent in explaining White access to both White and White middle-class neighborhoods, metropolitan factors produce a divergent effect. This study illustrates that more favorable metropolitan conditions explain access into White middle-class neighborhoods but not into White neighborhoods. In fact, for Whites, White neighborhood access is shown to be positively correlated with declining manufacturing and service sectors. Furthermore, the metropolitan White high-income population positively effects White access into White middle-class neighborhoods while it negatively effects access into White neighborhoods. These observations make it clear that Whites seek White middle-class neighborhoods when more advantaged metropolitan conditions are presented.

Whites are also more likely to move into White neighborhoods in metropolitan areas that have large total populations as well as large White populations. This is not the case for White access into White middle-class neighborhoods where both the sizes of total population and the White population are negatively correlated with locational attainment. In spite of this difference, increasing Black-White racial residential segregation supported locational attainment into both White and White middle-class neighborhoods. When interpreted together and in light of integral metropolitan conditions, these overall findings further support the notion that White neighborhoods as a proxy for locational attainment is a weak indicator of neighborhood quality because neighborhood class status is ignored. As a consequence, when White race alone is used as a neighborhood quality indicator for Blacks, it may create problematic interpretations of upward mobility.

Across all neighborhood quality indicators, individual socioeconomic status matters in explaining locational attainment for both Black and White movers in the U.S. Of the three middle-class

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

SES indicators, college education generally had a stronger predictive effect than both household income and professional occupation for locational attainment. It is no surprise that human capital, especially for movers, matters for locational attainment and that as an individual mover exhibits stronger socioeconomic characteristics, their ability to access quality neighborhoods improves. While this study cannot compare the size of individual effects on locational attainment between Black and White movers, it does illustrate that individual effects are consistent in predicting locational attainment for these groups. In other words, Black and White movers are able to translate socioeconomic status into quality neighborhoods. Still, the overall locational attainment outcomes for Blacks and Whites are not equal. The present study provides evidence that the metropolitan structure produce significant locational attainment differences between Black and White movers explaining much of the racial disparity experienced between the races.

Further, an increasing metropolitan Black middle-class population matters for locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods. While Blacks living in metropolitan areas with larger populations and a larger Black population are not better able to access White neighborhoods, they are better able to access Black middle-class neighborhoods in metropolitan areas that are more populous. In other words, larger metropolitan areas better facilitate Black access to Black middle-class neighborhoods while the size of the Black population does not have a significant effect. Yet, the increasing metropolitan Black college-educated and Black high-income populations are key factors in explaining Black access into Black middle-class neighborhoods. This observation suggests that Black middle-class neighborhoods are not a product of a sizeable Black population but a sizeable Black middle-class population. Furthermore, while Black-White racial residential segregation acts as an obstacle in Black access of White neighborhoods, it has no effect in their access of Black middle-class neighborhoods. This observation makes it clear that Black access to Black middle-class neighborhoods is not a product of racial residential segregation supporting the MCM model. And this suggests that Blacks may seek to create Black middle-class neighborhoods instead of being forced to create them. Furthermore, whether metropolitan conditions are used to explain White locational attainment into White compared to White middle-class neighborhoods or are used to understand Black locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods, these unique larger macro-contexts across metropolitan areas are important in explaining individual locational attainment for Blacks and Whites.

Generally, the spatial assimilation model cannot explain locational attainment into Black middle-class neighborhoods because this model would not consider this same-race middle-class

neighborhood as a proxy for neighborhood quality. Nor does the place-stratification perspective do so as it considers the concentration of Black residents, even if noted to be largely middle-class, as an outcome of racial residential segregation producing its negative byproducts. It might be important to consider that, like findings for Asians and Hispanics who are bypassing White neighborhoods into alternative quality neighborhoods, comparable locational attainment for Blacks may exist. The minority culture of mobility model provides an essential need to consider Black middle-class neighborhoods as an important neighborhood quality indicator. It also may provide for a better explanation of Black locational attainment into these alternative quality neighborhoods.

VII. FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should continue to explore nuances in White locational attainment of White neighborhoods and White middle-class neighborhoods using alternative definitions of White middle-class. Although, this study offers a conservative definition of middle-class, it was still able to present some nuance across White neighborhood quality indicators. As a result, Black locational attainment should also continue to be challenged as it relates to traditionally used neighborhood indicators. In light of the growing Black middle-class, the ability of Blacks to better select their ideal neighborhood types in the midst of individual- and institutional-racism in the housing market, and the minority culture of mobility model's explanation of the tendency of high socioeconomic Blacks to seek out high quality Black middle-class neighborhoods, alternative Black middle-class neighborhood definitions should continued to be explored. As well, future work should explore the quality of these increasing Black middle-class neighborhoods and the ability of its residents to access resources and avoid the deleterious consequences associated with Black residentially segregated neighborhoods. Finally, the minority culture of mobility model should continue to be tested along side the spatial assimilation model and place-stratification perspective in understanding Black locational attainment in the 21st century.

VIII. DISCLAIMER

"Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed."

IX. REFERENCES

- Adelman, R. M. (2004). "Neighborhood opportunities, race, and class: The Black middle-class and residential segregation". *City & Community*, 3(1), 43–63.
- Adelman, R. M. (2005). "The Roles of Race, Class, and Residential Preferences in the Neighborhood Racial Composition of Middle-Class Blacks and Whites." *Social Science*

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

Quarterly, 86(1), 209–228.

- Adelman, R. M., Tsao, H.-S., Tolnay, S. E., & Crowder, K. D. (2001). "Neighborhood Disadvantage among Racial and Ethnic Groups: Residential Location in 1970 and 1980." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 42(4), 603–632.
- Alba, R. D., & Logan, J. R. (1991). "Variations on two themes: Racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence." *Demography*, 28(3), 431–453.
- Alba, R. D., & Logan, J. R. (1992). "Analyzing Locational Attainments: Constructing Individual-Level Regression Models Using Aggregate Data." *Sociological Methods & Research*, 20(3), 367–397.
- Alba, R. D., & Logan, J. R. (1993). "Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation". *American Journal of Sociology*, 1388–1427.
- Alba, R. D., Logan, J. R., & Stults, B. J. (2000). How Segregated Are Middle-Class African Americans? *Social Problems*, 47(4), 543–558.
- Benetsky, M., & Koerber, W. (2012). How do the ACS five-year migration data compare to the 2000 Census migration data? Journey to Work and Migration Statistics Branch. Retrieved May 27, 2013, from http://www.census.gov/hhes/migration/files/PAA_2012_County-County.pdf
- Bobo, L., & Zubrinsky, C. L. (1996). Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice? *Social Forces*, 74(3), 883–909.
- Charles, C. Z. (2000). Neighborhood racial-composition preferences: Evidence from a multiethnic metropolis. *Social Problems*, 379–407.
- Clark, W. A. V. (1986). Residential segregation in American cities: A review and interpretation. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 5(2), 95–127.
- Clark, W. A. V. (1992). Residential preferences and residential choices in a multiethnic context. *Demography*, 29(3), 451–466.
- Clark, W. A. (2002). Ethnic preferences and ethnic perceptions in multi-ethnic settings. *Urban Geography*, 23(3), 237–256.
- Crowder, K. D., Tolnay, S. E., & Adelman, R. M. (2001). Intermetropolitan Migration and Locational Improvement for African American Males, 1970–1990. *Social Science Research*, 30(3), 449–472.
- Crowder, K., Pais, J., & South, S. J. (2012). Neighborhood Diversity, Metropolitan Constraints,

- and Household Migration. *American Sociological Review*, 77(3), 325–353.
- Crowder, K., South, S. J., & Chavez, E. (2006). Wealth, Race, and Inter-Neighborhood Migration. *American Sociological Review*, 71(1), 72–94.
- Farley, R., Schuman, H., Bianchi, S., Colasanto, D., & Hatchett, S. (1978). "“Chocolate city, vanilla suburbs:” Will the trend toward racially separate communities continue?" *Social Science Research*, 7(4), 319–344.
- Farley, R., & Frey, W. H. (1994). Changes in the segregation of whites from blacks during the 1980s: Small steps toward a more integrated society. *American Sociological Review*, 23–45.
- Flippen, C. A. (2001). Residential Segregation and Minority Home Ownership. *Social Science Research*, 30(3), 337–362.
- Freeman, L. (2000). Minority housing segregation: A test of three perspectives. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 22(1), 15–35.
- Freeman, L. (2008). Is Class Becoming a More Important Determinant of Neighborhood Attainment for African-Americans? *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(1), 3–26.
- Freeman, L. (2010). African American Locational Attainment before the Civil Rights Era. *City & Community*, 9(3), 235–255.
- Frey, W. H. (2010). Population and Migration | Brookings Institution. Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. Retrieved May 21, 2013, from <http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/metro/metroamericachapters/population>
- Frey, W. H., & Farley, R. (1996). Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Are Multi-ethnic Metros Different? *Demography*, 33(1).
- Friedman, S. (2008). Do declines in residential segregation mean stable neighborhood racial integration in metropolitan America? A research note. *Social Science Research*, 37(3), 920–933.
- Friedman, S., Gibbons, J., & Galvan, C. (2014). Declining segregation through the lens of neighborhood quality: Does middle-class and affluent status bring equality? *Social Science Research*, 46, 155–168.
- Glaeser, E., & Vigdor, J. (2012). The End of the Segregated Century: Racial Separation in America's Neighborhoods, 1890-2010.
- Guest, AM. 1980. "The Suburbanization of Ethnic Groups," *Sociology and Social Research* 64(4): 497-513.
- Iceland, J., & Sharp, G. (2013). White Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Conceptual Issues, Patterns, and Trends from the U.S. Census, 1980 to 2010. *Population*

Augustus Anderson
Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class
Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010
Research and Policy Review.

- Jargowsky, Paul A. (1997). *Poverty and Place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Kasinitz, P., Mollenkopf, J., Waters, M., & Holdaway, J. (2008). *Inheriting the City: the Second Generation Comes of Age*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Krysan, M., Couper, M. P., Farley, R., & Forman, T. A. (2009). Does Race Matter in Neighborhood Preferences? Results from a Video Experiment¹. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(2), 527–559.
- Lacy, Karyn. (2007). *Blue-Chip Black: Race, class, and status in the new black middle-class*.
- Landry, B. (1987). *The New Black Middle-class*. University of California Press.
- Landry, B., & Marsh, K. (2011). The Evolution of the New Black Middle-class. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37(1), 373–394.
- Logan, J. R., & Alba, R. D. (1993). Locational returns to human capital: Minority access to suburban community resources. *Demography*, 30(2), 243–268.
- Logan, J. R., Alba, R. D., McNulty, T., & Fisher, B. (1996). Making a place in the metropolis: Locational attainment in cities and suburbs. *Demography*, 33(4), 443–453.
- Massey, Douglas S., & Denton, Nancy A (1985). Spatial assimilation as a socioeconomic outcome. *American Sociological Review*, 94–106.
- Massey, Douglas S. (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Oliver, Melvin and Thomas M. Shapiro. (1995). *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.
- Pais, Jeremy. (2013). Individual and US County Determinants of Repeat Migration: a Comparison of Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics. *Population, Space and Place*.
- Pais, Jeremy, Scott J. South, S. J. & Kyle Crowder. (2012). Metropolitan Heterogeneity and Minority Neighborhood Attainment: Spatial Assimilation or Place Stratification? *Social Problems*, 59(2), 258.
- Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. 1925 [1984]. *The City: Suggestions for Investigations of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pattillo, M. (2005). Black Middle-Class Neighborhoods. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31(1), 305–

- Rosenbaum, E., & Friedman, S. (2001). Differences in the locational attainment of immigrant and native-born households with children in New York City. *Demography*, 38(3), 337–348.
- Scopilliti, M. N. (2009). *Locational Attainment and Residential Segregation in US Metropolitan Areas*.
- Sharkey, P. (2014). Spatial Segmentation and the Black Middle-class. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(4), 903–954.
- Sharp, G., & Iceland, J. (2013). The residential segregation patterns of whites by socioeconomic status, 2000–2011. *Social Science Research*, 42(4), 1046–1060.
- South, Scott J., Kyle Crowder & Jeremy Pais. (2011a). Metropolitan Structure and Neighborhood Attainment: Exploring Intermetropolitan Variation in Racial Residential Segregation. *Demography*, 48(4), 1263–1292.
- South, Scott J., Jeremy Pais, & Kyle Crowder (2011b). Metropolitan influences on migration into poor and nonpoor neighborhoods. *Social Science Research*, 40(3), 950–964.
- Spivak, A. L., Bass, L. E., & John, C. S. (2011). Reconsidering race, class, and residential segregation in American cities. *Urban Geography*, 32(4), 531–567.
- Swisher, R. R., Kuhl, D. C., & Chavez, J. M. (2013). Racial and Ethnic Differences in Neighborhood Attainments in the Transition to Adulthood. *Social Forces*, 91(4), 1399–1428.
- Timberlake, J. M., & Iceland, J. (2007). Change in Racial and Ethnic Residential Inequality in American Cities, 1970–2000. *City & Community*, 6(4), 335–365.
- Timberlake, J. M., Howell, A. J., & Staight, A. J. (2011). Trends in the Suburbanization of Racial/Ethnic Groups in US Metropolitan Areas, 1970 to 2000. *Urban Affairs Review*, 47(2), 218–255.
- Vigdor, J. L. (2013). Weighing and Measuring the Decline in Residential Segregation. *City & Community*, 12(2), 169–177.
- Wilson, William Julius. (1978). *The Declining Significance of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woldoff, R. A. (2008). Wealth, human capital and family across racial/ethnic groups: Integrating models of wealth and locational attainment. *Urban Studies*, 45(3), 527–551.
- Woldoff, R. A., & Ovadia, S. (2009). Not Getting Their Money's Worth African-American Disadvantages in Converting Income, Wealth, and Education into Residential Quality. *Urban Affairs Review*, 45(1), 66–91.

Augustus Anderson

Dissertation Paper 3 - Black Locational Attainment into Black Middle-Class
Neighborhoods in the Post-Civil Rights Era, 1970-2010

Wright, Richard, Steven Holloway, & Mark Ellis. (2013). Gender and the Neighborhood

Location of Mixed-Race Couples. *Demography*, 50(2), 393–420.

Table 1. Distribution of Middle Class Attributes by Race, 1970-2010

Attributes (25 years+)	1970		2010		1970-2010	
	<i>Blacks</i>	<i>Whites</i>	<i>Blacks</i>	<i>Whites</i>	<i>Blacks</i>	<i>Whites</i>
College Education	5%	13%	20%	34%	323%	174%
PMT Occupation	19%	41%	40%	51%	109%	26%
Household Inc >=\$50k	16%	38%	33%	52%	106%	37%
College Education <i>and</i> PMT Occupation	4%	11%	15%	26%	285%	149%
College Education <i>and</i> Household Inc >=\$50k	4%	10%	15%	29%	317%	174%
PMT Occupation <i>and</i> Household Inc >=\$50k	12%	30%	25%	40%	116%	33%
College Education <i>and</i> PMT Occupation <i>and</i> Household Inc >=\$50k	3%	9%	12%	23%	274%	156%
College Education <i>or</i> PMT Occupation <i>or</i> Household Inc >=\$50k	46%	73%	65%	79%	42%	9%

Source: Census 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and ACS 2006-2010

Table 2. Locational Attainment in the U.S. of Black and White Movers, 1970-2010

		Neighborhood-Level Variables									
		Pct White			Pct Middle Class			Pct White Middle Class			
		<College Education	>=College Education	Difference	<College Education	>=College Education	Difference	<College Education	>=College Education	Difference	
WHITES	1970	0.93	0.94	0.01	0.71	0.80	0.09	0.72	0.81	0.09	
	1980	0.88	0.88	0.00	0.68	0.75	0.07	0.70	0.78	0.08	
	1990	0.83	0.84	0.01	0.70	0.79	0.09	0.76	0.84	0.08	
	2000	0.80	0.81	0.01	0.78	0.86	0.08	0.78	0.86	0.08	
	2010	0.75	0.75	0.00	0.74	0.82	0.08	0.75	0.84	0.09	
	CH 70-10	-0.19	-0.20		0.04	0.02		0.04	0.04		
			No PMT Occupation			No PMT Occupation			No PMT Occupation		
	1970	0.92	0.94	0.02	0.69	0.77	0.08	0.70	0.78	0.08	
	1980	0.87	0.88	0.01	0.66	0.73	0.07	0.69	0.76	0.07	
	1990	0.83	0.84	0.01	0.68	0.76	0.08	0.74	0.82	0.08	
	2000	0.81	0.81	0.00	0.77	0.83	0.06	0.77	0.84	0.07	
	2010	0.76	0.75	-0.01	0.73	0.80	0.07	0.75	0.81	0.06	
	CH 70-10	-0.17	-0.20		0.06	0.04		0.07	0.04		
			Household Income <50k			Household Income <50k			Household Income <50k		
	1970	0.91	0.94	0.03	0.66	0.77	0.11	0.67	0.77	0.10	
1980	0.86	0.89	0.03	0.65	0.73	0.08	0.67	0.76	0.09		
1990	0.82	0.85	0.03	0.66	0.76	0.10	0.72	0.82	0.10		
2000	0.79	0.82	0.03	0.76	0.84	0.08	0.76	0.84	0.08		
2010	0.75	0.76	0.01	0.72	0.80	0.08	0.73	0.82	0.09		
CH 70-10	-0.18	-0.19		0.09	0.04		0.09	0.06			
BLACKS			Pct White			Pct Middle Class			Pct Black Middle Class		
			<College Education	>=College Education		<College Education	>=College Education		<College Education	>=College Education	
	1970	0.34	0.47	0.13	0.52	0.65	0.13	0.47	0.62	0.15	
	1980	0.34	0.49	0.15	0.54	0.66	0.12	0.53	0.67	0.14	
	1990	0.40	0.53	0.13	0.61	0.74	0.13	0.62	0.76	0.14	
	2000	0.37	0.49	0.12	0.68	0.79	0.11	0.64	0.78	0.14	
	2010	0.39	0.48	0.09	0.65	0.76	0.11	0.62	0.75	0.13	
	CH 70-10	0.15	0.02		0.25	0.17		0.32	0.21		
			No PMT Occupation			No PMT Occupation			No PMT Occupation		
	1970	0.33	0.38	0.05	0.50	0.60	0.10	0.45	0.58	0.13	
	1980	0.34	0.40	0.06	0.52	0.61	0.09	0.51	0.62	0.11	
	1990	0.39	0.46	0.07	0.58	0.69	0.11	0.58	0.71	0.13	
	2000	0.36	0.42	0.06	0.66	0.74	0.08	0.61	0.72	0.11	
	2010	0.38	0.43	0.05	0.64	0.72	0.08	0.60	0.71	0.11	
	CH 70-10	0.15	0.13		0.28	0.20		0.33	0.22		
		Household Income <50k			Household Income <50k			Household Income <50k			
1970	0.32	0.38	0.06	0.48	0.60	0.12	0.42	0.58	0.16		
1980	0.32	0.41	0.09	0.51	0.62	0.11	0.49	0.64	0.15		
1990	0.38	0.46	0.08	0.56	0.70	0.14	0.55	0.73	0.18		
2000	0.35	0.44	0.09	0.65	0.76	0.11	0.60	0.75	0.15		
2010	0.38	0.44	0.06	0.63	0.74	0.11	0.58	0.74	0.16		
CH 70-10	0.19	0.16		0.31	0.23		0.38	0.28			

Source: Decennial Census 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and ACS 2006-2010.

Table 3. Random Effect Regression HLM Model Predicting Locational Attainment of Black and White Movers into White Neighborhoods, 1970-2010

	Blacks						Whites				
	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010		1970	1980	1990	2000	2010
INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES											
Sex	-0.00971***	-0.0249***	-0.0239***	0.0292***	0.0276***	Sex	0.0159***	0.0146***	0.0134***	-0.0104***	-0.00736***
Marital Status	0.104***	0.147***	0.171***	0.170***	0.136***	Marital Status	0.197***	0.211***	0.197***	0.198***	0.140***
Age	-0.0107	-0.116***	-0.194***	-0.0404***	-0.128***	Age	0.0447***	0.0874***	0.142***	0.107***	0.0250***
Age^2	0.01	0.126***	0.195***	0.0399***	0.121***	Age^2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
High School	0.0196***	0.0911***	0.110***	0.117***	0.0903***	High School	0.164***	0.134***	0.201***	0.139***	0.118***
Some College	0.128***	0.191***	0.231***	0.236***	0.200***	Some College	0.198***	0.152***	0.236***	0.166***	0.126***
College Education+	0.293***	0.418***	0.464***	0.483***	0.410***	College Education+	0.186***	0.159***	0.264***	0.218***	0.151***
HH Income (2010 dollars)	0.0975***	0.0929***	0.0545***	0.112***	0.115***	HH Income (2010 dollars)	0.0378***	0.0223***	0.0437***	0.0825***	0.100***
Manufacturing Occupation	0.0218***	0.0920***	0.127***	0.124***	0.101***	Manufacturing Occupation	0.0266***	0.0320***	0.0325***	0.0395***	0.0445***
PMT Occupation	0.0683***	0.125***	0.133***	0.114***	0.107***	PMT Occupation	0.0919***	0.0492***	0.0517***	0.00750***	0.0128***
Service Occupation	0.0195***	0.0250***	0.0357***	0.0297***	0.0312***	Service Occupation	0.000674	-0.0284***	-0.0209***	-0.0401***	-0.0161***
Military Occupation	0.643***	0.377***	0.230***	0.249***	0.212***	Military Occupation	-0.0134***	-0.282***	-0.302***	-0.236***	-0.0912***
Public Sector Occupation	-0.00952**	-0.0168***	-0.0362***	-0.0475***	-0.00873	Public Sector Occupation	-0.0154***	-0.0173***	-0.0453***	-0.0166***	0.00328
REGIONAL VARIABLES											
Northeast	0.0625*	-0.00785	0.151***	-0.0915***	-0.147***	Northeast	-0.0192	0.0485***	0.0794***	0.148***	0.0834***
Midwest	-0.00983	-0.106***	0.0477**	-0.0744***	-0.0818***	Midwest	-0.0902***	-0.120***	-0.0403***	-0.0332***	-0.00877
West	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	West	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
	-0.06	-0.0777	0.0387	-0.361***	0.0393**		0.146***	-0.246***	0.0892***	0.0983***	0.0445*
METROPOLITAN VARIABLES											
Total Metropolitan Population (Logged)	-0.347***	-0.228***	-0.350***	-0.244***	0.00387	Total Metropolitan Population (Logged)	0.0899***	0.0792***	0.0992***	0.0728***	0.0267*
Percent Age 65+ years	-0.0128	-0.0221**	-0.0947***	-0.0988***	0.0249***	Percent Age 65+ years	0.0461***	-0.00505	-0.0532***	-0.0516***	-0.0173
New Housing (<10years)	-0.140***	0.0301***	0.0890***	0.0728***	-0.000553	New Housing (<10years)	-0.0518***	-0.00579	-0.0276***	-0.0135***	-0.0157*
Pct Homeownership	-0.193***	0.0882***	-0.146***	-0.151***	-0.00989	Pct Homeownership	-0.0214***	-0.0191***	-0.0293***	-0.0498***	-0.00209
Pct Military Sector	-0.0446***	0.101***	0.0136	-0.0749***	-0.00825	Pct Military Sector	0.00286	0.0136**	0.00740**	-0.0556***	-0.0115*
Pct Manufacturing Sector	-0.0567***	0.0194*	0.0269***	-0.0574***	0.0115*	Pct Manufacturing Sector	0.0492***	0.0184***	0.0111***	0.0305***	-0.0131
Pct Public Sector	0.0316	-0.0927***	-0.0573***	0.0700***	0.012	Pct Public Sector	0.0303***	-0.0405***	-0.0615***	-0.0118***	-0.0161*
Pct PMT Sector	0.0312***	0.152***	0.0957***	0.0199***	0.0146*	Pct PMT Sector	-0.0416***	-0.0804***	-0.0968***	-0.0211***	-0.0443**
Pct Service Sector	-0.151***	-0.0617***	-0.0951***	-0.120***	0.00988**	Pct Service Sector	0.0729***	0.0375***	0.0588***	0.0412***	0.0018
Pct Unemployment	0.0505***	-0.00593	0.00242	0.0883***	-0.00826*	Pct Unemployment	-0.1000***	0.0224***	-0.0287***	0.0367***	-0.0167**
Pct Poverty	-0.116***	0.0406***	0.0303***	-0.0928***	-0.0054	Pct Poverty	0.0509***	-0.0890***	-0.0247***	-0.105***	-0.00475
Black-White Dissimilarity Index	-0.189***	-0.192***	-0.0874***	-0.151***	-0.232***	Black-White Dissimilarity Index	0.0436***	0.0537***	0.0741***	0.0626***	0.0506***
Diversity Index	-0.0684***	-0.244***	-0.195***	-0.0871***	-0.174***	Diversity Index	-0.134***	-0.199***	-0.135***	0.0036	0.00463
Pct Black Population	-0.213***	-0.232***	-0.302***	-0.497***	-0.210***	Pct Black Population	0.237***	0.274***	0.295***	0.372***	0.507***
Pct Asian Population	-0.00729	0.0173*	-0.0422**	-0.0588***	-0.0513***	Pct Asian Population	-0.0402***	-0.0417***	-0.150***	-0.170***	-0.0563***
Pct Hispanic Population	0.0445***	0.115***	-0.0072	-0.240***	-0.154***	Pct Hispanic Population	-0.122***	-0.0694***	-0.0730***	-0.175***	-0.119***
Pct Black College Educated Population	-0.00329	-0.0212***	-0.0115***	-0.0283***	-0.00316	Pct Black College Educated Population	-0.0191**	0.146***	0.106***	0.0695***	0.0371**
Pct Black High Income Population (>\$50k)	0.00112	0.00322	-0.0222**	-0.0563***	-0.0132	Pct Black High Income Population (>\$50k)	0.0701***	-0.0468***	-0.0475***	-0.141***	-0.0244
Constant	-0.0538*	-0.162***	-0.303***	-0.248***	-0.142***	Constant	-0.284***	-0.220***	-0.348***	-0.312***	-0.293***
Observations	356,000	265,000	709,000	901,000	79,000	Observations	2,899,000	2,191,000	6,183,000	5,924,000	383,000
Number of MAs	256	339	362	362	313	Number of MAs	265	360	362	362	318
r2 - Overall	0.183	0.236	0.235	0.251	0.262	r2 - Overall	0.101	0.246	0.265	0.31	0.328
r2 - Between MAs	0.837	0.722	0.791	0.827	0.875	r2 - Between MAs	0.822	0.867	0.928	0.939	0.971
r2 - Within MAs	0.0568	0.0752	0.101	0.111	0.0676	r2 - Within MAs	0.0339	0.0343	0.0388	0.0454	0.0286

Standard errors in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Standard errors in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Decennial Census 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and ACS 2006-2010.

Table 4. Random Effect Regression HLM Model Predicting Locational Attainment of Black and White Movers into Same-Race Neighborhoods, 1970-2010

	Blacks into Black Middle Class Neighborhood						Whites into White Middle Class Neighborhood				
	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010		1970	1980	1990	2000	2010
INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES											
Sex	0.00124	-0.0143***	-0.0265***	0.0251***	0.00940***	Sex	0.0275***	0.0146***	0.00494***	0.00406***	0.00834***
Marital Status	0.176***	0.216***	0.227***	0.233***	0.162***	Marital Status	0.239***	0.162***	0.137***	0.138***	0.113***
Age	0.109***	0.0405***	-0.0150**	-0.0349***	-0.159***	Age	0.0914***	0.129***	0.0848***	0.0335***	-0.174***
Age^2	-0.102***	-0.0475***	0.0244***	0.0404***	0.148***	Age^2	-0.0414***	-0.104***	-0.0326***	-0.0212***	0.178***
High School	0.174***	0.200***	0.187***	0.191***	0.151***	High School	0.329***	0.271***	0.291***	0.220***	0.247***
Some College	0.328***	0.331***	0.363***	0.379***	0.293***	Some College	0.498***	0.434***	0.474***	0.384***	0.401***
College Education+	0.496***	0.556***	0.573***	0.633***	0.499***	College Education+	0.629***	0.627***	0.691***	0.617***	0.652***
HH Income (2010 dollars)	0.216***	0.303***	0.133***	0.191***	0.246***	HH Income (2010 dollars)	0.119***	0.0385***	0.0604***	0.154***	0.155***
Manufacturing Occupation	0.0610***	0.0947***	0.0845***	0.0658***	0.0578***	Manufacturing Occupation	-0.0338***	-0.0212***	-0.0218***	-0.0161***	-0.00414
PMT Occupation	0.234***	0.285***	0.278***	0.249***	0.277***	PMT Occupation	0.215***	0.180***	0.208***	0.174***	0.168***
Service Occupation	0.0334***	0.0620***	0.0479***	0.0390***	0.00624	Service Occupation	-0.00720***	-0.00526**	0.0150***	0.0147***	0.0191***
Military Occupation	0.146***	0.272***	0.273***	0.247***	0.267***	Military Occupation	0.0510***	-0.0958***	0.150***	0.0596***	0.133***
Public Sector Occupation	0.0471***	0.00819*	0.0231**	0.00272	0.0391***	Public Sector Occupation	-0.0536***	-0.0887***	-0.0876***	-0.0712***	-0.0340***
REGIONAL VARIABLES											
Northeast	0.315***	-0.00781	-0.138***	-0.292***	-0.164***	Northeast	-0.0702***	-0.0243**	0.101***	-0.0102	-0.0198
Midwest	0.318***	-0.017	0.181***	-0.131***	-0.0189	Midwest	-0.0410***	0.0104	0.0514***	-0.0223***	-0.0653***
West	0.520***	0.243***	0.369***	0.0555	-0.0031	West	0.127***	0.0352	0.263***	-0.0783***	0.0618**
METROPOLITAN VARIABLES											
Total Metropolitan Population (Logged)	0.0972***	0.147***	0.0851***	0.0667***	0.0766**	Total Metropolitan Population (Logged)	0.184***	-0.0441***	-0.0381***	0.00645*	-0.0145
Percent Age 65+ years	0.00495	0.00655	-0.0763***	-0.0336***	0.00662	Percent Age 65+ years	-0.100***	-0.131***	-0.0970***	-0.0924***	0.0153
New Housing (<10years)	0.0720***	-0.0887***	-0.0745***	-0.0122	-0.012	New Housing (<10years)	0.205***	-0.00780*	-0.00952***	0.000897	0.0489***
Pct Homeownership	0.0609***	0.527***	0.114***	0.185***	-0.0329	Pct Homeownership	0.246***	0.0112**	-0.0425***	0.0203***	0.0310**
Pct Military Sector	-0.235***	0.0980***	-0.219***	-0.0463***	-0.0187	Pct Military Sector	-0.0553***	0.0904***	0.0242***	-0.00755***	-0.00858
Pct Manufacturing Sector	0.0925***	0.0742***	-0.0567***	-0.0269***	-0.0236	Pct Manufacturing Sector	0.0488***	0.0332***	0.0159***	0.0325***	0.00768
Pct Public Sector	0.235***	0.0595***	0.355***	0.197***	0.0553**	Pct Public Sector	0.0440***	-0.125***	-0.0121**	0.00970***	0.0129
Pct PMT Sector	0.0476***	0.0794***	0.0972***	0.113***	0.00746	Pct PMT Sector	0.125***	0.301***	0.301***	0.328***	0.107***
Pct Service Sector	-0.0185	0.175***	-0.00403	0.0352***	0.0117	Pct Service Sector	0.0480***	-0.0222***	-0.0746***	0.0212***	0.0362***
Pct Unemployment	-0.0762***	0.0178	-0.100***	-0.00265	0.00994	Pct Unemployment	-0.0167***	0.00201	-0.0562***	0.0532***	-0.0172**
Pct Poverty	-0.214***	-0.0709***	-0.0607***	-0.0903***	-0.0552**	Pct Poverty	-0.121***	-0.120***	-0.0855***	-0.132***	0.0210*
Black-White Dissimilarity Index	-0.0382**	0.0159	0.00252	0.0355***	-0.00818	Black-White Dissimilarity Index	-0.0397***	0.0557***	0.0940***	0.0221***	-0.011
Diversity Index	0.0342	-0.121***	-0.0525***	-0.0899***	0.0199	Diversity Index	0.112***	-0.0128	0.0238**	0.0270***	0.0783***
Pct Black Population	-0.0343*	0.103***	0.0182*	-0.0172**	-0.0424	Pct White Population	-0.0106**	-0.181***	-0.151***	-0.119***	0.0443*
Pct Asian Population	0.00395	0.00234	0.0114	0.0162	-0.0302	Pct Asian Population	-0.0212***	-0.0744***	-0.130***	-0.0634***	-0.0219**
Pct Hispanic Population	0.0671***	0.524***	-0.109***	0.129***	-0.0407	Pct Hispanic Population	-0.0376***	0.0180***	-0.0238***	0.0630***	-0.00239
Pct Black College Educated Population	0.0139***	0.0690***	-0.0360***	0.00167	0.0947***	Pct White College Educated Population	-0.0620***	-0.0220*	-0.0828***	-0.0523***	0.0833***
Pct Black High Income Population (>\$50k)	0.00386	0.0446***	0.194***	0.152***	0.172***	Pct White High Income Population (>\$50k)	0.108***	0.0909***	0.164***	0.105***	0.347***
Constant	-0.532***	-0.281***	-0.453***	-0.411***	-0.356***	Constant	-0.445***	-0.453***	-0.578***	-0.464***	-0.590***
Observations	356,000	265,000	709,000	901,000	79,000	Observations	2,899,000	2,191,000	6,183,000	5,924,000	383,000
Number of MAs	256	339	362	362	313	Number of MAs	265	360	362	362	318
r2 - Overall	0.381	0.273	0.263	0.293	0.272	r2 - Overall	0.296	0.267	0.332	0.356	0.336
r2 - Between MAs	0.633	0.52	0.428	0.688	0.6	r2 - Between MAs	0.783	0.753	0.644	0.882	0.954
r2 - Within MAs	0.172	0.168	0.186	0.195	0.162	r2 - Within MAs	0.163	0.104	0.134	0.152	0.124

Standard errors in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Standard errors in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Decennial Census 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and ACS 2006-2010.