LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

PATTERNS OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION:
THE MEXICAN AMERICAN POPULATION IN
THE URBAN SOUTHWEST, 1970

presented by

Manuel Mariano Lopez

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph. D. degree in Sociology

Major professor

Date 11/8/77

O-7639


3 1293 10131 9287

APR 2 4 2001

PATTERNS OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION:

THE MEXICAN AMERICAN POPULATION

IN THE URBAN SOUTHWEST, 1970

By

Manuel Mariano López

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1977

ABSTRACT

PATTERNS OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION:

THE MEXICAN AMERICAN POPULATION

IN THE URBAN SOUTHWEST, 1970

By

Manuel Mariano López

The degree of residential segregation of Mexican Americans from Anglos and from Blacks, and the latter two from each other, is examined through the comparison of indexes of dissimilarity for 56 Southwestern (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas) cities. Three alternative explanations for the emergence and/or maintenance of ethnic and racial residential segregation are analyzed with particular emphasis on their applicability to Mexican Americans: (1) a market model; (2) a cultural, or propinquity, model; and (3) an exclusionary practices model based on majority group discrimination.

The overall pattern of residential segregation is one in which the index of dissimilarity for the Anglo from Black populations exhibits the highest values ($\overline{X}$=70.7), that of Mexican Americans from Blacks a middle ground ($\overline{X}$=55.0), and that of Mexican Americans from Anglos the lowest values ($\overline{X}$=42.9). When measured by mean indexes of dissimilarity, residential segregation in the Southwest diminished between 1960 and 1970. The greatest decline in index values (for both the mean, -21.2 percent and individual cities, 28) occurred in the Mexican American from Anglo population index while the smallest decline in the mean was that

for the Mexican American from Black (-4.0 percent).

The series of hypotheses formulated to test the three competing models on the macro level yielded equivocal results. The comparison of each of the two principal minority groups with the majority, and with each other, indicated that while "traditional" economic or demographic variables could account for enough of the variance in residential segregation to be of continued usefulness, other factors were of greater import. A general pattern emerged, from the tests of hypotheses comparing segregation by ethnicity or race with segregation by income, occupational status, rent level and value of owner occupied housing. Segregation indexes containing an ethnicity factor were significantly greater than those based solely on the above-mentioned socio-economic characteristics. A simple model, which the Taeubers had illustrated as paralleling an indirect standardization, was also employed. Segregation indexes based on observed ethnic residential patterns were found to be higher than expected on the basis of differentials in income, occupational status, value of housing or rent. The macro level statistical analysis offered less direct contradiction of the cultural and exclusionary models than of the purely economic model. A subsequent review of the literature on survey and participant observation studies of single, or small numbers of, cities also supported an exclusionary practices interpretation of continued minority residential segregation.

The statistical analyses and literature review indicated that in the shaping of future housing policy social analysts must realize that reduced segregation index values portend neither improved housing

nor ameliorated social conditions for minority group members. The existing residential patterns within cities are too firmly fixed, the population shifts necessary for "equalization" would be excessively disruptive, and majority group opposition to any such program would exacerbate rather than mitigate prevailing antagonisms. The assimilationist conception that integration indicates equalization appears to be at the root of many minority group members' housing problems, including those of poor whites.

An alternative approach to solving the housing problems of Mexican Americans is suggested. Past housing policy is viewed as having been successful in meeting the housing needs of only limited numbers of upwardly mobile, middle-class minority group members and ignoring the vast numbers of minority peoples who continue to be ill-housed. A national housing policy focussing on the improvement of existing barrio and ghetto housing, and the construction of adequate new low-cost housing in the barrios/ghettoes, is suggested. Despite urban renewal's failures and excesses, its basic philosophy is viewed as sound and representing an alternative avenue toward solving minority group housing problems.

OFELIA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincerest appreciation to a number of persons who have helped make this dissertation a reality. To my committee I owe a great deal for their insights and encouragement. Professor James B. McKee has served on my committee from its inception while Professors Marilyn Aronoff and Frederick Buttel readily agreed to step into the void when problems of a leave-of-absence and a resignation from the faculty decimated my original committee. Their critical and insightful input, whether over the course of the entire three years or the last eight months, has proven to be of great value. Gracias.

As is usually the case, a number of others have helped ease the way. At Michigan State University I would like to specially thank Dr. J. Allan Beegle who supported me on my return from teaching duties as an hourly research assistant, easing any mental strain which may have resulted from financial pressures. And at Pan American University in Edinburg, Texas I wish to thank Dr. David Alvirez, Head of the Department of Behavioral Sciences, for his cooperation in securing an extended leave-of-absence from the University. To David I also owe a word of gratitude for his encouragement and his considerateness in granting me a half-time teaching schedule in the Spring of 1976 when an emergency situation and enrollment pressures dictated otherwise. To my colleagues at Pan American who accepted teaching overloads as a consequence, I also express my gratitude.

Gratitude is also extended to the National Science Foundation. Funding through the Foundation's Doctoral Dissertation Research (grant number SOC75-17604) program made attainable the data necessitated by the approach utilized in this study.

I have reserved my final expressions of gratitude for the two most influential people of the last few years. To my chairman, Dr. James J. Zuiches, I owe a great deal more than can be reciprocated by a mere "thanks." Over the long process from pilot study through grant proposal to dissertation I managed to monopolize much of his time. Throughout, he was always willing to listen to evolving ideas, to share the benefit of his writing-research experience, and to provide both encouragement and insight when data or methodological problems made the research process discouraging. His interest, insight, criticisms and suggestions have in many ways made this work both easier and better. Any errors which remain reflect my inability to operationalize many of his suggestions.

The person to whom my profoundest appreciation is extended is my wife Ofelia, to whose capacity for love, understanding, and sustenance this work is dedicated. This dedication can in no way express the profundity of my gratitude. During the frequently frustrating course of a readjustment to academic discipline and the rapid progress through a program intensified by an anticipated recall to teaching duties, she provided the continual encouragement and inspiration needed to persevere. Esta obra es tanta tuya como mia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

Where racial and ethnic minorities should live has been a continued issue in urban America (McEntire, 1960: 2). Housing, as Myrdal (1944: 375) has noted, is much more than mere shelter, it provides a setting for one's entire social existence. In the case of minority groups, housing involves issues which transcend the availability and quality of housing units, despite the importance of these factors. The foremost issue of minority group housing is segregation. In the struggle to achieve full citizenship and the equal participation and rights inherent in it, freedom to locate one's home without constraint has become a major focus. As Glazer (1970: 63) put it, "residential segregation is a far more serious threat to American democracy and the health of American society than poor housing." And Moynihan (1970: 9) echoes this sentiment in his interpretation that "the poverty and social isolation of minority groups in central cities is the single most serious problem of the American city today."

In the course of his "classic" study depicting interracial relations in the United States, Myrdal (1944: 620) casually remarked that "Only Orientals and possibly Mexicans among all separate ethnic groups have as much segregation as Negroes." Despite the issue-raising remark contained in this oft-scrutinized work and the significance of

residential segregation for the life chances of diverse minority groups the, perhaps unconsciously extended, challenge to Oriental and Mexican American researchers has not been taken up and the majority of literature on American racial and ethnic relations concerns itself with Blacks and European immigrants. Considerably less space is devoted to Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and Amerindians. While there exist excellent works on the Black and European ethnic populations, there is an alarming paucity of works referent to the problems encountered by Mexican Americans in an urban environment. Nothing comparable to the Taeubers' (1969) seminal contribution to an empirical understanding of the extent and variation in residential segregation by race across U. S. cities has appeared with reference to the residential segregation of Hispanic groups. Only one study, by Joan Moore and Frank Mittelbach (1966) has been reported. Although appearing in modified form in various "readers," it was primarily an advance report later incorporated into a much larger general study and, unfortunately, appears not to have stimulated widespread research interest. Yet, Mexican Americans have been described as this nation's second largest minority (Grebler, et. al., 1970).

It has been implied that a person's position in the stratification system is dependent upon either his competitive advantages or disadvantages. If, as some point out (Hollingshead, 1947: 202; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 148), ethnicity is generally likely to be either advantageous or disadvantageous, then ethnic segregation continues to merit study. Whereas the European case, generally speaking, was typified by a pattern of temporary residential segregation followed

by upward mobility and residential desegregation, can the same be expected of the Mexican American experience? Is the residential segregation of Mexican Americans solely a function of economic differences or is its principal determinant a persistent, but underlying, system of general ethnic discrimination in modern America? Have Mexican Americans always suffered such residential segregation unnoticed, or has there been a recent increase, decrease or stabilization? What explicatory socioeconomic and housing characteristics are statistically [i.e. "objectively"] useful in studying and understanding the present pattern(s) of such segregation? If the Mexican American population is to be incorporated into the mainstream of American social, economic and, perhaps, political life there are among the many questions that demand responses.

More than ten years after the passage of major civil rights legislation, few, if any, answers have been tendered to the above questions. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to provide an up-to-date description and assessment of the patterns of Mexican American residential segregation in the urban Southwest. This assessment and description of the patterns in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas will be undertaken by means of (1) the calculation of indexes of residential dissimilarity (D) for Mexican Americans from non-Mexican whites and from Blacks, (2) the analysis of the relationship of housing conditions and socioeconomic characteristics to such indexes, and (3) the use of such "correlates" to "test" three theoretical explanatory frameworks pertaining to residential segregation in general.

My study is not aimed at the proposal of solutions to the complex problem of minority group residential segregation, but rather to a description and assessment of inter- and intra-city patterns of this phenomenon. My aim is not so much a detailed knowledge of any single city or subset of cities as it is a comparative assessment of differential residential segregation through the identification and evaluation of those patterns and processes which are common to all communities and those which vary significantly. Overall, the intent is to provide a better understanding of the characteristics which correlate highly with residential segregation by undertaking a comprehensive and comparative analysis of the three prominent ethnic-racial groups of the Southwest and their socioeconomic positions. What characteristics most readily account for variation among cities and between groups? Which account for similarities? Do the two minority groups have significantly different characteristics or experiences which account for any observed variations in their relationships to the dominant group?

It is anticipated that the study could indirectly prove useful for regional and national policy- and decision-makers in their efforts to shape future housing programs necessitated by a rapidly expanding Hispanic population. Secondly, that it might help overcome some of the ignorance and indifference imposed by the past burden of poor, ethnocentric research by contributing to the understanding of the Mexican American's past and, more importantly, present place within the framework of our national, urban social structure. And finally, that it might serve as a macro-level benchmark for delineating further macro-

and micro-level research possibilities on residence and Mexican American ethnicity as other studies have done for the Blacks or European ethnics.

My discussion commences with a brief review of the importance of residential segregation research as it regards Mexican Americans. From there I establish that housing segregation reflects the larger stratification system. Moving to a brief review of the shortcomings of general research on Mexican Americans I suggest that the integration of diverse materials and approaches provides for a more comprehensive understanding of the problems encountered by the group. Building on this suggestion I turn to a brief historical overview of the evolution of Anglo-Mexican relations in the Southwest. The literature review component of the study concludes with a presentation of three theoretical frameworks employed in the explanation of residential segregation. After generating a series of hypotheses from these frameworks in Chapter IV and presenting my strategy for their analysis in Chapter V, I turn to a presentation of the indexes of dissimilarity for 1970 and the tests of the hypotheses derived from the theoretical frameworks. I conclude the analysis component with a brief discussion of the trends in Southwestern urban segregation from 1960 to 1970. The study is concluded with a summation of the findings, their significance with regard to the theories of residential segregation, and some suggestions for further research into the issue of Mexican American urban residential segregation.

The Necessity of Research on Hispanic Residential Segregation

The gravity of the issue of Hispanic residential needs was recently underscored by an article in The New York Times (Holsendolph, 1976: 13). The article noted that this nation's Hispanic population has increased sharply over the last two decades and continues to increase at, perhaps, an accelerated rate. The population which will be engaged in household formation processes in 1990 is already among us. It is rapidly becoming clear that this population will require more dwellings, transportation facilities, offices and factories. Yet our policy makers and planners have not begun assessing the broad and complex implications raised by rapid Hispanic population growth.

Although the figures citing the presence of "illegal" aliens are astronomical and most likely border on exaggeration, the previously unobserved or immaterial national migrations of Hispanics now constitutes "an evolving internal problem with both national and international consequences that gets little attention from ... enlightens[sic] leadership sectors of our society" (quoted in Holsendolph, 1976: 13). As Moynihan (1970: 21) had warned years earlier, "most of the issues that appear most critical just now do so in large measure because they are so little understood."

An earlier report, by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (1974), supports the more recent contentions regarding the necessity of researching important issues, for example residential segregation, as they pertain to the Mexican American population. Although the Commission's chief concern was with a problem area of only tangential interest to us, the general need for research as a policy-formation aid

was repeatedly stressed (see also Parsons, 1972: 7-8), as may be observed in these passages from the text:

> Data on Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other persons of Spanish speaking background currently are in demand by a large number of governmental and private agencies and institutions (1974: 15).

and

> State and local governments charged with distributing Federal assistance ... need social and demographic data to identify the needs of their disadvantaged communities and to evaluate the effectiveness of existing Federal programs (1974: 26).

Yet two years later, the absence of relevant data for policy-making determinations involving this same group is decried by an official of an agency functioning under the auspices of the Justice Department. While it appears paradoxical when one views the prevalence of the view that public policy often abets imbalances in urban life (Moynihan, 1970: 11), it is apparently consistent and common that the planners and decision-makers who "endeavor to design our cities ... proceed without an adequate understanding of the manner in which man relates ... to his environment" (Willhelm, 1962: 1). The lack of public discussion regarding the influence of the federal government's role in maintaining patterns of segregated housing has served as a barrier to understanding the problems of the city (Weissbourd, 1964: 2). Obviously, the recent inaction of governmental agencies has dangerously increased the possibility of a similar obfuscation regarding the problems, including segregated residential areas, of the nation's Hispanic populations.

The issue of where, and under what conditions, this expanding minority population will live must be quickly confronted by planners

if they are to avoid haphazard dawnings of new or extensions of existing Hispanic slums in, or on the fringe of, a great number of U. S. cities. Under normal circumstances, Michelson (1970: 22) has noted that "cities are now created less by piecemeal accretion than they once were." Even if the expanding Hispanic populations create more atypical circumstances, it seems likely that one would agree that Michelson's larger point, that public officials in concern with, or independent of, private entrepreneurs have the capacity to shape the urban environment is still valid and has not been negated. Crucial social decisions are inherent in the planning, or as it appears at this time, non-planning process. The eventual achievement of the proposed ideal of national housing policy ["a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family"] presupposes a special commitment to the needs of minority groups. Blacks and Hispanics now represent approximately one-sixth of our national population and have the added potential for outstripping the growth rate of the dominant majority for some time into the future. But, as Moynihan (1970: 12) notes, most federal urban programs are "typically ... based on 'common sense' rather than research in an area where common sense can be notoriously misleading." The realization that the programs of nearly all federal departments and agencies directly or indirectly have important consequences for life in the cities of our nation and those who must live in them, and that these policies can have impacts on segregating or desegregating neighborhoods (Moynihan, 1970: 8-9) underscores the severity of the data shortcomings for our Hispanic populations. Again Moynihan's (1970: 21) comments speak to the issue: "The federal government must

provide more and better information concerning urban affairs, and should sponsor extensive and sustained research into urban problems." In the absence of such information, adequate planning for the housing and related needs of an expanding population is at best severely hampered, and at worst impossible. The sole existing study regarding the segregated nature of Mexican American residential patterns is now seriously outdated (see Moore and Mittelbach, 1966).

Stratification and Housing: Explorations on their Interrelationship

The allocation and distribution of residential subgroups is a central component of urban stratification systems. As the Commission on Race and Housing (1958: 3), echoing Myrdal's earlier assertion, aptly noted "where a person lives bespeaks his social status ..." This view is of great import in understanding the relationship of minority group membership and housing. In our society, minority group membership is equated with low status (Commission on Race and Housing, 1958: 18), a fact which has not escaped Robert E. Park, a pioneer human ecologist, who viewed the "race problem" as a struggle for status (Lind, 1955: 53). More recently, Leo Grebler has viewed urban residential segregation as a good indicator of a minority's general status in our society (Moore and Mittelbach, 1966: vii). In most American cities, then, residential segregation reflects the "realities of social distinctions" (Moore and Mittelbach, 1972: 80). Employing Weber's (1946: 180-195) "classic" multidimensional notion of stratification, it is reasonable to state that stratification systems employ an areal dimension as one way of segregating different groups while simultaneously "symbolizing distance and prestige" (Etzioni, 1959: 258). Thus, I view the

differentiation of residential areas as being "to a very large extent a spatial manifestation of social stratification." This is, of course, by no means a novel stance, as it has frequently appeared in the literature to support the contention that social distances have a tendancy to manifest themselves as physical distances (Wirth, 1928: 28, 38, 284; Hawley, 1971: 187). When, for instance, we separate the wheat of Robert E. Park's sound judgement from the chaff of his overstatement, we note an early expression of this conception:

> ... social relations are ... frequently ... correlated with spatial relations; because physical distances so frequently are, or seem to be, the indexes of social distances, ... (quotes in Duncan and Duncan, 1955a: 493).

Shibutani and Kwan (1965: 33) content that in the contemporary United States "one's social status depends upon his position in two coexisting systems of social stratification: class and ethnic. ... one's ethnic identity, ... places a ceiling upon the extent to which he can rise." The majority of stratification theories, and research, concern themselves chiefly with the economic dimension, focusing on such issues as the inequality of rewards and privileges among occupational groups or between labor and capital. The idea that ethnic groupings are even a possible basis for stratification is rejected by some. But, as has been pointed out (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 29), while people are classified or distinguished from each other on several criteria simultaneously, those which determine status within the community are of the utmost importance. Status, in turn, bestows or denied certain privileges, prestige and, perhaps, immunities. Following Sorokin's usage, stratification is defined as "the differentiation of a

population into a hierarchy of layers, and if this means an unequal distribution of rights and privileges, power and influence, then it is clear that ethnic differentiation may be the basis of a stratification system" (Lieberson, 1970: 172).

Social distance in intergroup relations, expressed either physically or otherwise, is generally accompanied by social deprivation (Moore and Mittelbach, 1972: 80). Residential segregation is central to the maintenance of the existing, discriminatory system because it influences the extent and quality of social interaction and differentially structures access to jobs, income, education, and public goods (Hollingshead, 1947: 197, 202). Housing has been viewed as the area of greatest resistance to the concept of equality of opportunity (Hager, 1960: 80) and hence the processes operating in the context of the housing market are among the most resistant to change (Freeman and Sunshine, 1970: vii). The significance of housing for creating and maintaining urban stratification systems stems from its central role as

> ... the core mediator of access to a wide variety of social values available in urban areas. Because social values are unevenly distributed across urban space, the location of a housing unit determines as much about the opportunities available to residents as does the sheer physical quality of the unit itself. Depending upon where it is located, a house or an apartment may "carry" with it more or fewer public services, better or worse schools, more or less access to commercial activities (and employment opportunities), more or less interaction with people who are prized, or people who are shunned (Anton and Williams, 1971: 1).

The social and economic costs of residential segregation to the community as a whole, as well as the specific "pariah" population, is enormous. John C. Houlihan, former Mayor of Oakland, California, has

stated that "the social stratification that the central city has brought about represents a fatal hardening of the arteries if it is not rectified" (Weissbourd, 1964: 1). Whether residential segregation be de facto or, as in the past, de jure it has been of crucial importance in providing the basic structure for the creation and maintenance of nearly all other forms of institutional segregation (Johnson, 1943: 8; Commission on Race and Housing, 1966: 282; Gans, 1968: 347-349). Among the most frequently enumerated institutional areas severely affected by residential patterns is education, where it appears that funding inequities due to the preeminence of property taxes as the bulk of local revenues and educational segregation itself are insurmountable without a substantial reduction in residential segregation (Carter, 1970: 70; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1972: 8). Earlier references to the negative impact of residential segregation on the target population included those of diminution or abject neglect of public services, such as the provision of water, sanitation, street and pavement maintenance, police protection, and housing code enforcement (Myrdal, 1944: 643; McEntire, 1960: 89).

The presence of minorities of lower status in any given residential area is reflected in a diminished desirability of that area for other elements of the population (Lieberson, 1963: 4). The restraints imposed by an emerging or existing pattern of residential segregation exacerbate the housing problems of minority groups as they circumscribe choice and lead to scarcity in times of rapid population growth, which in turn leads to overcrowding, the subdivision of housing units and, sometimes, doubling up of families (Commission on Race and Housing,

1958: 42; Grodzins, 1958: 9). On an individual level, it can lead to the disruption of family life by creating unnecessary strains brought about by the inability to acquire suitable housing consistent with the family's life-cycle stage (Forman, 1971: 42). In either of the above situations, the result is the same, members of an outcast minority group are forced to make-do with that which has been made available. The resultant concentration of members of such racial or ethnic groups increases their conspicuousness, causing their distinctive characteristics to stand out all the more (Wirth, 1928: 38, 65; McEntire, 1960: 94; Breton, 1964: 204). Such spatially isolated groups, when visible, more readily become the objects of discrimination, for as Park wrote "... race prejudice is a function of visibility. The races of high visibility, ... are ... inevitable objects of race prejudice" (quoted in Wirth, 1928: 283). When "invisible" these groups are allowed to have their needs go unfulfilled and are readily neglected. Thus, segregation on a residential basis facilitates the exploitation of minority groups in many ways often seemingly unrelated to housing (Commission on Race and Housing, 1958: 36; Grier and Grier, 1971: 444).

Segregation by residence has a tendency to outlive barriers in the school and workplace and persists as a stimulant to prejudice. Physical distance tends to be among the last barriers to topple (Commission on Race and Housing, 1966: 285; Berry, et. al., 1976; 249-250). As Deutsch and Collins (1951: 5) noted, residential segregation "has a dynamic which tends to be self-perpetuating and reinforcing of prejudice." The resultant social distance reinforces mutual categorization as "we" and "they." Thus, existent misunderstandings are perpetuated

through the inability to evaluate each other's intentions and actions in proper context (Helper, 1969: 11; Kramer, 1970: 69). Of all the factors leading to intergroup social isolation, the Commission on Race and Housing (1966: 282) found residential segregation to be the most important. The very existence of residential segregation reinforces other forms of discriminatory behavior through the prevention of normal contacts. The belief that such contacts would gradually lead to the diminution of prejudice (e.g. Homans, 1950: 111-113) is illustrated by the following passage:

> Under conditions which provide new knowledge about the other race, cultural prejudice will obviously no longer serve the knowledge function. When more accurate information becomes available, the prejudice will be seen as inadequate by the open minded person and thus should change (McClendon, 1974: 60).

Following Shibutani and Kwan's (1965: 38) reasoning, the importance of continued misunderstanding caused by spatial distance lies in the fact that "human beings interact not so much in terms of what they actually are but in terms of conceptions that they form of themselves and of one another." Since social learning derives from many sources other than schools, the intergroup isolation brought about and supported by residential segregation is seen as preventive of a free and easy contact and experience on a relatively intimate and equal status basis with other groups. Thus, any reduction of suspicion and hostilities which such contact might conceivably lead to is effectively circumscribed (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 106; Wilner, et. al., 1969: 147). If, as Lieberson (1963: 18) notes, the process of assimilation is associated with that of residential segregation, it has great consequences for

recent ethnic immigrants belonging to current outcast minority populations. Ecological groups are more likely to avoid contacts of an intimate nature—and even informal communication—with other groups than are those which are spatially dispersed. Isolation of this nature facilitates the withholding of allegiance to the larger social entity (Etzioni, 1959: 259). Hawley contended that should such an ecologically based minority group be redistributed to reflect the territorial pattern of the majority group, there would occur a mitigation of subordinate status and a consequent facilitation of the assimilation of the group into the existing social structure (Lieberson, 1963: 6).

A system of ethnic stratification also reflects other forms of social stratification (Lieberson, 1970: 172). As Eunice and George Grier have stated, "freedom of opportunity is not divisible, there can be no equal access to employment where there is unequal access to housing" (Mercer, 1962: 47). Thus, we see that ecological patterns may be viewed as being both a consequence and determinant of social structural arrangements, as a fundamental ingredient of urban life as well as a reflection of it.

The Duncans (1955a: 493, 503) view ecological analysis as a promising approach to the study of urban social stratification. They conclude that a primary focus of urban stratification studies should be a systematic consideration of the spatial aspects of stratification phenomena and suggest that ethnic categories other than race are in all likelihood relevant, but that the paucity of data made for difficulty in studying them.

In the interval since their thought-provoking article adequate

empirical data on the Mexican American population has been made available through the decennial censuses. In conjunction with available socio-historical accounts this data allows for a systematic consideration of the spatial aspects of the stratification of Mexican Americans in the contemporary American Southwest.

CHAPTER II

THE SPATIOTEMPORAL MILIEU OF MEXICAN AMERICAN RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

Introduction

Some Shortcomings of Research on the Mexican American People

The Taeubers (1969: 15) note that the body of literature concerning itself with the plight of the Black in the United States is extensive, but that its quality is not high, largely because it is "polemic and for the most part proceeds from unanalyzed assumptions." The situation of research on the Mexican American is better only in that there is less dross, solely due to the fact that there has been so much less written. Many of the images of the Mexican Americans among both the general and academic populations have no ascertainable basis in reality (Rios, 1971: 59-73; Romano-V., 1971: 26-39). There has been, for instance, a problem in accurately reflecting the nature of the population. Mexican Americans have been a primarily urban population group for a rather long period of time [see Table 1]. By 1940, the Mexican American population's urban component already constituted 51 percent of the group's Southwestern population. It rose steadily from 1940 through 1970, when the Mexican American's percentage urban reached 85 percent. Despite the "urbanness" of the Mexican American population, much of the literature still concerns itself with their "traditional"—"peasant" has been an oft-substituted term—culture and

rural poverty (e.g. Heller, 1966; Rubel, 1966; Madsen, 1973) or with general socioeconomic issues not specifically applicable to the urban setting (e.g. Schmidt, 1970). Thus, the greatest gaps in information continue to concern the Mexican American in the urban environment. Despite the newfound interest in this group during recent years, relatively little work of high calibre has been produced. Too many hours

Table 1. The Urbanization of the Southwest's Mexican American Population, 1940-1970 (Percentage Urban)

	1940	1950	1960	1970
Arizona	42%	61%	75%	82%
California	68	76	85	91
Colorado	35	50	69	79
New Mexico	25	41	58	63
Texas	55	68	79	83
SOUTHWEST	51	66	79	85

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1974: 24, Chart B-a, 25, Table B-2).

of debate and pages of typescript have been wasted on the issue of the "correct" name for the group. As Penalosa (1973: 55) has so persuasively argued, it is time to move beyond terminology and definitional polemics and on to an examination of the dimensions which would most fruitfully illuminate the present state of the Mexican American community.

Necessary Additional Components

Merton (1949) illustrated, long ago, the inadequacy of using individual prejudice as a means of predicting discriminatory behavior and in accounting for changes in practices. The typology Merton presents drives home the importance of factors other than individually held attitudes for intergroup relations. The most important of these factors is the operation of the basic social institutions. By defining the problematic nature of, and an approved solution to, the "housing problem" in a decided fashion, the institutional structure channels human experiences in limited directions while either ignoring or prohibiting other possibilities (Williams, 1970: 38). As Suttles (1972: 7) has so insightfully and succinctly summarized, "residential groups and locality groups are inevitably partial structures whose very existence and character depend on their relationship to a wider society." The housing market in any community is a complex system of social control wherein financial institutions, real estate agents, property owners, and zoning commissioners are crucial actors in the game of normative conformity (Tilly, 1961: 330). The allocation of ethnic and racial residential areas occurs within the context of this system. Simply put, the metropolitan housing market is a basic institutional mechanism by which dominant class and status groups preserve their rewards and privileges vis-a-vis subordinate class and status groups.

The essence of this introduction is simply summarized by ex-mayor Houlihan, "All the problems are related and demand an understanding of the whole" (Weissbourd, 1964: 1). Residential segregation, like all other phenomena in society, is part of a larger social

structure. In order to better understand residential segregation it is necessary to be aware of the operation of that structure; the changes it has undergone over the course of time; and how these changes have operated to maintain, aggravate, or ameliorate the residential segregation of all, or just certain, minority groups. As suggested by Park (1952: 201-202), a better understanding of the "correlates" of Mexican American residential segregation has been sought through the integration into the analysis of previously ignored or inadequately utilized socio-historical materials.

While the Taeubers could adequately presuppose reader familiarity with many aspects of the history of racial separation, and could therefore dispense with a historical presentation recapitulating Black-white intergroup relations, the same is not true for either the Mexican American-Anglo or Mexican American-Black cases. The historical relationships of the two minorities to the region and its Anglo population differ substantially. Moreover, the prevalence of misinformation and stereotypical images fail to provide an adequate frame of reference for understanding Mexican American participation in urban American society. This understanding necessitates the realization that (1) Mexican Americans have a long, complex history and (2) that the evolution of Anglo-Mexican interaction has played a crucial role in the emergence of present residential patterns. In an effort to provide a fuller comprehension of contemporary Mexican American residential patterns in the urban Southwest, we turn now to a brief historical overview of Anglo-Mexican relations.[1]

Historical Overview

Introduction

Articles VIII and IX of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo read, in part,

> VIII. Mexicans now established in territories previously belonging to Mexico, and which remain for the future within the limits of the United States, as defined by the present treaty, shall be free to continue where they now reside, ..., retaining the property which they possess ...
>
> Those who shall prefer to remain in said territories, may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens, or acquire those of citizens of the United States. ...
>
> IX. Mexicans who, ... shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic, ... shall ... be admitted, at the proper time ... to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the mean time shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.

With the signing of this historic document, in 1848, the Mexican American people were created as a people. They were, as Alvarez (1973: 924) has noted, "Mexican by birth, language and culture; United States citizens by the might of arms."

Heller (1966: 4), and others, have stated that both in their rate and degree of acculturation and assimilation, that Mexican Americans are among the least "Americanized" of all the ethnic groups in the United States. Extant arguments of pathological deficiencies to the contrary, the retention of their "Mexicanness" is primarily a result of the combination of their historical experience and the contiguous, practically barrierless, international border. Both psychologically

and culturally the Mexican immigrant's "country of origin" and "country of destination" are one. Mexicans have always resided in the Southwest, and only its ownership and name have changed (McWilliams, 1948: 58; Estrada, Hernandez and Alvirez, 1972: 7). Nonetheless, in the Southwest the immigrant and native both faced formidable handicaps in the form of strong prejudices against "Mexicans" which had evolved gradually over time. And while, as one Mexican American noted, Anglo Americans may have abandoned geographic imperialism they replaced it with an extensive "mental imperialism" which has resulted in a questioning of one's sense of worth among all classes of Mexican Americans. Their society never lets them forget that "Mexican" blood flows in their veins (Madsen, 1973: 23, 30; Simmons, 1973: 46).

The Pre-Texas Revolution Era

The arrival of the Spaniards in Mexico initiated the development of a mestizo people which today comprises the largest aggregate within Mexican society. The mestizo embodies an oft-overlooked, yet extremely important, characteristic of the "Hispanic Southwest"—its biological, cultural and social heterogeneity.

Generally speaking, as the early European settlements progressively expanded outward, the Native American populations either acquiesced and cooperatively got out of the way, or were exterminated (Alvarez, 1973: 920-921). The Spanish method of colonization and its attendant policies were designed, however, to effect the incorporation of the Indian element into the white social structure. Admittedly, Indian social status was the lowest and the treatment of Amerindians was always coercive and, frequently, brutal. Nonetheless, this

colonization policy contrasted sharply with that of the English. Although initially directed toward the Christianization of the Indians, the English policy reflected the conviction that the Indians were—and would continue to be—savages to be expelled or annihilated. While the Spanish were equally as ethnocentric with regard to their racial superiority, their contacts with the Indians resulting from their colonization practices led to intermarriage, or enduring liaisons, and to mestizo progeny. Consequently, the Spanish-speaking population that was to meet Anglo-America's frontier settlers at the borders of Texas and Florida was even more heterogeneous racially than that of the oft-conquered mother country, Spain. This population was likely to be viewed by the Anglo Americans as nonwhite and inferior to even the hated Spaniards.

The Treaty of Paris (1783) freed the colonies from their English bondage, and the Louisiana Purchase (1803) gave the young republic an enormously vast new territorial empire. Thus, Anglo Americans and Spanish Americans became uneasy neighbors. Boundary problems on the fringes of Florida and Texas had resulted in tense diplomatic situations which occasionally erupted into open conflict. Early relations between the Spanish American and Anglo American peoples were influenced by a mutual antipathy based on the Anglo American sentiment that Spanish culture was inferior to American culture. The Spanish and English had been bitter rivals for centuries and had doubtless formed negative views of each other. These stereotypes and ethnocentric views had subsequently been transferred to the English colonies and into the minds of Americans. On the other side, the Spanish held little admiration

for the young American republic. The U. S. was seen as a "territorial purse snatcher" more dangerous in terms of its greed and aggressive knavery than as a potential conquerer. A number of early "filibustering" expeditions into Texas and the commencement of Mexico's revolution against Spanish control aggravated these hostilities. Thus, despite the remarkably similar origins and forms of government, the mutual antagonisms between the Anglo American people of the United States and the Spanish-Indian populace of Mexico had escalated to such a degree, by 1821, on the eve of the initial massive influx of Anglo American immigrants into Texas, that they precluded the emergence of a framework of common values (McLemore, 1973: 659-664).

It should also be made clear that the Anglo American frontiers were frequently "second frontiers." In our case, the Spanish-Mexicans had invested more than two and one-half centuries of experimentation in order to accumulate the necessary knowledge of the land to allow them to adapt their methods of "civilization," irrigation and animal husbandry; to initiate industries; to expand their knowledge of the native Indian populations and their ways of life; and to promote colonization. These adaptations had just begun to reap rewards for the Mexican ranchers at about the time of the first large wave of Anglo American settlers into Texas. Within a very short time, however, the Anglo American immigrant component and its slaves equalled, and then surpassed, that portion of the native Texan population which could be designated as either "Mexican" or "settled" (McLemore, 1973: 659, 665). Simultaneous with the massive Anglo American influx, a serious political struggle was emerging within Mexico over the nature of the nation's

governmental structure. A centralist faction favored strong administrative control of all Mexican territory by a governing elite located in Mexico City. A competing federalist faction was in favor of implementing the principles of the rights of man as delineated by the U. S. Constitution and by the French political theorists of the Enlightenment. The Province of Texas became a federalist stronghold, loyal to the federalist constitution of 1824 (Alvarez, 1973: 923). It is within this context that the Texan "revolution for freedom" actually took place. And, even after Santa Ana's defeat, the lines of opposition within Texas were not as clearly and distinctively drawn between Mexicans and Anglo Americans as many would suspect (McLemore, 1973: 667).

The Post-Texas Revolutionary Era

Although ostensibly at peace after 1836, a "guerilla war" was carried on between Mexico and the Republic of Texas which repeatedly swept back and forth across the Nueces-to-Rio Grande no-man's land (Taylor, 1934: 21). Such "unofficial warfare" did not cease until the outbreak of the Mexican American War (1946-1848). This conflict consolidated a system within which "Mexicans" were subordinated to Anglos in Texas (McLemore, 1973: 667) and, subsequently, other segments of the Southwest.

Antagonisms between the Anglo American and Mexican people prior to the outbreak of the war deepened into a passionate hostility that provides us with a crucial insight into the century that has followed. The idea of "mission" was very strong during the war, as was an urge to spread democratic institutions to a less fortunate people. The imminent conquest of Mexico was to be a great blessing for the conquered:

"American expansion into Mexico meant lifting the poor Mexicans from the abyss of despair and increasing their happiness" (Rappaport, 1967: 44-45). This "mission" was subsequently translated, in modern times, into strenuous efforts to eradicate ethnic differences and remold the Mexican American into "100 percent Americans" (Madsen, 1973: 1).

The signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo enabled Mexicans who resided in the United States to opt for American citizenship. But, whatever their choice regarding citizenship, language and culture could not be changed overnight merely because the lands occupied by Mexicans were now part of the United States; they retained their "Mexicanness." The ascribed social status as an inferior minority conferred on these persons of Spanish-Mexican ancestry at this stage in time was to have prolonged and long-lasting repercussions. Thus, for instance, while prohibited from taking occupied Mexican-owned lands by the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, Texans took lands that had remained in undisputed possession of Mexican families for as long as a century. Murder and bluff were not uncommon in the process. The Mexicans were simply not looked upon as occupants (Rios, 1971: 64). As Frederick Law Olmstead observed, they were considered heathens not to be acknowledged as "white folks" and therefore were inevitably subjected to insolent and unjust treatment (Taylor, 1934: 39). Others had been less kind and had viewed them as "reptiles" who must "either crawl or be crushed."

From the close of the Mexican American War through our own Civil War interethnic relations on the border did not improve appreciably beyond those detailed above. The Mexican populace was involved, if not

through actual extension of aid, by the very fact that it was their border which offered freedom to runaway slaves. Whatever the case, the situation generated suspicion of and hostilities against the entire Mexican ancestry population of the U. S. side of the border. As a result of their "sympathetic" status the "Mexican" population was constantly harrassed. For example, in Colorado County, Texas, where after the discovery of a reputed Black insurrectionary plot in 1856, "without exception every Mexican in the county was implicated. They were arrested and ordered to leave the county. ..." And, as Olmstead noted, despite the guarantees of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the whole "native," i.e. Mexican American, population of county after Texas county was driven from their homes and forbidden under pain of death from returning to the vicinity of the plantations through the formal proceedings undertaken by the larger planters (Taylor, 1934: 37-39).

After the Civil War, the relations between Mexicans and Anglos, especially Texans, took on forms that were shaped by that conflict. At the close of the war, and until 1880 at least, friction along the Texas border was continual and intense, and "race hatred" flared up over both political and economic issues (Taylor, 1934: 42-49). Early Texas fiction fed on these animosities and subsequently diffused them more extensively through its characterization of Mexicans (Rios, 1971: 66-67). As Agnes Pallen wrote, in 1925, "We always picture Mexico as cactus-covered desert populated exclusively by bloodthirsty natives whose chief interest in life is cutting one another's throats ..." (Adler, 1970: 128). Diffusion of such stereotypical images has had enormous consequences for future generations of Mexican Americans as they struggle

for survival in an Anglo-American-dominated, stereotype-laden world.

The Post Mexican Revolutionary Era: A Socio-Cultural Profile

Prior to 1900 the influx of Mexicans into the United States was comparatively miniscule. This may actually reflect changing entry formalities, since between 1850 and 1900 the formalities were minimal and statistical records rather unreliable. During more recent times the increased rigidity of visa status formalities has helped to identify two prominent waves of legal Mexican immigration. The first dates from 1915 to the Depression era and the other dates from World War II up through the present (Estrada, Hernandez and Alvirez, 1972: 1-2).[2] The Mexican immigrants came in search of new horizons, of prosperity and of liberty. Instead they found an antagonistic atmosphere for everything Mexican, they were treated badly and exploited for their physical endurance—the legacy of two wars and a stereotype-laden literature. The general consensus in the Southwest was that Mexican Americans were essentially inferior: "The Mexicans are like children. They have an average mentality of a nine-year old child. If you tell them to do two things, they will do one of them wrong or forget to do it at all." And thus the Biblical notion of "hewers of wood and drawers of water" was applied as it was generally believed that God had created Mexicans to labor. But, then again, there were some Mexicans who "are very bright, but you can't compare their brightest with the <u>average</u> white children. They are an inferior race." The last phrase is of key importance to an understanding of anti-Mexican sentiment, a belief in the superiority of the white race over an ignorant and degraded "hybrid race of Spanish and Indian origin ..." (Taylor, 1934:

32, 127, 203, 300). Despite being technically classified as Caucasian, the person of Mexican descent in the Southwest has generally been regarded as "non-white" in the eyes of the general majority group public, primarily because of their mixed Spanish-Indian heritage which has frequently resulted in a darker complexion and distinctive facial features. Thus, if we recall Olmstead's early statement, they were "not acknowledged as 'white folks'" (McWilliams, 1948: 114; Rios, 1971: 65).

Associated with the assumption of Mexican inferiority is that of group homogeneity—that there is a marked lack of internal differentiation, that all Mexicans are alike. Furthermore, over time, from the 1920's through the 1970's, no distinction has been made between Mexican Americans and Mexican Nationals (McWilliams, 1948: 75; Rios, 1971: 60; Simmons, 1973: 41). Consequently, as Manuel Gamio noted, in his classic Mexican Immigrants to the United States (1930), even if "they are American citizens, they remain on economic, political and social levels always inferior to those occupied by Americans of like condition and capacity" (quoted in Heller, 1966: 12). And as Jose Vasconcelos so aptly summarized this reality in his Ulises criollo (Mexico, 1937):

> In speaking of Mexicans I include many who, though they lived in Texas and though their parents were naturalized citizens, would make common cause with me for reasons of race. And even if they hadn't wanted it that way, it would have been the same, because the yankees so classify them (quoted in Rios, 1971: 71).

So prevalent had this conception become that as early as the 1930's Taylor could quote a Mexican National as saying "Texas-Mexicans and Old Mexico Mexicans are the same; the only difference is whether they

are born here or there." But, Mexican Americans (and Mexicans) in the Southwest are not historically, genetically or culturally homogenous. Each wave of immigrants differed, each area to which they travelled differed. Mexico was different with regard to the extensiveness of industrialization, urbanization and "modernization" (Penalosa, 1973: 61). And, it seems obvious, the two nations have not made parallel strides in growth/development over time.

The negative images which have evolved over time can be seen as rationalizations of, and support for, the status quo. Since Mexican Americans are so obviously inferior, their subordinate status is appropriate and is of their own doing (Simmons, 1973: 41, 49). The hybrid Mexicans get no social equality since they do not desire such and keep "their place" (Taylor, 1934: 163-164, 254, 304). This conception fails to reflect reality. The subordinate Mexican and Black populations are not content with their lot, with most, regardless of class, being keenly aware of Anglo American attitudes and practices toward their group. Thus, the superior, intelligent and enlightened white population had to take appropriate action. For instance, in Los Angeles, parks, swimming pools and theatres were primarily restricted to "whites" with "Tuesdays reserved for Negroes and Mexicans" (Scott, 1970: 110). Other intimations of minority group dissatisfaction and resulting white response can be seen in advertisements, such as the one in San Antonio (1927) which noted that it was the "Only pool in city that does not allow Mexicans" (Taylor, 1934: 264). Some such images continue to persist, albeit to a lesser degree, and are not limited to either mere prejudicial statements or minor behavioral manifestations as illustrated

above with regard to recreational facilities. The ramifications of these attitudes are widespread as they were translated into behavioral patterns in, among others, the crucial area of housing.

Residential Segregation, 1960

For 1960, Moore and Mittelbach (1966) found that sharp differences existed in the extent of segregation between various subpopulations, with wide variations across the 35 cities they studied [see table 2]. For example, we see that segregation of Mexican Americans[3] from Anglos ranged from a low of 30 in Sacramento, California, to a high of 76 in Odessa, Texas. Segregation of Blacks from Anglos ranges from a low of 57 in Pueblo, Colorado, to a high of 94 in Lubbock, Texas. The lack of uniformity is even more apparent when we examine the segregation of the two minorities from each other, shown in the last column of the table. The segregation of Blacks from Mexican Americans ranges from a low of 29 in Odessa to a high of 89 in Lubbock. The pattern of the segregation scores for the three types of segregation which held for 26 of the 35 cities was as follows: the highest segregation was that of Blacks from Anglos; the intermediate level of segregation was that of Mexican Americans from Blacks; and the least segregation was between Mexican Americans and Anglos.

In Moore and Mittelbach's (1966: C-7, C-8) stepwise regression analysis, relatively few independent variables accounted for most of the ascertained variance. The resulting "best" equations selected for each dependent variable "explained" from 49 to 69 percent of the variance in the D's. And while the statistical measures to illustrate the "taste for discrimination" failed to show any significant relationship

Table 2. Indexes of Residential Dissimilarity for 35 Southwestern Central Cities, 1960

City	Mexican Americans from Anglos	Mexican Americans* from Blacks	Blacks from Anglos
Abilene, Texas	57.6	55.7	85.1
Albuquerque, New Mexico	53.0	62.4	81.7
Austin, Texas	63.3	66.1	72.1
Bakersfield, California	53.7	61.4	87.7
Colorado Springs, Colorado	44.8	53.8	74.0
Corpus Christi, Texas	72.2	51.0	91.3
Dallas, Texas	66.8	76.1	90.2
Denver, Colorado	60.0	68.0	86.8
El Paso, Texas	52.9	59.5	79.2
Fort Worth, Texas	56.5	78.1	85.4
Fresno, California	49.0	55.2	92.0
Galveston, Texas	33.3	52.1	73.8
Houston, Texas	65.2	70.9	81.2
Laredo, Texas	39.4	43.9	60.1
Los Angeles, California	57.4	75.7	87.6
Lubbock, Texas	66.0	89.0	94.4
Oakland, California	41.5	56.4	72.2
Odessa, Texas	75.8	29.2	90.5
Ontario, California	50.6	32.6	80.1
Phoenix, Arizona	57.3	60.7	90.0
Port Arthur, Texas	45.9	76.3	89.7
Pueblo, Colorado	40.2	44.1	57.0
Riverside, California	64.9	45.6	80.8
Sacramento, California	30.2	47.8	61.9
San Angelo, Texas	65.7	75.6	77.5
San Antonio, Texas	63.2	77.4	84.5
San Bernardino, California	67.9	35.2	83.5
San Diego, California	43.6	55.2	81.1
San Francisco, California	38.1	65.9	71.5
San Jose, California	43.0	44.4	64.7
Santa Barbara, California	46.5	37.6	76.7
Stockton, California	52.6	31.0	73.0
Tucson, Arizona	62.7	64.1	84.5
Waco, Texas	59.7	60.6	74.3
Wichita Falls, Texas	64.8	47.6	86.1
MEAN	54.5	57.3	80.1
STANDARD DEVIATION	11.4	15.1	9.5

SOURCE: Adapted from Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 17-18), Tables 2 and 3.

*Mexican American has been employed for the sake of clarity, it is listed as White Persons of Spanish Surname in the original Moore and Mittelbach tables.

to both intercity and intergroup segregation, Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 39-40) concluded that some of the influence of discrimination—for which they were unable to find a statistical proxy—was buried in the variance left unaccounted for by the analysis.

The Socio-Historical Milieu as an Explanatory Aid

One of the most notable weaknesses of the earlier Moore and Mittelbach study is its failure to provide either a sufficient conceptual framework or an adequate historical background for their analysis, the bulk of which was summarized in the preceding section. Let us return briefly to the socio-historical approach and see how it may have effectively enhanced Moore and Mittelbach's empirical analysis.

Mexican Americans have been classified as being prone to propinquity, of instinctively huddling together in certain districts because they like to live in a clannish manner among their own kind (Fuller, 1920: 2). Madsen (1973: 33) aptly summarizes the propinquity-prone perspective when he notes that the Mexican American's "world is a Latin [sic] world and he avoids all unnecessary contact with Anglos whom he regards as threatening and incomprehensible." But, the exclusionary practices of the Anglo American population are as relevant to an understanding of enclave formation and maintenance as are any isolationist practices of the Mexican ancestry group itself. As early as the 1930's Taylor's (1934: 228) extensive interviewing revealed that "The Mexicans do not prefer complete separation. ... They prefer to be free to move where they please. The American people impose the separation. ..." The Mexican American impressions uncovered by Taylor reveal that, contrary to the arguments of the voluntarist explanation of

ethnic ghettoization, it was the Anglo American population which preferred separation. Many persons of Mexican ancestry were found to desire residences in better sections of town. Taylor's findings are corroborated in a study by Bogardus (1930: 75), who quotes a Mexican as saying that "that is where the Americans want the Mexicans to go—to places where the Americans will not go themselves." Case and Kirk's (1959: 19) later study found that 46 percent of the Black and 38 percent of the Mexican American families surveyed wanted to move. And as early as the turn of the century, Fuller (1920: 3) had cryptically noted a case wherein the head of the household wanted to move and was willing to pay more in rent for better housing but was unable to do so. Fuller's limited "analysis" offers no plausible explanations for this failure. In their study, Case and Kirk (1959: 69) discovered that 18 percent of all minority and 15 percent of the Mexican American families questioned had actually attempted to move into non-minority neighborhoods but had been unsuccessful.

The most direct device for maintaining segregation has been the simple refusal to sell to the ostracized Mexican. Pressures brought against real estate brokers in order to assure conformity to the white normative pattern were not unheard of as early as the late 1920's. As early as 1923 and 1924 newspaper advertisements for new "additions" proclaimed "No Mexicans Allowed" (Bogardus, 1930: 77-78; Taylor, 1934: 227-228). When simple refusal to sell or social pressure became ineffective, the restrictive covenant gained widespread popularity (Long and Johnson, 1947: 91, 103; Perales, 1948: 139-149). As early as 1910, such restrictions were included in deeds for the Bishop, Texas,

townsite:

> ... when said lots or any portion thereof are conveyed to either a Mexican or a Negro or both that the title to the same shall thereupon revert to the grantor herein, and this condition shall be binding upon the grantee and his heirs and assigns, and run with said lots ... (Taylor, 1934: 226).

In the mid-1940's, the Rev. John J. Birch remarked that "in practically every city and town of California, Texas and Arizona, there are residential districts where persons of Mexican extraction, regardless of wealth and social position, are not permitted to reside on the ground that they are not 'white'" (Perales, 1948: 55).[4] Rental units were also covered by such restrictions throughout Texas (Perales, 1948: 124, 186ff). In the 1940's, restrictive covenants on land sites in Phoenix influenced the development of city housing projects. Because of restrictions contained in deeds throughout the city, it was necessary to construct one housing project exclusively for "whites," another for Mexican Americans, and yet another for Blacks (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1962: 34).

The influence of such legal restrictions in the past and the existing cultural associations which emerged from them have caused, in large part, the preference to gather in well-defined areas (Case and Kirk, 1959: 73). The legacy of the period of legal machinations such as restrictive covenants has frequently been noted in practices which have continued well beyond their basis in legality. A staff report to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1964 described remnants of these prior practices:

> The problem of housing discrimination includes governmental support of residential segregation, the inability to obtain loans for certain properties,

> the refusal of some real estate brokers to show certain properties to Spanish-speaking homeseekers, the charging of higher rents to the Spanish-speaking, and the outright refusal by landlords, builders, and homeowners to rent or sell to them (quotes in Schmidt, 1970: 51).

It seems reasonable, then, to view Mexican American propinquity as having a basis in past restrictive practices coupled with past decisions, by recent arrivals and long-term residents alike, to seek the course of least resistance. As two Anglos, quoted by Taylor (1934: 134, 262), put it: "usually a Mexican won't stay 'where he has trouble'" and "the Mexicans don't like it; they know they are not allowed, and don't try."

Nam (1959: 328) notes that in many community studies, time of arrival of different groups is a key status rank variable. But as Bogardus (1930: 74) pointed out a number of years ago, the "Mexican" community is often the original part of the American city: San Antonio was founded in 1718 and Albuquerque, though not formally incorporated as an "American" city until 1890, was founded in 1706. Many of the Southwest's cities were settled by the Spanish-Mexicans and represent another of the many second frontiers for the Anglo American immigrants. Originally, the pattern was to organize these early cities around multi-purpose plaza areas. With the completion of the railroads and the consequent flood of new Anglo American immigrants, many such plazas were circumvented by transportation nodes and terminals. Central places, therefore, arose at some distance from the original plazas and experienced much of the subsequent urban growth, leaving the old plazas as "backwaters." The subsequent rapid urbanization of the Southwest

resulted in further absorption of scattered Mexican American barrios having roots in the Southwest's agricultural past as agricultural lands were rapidly converted to urban uses (Moore and Mittelbach, 1966: 10, 12). For instance, in the original settlement pattern of Los Angeles, the Mexican population occupied what was then the periphery of the city, living in compact little communities. The present city grew around these scattered communities and absorbed them into the urban patterns of activity. The enclaves retained their ethnic character but the population was now "urban" and gradually abandoned their primarily agricultural occupational orientations (Case and Kirk, 1959: 9; Jacobs, 1967: 138). Thus, we see a difference in the Mexican American's pattern of "ghettoization" from that of the "traditional" process undergone by other urban ethnics: Mexican American urbanization has not meant an almost exclusive concentration in the older central areas of Southwestern cities. Although many of the enclaves are to be found in areas adjacent to the present central business district, they are more widely scattered throughout the cities as a result of the historical evolution of the city itself. There are even a few places where Mexican Americans are the numerical majority. While Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 12) claim that in Laredo, for instance, Mexican Americans are not found in subordinate enclaves and constitute a "social" majority they offer no supportive evidence. There are all-to-many cases in Texas wherein Mexican Americans constitute the numerical majority but the legacy of the past continues to impose a subordinate status upon them (McWilliams, 1948; Rubel, 1966; Madsen, 1973).

Summary

A history of the Mexican Americans has not been my intent. This brief socio-historical overview has been intended more as a consciousness and issue-raising component. More than anything else, the brief review should make the reader aware of the forces that have been at work over time. Used in conjunction with the empirical component of the study such a historical perspective should enable a more critical evaluation of the applicability to the Mexican American of the three theoretical frameworks frequently employed for explaining residential segregation. We turn our attention to a presentation and brief critique of these frameworks in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON ETHNIC RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

Introduction

Most stratification theories are "concerned primarily with economic dimensions such as the unequal distribution of rewards and privileges to labor and capital or to occupational groups" (Lieberson, 1970: 172). American demographers have fixed on the issues and have joined their non-demographer colleagues, especially with regard to occupational mobility and labor force analyses (Schnore, 1965a: 59). Other demographers and sociologists, relatively few by comparison, have seen in the uneven residential distribution of occupational, ethnic and racial groups the spatial manifestation of an urban stratification system (Duncan and Duncan, 1955a: 493; Etzioni, 1959: 258; Taeuber, 1964: 42; Lieberson, 1970: 173). As a group, the questions whose answers they most seek to understand are simply "who chooses which, what makes people choose as they do, and what happens to people who have, for reasons of income and race, no choice at all?" (Gans, 1968: 3). Over the years, there have emerged three alternative explanations for the emergence and/or maintenance of ethnic and racial residential segregation in U. S. urban communities;

1. The unequal distribution of purchasing power among families (a variant of the market model of "classic economics");
2. Cultural solidarity, or voluntary self-segregation; and

3. Exclusionary policies and practices, ideologies and interests, of the dominant group(s) in the society.

The Purchasing Power Explanation: A Variation on the Market Model

One of the most frequently espoused theoretical positions regarding residential segregation is that "the spatial distribution of people is seldom the product of deliberate design; after each migration new patterns of settlement develop through competition and natural selection" based on purchasing power (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 147, 159; see also McKenzie, 1925: 64; Warner and Srole, 1945: 34). Ethnic segregation in industrial cities, especially those undergoing rapid growth, was attributed to this selective process, a process which, evidently, had been at work for ages

> If we compare the medieval town with the modern urban community we find that the two structures have something fundamental in common, namely, the segregation of the population into distinct classes and vocational groups. This process is essentially a process of competition. ... (Wirth, 1928: 284).

Immigrants of low status are seen as settling in those areas of the city where rents are low, while those who could afford better housing usually chose to live in mixed areas among the more "successful" members of other minority groups. In Wirth's (1928: 4) terminology, the former's settlement in the ghettos represented an area of first settlement. The poor immigrant drifted to these slums primarily as a result of the attraction of low rents and the added benefit, due to the nature of industrial activity at the time, that they were within easy walking distance of their employment (Bogardus, 1930: 79; Banfield, 1968: 68). The spatial distribution of ethnic groups in the United States developed as members of each group settled in the best housing

they could find, given their poor ability to compete with others (Lieberson, 1963: 4; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 119-120). The consequences of such disadvantageous competitive capacities was as Hollingshead succinctly summed it up, that "... competition in a market ... gives society its more or less ecological base" (quotes in Firey, 1947: 16).

Handlin (1951: 146) has noted that the immigrants found their first homes "in quarters the old occupants no longer desire." Milton Gordon (1964: 97) acknowledged the ecological-economic argument when he pointed out that immigrants, arriving when they did, as the existence of the western frontier was drawing to a close, gathered in the urban slums and took their places on the lowest economic rungs of the industrial ladder. For McKenzie, this was the essence of the process, all forms of urban segregation were based on the rent and income factors (Firey, 1947: 11). As the process continued and time passed, the next new wave of immigration arrived and the earlier immigrants were "pushed" up to the next rung on the economic ladder as the second and subsequent generations acquired increasing measures of education and the requisite industrial-technical and language skills to take advantage of favorable opportunities (Wirth, 1928: 228-229; Edwards, 1966: 280).[1] As Edith Elmer Wood, writing in 1935, summarized it:

> ... Newcomers sought the cheapest and therefore the worst housing, literally pushing out, and necessarily into something better, the last previous immigrant wave. They were able to afford the move because rapidly expanding population meant rapidly expanding jobs. ... Living in these slums was a temporary discomfort, ... (quotes in Banfield, 1968: 30).

These patterns of temporary segregation, to be followed by upward mobility, characterized "virtually all immigrant groups in the United

States" (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 120). Thus, the atmosphere of the "blighted area" surrounding the central business district was viewed as temporary and to be bestowed minimal commitment (Michelson, 1970: 9).

This same temporary process has frequently been viewed from a slightly different perspective, one which emphasizes a "filtering down process" rather than a "push" factor in changing residential location. While both say basically the same thing, a brief look at the "filtering" argument may be of subsequent usefulness in this study.

As the economic situation of each succeeding wave of immigrants improved and as their existing housing aged and, consequently, "declined" some groups found that the quantity of housing they needed had increased and they sought newer housing—at least that which was newer for it. Gradually the group began to move from the original locus (Wirth's area of first settlement) and into neighborhoods previously inhabited by the prior wave of immigrants who had also begun their search for new quarters as their existing housing began to decline and their (status) needs and incomes increased. Thus, our alternative interpretation of ecological succession of immigrant groups focuses on a passing down of housing for occupancy by the more prosperous and thrifty members of successively lower-income ethnic groups as adequate supplies of better housing become available at the upper end of the chain for those groups having progressed up the economic ladder and become, at least relatively, well-off—thus the term "filtering" (Muth, 1969: 98; Greeley, 1975: 62). It is suggested that as members of the more prosperous group moved, their housing because it was not likely to have been within the financial reach of the next lowest group, probably went

quite frequently to the less prosperous, but nonetheless slowly progressing, members of their own group whose housing was subsequently passed down the filtering chain. Bogardus (1930: 75) strongly implies this when he refers to economic mobility and areas of second and third settlement (see also Jonassen, 1949: 37). Handlin (1951: 164-165) notes that, in some cases, "so many moved that these newer places began to repeat the experience of the area of first settlement."

The "market model" implies that at any given time the level of ethnic residential segregation is attributable to differences in a group's socioeconomic position. Implied in such a conceptualization is the argument that the various existing social classes are differentially distributed over the residential areas of the city. Thus, one would expect ethnic residential segregation to be accounted for by the socioeconomic differentials of the groups considered (Warner and Srole, 1945: 34; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 159, 163-164). Schnore (1965b: 126) has found that residential patterning is, in part, a class phenomenon. With respect to socioeconomic status, the Duncans (1957) found a pattern of differentiation resembling that found in the white community within the Black community of Chicago. In both communities, higher status groups were found to be residentially segregated from the lower status groups.

The "Voluntarist" Perspective

The pioneers of the "Chicago School," Park and Burgess had argued that among some recent immigrants propinquity was equally as important as "cost accounting" in the selection of residential location (Suttles, 1972: 26). In another early ecological study, Christen

Jonassen (1949: 41) stated that "men tend to distribute themselves within an area so as to achieve the greatest efficiency in realizing the values they hold most dear." In the view of Robert Blauner (1972: 86) the ethnic ghettos that resulted from the massive immigration of earlier days arose more through voluntary choice than coercion. The immigrant inhabitants of these ghettos freely chose to set out for America and once here freely chose to reside among fellow ethnics. These ghettos were basically temporary way stations along the roads of acculturation and assimilation. Such ethnic ghettos were one- or two-generation phenomena—where they continued to persist they reflected voluntary decisions to remain among fellow ethnics and to maintain group institutions. As a consequence, Gordon (1964: 34, 37) can depict the American social structure as consisting of a series of subsocieties based on ethnic identity. He writes that within these ethnic groups there develops a network of organizations and informal social relationships which allows, or even conceivably encourages, ethnics to remain within the confines of their group for all their primary, and some of their secondary, relationships (see also Park and Miller, 1925: 120-144; Breton, 1964: 200; Kramer, 1970: 62). De facto ethnic societies developed in the first generation as a result of numerous natural factors (e.g. sparsely settled interior regions). Subsequently, the search for an "oasis of familiarity in a strange land" led to the recreation of miniature ethnic societies as friends, relatives, and countrymen joined the original settlers (Gordon, 1964: 133-134; Greeley, 1975: 39). Breton (1964: 193) argues that the direction of the immigrants' integration was dependent to a great degree on the positive

and negative forces of attraction and repulsion of the various communities. In larger cities, ethnic groups of the second, third, fourth and even later generations have been known to continue to live in self-imposed isolation (Banfield, 1968: 81; Gans, 1968: 37, 263; Kantrowitz, 1969: 684). Ecological groups such as these have greatly increased opportunities for the avoidance of intimate contacts, or even informal communication, with outside groups than do the non-ecological ethnic groups. Such opportunity more readily permits the circumscription of loyalty to the larger society which engulfs them (Etzioni, 1959: 259; see also Park and Miller, 1925: 120-144).

Why? Robert Park answered that the continued existence of the ethnic ghetto was due to the fact that it met a need and performed a function (Wirth, 1928: vi). Using the Jews as a historical illustration, Wirth notes that segregation into separate local areas within a city did not originate from any formal edict or preconceived design. Rather, the ghetto stabilized the needs and practices rooted in the religious and secular customs and heritages of the ethnics themselves. This voluntary congregation was due to the need for communal organization (Wirth, 1928: 18). These enclaves were a haven for their inhabitants. Wirth went on to note that within his own community the ethnic was at home. The ghetto allowed him to relax, to drop the etiquette and formalism required of him in the outside world. Whereas the world at large was cold and strange, in the ghetto it was warm and familiar and he was, or felt, free to be himself. Once in the ghetto, the ethnic was among his own kind and he could converse in a familiar tongue. Common troubles, ceremonies and sentiments were shared. Without this

security among his own kind life in the world "beyond the pale" would have been insufferable (Wirth, 1928: 26-27). Wirth's rendition of the functions of the ghetto presents the view that, like Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier, it served as a "safety valve." Invariably individuals would attempt to move out of the ghetto and into the world that lay beyond. Sometimes, broken and humiliated, the expatriate would return to the warmth and intimacy that could be found only among his own people (Wirth, 1928: 36-37, 122-123).

For Wirth, the case of the modern ghetto, as typified by those in the United States, was altogether different. This ghetto was infrequently anything more than a transitional area, an intervening stage between the old and the new wisdoms:

> ... The actual immigrant from the East who settled in a Western ghetto may, by reason of age, poverty, or prejudice, remain there and die there. But his children seldom, perhaps never, do so: their modern education weakens the sentimental attachment to the ghetto, and they prefer to live farther afield and enjoy a sense of actual equality with their non-Jewish neighbours. ... (Wirth, 1928: 129).

As in the case of its European predecessor, the modern ghetto serves a a function. An extremely important and powerful factor in the distribution of population is tolerance. The tolerance of "strange" ways of living or of cultural heterogeneity is such that one can obtain freedom from hostility, from criticism, and the support of kindred spirits only in such places as immigrant colonies. The arrangement made with the dominant group(s), that of living apart in certain areas, is primarily utilitarian. The accommodation between the two groups—a "dissenting" minority and the dominant population—is a form of tolerance that leads to the development of a <u>modus vivendi</u> between them

(Wirth, 1928: 5, 20, 24). Wirth (1928: 288) would note that it is to such a modus vivendi, which permitted physical and encouraged social isolation, that the Jews owed their continued existence as a separate and distinct group.

Lester Granger has noted that when people find themselves in strange surroundings while simultaneously endeavoring to embark on a fresh start they both desire—and probably require—to sojourn among compatriots (Schorr, 1963: 86). Even the Taeubers have conceded that for most Blacks, to live near family and friends, a purely voluntary option, means to live near other Blacks and that if this were to be carried out on a mass basis would produce a high degree of residential segregation (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 22). Generally speaking, then, settling down in areas which have much the same traditions and customs as the newcomers is more uncomplicated than in those of mixed nativity (or race). The environment is generally less hostile and the need for neighboring and intensive group-centered living, like that of the Italians and Puerto Ricans, more easily met (Gans, 1968: 37, 263; Keller, 1968: 48-49, 66). For Shibutani and Kwan (1965: 38) such actions are easily understood, the better we know someone, the greater the prospect of our correctly understanding his objectives and, thus, the more ready development of assurance among them. Kramer (1970: 81) goes as far as saying that all new ethnic arrivals sought the security and warmth of the insular enclave due to its strategic utility for facilitating adjustment to their alien status. As Park and Miller (1925: 47) wrote:

> ... the most serious condition results from the loss of status and the consequent diminished sense of personality when the immigrant encounters American conditions.

Within such enclaves, this alien status had positive ramifications as it provided for the realization of self-respect and social location on the basis of a "consciousness of kind," thus mitigating its concomitant negative connotation in the outside world (Park and Miller, 1925: 47-59; Kramer, 1970: 70, 81-82). Although the enclave-community as a whole may have itself been marginal to the host society, its insular nature and perceived homogeneity minimized the pathos of social inferiority in the new environment by providing a framework within which the recent immigrants could experience themselves as persons and could concurrently avoid the pressures toward conformity of the external world (Keller, 1968: 66; Kramer, 1970: 68; Greeley, 1975: 40, 187). Its internal institutional structure accorded the immigrant the pursuit of at least limited ends, by providing him with means which afforded what were for him both rational and realistic options (Park and Miller, 1925: 120-144).

Gradually the immigrant community's culture evolved as members developed linguistic proficiency and acquired new skills, to the point where it provided a framework from which to issue forth into the larger host society (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965; 535; Kramer, 1970: 62, 82). The occurrence of such acculturation reflects Wirth's (1928: 74, 256) contention that ghetto residents were destined to assimilate[2] and to consequently disappear as distinct groups. Actually, the foundation for this perception was laid by Park and Burgess when they contrasted the American esteem for cost accounting with the immigrants' preference for propinquity. Their conclusion, too, was that immigrant neighborhoods were provisionary and would dissipate with "Americanization" (Suttles,

1972: 26). Others have subsequently written that the transition from one's own to the host culture was softened by the ghetto's neutralizing the strangeness "beyond the pale" with the affinity of the familiar, by serving as a refuge from which new cultural acquisitions might be examined on approval, with no concomitant obligation toward accommodation (Kramer, 1970: 79; Simmons, 1973: 49). As such experimentation was realized and the appropriate linguistic and technical proficiency were also achieved, the immigrant groups were capable of discharging formerly circumscribed activities, with the consequence that the implementation of the traditionally restrictive occupational patterns became much more encumbered and were, generally after some ensuing conflict, subsequently suppressed. As this was occurring at the workplace a similar breakdown was occurring in the patterns of residential segregation (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 535). For the most part, the generations that succeeded the first immigrant wave did not bother to learn the language and plainly had no intent of perpetuating ties with the homeland. For the younger generation, to have spoken with an accent would have invited the abuse and mockery of his American peers. With the punishment far outweighing all possible benefits of speaking one's parental tongue, many a youngster plunged headlong into his socialization into 100 percent Americanism and by the third generation much of the culture had been lost and the community dispersed (Park and Miller, 1925: 51-52; Kahl, 1966: 247; Boe, 1971: 74, 82). As Jack Agueros (1971: 94) so aptly put it, "Dick and Jane were not dead; they were alive and well in a better neighborhood." Lieberson (1963: 45) felt that it was clear that the general trend has been toward a decline in the residential

segregation of ethnic immigrants from native whites. In an earlier study, co-authored by Duncan, a decline in residential segregation of ethnics had been reported between 1930 and 1950. The average segregation indexes for 4 "old" and 6 "new" countries of origin, corresponding roughly to the two major contemporary waves of immigration, showed that the "old" wave was rather significantly less segregated than the "new," implying the operation of an assimilation process basically consistent with that projected by Park and Burgess (Duncan and Lieberson, 1959: 364-374).

The Exclusionary Policies Explanation

The so-called "American Creed" espouses the essential dignity of the individual and certain inalienable rights to freedom, justice, and equal opportunity—including that of free choice (Simmons, 1973: 40). But the choice open to many minority group members in reference to housing location is all too frequently a Hobson's Choice—the freedom to choose, but no real alternatives to choose from (Wurster, 1966: 44; Schmidt, 1970: 53). Thus, the third explanatory approach to be considered focuses on discriminatory practices, both institutional and individual.

A number of minority group members in the U. S. have had the distinction of having financial capabilities which afforded them the opportunity of better housing—but nonetheless being confined either to a continued existence with the poverty-stricken of their group or the "opportunity" of moving into a "better ghetto" (Jacobs, 1967: 134). As one young Black soldier put it [ca. 1960]: "My one sister is

married to a school teacher and he makes pretty good money, but they still have to live in the ghetto ..." (Jacobs, 1967: 149). It is people such as this schoolteacher, the "advanced" members of the minority group, who feel the deprivation of housing opportunities most. This is primarily due to the fact that middle-class groups seek, in addition to an adequate dwelling unit, a neighborhood having such qualities as "quiet, order, cleanliness, good facilities, and social prestige usually associated with a desirable neighborhood" (McEntire, 1960: 99). Owing to exclusionary practices, middle-class Blacks and Mexican Americans[3] are not allowed to compete in an open housing market in their efforts to obtain better dwellings (Helper, 1969: 4). This is exemplified by the experience of one Black couple, "we want to live out here in the Westwood section. But it took us six months and three lawsuits to finally get an apartment ..." (Jacobs, 1967: 148). In many places, signs reading "No Renting to Colored or Spanish" were not uncommon (Agueros, 1971: 97).

One might ask why this occurs. In Lieberson's (1963: 3) view, the significance of racial or ethnic groups lies in their role as delimiters of rivalry and competitive opportunities. Greeley (1975: 43) notes that land, family and common cultural heritage are of great importance, and those who are strange or different are suspect. Feelings of proprietary claim are integral to the emergence and maintenance of prejudices (Blumer, 1958: 4). In the customary fashion of the newly arrived, low-status immigrant groups, the newcomers cluster together and as they did so the older inhabitants simultaneously began drawing apart from them (McEntire, 1960: 349). As the minority is pressed

outwards in search of newer housing opportunities, there is a stimulation of antagonism between them and the majority (Commission on Race and Housing, 1958: 42) as it is perceived as a threat to "all those things a man has come to value in that particular area he thinks of as his own" (Greeley, 1975: 62-63).[4] Under such conditions, competition among individuals is converted into conflict between groups and minority homeseekers venturing outside "their" areas are generally regarded as invaders (McEntire, 1960: 96).

The Black ghetto was unlike that of the European ethnics because it seemed that it was not going to disappear. The ghetto came to be seen not as the adaptive device for easing newcomers into the mainstream of national life, but as a social mechanism locking certain urban newcomers—Blacks, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Amerindians—into a subordinate status (Moore and Mittelbach, 1966: 2). Americans did not want Blacks to assimilate to the point of social equality, intermarriage, and absorption into the mainstream as they had conceded the Europeans (Kahl, 1966: 247). "Black" carries too many imputations of status inferiority and integrated—as well as minority—neighborhoods are viewed as low status (Berry, et. al., 1976: 247). Ecological separation seemed adequate protection in this regard (Kahl, 1966: 247). Thus, there were simultaneous, and divergent, movements of population which have resulted in an expansion of minority residential areas in the central cities and achromatic communities in the suburban periphery (McEntire, 1960: 349). We see, then, another example in which social distance converts itself into spatial distance in the face of the refusal, in part forced by rapid growth, of the minority population's

recognition of the social distance symbolism of segregated, contained areas (Berry, et. al., 1976: 249-250).

Because some white Americans either fear or look down upon non-white peoples[5] the operations of the superindividual housing and real estate markets often reflect and reinforce anti-minority prejudices all the more (Jacobs, 1967: 136). The even larger housing industry—by which we also mean the banking and lending apparatus, developers, real estate associations, contractors and builders, and the insurance and mortgage firms—is status quo oriented (Hager, 1960: 81). When interviewed, the majority of realtors stated they provided what people wanted, and most white people held unfavorable images of Blacks and therefore refused to live in integrated buildings or neighborhoods (Helper, 1969: 73).

Thus, we shall see that a combination of factors are involved in producing and maintaining residential segregation:

1. Community, neighborhood and individual opposition to certain groups.
2. Restrictive covenants, zoning and other building ordinances.
3. The agreements, practices and codes of ethics among real estate board and operatives.
4. Neglect of the minority housing market by private builders and sources of finance.
5. Government acceptance and perpetuation of existing real estate practices (Weaver, 1948: 211).

Social segregation is not inherently produced by the construction of new housing or the passage of zoning laws but rather, as Myrdal (1944: 622) viewed it, the chief force for maintaining Black residential segregation was informal social pressure from whites. This conception is well-related by Jack Agueros' (1971: 94) experience when growing up:

> ...when we went over Cooney's Hill, we risked dirty looks, disapproving looks, and questions from the police, like, "What are you doing in this neighborhood?" and "Why don't you kids go back to where you belong?"

Whereas the European immigrants met similar rebuffs, the newer arrivals continue to experience them daily.

The minorities soon discovered that their ill-treatment went beyond the individual, that city administrations at first sanctioned such treatment and in a subsequent era became unwilling to enforce their own anti-bias housing regulations. Initial municipal anti-minority action took the form of segregation ordinances, dating from as early as 1912 (Franklin, 1967: 436-437, 641). But, as early as 1917, the U. S. Supreme Court held racial residential zoning ordinances unconstitutional (Vose, 1959: 17). Agreements between private citizens, however, were viewed as valid and the ordinances gave way to the use of racial restrictive covenants. These covenants had as their only purpose the conservation of all-white neighborhoods (Vose, 1959: 25). Covenants were, in effect, what Keller (1968: 36) might say was a process of institutionalization and formalization for protection against "recurring exceptions." Apparently, the shortage of housing combined with a wartime economy and the uprooting of farmers from southern agriculture had resulted in a loosening of the normative constraints as Blacks began their greak trek cityward. Thus, between 1915 and 1945 the federal courts in Washington, D. C., were consistently called upon to render decisions regarding these covenants. Invariably they upheld the covenants, with the U. S. Supreme Court ostensibly giving its tacit approval to the practice. When the first cases reached the Court,

it ruled that the Fourteenth Amendment was not applicable to the covenants because it protected citizens only against discriminatory actions by the state and the restrictions were placed in contracts by private action (Vose, 1959: 28). Two factors eventually led to the termination of racially restrictive covenants: the perennial shortage of good housing for Blacks was worsened by an end-of-war scarcity (Vose, 1959: 56), and a virtually irrefutable legal argument was developed in an article appearing in the California Law Review by a distinguished legal scholar. Professor Dudley O. McGovney argued that while individuals made the restrictive covenants, their enforcement brought the state into the confrontation and thus constituted a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment and the "equal protection" clause of the Fifth Amendment (Vose, 1959: 68-69). With the decision in Shelly v. Kraemer, 334 U. S. 1 (1948), the racially restrictive covenant was declared illegal.

But the battle had not ended, as Walter White of the NAACP was quick to point out, "it took four Supreme Court decisions over a period of more than twenty years to wipe out finally disfranchisement by white primaries, so will the vast interests attempt to find some other means of maintaining residential segregation" (Vose, 1959: 214). As an ex-leader of a federation of neighborhood associations stated in close parallel, "I'm sure that there will be methods devised that will protect people who want to have neighbors who think along the same lines" (Vose, 1959: 215).

The Civil Rights Act of 1968 prohibits discrimination in either the same or rental of apartment complexes or housing developments. Additionally, real estate brokers are prohibited from discriminating in

the same of single-family homes. Until the Jones v. Mayer decision, however, there was no legal prohibition of discrimination on the part of individuals selling their own property. Twenty years had elapsed, yet there continued to exist loopholes in the Court's verdict of 1948.

As Suttles (1972: 267) aptly points out, the use of legal proscriptions intent on the protection of the fights of certain groups often leads to the conversion into law of previously informal practices. The informal agreements and community conservation agreements which arose to replace the racially restrictive covenants (Vose, 1959: 229) soon gave way to more sophisticated strategies.[6] Zoning ordinances, having their legal base in the police power of the states, have been used in many localities against minority groups seeking improved housing (Commission on Race and Housing, 1966: 281; Miller and Davidson, 1972: 657-658). City administrators have resorted to manipulating ordinances with the intent of placing limitations on the selection of sites for public housing and thereby containing Blacks, and others, within "their" existing areas (Hager, 1960: 84). In 1969, voters in Union City, California, rejected a zoning variance which would have allowed the construction of a public housing project for persons of low- and middle-incomes (Miller and Davidson, 1972: 660). As a result, the Southern Alameda Spanish Speaking Organization (SASSO) filed suit [SASSO v. Union City, Ca., 424 F.2d 291(9th Cir. 1970)] declaring that the original zoning ordinance's sole purpose was to bar integrated housing. In the same vein, California's Constitution, Article 34, provided that "no low-rent housing project shall be developed, constructed or acquired in any manner until the project is approved by a state

referendum." The constitutionality of this provision was challenged by some low-income residents who would have qualified for such housing in San Jose and San Mateo had the proposals not been defeated when submitted to referendum. In James v. Valtiera, 402 U. S. 137(1971), the U. S. Supreme Court reversed a lower court decision and held that Article 34 was constitutional. The provision was viewed as economic in orientation and not as racially discriminatory. Thus, it appears, that laws based on economic descriptions will serve to exclude large numbers of non-whites by providing a camouflage for baser motives (Miller and Davidson, 1972: 661-662).

Such strategies are partially responsible for eliciting the observation that "There is no free market for Negro housing" (Brown, 1965: 360). The result has been the emergence of a "dual market" wherein Blacks and some other minorities have been prevented by realtors and mortgagors from living in areas in the city other than "their own" (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 25; Herbers, 1971: 12). Over the course of time, as whites departed from the inner city to the suburbs—or perhaps the more attractive sections lying within city boundaries—Blacks found housing opening up to them, not on their own terms but rather on those arranged for them by owners, mortgage companies, and realtors (Franklin, 1967; Herbers, 1971: 1, 12).

In an excellent overview of the real estate industry's role in structuring access to housing, William H. Brown, Jr. (1972: 66) notes that the industry had long ago acquired the reputation as an institution whose policies and practices were consistently and vigorously oriented toward the perpetuation of racial discrimination in housing.

Indicative of this discriminatory posture was a passage in the National Real Estate Board of Chicago's 1924 code of ethics, which stated that

> A realtor should never be instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood a character of property or occupancy, members of any race of nationality, or any individuals whose presence will clearly be detrimental to property values in that neighborhood (quotes in Brown, 1972: 68).

Along these same lines, both Abrams (1966: 524n) and Long and Johnson (1947: 58) cite the National Association of Real Estate Board's (NAREB) 1943 brochure "Fundamentals of Real Estate Practice" which served as a supplement to the official code of ethics:

> The prospective buyer might be ... a colored man of means who was giving his children a college education and thought they were entitled to live among whites. ... No manner what the motive or character of the would-be purchaser, if the deal would instigate a form of blight, then certainly the well-meaning broker must work against its consummation.

As McEntire (1960: 239) noted, and the above quotations appear to sustain, racial discrimination in real estate was not a practice limited to individual brokers and salesmen, but rather represented one of the norms of the industry to which the individual realtors conformed for fear of sanctions by their peers. As he notes shortly afterwards, in 1955 a real estate board in Los Angeles County expelled a number of members for just such a failure to conform—they sold to Mexican Americans (McEntire, 1960: 241-242). And, as noted by Abrams (1966: 518), when the Supreme Court had ruled against the racially restrictive covenants, the Los Angeles Real Estate Board promptly broadcast eight ways to evade the decision. In 1963, an attempt at introducing a local ordinance banning racial discrimination by property owners was defeated

in Berkeley, California. Shortly thereafter, the California Real Estate Association announced plans to use the initiative for the purpose of amending the state constitution to guarantee property owners the right to dispose of their property to whomever they chose. NAREB's support was soon forthcoming. The intent of the amendment was, in fact, prohibition of the application of anti-bias laws to the realm of housing, thereby serving as a bulwark against open occupancy in housing. Although Proposition 14 passed by nearly a 2 to 1 margin, the California Supreme Court, recognizing its true intent, declared the amendment unconstitutional in 1966 (Abrams, 1966: 518-519; Casstevens, 1967: 2ff.).

Mortgage-lending institutions have provided major support for residential segregation. Their common policy of lending to nonwhites only if the purchase of housing is limited to certain areas, and denying loans when potential purchases are in white neighborhoods has succeeded in maintaining patterns of racially segregated housing in many cities (Commission on Race and Housing, 1966: 279). Contrary to Laurenti's (1966: 291) findings for San Francisco, where cash downpayments by Blacks were 17 to 25 percent lower than those for whites and first mortgages extended to them were as large or larger and involved the same loan/price ratios and interest rates, the Commission on Race and Housing (1966: 283) found that nonwhites received less housing value for the dollar and less favorable mortgage credit terms than white buyers. If the desired housing was in a "blighted" area the interest rates were higher, down payments were required to be larger and the repayment period on the loand were shorter than if the housing was in a "good quality" [i.e. white] district. The Commission (1966: 269)

further reported that many would-be nonwhite purchasers could not quality for mortgage loans under the commonly established prerequisites. Jacobs (1967: 135) illustrates the predicament well, in Los Angeles

> ... we went to a bank to get an FHA loan, a government loan, but when we told the bank where the house was located, they refused to make us a loan. They told us they wouldn't make loans to Negroes who were trying to move into white neighborhoods.

And in the rental sphere, we are informed that "the savings and loan association discourages this sort of thing" (quoted in Jacobs, 1967: 148).

While the Fair Housing Act of 1968 and the decis-on in Jones v. Mayer may have given minority group members the right to leave their ghetto enclaves, persons who would otherwise be able to move are confronted with a shortage of available housing elsewhere (Miller and Davidson, 1972: 659). This, too, reflects on the financial institutions involved in the housing industry. In addition to their refusal to make loans to individual Blacks, they have concurrently refused loans to contractors and/or organizations seeking to build new or rehabilitate old housing for Black occupancy (Weaver, 1948: 224-229). As Edith Elmer Wood (1966: 1) has noted, the results are that

> Slum districts stagnate with no new building undertaken and few repairs, while new residential districts are built up on the periphery, and ever-increasing rings of blight spread outward from the center.

And an extremely high proportion of the postwar new dwellings which were actually built for minority occupancy have been financed by mortgages purchased by government agencies. With few exceptions these new homes have been built in segregated areas (Commission on Race and

Housing, 1968: 31).

What we have noted here is that the basic mechanisms of the private enterprise system have not been successful in meeting the nation's overall housing needs, but rather tend to function to reinforce the existing patterns of residential segregation. These patterns of residential segregation in turn consign low-income families to the core of the cities, while simultaneously encouraging those who are better-off to desert the central city and move outward toward the periphery (Grier and Grier, 1971: 446-448). When, just shortly after World War II, the migrations of rural people to the nation's urban centers continued, there developed a "housing problem." At that time, the private sector, given the realities of land and construction costs, could not meet the needs—especially those of the poor segment—of the population unaided (Hartman, 1969: 442). As a result, over the past quarter century the federal government has assumed a greater role in the housing market. Given the laissez faire ideology of our political-economic system, their foremost strategy was not to supplant but rather serve as a supportive arm for the private enterprise housing industry. Despite such an approach, decisions on the amounts of housing produced, the type and location of new dwellings, the terms regarding their sale and rental, and the volume of consumer demand for housing reflect government action (McEntire, 1960: 291).

Why did the construction of new housing after World War II occur primarily in the suburbs? The Griers (1971: 446-447) answer that the previous growth of the cities had consumed the vast majority of land within their boundaries that was suitable for development. The

pressures which had built up over the course of time [a depression and a world war] made it imperative that action be taken quickly. In terms of cost and time, the suburbs were the most practical choice. The resultant urban decay and suburban sprawl are not solely the results of individual free choices in a free enterprise market. The choices were influenced by federal government actions, which while ostensibly neutral, have resulted in the subsidization of low density, middle-income living in the ring and high density, lower income, minority confinement to the city (Weissbourd, 1964: 2; Clawson, 1971: 41-44, 99). While the rapid urbanization of our nation is a racially neutral fact, it has had profound effects on American minority peoples. In answering the question of how best to develop the suburbs, key public policy decisions with unavoidably racial implications coupled with existing private sentiment in the housing industry has resulted in the financing of the flight of middle-income whites to the suburbs and increased the separation between white and Black (McEntire, 1960: 291; Grier and Grier, 1971: 446-448).

More important than discrimination per se, however, was the basic structure and functioning of the federal housing programs, of which three have dominated the field

1. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA)-Veterans Administration (VA) mortgage guarantee programs;
2. Low-income public housing; and
3. Urban Renewal (Grier and Grier, 1971: 449-451).

The FHA has been accused of serving the private real estate market and reflecting that market's interests (Williams, 1966: 99; Herbers, 1971: 1, 12). The previously mentioned conventional understandings which developed in the real estate business were affirmed by the

policies of federal agencies such as the FHA. For many years, the FHA actually insisted upon racially restrictive covenants as prerequisite to concessions of mortgage insurance (Williams, 1966: 100). Its 1938 underwriting manual stated: "If a neighborhood is to retain stability it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes" (U. S. Federal Housing Administration, 1938: Sec. 937).

On June 10, 1971 the United States Commission on Civil Rights publicly charged the FHA with "abdicating its responsibility" by delegating its legal responsibility to the private housing and home finance industries, both of which ignored the intent of the law (Herbers, 1971: 1). Howard A. Glickstein, the Commission's Staff Director, explained, "We found, in fact, a dual marketing system so pervasive, so entrenched and so commonplace that most real estate brokers described it openly to the Commission staff without any sense of wrongdoing" (quoted in Herbers, 1971: 12).

Another heavily subsidized federal housing program, public housing, has also made its contribution to the maintenance of residential segregation in urban America. The location of public housing projects in the inner city has, in fact, contributed to strengthening patterns of segregation (Weissbourd, 1964: 5). The public housing program was originally designed to stimulate the hard-hit building industry. In 1937, it acquired the social aim of alleviating substandard housing for the poor of the large urban centers. Concurrently, it was transferred from exclusive federal control to local city government control —the intent being a more efficient and thorough operation of the

program. Combined with the massive migration of Blacks during the post-World War II era, public housing evolved in such a fashion that it perpetuated the existing patterns of residential segregation as housing of this type tended to be constructed in existing Black slums. Thus, as the only low-cost housing available to Blacks was concentrated in the central cities, the pattern of racial segregation was maintained (Weissbourd, 1964: 3; Dean, 1966: 259). As Jacobs (1967: 152) has noted, "The public housing projects of Los Angeles stand as racial and ethnic islands ..."

The third major federal program—urban renewal—was established by the Public Housing Act of 1949. The primary aim of the program was to combat the physical decay of the central cities. Each project was to be implemented by the existing private enterprise system on the private market. The intent of the program was questionable from its inception, as the very institutional structure responsible for many of the nation's urban problems was being subsidized to revitalize those same cities (Turner, 1972: 27-28). The Commission on Race and Housing (1966: 284) for example, reported that shen the slums to be cleared were populated by minorities, "their relocation becomes very difficult because of the limited alternatives available to them." As Scott Greer (1966: 60-61) noted, minority urban renewal refugees were usually relocated near other Blacks, "Spanish-speaking" and skid roaders, in order to avoid political repercussions. Thus, urban renewal frequently created new slums by pushing the relocatees into areas and buildings which became seriously overcrowded and subsequently deteriorated rapidly (Gans, 1968: 262).

The FHA and VA mortgage insurance programs undoubtedly stimulated the building industry and, in effect, subsidized the nation's lending institutions through nearly $4 billion in acquired mortgages. But, these programs did little for the improvement of housing conditions among the nation's poor and minority populations. They were, in sum, beneficial only for private industry and the middle-income majority population (Gans, 1968: 263; Turner, 1972: 43). And the four years following the Housing Act of 1968 saw the production of more subsidized units for moderate-income families than had four decades of public housing for low-income families. When minority group members sought home-ownership under Section 235 of the Act, they were given little choice of houses or neighborhoods and were offered housing almost exclusively on a segregated basis. Minority group members received the cheapest, most inadequate housing and the lowest government subsidies. Here, too, private industry was the primary beneficiary as realtors garnered huge profits on poorly constructed or dilapidated housing (Herbers, 1971: 12).

In a sense, urban renewal has worked at cross purposes with FHA and VA programs. Urban renewal programs attempt to draw back the more prosperous who left the city while the VA and FHA programs simultaneously continue inducements for others to make their trek "suburbiaward" (Grier and Grier, 1971: 451). Turner (1972: 25) argues that such dual programs intensify residential segregation by further concentrating impoverished minorities in the core city while continuing to subsidize white out-migration to the single-family units of suburbia.

Evaluating the Perspectives

None of the approaches we have considered is "pure" and some overlapping of the perspectives is to be expected in the presentations of any individual writer's point of view. Much in each of these interpretations has been accepted by their proponents too uncritically. All display flaws, some to larger degrees than others, when attempts are made to use them in explaining Black and Mexican American residential segregation patterns.

In an examination of the planning process per se, Gans (1968: 5) essentially underlines the major weakness of both the "market" and voluntarist explanations. He notes that

> Between the physical environment and empirically observable human behavior, there exist a social system and a set of cultural norms which define and evaluate portions of the physical environment relevant to the lives of people involved and structure the way people will use (and react to) this environment in their daily lives.

The immigrant was confronted with an existent pattern of housing and commercial establishments in the city. He had to adapt to its structure and order (Lieberson, 1963: 5), and the question of "natural" competition would appear irrelevant. But the early "Chicago School" appears to have been caught in the grip of an ecological determinism which gave them a singular conception of the society/space relationship. Firey (1947: 3) notes that for them, space had a

> ... determinate and invariant influence upon the distribution of human activities. The socially relevant qualities of space are thought to reside in the very nature of space itself, and the territorial patterns assumed by social activities are regarded as wholly determined by these qualities.

The social structure and normative factor which Gans noted is relegated to obscurity. But, as Shibutani and Kwan (1965: 234) have pointed out, periods of sustained contact often produced conventional understandings regarding who occupied what areas, which subsequently resulted in legal enforcement. And Kahl (1966: 222), closer to the American scene, noted that the less obviously foreign a group was, the less influence ethnicity appeared to have on their general placement.

Poverty today is of a more permanent nature than when the European immigrant waves arrived on American shores. There have occurred numerous changes in the opportunity structure—something the "market model" analysts seem oblivious to—that have led to this. On arrival, the European immigrant found an expanding economy with factory jobs readily available for the semi- or un-skilled. Successive waves of these immigrants provided the cheap labor necessary for the nation's expanding economy. The immigrants as a group were never marginal classes, except, perhaps, for very limited periods (see Handlin, 1951: 66-72). The American economy's need for labor enabled the European immigrants to achieve enough stability to raise themselves and their offspring up off the bottom rung of the ladder (Gans, 1968: 236). During and after World War II, Blacks and Mexican Americans from the "rural backwaters of the South and Mexico" made the trek to the northern and western cities in large numbers. But the emerging new labor market had increasingly less need of semi- and un-skilled labor. They had arrived too late, at a time when strong backs were being rendered increasingly obsolete by new technologies. When jobs were made available, they were often in the least technologically advanced or most labor-

intensive sectors of the economy. The result was a decreased possibility of escaping the conditions of ghetto poverty or confinement (Turner, 1972: 22, 39).

Comparing a number of excellent studies (e.g. Duncan and Lieberson, 1959; Lieberson, 1963; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969) we note that Blacks have been more segregated than the white ethnics were. This reflects the perpetuation of Black identity in combination with persisting patterns of discrimination and segregation (see Clemence, 1967; Herbers, 1971). Such a pattern served to clearly distinguish the European and Black experiences.

The economically-oriented theory insists, nonetheless, that in the competition for a place to live, minority group disadvantages were based on insufficient income. The effective demand for housing must include, after all, consideration of the financial abilities of the respective groups. Muth (1969: 99) notes that several studies show the consumption of housing to be strongly related to income. But, income alone is an insufficient criterion to account for observed patterns of racial-ethnic residential segregation as Pascal, and others (McEntire, 1960: 91; Lieberson, 1963; 87; Freeman and Sunshine, 1970: 62), have noted. Regardless of the relative economic status existing between majority and minority, residential segregation continues to prevail (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 36). Fewer alternatives are available to minority members than to their white counterparts at equal levels of purchasing power (Commission on Race and Housing, 1958: 1).

The housing market as it pertains to both the minority and larger publics is itself regulated by factors other than "classic"

supply and demand economics (McEntire, 1960: 91; Wood, 1966: 1).[7] Wurster (1966: 31) forthrightly stated that the concept of the "consumer's dominant role in the housing process has always been largely mythical, except for the fortunate few." The idea, for instance, that people flee to the suburbs because they prefer suburban homes to city homes is largely one of these mythical constructs. Since, perhaps, the 1920's when most of the land in the long-established cities was built upon, there has really been little choice: either an apartment in the city or a house in the suburbs (Weissbourd, 1964: 8).

Another of the market myths is that of the "trickle-down" or "filtering-down" effect. At the time of the most recent Black and Hispanic migrations to the urban centers this was a non-functional mechanism. Lansing, et. al. (1969: 67-68) found that Blacks did not benefit from new construction nor did trickling down appear to benefit them as much as it did whites. In a more general finding, Northwood and Barth (1965: 83) simply note that the "trickle down" theory is generally faulty, as large quantities of housing for either middle or lower income families have not been produced in this fashion.

Etzioni (1959: 255) points out that the fallacy of the "market" perspective, as implied in Wirth's (1928) work, is its vacillation on the issue of assimilation. Since it will occur "eventually," the hypothesis is supported if a group is in the process of assimilating; if not, it means that the assimilation stage has yet to be attained, but it shall, "eventually." Additionally, ethnic analysts typically deemphasize the importance of race or color as a determining factor. The white immigrant ethnic could frequently flee identification with

the ethnic group; he was white. But the Black and many Mexican Americans are at a much more serious disadvantage in acculturating to the society and obtaining their full rights than any previous, or subsequent, European immigrant group. In general, they cannot flee their skin pigmentation no matter how fluent in the language or well-versed in the customs.

Some scholars have argued that the newcomers became nationals in America. Their sense of "ethnicity" was acquired after their arrival on our shores (Kramer, 1970: 58; Greeley, 1975: 27ff). The argument is, I believe, irrelevant to the study of residential segregation unless it is employed as a reflection of the normative-institutional forces in American society which pushed the "ethnics" into such consciousness. As Wirth (1928: 19) himself has written, "The factors that operated toward the founding of locally separated communities are to be sought in the character ... habits and customs not only of the Jews themselves, but those of the medieval town-dweller in general." As Wirth also noted, groups of people are singled out from others for unequal treatment by the societies in which they live (Helper, 1969: 16-17). Shibutani and Kwan (1965: 45) point out, real physical or cultural differences are not nearly as crucial as the populace's thinking they are different—"Classifications of human beings are matters of social usage."

The immigrant to this country was asked to make what is perhaps the ultimate sacrifice—a denial of his origin and an acceptance of the "American way of life." Gans (1968: 37, 263) has noted that certain groups are "ethnic villagers," that they place great emphasis on

kinship and the primary group. They live intensely group-centered lives among "extended families" comprising three generations. Other than the workplace, these "ethnic villagers" isolate themselves from the life of the city. If it is as he depicted it, this is a true case of voluntary segregation. The question becomes then, to what degree does such a pattern radiate outward? Are we speaking of whole tracts or just facing or adjacent blocks? The really crucial point in evaluating the voluntaristic nature of group segregation, however, is the determination of whether its "cause" is mutual preference for associating within the group or whether it results from categorical exclusion. Categorical exclusions occur when persons are assigned to general categories which actually cut across existing interaction networks, occupational statuses and communities. Both Mexican Americans and Blacks are viewed as having been subjected to categoric exclusion (Williams, 1970: 594-595).

Ethnic groups disadvantaged by coloration or cultural heritage may be forced in upon themselves (Michelson, 1970: 63). And, unlike Gans' "ethnic villagers," some group members remain within the social and physical confines of the enclave only if they continue to experience discrimination, or sense prejudice, when they venture forth into the larger community. Kramer (1970: 62) feels that the temptations of the greater opportunities available to these ethnics in the dominant community would otherwise draw them out. As concluded in a study of a Mexican American-Puerto Rican "neighborhood"—actually a specific census tract—in Detroit (Lebeaux and Salas, 1973: 96), "Latinos like other groups in the city are primarily concerned with providing good

houses and safe neighborhoods for their families, and less with the ethnicity of the neighborhood." Case and Kirk's (1959: 20) study of housing in Los Angeles illustrated very similar results. They found that 46 percent of all Black and 38 percent of all Mexican American households wanted to move, and that the figures for the tenant subcomponent rose to 55 and 45 percent, respectively. When asked if they would buy or rent in a neighborhood where there were few minority families, 85 percent of the minority families answered in the affirmative and 83 percent of the families in the special 701 family Mexican American study answered affirmatively (Case and Kirk, 1959: 65, 68).

As exclusion extended itself over time, minority status may have become self-perpetuating, and the viable minority community resulted in being as much a trap as it was a stepping stone. Within it the talented minority group member found a security and acceptance and a more readily achieved prestige based on restricted competition. If he ventured out into the larger community he had, like the amateur athlete turned professional, stepped into the "big time" to play the game by the rules others set—and the risks were great (Kramer, 1970: 4; see also Case and Kirk, 1959: 73). Thus, over the course of time, there may have developed a tendency to choose the "line of least resistance"—there is less hostility experienced if one settles among one's own, and there is less risk of losing face if one remains within the enclave (Wirth, 1928: 283; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 163). As Agueros (1971: 96) phrases it, "what do you say when you are powerless to get what you want, and what do you say when the other side has all the cards and writes all the rules?" It is not clear, then, that

preferences for residential segregation are of themselves a cause of residential segregation. Residentially segregated patterns, including those of Gans' "ethnic villagers," may have emerged as a result of adaptive reactions to a larger socio-cultural environment over which most minority families had little, or no, control. It may very well be that, in the beginning, the kind of spatial patterns that developed in a given community were not so much a product of deliberate planning but of competition and selection as the prevalent economic orientation insists. Or, perhaps, as the "cultural" perspective insists, like was attracted to like on a purely voluntary basis. What these perspectives overlook is that ethnic immigrants may also have been the targets of hostility, and in the course of sustained contact over time conventional understandings [Wirth's modus vivendi] may have developed regarding the occupancy of residential areas. Such normative contexts may subsequently have prevented ethnics, even those with adequate resources, from living in more desirable areas (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 119-120). Thus, members of the minority were unable to choose or control the conditions under which they lived. Forced to adapt, they may have "chosen" the course of "least resistance," living where there was the least opposition to their presence. Conscious wants are limited by experience and knowledge, and in cities with long traditions of segregation, minority group members often resigned themselves to segregation (Williams, 1964: 132; Wurster, 1966: 34). This meant the acceptance of ghetto housing in the enclave as they sought psychological security among their "own kind." Thus "commitment" to an area may have been an amalgum of necessity and emotional consonance (Keller, 1968: 110;

Kramer, 1970: 10; Schmidt, 1970: 53). Such courses of action probably laid the foundation for such "academic" insights as "The Mexican accepts what he is given" (Fuller, 1920: 7). Is it acceptance?

Concentration of racial groups (or visible and distinguishable ethnics, like the precominantly mestize Mexican American group) increases their visibility and causes their distinctiveness to stand out more prominently (McEntire, 1960: 94). Because some groups are viewed as more menacing—perhaps in addition to their very visibility due to many perceived points of cultural difference by a public which has been subtlely indoctrinated with an Anglo Conformity assimilationist perspective—the emergence of separate residential areas "fosters the persistence of private prejudices and mythologies" (Brown, 1972: 66-67). Such prejudices create problems for those upwardly mobile, acculturated minority group members wishing to move on to better housing in more advantageously situated neighborhoods. Eric Moore (1972: 12) has noted an interesting pattern wherein nonwhites exhibit a "markedly higher incidence of expressed desire to move" but subsequently fail to translate these verbalizations into behavioral patterns. Minority status limits the individual minority group pioneer's opportunities. Frequently, the resultant hostility of resentful white neighbors is what tempers the desire to "escape the ghetto" (Morrill, 1970: 197).

Years ago Park and Miller (1925: 306) wrote that the questions of prejudice and discrimination were not serious enough in this country to affect the persistence of immigrant groups and, by implication, enclaves. This reflects Robert Nisbet's comment that "for most citizens, the image of society and its problems is that of an essentially healthy

organism invaded by alien substances" (Greer, 1966: 127). There is seemingly a reluctance to engage in self-evaluation, even among some social scientists involved with the issue of the persisting ethnic-racial enclave. There is a refusal to acknowledge the limitations the society has placed on ethnic individuals or the hostility that has been aimed at them. This nation cut off large-scale immigration specifically due to an unfavorable disposition toward having large numbers of "strange" people in the country (Kahl, 1966: 247). Neither can we deny the existence of racially, ethnically and religion-based restrictive covenants which marked the supersedure of the "voluntary" enclave by the compulsory enclave (Abrams, 1947: 10). The court records of prolonged struggle will not allow us to gently assuage our collective conscience through "retrospective falsification." Nor can we accept claims that recent years have seen major breakthroughs in the amount and quality of housing available to minority group members and a tendency toward integration (Compare McEntire, 1960: 5, 350, and Clemence, 1967: 568) when voters approve thinly veiled attempts to prevent guarantees of open occupancy housing (Casstevens, 1967: 2ff.) or when an agency of the federal government accuses another of collusion in the maintenance of a dual housing market (Herbers, 1971: 1, 12). New approaches to public housing cannot undo the inequities which have persisted from 1935, the year the FHA was contrived, into the decade of the seventies (Herbers, 1971: 1, 12), a period which encompasses the Mexican Americans', Blacks', Puerto Ricans' and Native Americans' rural-to-urban migrations of greatest magnitude. As Israel Zangwill is quoted by Wirth (1928: 118):

> People who have been living in a ghetto for a couple of centuries are not able to step outside merely because the gates are thrown down ... The isolation from without will have come to seem the law of their being.

The ghetto became an institution and, as such, came to exist "in the habits and attitudes of individuals and in the culture of groups" (Wirth, 1928: 118). As attorney Loren Miller so aptly put it, it would be "folly to expect an overnight reversal of social attitudes implemented by court decisions and rooted in custom" (quoted in Vose, 1959: 212).

A general review of the extent theoretical literature pertinent to racial and ethnic residential patterns would seem to show that each of the major approaches focussing on the problem is by itself inadequate. Each approach employs an almost exclusive emphasis on only one of the relevant factors comprising a highly complex phenomenon. Yet a similar review of the empirical studies shows the process of segregation to result from a combination of market factors, the size and proximity of ethnic and racial groups, and discrimination (Freeman and Sunshine, 1970: 41). Glazer (1970: 62) notes that the "cause" is not only poverty ("market") or the desire ("voluntarist") to live together but discrimination as well. Wurster (1966: 44) ponders whether factors other than race prejudice per se should not be given greater consideration as they surely play some role in the process. The Griers (1972: 446) note that the situation of housing cannot be fully understood without the recognition that such problems as are involved were produced in part by "forces that are both broader than and different from racial discrimination." And as McEntire (1960: 68) write, it appeared that

the immigrants' concentration in ethnic enclaves had been partly economic, partly voluntary, and partly imposed upon them."

It appears that both the theoretically and empirically oriented scholars entered their work with a priori assimilationist assumptions that there was either no alternative explanation or only a limited hybrid explanation for what they were about to discuss. In his comments on the Park-Wirth approach, Etzioni (1959: 259) noted that these gentlemen overlook "the importance of partial segregation combined with partial assimilation, not as a transitional stage but as a basic form of social organization." This possibility should seemingly have been appreciated by these two ecologists as they had noted that groups whose numbers were frequently replenished by new arrivals—such as the case of the Mexican Americans in the Southwestern U. S.—leads to their continuation as a distinct group (Etzioni, 1959: 256). Like these two early ecologists, this possibility has escaped the overwhelming majority of contemporary researchers on the subject. Utilization of any of the three basic explanatory frameworks, or even a hybrid combination of them, to evaluate residential segregation leads to seriously distorted conclusions. All the approaches treated to this juncture have been assimilationist in orientation. Liberal social science research seems to have been intent on equating integrated housing with equality and segregated housing with inequality. The issue is not one of segregation versus integrated housing, but decent housing itself. Segregated housing is negative only if it means inferior housing and inferior opportunities. Present housing patterns leave the upwardly mobile minority group member with few options. Ghetto and barrio housing and public

service facilities (hospitals, schools, etc.) are inferior. If one wants better housing and public services, one frequently means housing in an integrated neighborhood. Thus, the responses in the Case and Kirk (1959: 20, 65, 68) study may have been motivated as much by the social connotations implied by integrated, non-minority neighborhoods as any assimilationist orientation amongst these persons. Given the option of decent housing and facilities among their fellow ethnics and equally good housing among the dominant majority we have little idea at present how minority group members will choose. Past research can only tell us that given the choice between poor ghetto-barrio housing and good integrated housing the upwardly mobile minority group member would prefer the integrated housing with all the social benefits that are implied by it.

In sum, the foregoing review of the literature suggests three competing assimilationist-oriented frameworks regarding the development and maintenance of residential segregation. Few studies have endeavored to empirically evaluate these competing explanations as they apply to any single ethnic group. Despite recent research interest in the Mexican American, scholars have overlooked the potential of census data for providing the opportunity to examine these theoretical orientations as they apply to the Mexican American population. In the chapter that follows, I develop a series of hypotheses designed to test the applicability of these assimilationist theoretical frameworks for explaining Mexican American residential segregation.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Introduction

A large number of issues need to be empirically investigated as they regard the residential segregation of Mexican Americans. Because of the paucity of past research on this topic, the magnitude of such potentially researchable issues is enormous. By necessity I shall restrict myself to an examination of those issues which flow most prominently from both the theoretical and empirical literature on radial, ethnic and class segregation.

Multiple Indicators of Group Socioeconomic Differentials: Variations on the Market Model

Social Class

Social class has been viewed as being of much greater importance with regard to housing than the ethnicity of individuals, as extensive residential integration by class infrequently materializes in the United States (Warner and Lunt, 1941; 248; Michelson, 1970: 119). Schnore (1965b: 126, 133) has noted that the residential segregation of color groups was in part reflective of a class phenomenon and that within such groups there existed internal segregation by class. If we employ Weber's (1946: 180-195) tripartite classificatory scheme, class is operationalized as an economic or income dimension. These observations would logically suggest an hypothesis that socioeconomic

differentiation is totally accountable for racial residential segregation if no significant residential segregation at equivalent levels of income exist (Warner and Srole, 1945: 34; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 159, 163-164). This socioeconomic interpretation implies that at any given time the level of residential segregation of ethnic groups is attributable to (1) significant differences in the groups' economic position, and (2) that economic class groups are themselves unevenly distributed over the city's residential areas. If there is no significant residential segregation of ethnic groups at equivalent levels of purchasing power, then the residential segregation of ethnics is due to socioeconomic differentiation (Darroch and Marston, 1971: 498).

Hypothesis 1a. Segregation by income level and segregation by ethnicity or race are unrelated.

Hypothesis 1b. There is no significant difference between segregation by income and intergroup segregation at equivalent levels of income.

Such hypotheses have not been supported in other studies. For instance, Lieberson (1970: 173) reports that the stratification between the dominant group and the subordinate group goes beyond that class segregation which occurs within the ethnic group. And Farley (1976: 31, 36) reports that an analysis of Detroit showed that when whites and Blacks were considered separately, very much the same pattern of moderate socioeconomic segregation was found. But, high interracial residential segregation hardly varied by socioeconomic status—higher income Blacks were as segregated from higher income whites as lower income Blacks were from lower income whites.

Status

Schwirian and Rico-Velasco (1971: 89) note that social status groups have dissimilar residential patterns such that groups that are most similar to each other are closest in the status hierarchy. Occupational division of labor is a major factor in societal differentiation processes and has generally been regarded as the most reliable of the single-item measures of social status available. Although there are reservations regarding the use of occupation as a gauge of segregation by social status, it is seen as preferable to the amount of formal education, the available alternative, because of the relationship of this factor and residential segregation itself to the stages of the life cycle and age (Nam, 1959: 329; Fine, Glenn and Monts, 1971: 93). The operational demarcation of social status employed is the division between white-collar and blue-collar workers as defined by the U. S. Bureau of the Census (1970: I, 105). Despite past objections to the obscuring of levels of skill by employing such designations, various research findings suggest its general validity. Residential association of clerical with other white collar workers has been found to be more greatly dependent upon status or prestige than on income or skill. Clerical and sales workers, in their attempts to maintain status, spend larger amounts of their incomes on housing than do blue-collar workers of equivalent incomes. And at each different level of income, clerical workers have higher mean dwelling ratings than even skilled blue-collar workers (Duncan and Duncan, 1955a: 503; Tilly, 1961: 328).

Hypothesis 2a: Segregation by occupational category and segregation by ethnicity or race are unrelated.

Hypothesis 2b: There is no significant difference between segregation by occupational levels and intergroup segregation at equivalent occupational levels.

Housing

The poverty of urban minorities is frequently seen as contributory to their residential segregation. Low-cost housing has a tendency to be "segregated" from high-cost housing (Taeuber and Taueber, 1969: 2). Under a market system of housing allocation, as is reputed to exist in the U. S., where people live is largely dependent upon the rental or sales price asked as contrasted with the income available for such expenditures. Thus, a considerable degree of residential segregation is to be expected on the basis of purchasing power (Warner and Lunt, 1941: 282; Muth, 1969: 61, 311; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 24). Although economic factors have been viewed as accounting for only a small portion of the observed levels of residential segregation (McEntire, 1960: 91; Lieberson, 1963: 87; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 2), an analysis of the effective demand for housing must include some consideration of the financial abilities of families (Case and Kirk, 1959: 43). One of the flaws of the earlier Moore and Mittelbach (1966) study was its failure to directly consider an "affordability" factor. Is the available housing for sale within the financial means of the minority group? I utilize a market-income measure—the ratio of group median income to the median value of housing available for sale—as a general answer to the question posed above. This income/price ratio is my measure of "affordability." If the "market model" perspective is to be viewed as an accurate reflection of reality, the residential segregation of minority gruops from the majority group should be no greater

than that which would be expected on the basis of lower minority purchasing power and the spatial distribution of low cost or rent housing.

> Hypothesis 3a: Affordability and residential segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.
>
> Hypothesis 3b: Segregation by rent level and segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.
>
> Hypothesis 3c: There is no significant difference between segregation by rent levels and intergroup segregation at equivalent levels of rent.
>
> Hypothesis 3d: Segregation by value of owner occupied housing and segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.
>
> Hypothesis 3e: There is no significant difference between segregation by value of housing and intergroup segregation at equivalent levels of owner occupied housing value (levels).

The Voluntarist Perspective

Demographic Reflections

Wirth (1938: 11) noted that large numbers of people generate greater ranges of variation and that these variations "give rise to the spatial segregation of individuals according to color, ethnic heritage, economic and social status ..." It is later implied (Wirth, 1938: 15) that the segmentalization produced by large numbers results in persons of homogenous [ethnic?] status drifting together. Larger group size permits the emergence of a separate opportunity structure situated almost exclusively within the confines of the ethnic community. Thus, if we view the size of the minority population as increasing the opportunities for maintaining separatism through support for a semi-separate economy serving the enclave (Lieberson, 1963: 37; Brown and Fugitt, 1972) we might logically infer

> Hypothesis 4: Absolute size of a given minority population and that minority's residential segregation from the majority population are unrelated.

"Non-commuting"

Foley (1975: 158) notes that urban land use patterns and transportation systems cater primarily to auto users, to the serious deprivation of those lacking access to an auto. It has been intimated elsewhere (Suttles, 1975: 242) that transportation systems may be of consequence as a mechanism of maintaining residentially segregated cities. Various studies have shown that demand for housing in any given area is predominantly from wage earners whose place of employment is located within a reasonable time-distance from that area (Rapkin and Grisby, 1960: 39). If we employ Gans' (1968: 6) concept of the effective environment, it is logical to assume that because the enclave is a consciously self-contained enclave community that auto ownership is not necessary. All services are to be found within convenient walking distance.

> Hypothesis 5: The percentage of minority households owning no autos and residential segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.

Generational Proximity

For white ethnics, the second and subsequent generations acquired the increasingly greater educational and technical skills needed to advantageously accept the opportunities to "escape" the enclave (Edwards, 1966: 280). Wirth's (1928: 129) view was that the second generation's outside ties weaken their sentimental attachment to the ethnic enclave, and they tend to drift farther afield residentially in order to attain a sense of equality with their neighbors. Kramer (1970: 62)

intimates that even if external conditions of discrimination were to combine with coherent internal institutions to maintain the ethnic community over time, the community nevertheless undergoes changes which bring about a closer approximation to the social patterns of the dominant community. Overall, these arguments suggest that the foreign born and native born groups of any given ethnic heritage differ markedly in their housing patterns. If voluntary, or propinquity-based, segregation existed the reverse pattern would seem to hold true. Thus

> Hypothesis 6a: Mexican American intergenerational segregation and Mexican American-Anglo segregation are unrelated.

As used here, generations refer to the foreign born (first), the native born of foreign or mixed parentage (second), and the native born of native born parents (third and subsequent). At the simplest level, intergenerational segregation refers to the residential segregation of the foreign born from all native born of that ethnic heritage. The data, however, permit a more detailed separation for Mexican Americans. I shall, therefore, also evaluate the residential segregation of the first from the second generation, the first from the third and subsequent generations, and the second generation from the third and subsequent generations.

> Hypothesis 6b: There is no significant difference in the segregation of Mexican American generations from each other.

The Exclusionary Perspective

The Proportion Minority

Weber pointed out that large numbers of inhabitants mean that personal mutual acquaintanceship is lacking (Wirth, 1938: 11). Schuman

and Gruenberg (1970: 217) report that systematic variations in attitudes toward Blacks are associated with the proportion that is Black. Allport (1958: 220-222) notes that a minority's relative density (proportion) leads to an intensification of existing prejudices as visibility leads to a perceived threat to, as Greeley (1975: 62-63) put it, "all those things a man has come to value in that particular area he thinks of as his own." Robin Williams, Jr. (1967: 109), has noted that segregation is higher in those cities having higher proportions of Blacks in their populations. Therefore,

> Hypothesis 7: A specific minority's proportion of the city population is unrelated to its residential segregation from the majority group.

Intercensal Change: A Variant on the Proportion Minority

Numerous investigations have emphasized that rapid increases in the numbers of proportions of Blacks may lead to increased discriminatory behavior as "visibility" increases perceived threats of minority group expansion (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 25, 77). Therefore,

> Hypothesis 8: Intercensal minority population growth is unrelated to an intercensal change in segregation.

In the following chapter I will more fully comment upon the unit of analysis, the methodology employed to measure residential segregation, and the specific nature of the study populations.

CHAPTER V

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Residential Segregation: Concept and Measurement

Introduction

Analysis of census statistics is a first step toward transforming legislative mandates into working social programs, an aid in defining universes of need, and for the delineation of special problem areas (Parsons, 1972: 7). An analysis of Mexican American residential segregation in an urban setting is one of the building blocks to understanding the socioeconomic position of this group in the Southwestern context. The analysis will be undertaken utilizing indexes of dissimilarity (D) for the three possible combinations of major ethnic-racial population groups in the Southwest: Mexican American-Anglo, Mexican American-Black, and Anglo-Black. Employing D as the foundation, there follows an exploration of the relationship of each type of residential segregation to housing and group socioeconomic characteristics derived from quantitative census data.

An attempt has been made to adhere to the insightful recommendations of Schnore and Pinkerton (1966: 492). Their proposal was quite straightforward; distributional analyses of socioeconomic status should be tripartite. They should be

1. comprehensive in scope;
2. comparative in design; and
3. explicitly longitudinal.

The analysis which subsequent follows is in basic compliance with this proposed formula for analytic enrichment. A simultaneous investigation into a large number of cities representing a full range of central cities by size, ethnic and racial composition, and economic bases meets the first two criteria. Furthermore, the potential understanding of the persistence and/or level of residential segregation is enhanced by the coexistence of two enduring and—for the most part—large urban minority populations throughout the Southwest—Mexican Americans and Blacks.[1] This coexistence provides an additional comparative framework within which the analysis of socioeconomic differentials may provide both greater depth and an understanding of how each affects the other's chances for residential and nonresidential mobility. In addition, the presence of a statistically distinguishable foreign and native born Mexican American population in the Southwest allows for some evaluation of intra-minority intergenerational dissimilarity.

While a longitudinal study is the most viable approach to understanding changing patterns of residential segregation, problems of intercensal changes in extensiveness of coverage and definition preclude an extensive longitudinal analysis. Although available for only a limited number of cities, comparable data for 1960 and 1970 permits the introduction of a dynamic quality into the present research which was unavailable in the Moore and Mittelbach study.

Unit of Analysis

Ideally the unit of analysis for this type of investigation would have been the urbanized area. Delimitations of zones of

influence made previously by Galpin, McKenzie, and others consistently illustrate that the effective population is greater than that which is contained within incorporated boundaries (Hawley, 1951: 100). The political border of the city

> ... is seldom a meaningful barrier to the processes of growth and deterioration of urban neighborhoods and accompanying population movements ... residential segregation within cities takes place within the larger context of segregation between the component parts of metropolitan areas (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 30).

The analytic importance of the urbanized area stemps from the fact that in recent decades growth has not been concentrated in the central cities, but rather in the surrounding areas. Thus, the use of the urbanized area as the unit of analysis has been viewed as theoretically preferable to the use of the central city in studying residential segregation (Taeuber, 1964: 45).

However, there are a number of factors mitigating against using urbanized areas and favoring the use of central cities as the unit of analysis. The major difficulties involve the availability, accuracy and cost of urbanized area data for the Mexican American and comparison groups. Data for all groups are readily available for aggregates such as central cities, satellite cities, counties, and SMSA's as well as somewhat more limited tract data for Blacks and Mexican Americans in various published reports. Few data are available for urbanized areas as such. An alternative technique, which appears to have some precedent (Fine, Glenn, and Monts, 1971: 92-93) was considered and felt to be deficient. This "eye-balling" technique is both extremely time consuming and non-uniform, i.e. it exhibits great inter-city variance in

accuracy.[2] Urbanized area data on custom-made work tapes from the Bureau of the Census are prohibitive.

Central cities—the alternative areal unit of analysis to urbanized areas—will be used in this study. The central city has been employed as the unit of analysis in residential segregation studies as often, or more so, than urbanized areas, even by those who favor urbanized areas on theoretical grounds (Lieberson, 1963; Taeuber, 1964: 45). The use of the central city as the unit of analysis has two useful features: (1) the only other study of Mexican American residential segregation (Moore and Mittelbach, 1966) employed the central city as the unit of analysis and therefore allows for limited longitudinal comparisons, and (2) fiscal allocations by the federal government are made primarily to political entities having political boundaries, such as incorporated cities, and not to statistical constructs such as urbanized areas and therefore policy decisions are predicated on data presented in this format. Additionally, in the Southwestern case, much of what are now the suburbs or urban fringe have components which historically have been rural-Hispanic. As the cities and suburbs of the Southwest rapidly expanded outward the fringe areas became incorporated and, subsequently, "urbanized."

The Dependent Variables

The principal dependent variable of the study if Mexican American residential segregation which is operationalized through the calculation of an index of dissimilarity between Mexican Americans and Anglos using the distribution of persons across tracts. Two comparatively lesser, but nonetheless important, dependent variables are indexes

for Mexican Americans from Blacks, and Blacks from Anglos which are calculated for comparison purposes.

The history of the formulation of numerical indexes to measure the degree of residential segregation need not concern us nor be reviewed here in detail; Taeuber and Taeuber's (1969: 195-245) Appendix [A] serves as an excellent synthesis and point of dpearture. Methodologically, the most serious fault of other possible indexes has been that the city percentage of the minority group in question was incorporated into their computation. Such inclusion inevitably confounded the city's level of residential segregation with the percentage minority and led to difficulties of interpretation, leaving the validity of much of the empirical work already done with them in question (Duncan and Duncan, 1955b: 210; Taeuber, 1964: 43). While no single index adequately mirrors all the minute differences between two patterns of residential distribution, it does reflect a basic aspect of a city's racial-ethnic residential pattern which allows for a range of comparisons. Furthermore, it lends objectivity to the pursuit of discovering what socio-organizational characteristics and their populaces correlate with different degrees of residential segregation. The index is a simple and relatively inexpensive to calculate summary device—a macro-measure reflecting imbalances in the distribution of ethnics and not spatial configurations such as the degree or location of concentration (Taeuber, 1964: 45). It generally only describes residential patterns in census geographic terms (tracts or blocks) rather than in social terms (neighborhoods). Residential segregation is seen as an existing pattern which is observable at any point in time. Thus, we

must be cognizant of the fact that the numerical index is a reflection of the actual residential pattern of the city, and not the severity or character of discriminatory or other forces effecting these patterns (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 36). As in Taeuber (1964: 42) segregation is viewed primarily "in terms of quantifiable results rather than in terms of the social, psychological, and economic factors [initially] producing the observable patterns." The conceptualization of residential segregation as the overall degree of unevenness in the spatial distribution of Anglos and Mexican Americans throughout a given city "leads directly to the use of the index of dissimilarity" (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 28-29).

The index is computed by using the formula

$$D = (100)\Sigma\,|\,Xi-Yi\,|\ \ /2$$

where X is the percentage of group one in area i

and Y is the percentage of group two in area i

If skin color or ethnicity are meaningless for the determination of residential location, then any randomly chosen tract can be expected to reflect the city's existing proportion of each group within its boundaries. Should such occur over all tracts, the index would assume a value of zero, indicating that there was no residential segregation. Specific values of the index can range from zero, no segregation, to 100, perfect segregation wherein each tract is monoracial (or ethnic). The numerical value reflects the minimum percentage of one group which would have to move from tracts containing too high a percentage of that group to others containing too low a percentage.[3] The higher the numerical value the greater the degree of residential segregation between

the groups while the lower the index value the greater the degree of intermixture (Taeuber, 1964: 44-45; Taeuber and Teauber, 1969: 29-30).

While results obtained by the Taeubers (1969: 31, 229) and Lieberson (1963: 35) suggest that a concern with the conceptual and methodological implications of reliance on tracts or blocks is warranted—and that the selection of areal unit has some effect on the resulting intercity analysis—the smallest areal unit for which data is available for Mexican Americans is the census tract.[4] The use of tracts has obviously been dictated by the nature of the available data but there has been no loss in conceptual adequacy as the tract has some other advantages over blocks. Being larger than blocks, a wider and more detailed range of tabulations of housing and population characteristics are published for tracts. Additionally, census tracts exhibit smaller sampling error than do block groups (Pohlmann, 1976: 6).

While the Taeubers (1969) and others (Sørensen, Taeuber and Hollingsworth, 1975) have used households as their basic component in computing the indexes of residential dissimilarity, I have used persons. It was felt that persons had distinct advantages over households for my purposes: (1) the previous study by Moore and Mittelbach (1966) employed people as the unit and some degree of comparability was desired for a limited longitudinal analysis; (2) such a procedure diminishes the probability of data suppression for tracts with few Mexican Americans or Blacks; (3) some of the cities considered have extremely small Black populations and the use of persons allows for their retention in the analysis of Anglo-Black and Mexican American-Black residential segregation; and (4) it allows for the hand calculation of

D's from Table P-2 of the tract volumes (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1972c) as a check on the method of tract inclusion/rejection required by the nature of the magnetic summary tapes.

The Independent Variables

A general review of the theoretical and empirical literature pertinent to racial and ethnic residential patterns has shown that the segregation process is comprised of a combination of market factors, ethnic spatio-demographic characteristics and exclusionary practices. The question remains, to what extent has each of these factors influenced the residential distribution of the Mexican American population of the urban Southwest? What factors, and to what degree, account for the differential segregation of Mexican Americans and Blacks from Anglos, and which account for inter-minority segregation?

There are two sets of independent variables utilized by this study in an attempt to answer the preceding questions. The first set, used primarily in the replication stage of the analysis, consists of attribute variables for housing and socioeconomic characteristics as employed in the earlier study and implied in the literature review of alternative explanatory frameworks. The second set is a series of inter- and intra-group indexes of dissimilarity employing those housing and socioeconomic characteristics which the literature labels as most salient in the explanation of existent patterns of residential segregation. For example, an index of dissimilarity will be calculated for a specific characteristic for the total population; between the dominant group and each of the minority groups and between minority groups, at the same level (viz. low or high); and within each of the groups. More

specifically we shall be dealing in these sets with variables associated with rent, quality of housing, socioeconomic status, and nativity in an effort to verify the applicability of the previously outlined theoretical frameworks.

The Data Set

Study Populations

It has become apparent in the prior discussions that we have not one, but three, distinct study populations—Mexican Americans, "Anglos," and Blacks. The latter group is the least problematic; it is simply that population defined as "negro" in census tabulations. The other two populations present some "problems" of definition more specific to this study and will be treated briefly here.

"Anglo" is defined statistically as white other than Mexican American (Grebler, Moore and Guzman, 1970: Table 2-1, 16n). While there may be some opposition to the aggregation of a multi-ethnic population into an implied monoethnic categorization, Glazer and Moynihan have provided an underlying rationale in their perspective which holds that the styles of the different white groups are becoming increasingly similar and Gans adds support when he argues that the values he ascertained among his Italian "urban villagers" were more "working class" than specifically Italian (Greeley, 1964: 111).

The principal obstacle to the study of the dynamics of the Mexican American population is the inconsistency of definition-identification over time. Mexican Americans have operationally been defined in terms of race ("Mexican") in the 1930 Census, Spanish mother tongue in the 1940 Census, Spanish surname in the 1950 and 1960 Censuses, and

by questions of a self-selection type on origin or descent in the Current Population Survey. The 1970 Census employed four major identifiers and two composite identifiers to provide statistical data on the population of Hispanic ancestry. To a large degree, the populations determined by the various identifiers overlap (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1975: 2). Under present conditions the most practicable method of identifying the Mexican American population is the Spanish heritage designation, which for the Southwest refers to persons of Spanish language and persons not of Spanish language but of Spanish surname (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1970: I, 97; U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1972c: App-4).

Data Restraints and Problematic Issues

The Spanish heritage data available from census tabulations fail to distinguish among the various ethnic subgroups and cannot be uniformly understood as being equivalent to persons of Mexican origin (Estrada, Hernandez, and Alvirez, 1972: 27).[5] It can be argued, however, that the use of Mexican American is justifiable. For instance, 83.2 percent of the Southwest's total Spanish surnamed foreign stock was Mexican or of Mexican descent (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1973d: 3). The Spanish origin question provides further supporting evidence. If we restrict ourselves to the population which designated itself as being of "Mexican" origin we find that 78.6 percent of all Spanish heritage persons in the Southwest are of "Mexican" descent.[6] The fact that not all Spanish heritage persons in the Southwest are Mexican Americans [or of Mexican descent] may be inconsequential if the stereotypical lumping together of all Hispanics as "Mexicans," "Greasers," or

"Meskins" continues to hold even some of its old sway.[7]

As in the case of Blacks (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 128), the usual census problem of completeness of coverage appears especially acute in the Mexican American case (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974). Little can, or is customarily, done to adjust for such undercounts (Van Arsdol and Schuerman, 1971: 461-466). Those who have worked with the data extensively feel that despite its deficiencies they would not anticipate greatly altered analyses with improved data (Poston and Alvirez, 1973: 699).

Restraints originating from the use of summary tape data required a slight modification of the previous "Anglo" usage. The usual derivation of the Anglo population [Anglo = White persons - Mexican Americans] was impossible to calculate. It was decided to substitute a category called Other "White" calculated by subtracting the Black and Mexican American populations from the Total population. The residual is strictly speaking not white but rather a collection of whites, Native Americans and the various Asiatic groups. This practice, however, is not uncommon, as others have defined "whites" as that which is left after "subtracting appropriate Negro data from the totals" (Kasarda, 1976: 128n).[8] The variables employed in the study were calculated on an Other "White" rather than "anglo" basis. However, the term "Anglo" will be used throughout the text as synonymous with the Other "White" category just described.

The Fourth Count summary tapes provide the advantage of additional data which would otherwise be unavailable from published reports. Published socioeconomic data by tract are provided for the Black and

Mexican American populations only when a given tract contains more than 400 persons in that racial-ethnic category. Summary tapes essentially have no such limitations and such data are not normally suppressed. While summary tapes are known to present difficulties with regard to discrepancies with printed tabulations, experienced researchers (Sørensen, Taeuber, and Hollingsworth, 1975: 141) have stated their belief that indexes computer calculated from tape files and indexes hand calculated from printed data rarely differ by as much as 1 percent. My indexes based on census tapes and those based on data in published reports differ. The intercorrelations between each dependent variable and its respective counterpart are high (.97 to .99). The differences are due to the differences between sample and complete count data. The Fourth Count tape data is based on sample data. Published data on the Spanish surnamed is sample data while that for the total population and race are 100 percent items. The population numbers reported for tracts in the published reports and those on the tapes may differ.

Summary tapes do not provide information in distinct portions for tracts split by city boundaries, only complete tracts are reported. In an attempt to overcome problems of including spacious tracts with sparse numbers of persons distributed over a large area, each split tract as indicated in the published tract volumes was examined. Those split tracts having 60 percent or more of their population inside the city limits were included in their totality; those with 60 percent or more outside the limits were excluded in their totality. The few tracts hovering at the 50-55 percent mark were further examined with regard to their reflection of the population composition of the city

as a whole before either being incorporated or discarded in the designation of tracts for analysis.[9]

In the series of inter- and intragroup socioeconomic indexes of dissimilarity I have employed a dichotomization scheme. The purpose of dichotomizing variables into high and low categories was (1) to pare down to a reasonable number the indexes to be computed; and (2) to permit the utilization of a simple model that is a direct algebraic equivalent to an indirect standardization technique (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 79-84). The dichotomization of income, rent and value of housing was carried out uniformly across all cities using the national median for each as the determinant for inclusion in the high (above median) or low (below median) categories. The Taeubers' (1969) "model" allows for the comparison of the actual indexes obtained with an expected index obtained through indirect standardization for income, rent or value of housing. The formula for their simple model is

$$A = B \times C + R$$

where

A = the index of dissimilarity between the distribution of Anglos and Blacks (or Mexican Americans) over census tracts

B = the absolute value of the difference between the percentage of socioeconomic factor z attributable to Anglos and the same factor z percentage attributable to Blacks (or Mexican Americans)

C = the index of dissimilarity between the distribution of the specific socioeconomic factor over census tracts

R = the residual (or A-BC)

The product BC is equivalent to the expected index of dissimilarity

from a calculation utilizing an indirect standardization technique (see Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 79-84). Thus, we are able to make a comparison of residential distribution according to economic resources irregardless of skin color or heritage with the actual interethnic residential segregation by economic resources.

The Strategy of Analysis

The aim of the study is primarily the testing of the generality of the reported theoretical perspectives with regard to the residential segregation of racial or ethnic groups in the American Southwest. The evaluation of these frameworks involves the utilization of two approaches. First, summary tape data which lends itself to the computation of theoretically relevant indexes of dissimilarity are utilized in an analysis involving both direct tests of the delineated hypotheses and an approach equivalent to indirect standardization which allows for a more detailed analysis. The second approach utilizes non-tape data which do not readily lend themselves to index compilation in direct tests of the hypotheses.

A final section of the analysis will deal with a replication and evaluation of the Moore and Mittelbach (1966) "best equation" stepwise regression approach and the Taeubers' (1969: 70-76) regression analysis of segregation change.

In the next chapter we note the degree of residential segregation in the 58 city sample in 1970 and then proceed to an evaluation of the hypotheses outlined in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS

Descriptive Statistics

When measured by mean indexes of dissimilarity, residential segregation in the Southwest had diminished between 1960 and 1970 as can be seen in the following summary.

Table 3. Indexes of Residential Dissimilarity (D) for Selected Southwestern Cities, 1960 and 1970: Means and Standard Deviations for all Cities

Index	1960 Cities	1970 Cities	
	Moore-Mittelbach	Moore-Mittelbach	Lopez
Mexican American vs. Anglo			
Mean	54.5	45.5	42.9
Standard Deviation	11.4	9.9	12.6
Mexican American vs. Black			
Mean	57.3	59.8	55.0
Standard Deviation	15.1	14.2	16.5
Black vs. Anglo			
Mean	80.1	74.2	70.7
Standard Deviation	9.5	13.9	15.9
N =	35	35	58

These summary data conceal dissimilar patterns and trends. While the general trend had been one of diminishing residential segregation, a number of cities had experienced increases in certain types

of intergroup segregation. A thorough comparison of the earlier Moore and Mittelbach data (see Table 2) and the more recent 1970 data (see Table 4) shows that only two cities, Sacramento and Stockton, had experienced increases in all three segregation indexes. On the other hand, nine cities had witnessed decreases in all indexes: Albuquerque, Colorado Springs, Lubbock, Oakland, Phoenix, Port Arthur, San Angelo, Santa Barbara and Tucson.

The Mexican American vs. Anglo index values had experienced the least number of total increases from 1960 to 1970—7 (or 20 percent) of the 35 parallel cities; 4 of the 13 (31 percent) in California; and 2 of the 16 (13 percent) in Texas. In addition to Sacramento and Stockton, San Jose, San Francisco, Pueblo, Laredo, and El Paso witnessed increases of varying degree in their indexes between 1960 and 1970. Conversely, the Mexican American-Anglo index also decreased in more cases than either of the two other indexes: 28 cities had lower indexes in 1970 than in 1960. For the 35 cities common to both studies, the Pearson r between the 1960 and 1970 Mexican American-Anglo indexes is .80, reflecting a not unexpected continuity and vigor over time (see Winsborough, et. al., 1975: 3).

When the 35 parallel cities of 1970 are utilized, the same city has the "distinction" of having the Mexican American-Anglo D of greatest magnitude. Odessa, Texas dropped from an index value of 75.8 in 1960 to one of 66.8 in 1970 but managed to prevail as the "most segregated" of the 35 Moore-Mittelbach cities. When all 58 cities of the expanded study are examined for 1970, Odessa's neighbor, Midland, which was not included in the 1960 study, slightly exceeds it with an index

Table 4: Hand Calculated Indexes of Dissimilarity for 58 Southwestern Central Cities, 1970, using Other "White" Designation

Central City	Spanish Heritage from Other "White"	Spanish Heritage from Black	Black from Other "White"
Abilene, TX	44.4	58.6	63.0
Albuquerque, NM	45.3	47.1	60.4
Amarillo, TX	53.4	92.0	86.2
Anaheim, CA	27.1	47.7	46.6
Austin, TX[1]	55.0	64.0	82.0
Bakersfield, CA[2]	43.7	69.7	88.8
Beaumont, TX	28.2	62.5	73.2
Brownsville, TX	53.8	40.7	61.5
Bryan, TX	63.7	48.1	88.3
Colorado Springs, CO	39.2	43.4	62.1
Corpus Christi, TX[3]	60.5	58.3	86.6
Dallas, TX[4]	44.8	82.0	93.2
Denver, CO	52.8	77.4	87.4
Edinburg, TX	38.6	35.3	65.9
El Paso, TX[5]	52.8	54.9	52.1
Fort Worth, TX[6]	48.9	78.6	83.7
Fresno, CA[7]	35.8	68.7	82.4
Galveston, TX[8]	27.2	61.9	71.8
Garden Grove, CA	17.8	43.2	42.1
Harlingen, TX[9]	48.6	33.2	70.5
Houston, TX	48.8	75.5	83.6
Laredo, TX	47.4	65.3	37.6
Long Beach, CA	24.0	65.0	79.4
Los Angeles, CA[11]	51.0	82.1	89.7
Lubbock, TX[12]	65.3	77.3	93.2
McAllen, TX	62.4	50.3	79.1
Midland, TX	68.0	54.0	91.9
Modesto, CA	26.4	62.8	78.0
Monterey, CA	36.9	27.9	36.0
Napa, CA	22.3	22.1	30.0
Oakland, CA[13]	38.6	46.9	64.0
Odessa, TX[14]	66.8	42.1	94.7
Ontario, CA	35.7	49.7	74.4
Oxnard, CA[15]	42.8	30.9	68.6
Pharr, TX[16]	57.2	26.4	82.0
Phoenix, AZ[17]	48.5	60.0	81.5
Port Arthur, TX[18]	29.0	66.5	82.5
Pueblo, CO	41.7	40.8	54.1

Table 4 continued

Central City	Spanish Heritage from Other "White"	Spanish Heritage from Black	Black from Other "White"
Riverside, CA	33.1	47.4	63.3
Sacramento, CA	30.7	51.4	62.0
Salinas, CA	31.4	22.8	45.6
San Angelo, TX	49.3	61.6	70.0
San Antonio, TX[19]	60.3	77.4	86.9
San Benito, TX	50.4	74.5	49.1
San Bernardino, CA[20]	56.7	53.5	82.3
San Diego, CA[21]	37.3	60.1	78.2
San Francisco, CA[22]	42.3	66.2	68.8
San Jose, CA	45.0	32.4	58.4
Santa Ana, CA	39.9	55.4	71.2
Santa Barbara, CA	36.1	29.2	52.6
Santa Rosa, CA	26.2	44.9	54.9
Stockton, CA	45.8	40.6	77.6
Texas City, TX	28.5	66.7	74.7
Tuscon, AZ[23]	53.6	58.5	69.0
Vallejo, CA[24]	21.6	44.2	53.4
Ventura, CA	29.5	48.3	72.9
Waco, TX	45.7	71.0	80.1
Wichita Falls, TX	33.3	72.6	79.2
Mean	42.9	55.0	70.7
Standard Deviation	12.58	16.53	15.86
r[25] =	.9953	.9999	.9974

SOURCE: Calculated from Tables P-1 and P-2 of PHC(1) Series, CENSUS TRACTS, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972, for each SMSA.

[1]Tract 0022 had fewer Other "White" than Spanish Heritage persons and the figures used in calculating the index were adjusted by setting the number of Spanish Heritage in the tract equal to the lower figure, i.e. the number of persons obtained by subtracting Blacks from the tract total.

[2]Ibid. tract 0022.

[3]Ibid. tract 0017.

Table 4 continued

[4]Ibid. tracts 0028, 0036, 0038.02, 0102, 0163 and 0185.01.

[5]Ibid. tract 0028.

[6]Ibid. tracts 0032 and 0063.

[7]Ibid. tracts 0008, 0018 and 0019.

[8]Ibid. tract 1239.

[9]Ibid. tract 0104.

[10]Ibid. tracts 0201, 0205, 0208, 0305, 0330, 0339 and 0501.

[11]Ibid. tracts 2224, 2265, 2284-2286, 2288, 2293, 2319, 2328, 2395, 2407, 2415, 2416, 2421, 2422.

[12]Ibid. tract 0012.02.

[13]Ibid. tracts 4018 and 4032.

[14]Ibid. tract 0018.

[15]Ibid. tract 0032.

[16]Ibid. tract 0213.

[17]Ibid. tract 1152.

[18]Ibid. tracts 0051 and 0059.

[19]Ibid. tracts 1302 and 1308.

[20]Ibid. tract 0048.

[21]Ibid. tract 0142.

[22]Ibid. tract 0609.

[23]Ibid. tract 0010.

[24]Ibid. tract 2519.03.

[25]Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between hand calculated indexes using OTHER "WHITE" designation and those using "ANGLO" designation.

value of 68. The lowest index for Mexican American-Anglo segregation in 1960, 30.2, belonged to Sacramento. The lowest 1970 index for the same 35 cities was Galveston's 27.2, but the overall low of 17.8 was that of Garden Grove, California.

The era from 1960 to 1970 saw 12 cities (34 percent) increase the "unevenness" of Black-Anglo residential patterns—6 of 16 (38 percent) in Texas and 5 of 13 (39 percent) in California. On the other hand, the indexes in 23 cities (66 percent) had decreased in varying degrees during the same period. Texas had a greater number (10) and comparatively greater percentage (63) of decreases than did California (with 8 and 62 percent, respectively). The association between the Black-Anglo segregation indexes for 1960 with 1970 of the coincident 35 cities was, as expected, very strong ($r = .78$).

In Moore and Mittelbach's 1960 study, Lubbock, Texas, exhibited the largest (94.4) Anglo-Black index value. For 1970, whether one uses the Moore-Mittelbach or all 58 cities, the largest value is Odessa, Texas' 94.7. Lubbock, the previous "leader," ranked second to its lower Panhandle "neighbor" with a D of 93.2. The lowest Black from Anglo index in 1960, 57.0, was that of Pueblo, Colorado. In 1970 the low for the 35 Moore-Mittelbach cities was Laredo's 37.6, while Napa's 30.0 was the low for all 58 study cities.

Twenty-one, or 60 percent, of the Moore-Mittelbach cities exhibited higher values in 1970 than 1960 for the Black from Mexican American D. Ten (63 percent) of the Texas cities and 10 (77 percent) of the California cities exhibited such increases in Mexican American-Black D values. The correlation for the Black-Mexican American indexes

of 1960 and 1970 was .72. While still a very strong association it was comparatively the weakest of the three and signifies, perhaps, greater instability in this type of segregation over the decade.

The distinction of having had the highest value for the Mexican American-Black D in 1960 had been Lubbock, Texas' (D=89.0). By 1970 this distinction had been relinquished to Los Angeles, California and Dallas, Texas, which were in a virtual tie with D's of 82.1 and 82.0, respectively. In the expanded sample, the distinction of having had the highest D (92.0) fell to yet another Texas Panhandle city, Amarillo. Whereas Stockton, California, had exhibited the low index of 30.0 in 1960, the 1970 low for the Moore-Mittelbach cities was the 29.2 for Santa Barbara. When all 58 of the 1970 cities are used, Napa's 22.1 once again makes it the least segregated of cities.

Initial scrutiny of the 35 cities involved in the 1960 to 1970 comparisons has failed to uncover consistent patterns for increased or decreased index values. Further analysis of segregation change is deferred to the subsequent examination and discussion of Hypothesis 8 and the parallel replication of a model presented by Taeuber and Taeuber (1969: 70-77).

As in the case of 1960, the general pattern is one in which the D values for Anglo from Black residence exhibit the greatest magnitude, those of Mexican American from Black residence a middle ground, and those of Mexican American from Anglo the lowest magnitude. There were, however, inconsistencies in the pattern. Unlike 1960, the Mexican American-Anglo D values exhibited the least variability about the mean. And, whereas only 9 of 35 (26 percent) of the cities deviated from the

pattern in 1960, some 23 of the 58 cities (40 percent) exhibited variations in the pattern in 1970. Of all the cities in the 1970 analysis, 41 percent of the Texas cities (11) and 40 percent of the California cities (10) strayed from the proposed general pattern. Moore and Mittelbach (Grebler, et. al., 1970: 278-79) fail to adequately explain this occurrence. They argue that their 9 exceptions are primarily middle-sized or smaller communities. They contradict htemselves later in the same paragraph by noting that the cities exhibiting the general pattern present "much greater diversity" and include "not only all of the very large communities but smaller cities as well." The use of "middle-sized" in the earlier study is vague, to the point that comparison is limited. What is of interest, however, is that some cities which formerly adhered to the general pattern (Albuquerque, Laredo and San Jose) no longer exhibited that pattern, while others which had not previously (Abilene, Ontario, Riverside, and Wichita Falls) now adhered to it. Both Albuquerque (243,751) and San Jose (443,950) had populations which were relatively large and both Abilene (89,491) and Ontario (64,118) had relatively small populations. The Moore-Mittelbach logic does not appear to have great validity, especially in view of the inconsistency of the pattern for a large number of cities (23). I am much more inclined to accept their argument that minority group members hold general images about cities, considering some to be particularly "bad" and others "good" on grounds other than residential segregation (Grebler, et. al., 1970: 279). These subjective impressions may be the basis for the divergence of some cities from an observable pattern. Unfortunately, such an impression is unquantifiable

using a demographic-census data base, as manifested by Moore-Mittelbach's inability to adequately explain the departure of some cities from an observed general hierarchy of segregation.

Given that we are discussing patterns of segregation, it would appear appropriate to comment here on another pattern illustrated by the data. For 1960 and 1970 California's mean D's were lower than either the overall or Texas' mean indexes of dissimilarity, as can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Mean Indexes of Dissimilarity, California and Texas, 1960 and 1970*

	INDEXES					
	Mexican American from Anglo		Mexican American from Black		Black from Anglo	
Cities	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970
California						
Mean	49.2	35.1	49.5	48.5	77.9	64.9
Std. Dev.	10.1	9.4	13.1	15.3	8.7	16.1
	(13)	(25)	(13)	(25)	(13)	(25)
Texas						
Mean	59.3	49.3	63.0	61.2	82.2	76.4
Std. Dev.	11.1	12.0	15.3	15.8	8.7	14.0
	(16)	(27)	(16)	(27)	(16)	(27)
All						
Mean	54.5	42.9	57.3	55.0	80.1	70.7
Std. Dev.	11.4	12.6	15.1	16.5	9.5	15.9
	(35)	(58)	(35)	(58)	(35)	(58)

*Values enclosed in parentheses in all tables are the N's for each column. They may vary slightly because of missing data.

Generally speaking, we see that mean segregation levels had declined from 1960 to 1970 with the greatest decline having occurred in the mean Mexican American-Anglo D and the smallest decline in the Mexican American-Black index. It is also worth noting that in all but one case, the Mexican American-Anglo D for California cities, the degree of variability about the mean has increased, indicating a greater dispersion of index scores than had occurred earlier. This pattern was especially pronounced for the Black-Anglo index.

Having provided a general glimpse of emerging patterns for the reader I turn how to the testing and evaluation of the hypotheses developed in Chapter IV.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a: Segregation by income level and segregation by ethnicity or race are unrelated.

The hypothesis is not statistically substantiated for segregation of the majority from the minority. There is a positive relationship between the index of residential dissimilarity for ethnicity and a similar index based on the median family income of the total tract population, without regard to a family's race or ethnicity. Family income in each tract is dichotomized, with low incomes falling below, and high incomes above, the national median family income.

The Mexican American-Anglo case exhibits a positive relationship of substantial magnitude ($r=.67$, $p=.001$). This result indicates that there is a distinct positive correlation between segregation by ethnicity and segregation by income level. While cognizant of Gordon't (1968: 595) cogent argument that there is "nothing more

fundamental about a partial, as compared to a zero-order association, unless good theory makes it so," the great diversity in the cities' population size and proportion ethnic may obscure, or mask a relationship. Such obscuration appears to be partially the case with the above relationship. By controlling for the percentage of the total population which is Mexican American the size of the partial is reduced to .62 (p=.001). However, either case results in the rejection of the null hypothesis for the Mexican American-Anglo segregation pattern as both indicate a distinct relationship between segregation by ethnicity and segregation by income level.

The association between Black-Anglo segregation and segregation by income is positive and of moderate magnitude (r=.53, p=.001). Segregation by income explains 28 percent of the variance in racial segregation. As in the case of Mexican American-Anglo segregation the hypothesis can be rejected as a positive correlation between segregation by race and segregation by income level exists.

The relationship of Mexican American-Black segregation to residential segregation by income is less problematic, in a statistical sense. As in the previous two cases, the relationship is positive, but the magnitude is weak (r=.18, p=.195). The result of controlling was primarily the increment in explained variance from an initially negligible 3 percent to an improved, but still negligible, 6 percent. The null hypothesis of no relationship between racial and income segregation cannot be rejected for inter-minority segregation at this point. It is possible that the high incidence of lower incomes among both Mexican Americans and Blacks may be affecting the magnitude of the

relationship between segregation by race and segregation by income level. Both groups exhibit a high proportion of low family incomes and this may create a constant effect which reduces the correlation between Mexican American-Black segregation and segregation by income level. As will be noted shortly, the degree to which this occurred could not be ascertained from the available data.

> Hypothesis 1b: There is no significant difference between segregation by income and intergroup segregation at equivalent levels of income.

Utilizing t-tests for the difference between group means we see that the difference between the low from high income D's and the Mexican American-Anglo low income level D's is significant (see Table 6). The hypothesis would be rejected on the basis of Mexican American-Anglo lower class segregation. However, the case of upper class segregation would lead us not to reject. The probability of falsely rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true (type I error) is extremely high ($p=.359$). Thus, while the difference between segregation by income and segregation by ethnicity at low income is significant there is no significant difference between overall segregation by income and ethnic segregation at the high income level. The signs of the t-values in both cases indicate that the index containing the ethnic factor can be said to have a greater effect on segregation than that dealing with economic standing in general. However, at the higher income levels ethnicity appears to play a lesser role than it does at lower levels. This is, perhaps, a function of the Mexican Americans' general caucasoid physionomy and of the higher income Mexican Americans' greater facility to acculturate himself. Thus, even in the sense of a greater

Table 6. Comparison of Sample Means for Various Combinations of Income and Ethnic Segregation: T-Test Results

Paired Indexes	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	2-Tail Probability
Low from High Income with Mexican American Low Income from Anglo Low Income	33.3 38.9	6.9 11.1	-4.89	55	< .001
Low from High Income with Mexican American High Income from Anglo High Income	33.3 34.6	6.9 10.3	- .93	55	.359
Mexican American from Anglo Population with Mexican American Low Income from Anglo Low Income	42.6 38.9	12.8 11.1	5.44	55	< .001
Mexican American from Anglo Population with Mexican American High Income from Anglo High Income	42.6 34.6	12.8 10.3	6.60	55	< .001
Mexican American from Anglo Population with Internal Mexican American High from Low Income	42.6 33.4	12.8 9.2	4.64	55	< .001
Mexican American from Anglo Population with Low from High Income	42.6 33.3	12.8 6.9	7.24	55	< .001

acceptance by the "host" culture as a result of a people's lesser adherence to their "foreign" heritage, ethnicity appears to be more significant a factor than mere family income level.

When the ethnicity by income indexes are compared with simple interethnic segregation indexes the results are similar. The mean of the purely ethnic index is significantly larger than that of the interethnic by income indexes. The Mexican American-Anglo D is also significantly greater than the D for internal Mexican American and overall class segregation indexes.

There is evidently very little empirical literature on such intergroup class phenomena and thus specific guidelines for evaluating the present results are lacking. While the initial mixed results suggest that intergroup class segregation is a complex phenomenon, the tangential data suggest that there are definite grounds to reject the hypothesis.

The present hypothesis cannot be tested utilizing either of the Black segregation indexes—Mexican American-Black and Black-Anglo. The problem probably lies in the utilization of family income which may have decreased already small numbers of Blacks in many Southwestern cities to even smaller numbers of Black families. Such a decreased N enhances the probability of suppression of data for the purposes of protecting citizen confidentiality. Extensive suppression seems to have occurred as neither intragroup (Black high from low incomes) nor intergroup (e.g. Black high from Anglo high income) indexes produced from the census tapes are usable, being either uniformly zero or uniformly 50.0, neither of which seems logically possible upon perusal of

available census tract data.

The general pattern in the comparison of segregation by ethnicity or race with segregation by income is one in which segregation by ethnicity is significantly greater than mean segregation by income (see Table 6), even when size of city is taken into account (see Table 7). If we compare the Mexican American-Black index with the income index for each case, 96 percent (54) of the cities exhibit higher racial than class segregation. In all cases, Black-Anglo segregation exceeds high-low income segregation.[2] While this sheds light on the situation in the Southwest it cannot conclusively disprove the hypothesis. Resolution of the question regarding the interrelationships of race and income awaits future research utilizing more adequate data. Meanwhile, in our case the data suggests a rejection of the null hypothesis for Mexican American-Anglo segregation.

Before proceeding to the next hypothesis I would like to comment upon the relevance of the earlier findings of Lieberson (1970: 173) and Farley (1976: 31, 36) for the cities in this study. Farley and Lieberson's observations are sustained by my data. In 40 of the 56 cities (71 percent) for which data are available, interethnic Mexican American from Anglo segregation exceeds intraethnic class segregation. A comparison of means for all cities, and by population size categories (see Table 7, col. 5), also reflects this. Whether these observations also hold in the case of Blacks and Mexican Americans or Blacks and Anglos cannot, unfortunately, be determined from the available data.

> Hypothesis 2a: Segregation by occupational category and segregation by ethnicity or race are unrelated.

Table 7. Comparison of Racial and Ethnic Indexes of Dissimilarity (D) with Class, Status, and "Affordability" Indexes, by City Population Size Categories, 1970

Population Size Categories	Mexican American from Anglo D (1)	Mexican American from Black D (2)	Black from Anglo D (3)	Upper from Lower Income D (4)	Mexican American High from Low Income D (5)	Manual from Middle Class D (6)	High from Low Rent D (7)	High from Low Value D (8)
Largest Quartile*								
Mean	46.4	65.6	77.0	33.8	32.7	32.3	48.3	58.7
Std. Dev.	9.0	14.3	12.3	4.2	2.9	6.3	8.7	6.8
Second Quartile								
Mean	40.6	58.9	72.6	32.1	33.2	26.8	47.1	51.9
Std. Dev.	13.7	14.3	11.7	6.2	8.0	6.9	7.7	8.7
Third Quartile								
Mean	43.1	54.7	73.0	33.4	35.6	26.2	44.2	51.8
Std. Dev.	13.2	15.3	14.1	6.2	8.9	6.3	6.6	10.5
Smallest Quartile								
Mean	40.1	48.5	67.2	33.9	32.1	26.5	49.7	47.9
Std. Dev.	14.8	16.7	14.3	10.3	14.2	10.7	14.1	10.7
All Cities								
Mean	42.6	56.9	72.4	33.3	33.4	28.0	47.4	52.6
Std. Dev.	12.8	16.0	13.3	6.9	9.2	8.0	9.7	9.9

*All component cells are of equal size (14) as are the summary cells for All Cities (56).

There is a positive relationship between the index for ethnic or racial segregation and the citywide D for occupational status (white from blue collar or manual from middle class) segregation.

The correlation of Mexican American from Anglo segregation with overall occupational segregation is of very strong magnitude (r=.76, p=.001). When city population size is held constant the strength of the relationship is barely changed ($r_{12.3}$=.75, p=.001).

The relationship between Black-Anglo residential segregation and segregation by occupational status is positive and of substantial magnitude (r=.59, p=.001). City population size is a factor, which when controlled barely reduces the partial ($r_{12.3}$=.56, p=.001). As in the case of the first hypothesis, the present hypothesis has not been statistically substantiated for minority-majority group segregation.

The association between Mexican American-Black segregation and segregation by occupational status is the least problematic. The product moment correlation is low positive (r=.24, p=.078). When city population size is also considered, the partial is reduced substantially ($r_{12.3}$=.15, p=.274). The hypothesis of no relation cannot be rejected.

In examining each of the 56 cities for which there was available tape data, a general pattern emerges in which segregation by race or ethnicity exceeds segregation by occupational status. All three racial or ethnic segregation indexes exhibit higher mean values than white collar from blue collar segregation (presented as middle class from manual in Table 7, col. 6), even when divided into city population size

categories. The D values for Mexican American-Anglo ethnic segregation exceed those for occupational segregation in 54 cities (96 percent); the Mexican American-Black index is higher in 55 cases (98 percent), and the Black-Anglo D is higher in every case. Segregation by race or ethnicity was found to significantly exceed segregation by occupational status (see Table 8).

A brief reflection on intraminority segregation by occupational status may provide further support for, or insight into, the earlier Lieberson and Farley statements. As in the case of class, internal segregation among Mexican Americans by occupational status is less pronounced than interethnic segregation with Anglos in 44 cases (79 percent). Interracial segregation from Blacks exceeds intragroup Mexican American occupational segregation for 53 cities (95 percent). The occupational data have not been subject to suppression and permit us to compare interracial and internal Black segregation for the first time. Intra-Black residential segregation by occuupational status is less pronounced than interracial segregation with Anglos in 42 of 48 cases (88 percent) for which data is available. In 45 cities (94 percent) intra-Black segregation is exceeded by Mexican American-Black segregation. In both cases of minority from majority residential segregation, the Farley and Lieberson position that intragroup segregation is exceeded by intergroup segregation is substantiated. While the same is true in the minority case, the result has less discernible meaning. Much more research on interminority relations would appear to be necessary before any conclusions can be attempted on the basis of the limited observations in this study.

Table 8. Comparison of Sample Means for Various Combinations of Occupational and Ethnic or Racial Segregation: T-Test Results

Paired Indexes	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Values	Degrees of Freedom (df)	2-Tail Probability
Manual from Middle Class Workers* with:	28.0	8.0			
Mexican American Manual from Anglo Manual Workers	43.8	14.2	-11.28	55	<.001
Mexican American Middle Class from Anglo Middle Class Workers	33.3	10.3	- 4.68	55	<.001
Mexican American Manual from Black Manual Workers	63.5	15.8	-16.30	55	<.001
Mexican American Middle Class from Black Middle Class Workers	68.7	15.2	-20.70	55	<.001
Black Manual from Anglo Manual Workers	77.8	13.2	-30.42	55	<.001
Black Middle Class from Anglo Middle Class Workers	77.9	15.4	-26.85	55	.001
Mexican American from Anglo Population	42.6	12.8	-12.82	55	<.001
Mexican American from Black Population	56.9	16.0	-13.44	55	<.001
Black from Anglo Population	72.4	13.3	-31.17	55	<.001

*The Manual category refers to the Bureau of the Census' Blue Collar definition while Middle Class is based on Census' white collar designation.

Hypothesis 2b: There is no significant difference between segregation by occupational status and intergroup segregation at equivalent occupational levels.

In examining the results of t-tests employed to verify or reject this proposition (see Table 8), we note that in all cases the differences between segregation by occupation and racial or ethnic segregation by occupational status are significant. The hypothesis is rejected. Because the differences are significant and the ethnicity by occupational level index exceeds that for segregation by occupational status, it appears improbable that the residential segregation of ethnics is due to differentiation in occupational status alone.

Hypothesis 3a: Affordability and residential segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.

There is a direct relationship between Mexican American-Anglo segregation and a Mexican American affordability ratio (Mexican American median income to the median value of all housing available for sale), but the magnitude is extremely low (r=.15) and the relationship is nonsignificant (p=.265). Mexican American-Black segregation and an affordability ratio based on their respective affordability ratios exhibited a negligible inverse relationship (r=-.09) which was statistically nonsignificant (p=.511). The relationship of Black-Mexican American segregation to their separate affordability ratios was only somewhat better. The association with the Mexican American affordability ratio was moderately positive (r=.36, p=.007) while that with the Black index was positive and of low magnitude (r=.26, p=.06). For Black-Anglo segregation and a Black affordability ratio, there emerged a negligible direct relationship (r=.07) which is statistically nonsignificant (p=.602).

Correlational analysis based on aggregate data from publically available census reports illustrates that affordability has little value in explaining the segregation of an ethnic or racial minority from the majority. Affordability explains from half of one percent to 2 percent of the variance in majority-minority group segregation. Obviously, affordability is not a major factor in assessing majority-minority residential segregation. While its role in explaining inter-minority segregation appears more cimplex the Mexican American affordability ratio's explained variance figure of 13 percent of Mexican American-Black segregation is not substantively important. Since the risk of a type I error is also high, I cannot reject the hypothesis that ethnic-racial segregation and affordability are unrelated.

Hypothesis 3b: Segregation by rent level and segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.

There is a positive relationship between segregation by rent level and segregation by race or ethnicity. The Pearson r for Mexican American-Anglo with rent level segregation is substantial (r=-.58, p=.001). When the potentially masking effect of city size is controlled the partial does not diminish ($r_{12.3}$=.58, p=.001). Rent level segregation explains one-third of the variance in Mexican American-Anglo segregation with overall population size controlled.

The association between segregation by rent level and Black-Anglo segregation is of a much smaller magnitude (r=.32, p=.016) than that for Anglos and Mexican Americans. Rent level segregation accounts for 10 percent of the variance in Anglo-Black racial segregation. When the percentage Black is controlled for, explained variance increases to 13 percent ($r_{12.3}$=.35, p=.007). Thus, we note that segregation of high

from low rental units accounts for more of the variance in Mexican American-Anglo than in Anglo-Black ethnic segregation.

The case of the relation of Mexican American from Black segregation to rent level segregation is very different. The Pearson r between these two measures is essentially zero (r=.005, p=.973), as rent level explains less than one-hundredth of one percent of the variance in racial segregation.

In sum, the hypothesis can be rejected for minority-majority segregation but cannot be rejected for interminority segregation. Rent segregation thus fails to account for interminority racial segregation.

> Hypothesis 3c: There is no significant difference between segregation by rent level and intergroup segregation at equivalent levels of rent.

The results of the tests of this hypothesis are mixed (see table 9). For both secregation of Mexican Americans from Blacks and Blacks from Anglos the hypothesis is rejected. The differences between segregation by rent level and by rent level and race are significant. In each case the sign of the t-value indicates that the index containing a racial factor can be said to exhibit greater segregation than that which consists exclusively of an economic factor.

For Mexican American from Anglo segregation the results are reversed. Neither of the two cases of rent segregation is significantly different from rent segregation by ethnicity. The t-values are of almost equivalent inverse magnitudes. What does such a result imply? One possible interpretation revolves around early settlement patterns and subsequently rapid urbanization engulfing these areas of long-standing Mexican American occupancy. Still another revolves about

Table 9. Comparison of Sample Means for Various Combinations of Rent Level and Ethnic-Racial Segregation: T-Test Results

Paired Indexes	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	2-Tail Probability
Low rent from high rent with:	47.4	9.7			
Mexican American Low Rent from Anglo Low Rent	48.2	12.7	- .45	55	.656
Mexican American High Rent from Anglo High Rent	46.7	20.4	.33	54	.744
Mexican American Low Rent from Black Low Rent	61.0	16.7	-5.61	54	<.001
Mexican American High Rent from Black High Rent	68.6	14.7	-8.73	51	<.001
Black Low Rent from Anglo Low Rent	71.8	16.0	-9.88	55	<.001
Black High Rent from Anglo High Rent	77.5	17.0	-11.64	55	<.001
Mexican American from Anglo Population	42.6	12.8	3.37	55	.001
Mexican American from Black Population	56.9	16.0	-3.83	55	<.001
Black from Anglo Population	72.4	13.3	-13.73	55	<.001

methodological considerations—the level chosen as the demarcation between low and high rent is the national median which may have been inappropriate and has consequently led to a masking of the pattern. For instance, there is no significant difference between Mexican American high and low rent and the general high-low rent indexes (t=.57, 55df, p=.569). A final methodological consideration is that of the statistical concept of independence. The zero order relationship between Mexican American from Anglo high rent is a negligible .06 (p=.684)—not far from an indication of complete independence. The case for Anglo-Mexican American low rent segregation and overall low-rent segregation is different as the association is low rather than negligible (r=.29, p=.031). The final consideration is simply that there is no significant difference and that the hypothesis cannot be rejected in this specific case. Final determination of the previous allusion is reversed for further consideration. In sum, we have rejected the hypothesis for two of the three possible indexes and are reserving judgment on the third.

Hypothesis 3d: Segregation by value of owner occupied housing and segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated

There is a direct relationship of moderate to substantial magnitude between residential segregation by race or ethnicity and segregation of unequally valued owner occupied housing (high from low). For Mexican American from Anglo segregation the Pearson r for this association is .54 (p=.001). In the case of Mexican American-Anglo Segregation, therefore, the uneven distribution of housing by value

accounts for 29 percent of the variance in ethnic segregation. Controlling for city population size barely reduces the partial ($r_{12.3}$ = .52, p=.001).

For the segregation of Mexican Americans and Blacks, the relationship between racial segregation and segregation by housing value is of a lesser magnitude than the Mexican American-Anglo case (r=.37, p=.006). The distribution of housing by value explains approximately half as much variance in the Mexican American-Black (14 percent) as it had in the Mexican American-Anglo case. Controlling for size radically alters the relationship as the explained variance is halved to 7 percent ($r_{12.3}$=.27, p=.05).

For the final racial-ethnic segregation combination, that between Blacks and Anglos, we find a positive relationship with distribution by housing value of approximately the same magnitude as that between Mexican Americans and Anglos (r=.53, p=.001). In the present case, 28 percent of the variance in racial segregation is explainable by the dispersion of housing by value. Size affects the original relationship more than in the Mexican American-Anglo situation as the partial is reduced ($r_{12.3}$=.47, p=.001).

In sum, we can reject the hypothesis for minority-majority residential segregation. The case of interminority segregation, however, is different from that of the minority-majority cases and may warrant use of different acceptance criteria. While the proportion of explained variance may be considered low under normal circumstances, it may have a different meaning in trying to comprehend interminority segregation. While I am inclined to also reject the hypothesis in

this case it seems prudent to reserve judgment in the light of unavailable guidelines from prior research.

> Hypothesis 3e: There is no significant difference between segregation by value of housing and intergroup segregation at equivalent levels of owner-occupied housing value.

The results of tests, reported in Table 10, to determine the validity of the hypothesis lead me to reject the hypothesis. However, the results are somewhat inconclusive with respect to which characteristic is of greatest importance. For both Mexican American-Black and Black-Anglo observations, the t-values indicate that the combined economic racial factor is greater than would be expected on the basis of purely economic factors. In other words, race makes a meaningful difference in segregation by value of owner occupied housing. For the Mexican American-Anglo comparisons, however, both indicate that the combined economic-ethnic factor is less than would be expected on the basis of economic factors alone. The comparison of ethnic or racial indexes with the housing value index parallels that of the latter index and the value of housing by racial or ethnic ownership indexes. Briefly, we have rejected the hypothesis but our results vary with regard to what such significant differences mean. The zero-order correlations, together with t-values and significance, void the argument of independence. What may lie behind the results for Mexican American-Anglo segregation are the historical settlement patterns alluded to previously. Many of the cities in my study were founded before the Anglo American incursion into the Southwest. The patterns which emerged as the cities grew, especially as both positive and negative (the Depression) features in the American economy attracted people to

Table 10. Comparison of Sample Means for Various Combinations of Segregation by Value of Owner Occupied Housing and Ethnic-Racial Segregation: T-Test Results

Paired Indexes	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	2-Tail Probability
Index for Segregation by Value of Owner Occupied Housing with:	52.6	9.9			
Mexican American Low Value from Anglo Low Value Housing	48.3	14.1	2.66	55	.01
Mexican American High Value from Anglo High Value Housing	39.2	16.2	6.36	55	<.001
Mexican American Low Value from Black Low Value Housing	62.3	15.0	-4.61	54	<.001
Mexican American High Value from Black High Value Housing	69.3	17.7	-6.32	47	<.001
Black Low Value Housing from Anglo Low Value Housing	75.3	16.6	-10.13	55	<.001
Black High Value Housing from Anglo High Value Housing	80.0	19.2	-10.69	53	<.001
Mexican American from Anglo Population	42.6	12.8	6.72	55	<.001
Mexican American from Black Population	56.9	16.0	-2.10	55	.001
Black from Anglo Population	72.4	13.3	-12.84	55	<.001

the area, may have been such that my general value segregation index represents a counter-balancing of ethnic housing value segregation.[4] If this were so, why then are the patterns involving Blacks different? If urban development were reviewed from an historical perspective I suspect that Blacks are relative latecomers to the Southwestern milieu (see Moore and Mittelbach, 1966: 17; Pinkney, 1970: 74). While such an interpretation somewhat simplistically overlooks the role of prejudice and discrimination against Blacks, I reserve discussion of these two factors for the overall evaluation of my concluding chapter. But before moving on to the next hypothesis, I must also note that there is also a distinct possibility that the case of the Mexican American's segregation from the Anglo majority is different from that of either to the Black minority. Further probing into this possibility is at present beyond the scope of this work but my future plans include an extensive re-evaluation of the

> Hypothesis 4: Absolute size of a given minority population and that minority's residential segregation from the majority population are unrelated.

There is a direct relationship between minority population size and minority segregation from the majority population. For the relationship of Mexican American-Anglo segregation to the size of the Mexican American population the Pearson r is .29 (p=.031). When the size of the total city population is held constant the magnitude of the initial relationship increases slightly ($r_{12.3}$, 3=.31, p=.021). The proportion of the variance in ethnic segregation explained by Mexican American population size is but 10 percent.

The relationship of Black-Anglo segregation to Black population

size reveals a moderate Pearson's r of .31 (=.018). Controlling for city size drastically reduces the magnitude of the partial ($r_{12.3}$=.09, p=.515). City size explains a great degree of the relationship between Black population size and Black-Anglo segregation. At best the size of the Black minority explains 10 percent of the variance in Black-Anglo racial segregation. The "explanatory power" of Black population size is less than one percent when the vastly disparate city sizes in the study are controlled for. Thus, we have a situation for which there is an absence of both statistical significance and substantive importance. On this basis, I cannot reject the null hypothesis of no relationship.

Mexican American-Black segregation's association with minority group size is interesting. The Pearson r's are both moderate, with those for Mexican American population size (r=.33, p=.014) and with Black population size (r=.38, p=.004) in basic agreement. Explained variance in Black-Mexican American segregation is not very high, 11 percent when Mexican American size is utilized and a slightly higher 14 percent for that explained by Black population size. The hypothesis cannot be rejected if the implication is that a minority size and that group's residential segregation are causably related. However, while minority population size may not explain as much of the variance as previous researchers would have us believe, it does play at least a small part in the schema of segregation. The size of the minority appears to be a contributory characteristic which affects segregation but cannot explain its persistence (see Table 11).

Table 11. Mean Indexes of Residential Segregation According to Size of the Black or Mexican American Population

Population Size	Indexes			
	Mexican American from Anglo by Mexican American Population Size	Black from Anglo by Black Size	Mexican American from Black by Mexican American Size	Mexican American from Black by Black Size
Largest Quartile				
Mean	49.3	79.8	65.3	67.7
Std. Dev.	6.7	9.6	15.0	11.3
	(14)	(14)	(14)	(14)
Second Quartile				
Mean	45.0	76.4	56.7	59.0
Std. Dev.	11.9	11.2	14.1	13.5
	(14)	(14)	(14)	(14)
Third Quartile				
Mean	39.1	69.6	47.7	49.5
Std. Dev.	12.8	14.6	14.5	14.9
	(14)	(15)	(14)	(14)
Smallest Quartile				
Mean	36.8	63.5	58.1	51.7
Std. Dev.	15.4	11.9	16.9	18.7
	(14)	(13)	(14)	(14)

Hypothesis 5: The percentage of minority households owning no autos and residential segregation by race or ethnicity are unrelated.

There is a positive relationship between the absence of an auto from a household and segregation by race or ethnicity. The relationship of Mexican American-Anglo segregation to the degree of absence of an auto in Mexican American households is of low magnitude (r=.29, p=.029). The partial correlation coefficient hardly differs when city size is held constant ($r_{12.3}$=.27). More importantly, Mexican American poverty is moderately associated with both Mexican American-Anglo segregation (r=.56) and the absence of an auto in Mexican American households (r=.44). When controlled for the percentage of Mexican American households living in poverty the initial low positive association is reduced to a negligible level ($r_{12.3}$=.05) indicating that the relationship between Mexican American nonownership and Mexican American-Anglo segregation is more adequately explainable by Mexican American poverty. The relationship of Black-Anglo segregation to the absence of an auto from Black households is moderate (r=.37, p=.004) and explains 14 percent of the variance in racial segregation. Controlling for the percentage of the city's population which is Black reduces the partial to a point where only 7 percent of the variance in racial segregation is explained.

Interminority segregation and minority auto nonownership somewhat parallel the case of majority-minority segregation. Black auto ownership, when correlates with Black-Mexican American segregation, illustrates a moderate association (r=.30, p=.025) which explains 9 percent of the variance in interminority racial segregation. Mexican

American auto nonownership's relationship is of a much smaller magnitude (r=.04, p=.742) and explains an infinitesimally small two-tenths of one percent of the variance in Mexican American-Black racial segregation.

A maximum of 9 percent in explained variance for residential segregation is not substantively important. With such a consideration in mind the hypothesis cannot be rejected.

> Hypothesis 6a: Mexican American intergenerational segregation and Mexican American-Anglo segregation are unrelated.

There is an inverse relationship between Mexican American-Anglo ethnic segregation and the intraethnic segregation of the first generation. When the segregation of first (foreign born) from second (native of foreign or mixed parentage) generation persons of Mexican descent is correlated with overall Mexican American segregation from Agnlos the result is a negative association of moderate magnitude (r=-.28, p=.035). When the overall disparity in the distribution of all foreign- from native-born is controlled the increment in the partial is rather substantial ($r_{12.3}$=-.51, p=.001). Thus, the more first and second generation Mexican Americans are segregated from each other, the less the overall segregation of Mexican American from Anglos. Conversely, the less segregated (more concentrated) the first and second generations, the greater the overall segregation of Mexican Americans from Anglos. Such a finding appears to underscore the importance of the acculturation process in a minority's quest of acceptance. The greater the acculturation of the group to "American" ways, the more acceptable they become as neighbors. First from second generation

ethnic segregation explains some 26 percent of the variance in ethnic minority-majority group segregation. In first from third (native of native parentage) generational segregation, which is also inverse ($r=-.42$, $p=.001$), the initial association accounts for 18 percent of the variance in minority-majority segregation. Controlling for the overall distribution of foreign- from native-born leads to a substantial increment in the partial ($r_{12.3}=-.70$). Although D is not a measure of concentration, the results imply that the less the segregation of the Mexican American generations, the greater their segregation from the dominant group. A full discussion of the relevance of this observation in evaluating the propinquity argument will be reserved for the final chapter.

The relationship between second and third generation ethnic segregation and Anglo-Mexican American segregation is positive and of low magnitude ($r=.16$, $p=.238$). Controlling for the residential disparity of foreign and native born seems illogical given that both of the involved generations are native born. The proportion of variance explained by second from third intragroup segregation is a very low 3 percent.

The hypothesis regarding the intergenerational segregation of Mexican American and Mexican American-Anglo segregation is rejected for two of the three possible cases. Only in the case of relationship of second from third generational segregation and Mexican American-Anglo segregation is the hypothesis not rejected. All three intergenerational segregation combinations are significantly different from Anglo-Mexican American segregation (see Table 12). Once more, a fuller

Table 12. Comparison of Sample Means for Various Combinations of Mexican American Intergenerational Segregation: T-Test Results

Paired Indexes	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Value	Degrees of Freedom (df)	2-Tail Probability
First from Second Generation	22.6	10.0	-2.92	55	.005
with					
Second from Third Generation	25.9	9.2			
First from Third Generation	30.1	10.2	3.48	55	.001
with					
Second from Third Generation	25.9	9.2			
First from Second Generation	22.6	10.0	-8.65	55	.001
with					
First from Third Generation	30.1	10.2			
Anglo from Mexican American	42.6	12.8	8.15	55	.001
Population with					
First from Second Generation	22.6	10.0			
Anglo from Mexican American	42.6	12.8	8.64	55	.001
Population with					
Second from Third Generation	25.9	9.2			

interpretation of such findings are reserved for later discussion.

> Hypothesis 6b: There is no significant difference in the segregation of Mexican American generations from each other.

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference in Mexican American intergenerational segregation is rejected on the basis of the test results (see Table 12). The signs for the t-values provide further information which will serve us well in the further analysis planned for the final chapter. For the first test pair the negative sign indicates that second from third generation segregation is significantly higher than first from second generation segregation. Similarly, for the second paired indexes, the sign indicates significantly greater segregation of the first from the third generation than the segregation of the second from the third. The final paif of indexes manifest significantly greater segregation of the first from third than first from second generation. The test results contradict the solidarity argument suggested earlier in the literature review by Wirth (1928: 129) and, perhaps, paralleling the pattern implied by Edwards (1966: 280).

> Hypothesis 7: A specific minority's proportion of the city population is unrelated to its residential segregation from the majority group.

There is a moderate positive association between a minority's proportion of the city population and its residential segregation from the majority group. The Mexican American-Anglo segregation index and the Mexican American percentage of the total city population are moderately correlates ($r=.38$, $p=.004$). When the size disparity of city populations is controlled, the relationship increases somewhat in

magnitude and explanatory power ($r_{12.3}$=.41, p=.002). The proportion of variance in Mexican American-Anglo segregation explained by the cities' proportion Mexican American increases from 14 to 16 percent when overall city size is controlled.

The relationship of the city population's proportion Black with the Black-Anglo segregation index is also of a moderate positive nature (r=.42, p=.001). Controlling overall size reduces the magnitude of this association slightly ($r_{12.3}$=.37, p=.005) and the proportion of explained variance diminishes accordingly from 17 to 14 percent.

The hypothesis could be rejected on statistical grounds but this might confuse the issue. It is not meant to imply that the proportion minority is not important but rather that it is contibutory and not of key importance theoretically. The proportion minority neither causally explains the existence of segregation—a small proportion does not insure the absence of segregation—nor the continuation over time of residential segregation. As can be seen in Table 13, however, the persistence of residential segregation in cities with extremely small minority group representation illustrates that the proportion minority affects the degree of segregation.[5]

> Hypothesis 8: Intercensal minority population growth is unrelated to an intercensal change in segregation.

There is no uniform pattern with respect to the interrelationship of intercensal minority population growth and an intercensal change in segregation.[6] The Mexican American-Anglo segregation index underwent an average decrease of 16 percent. The Anglo population experienced an average decrease of 11 percent while the Mexican American population experienced an average growth of 73 percent![7] Nonetheless,

Table 13. Mean Indexes of Residential Segregation According to the Proportion of the City Population Mexican American or Black

Population Size	Mexican American from Anglo by Proportion Mexican American	Black from Anglo by Proportion Black
Largest Quartile		
Mean	48.5	78.8
Std. Dev.	9.6	11.2
	(14)	(14)
Second Quartile		
Mean	46.1	80.9
Std. Dev.	10.2	10.5
	(14)	(15)
Third Quartile		
Mean	43.0	66.2
Std. Dev.	14.1	10.1
	(14)	(13)
Smallest Quartile		
Mean	32.7	62.8
Std. Dev.	11.7	11.8
	(14)	(14)

Anglo population change exhibits a moderate inverse association with Anglo-Mexican American segregation change (r=-.45, p=.003) while Mexican American population change exhibits a low negative association (r=-.16, p=.297). The change in Anglo population accounted for 20 percent of the variance in changed interethnic segregation whereas a change in Mexican American population accounted for only 3 percent.

Between 1960 and 1970 the Black population grew by an average 29 percent. Black-Mexican American segregation increased by an average 3 percent. The change in Mexican American population exhibited a low inverse association with the change in the Black-Mexican American indexes (r=-.21, p=.170) while the increase in Black population manifested a low positive relationship (r=.19, p=.219). Neither increment evidenced an appreciable explanation of changed segregation, as the growth in the Mexican American population accounted for but 5 percent of the variance and the accretion of the Black population for an even smaller 4 percent.

In the interim from 1960 to 1970, Black-Anglo segregation index declined by an average 9 percent. Both the decrease in Anglo population and the increment of the Black population exhibit negligible positive association with changed Black-Anglo segregation. The Pearson r for Black population growth and changed Black-Anglo segregation is .06 (p=.714) while the association between the Anglo decrement and segregation change was of only little better magnitude (r=.10, p=.516). As suspected the proportions of explained variance in changed Black-Anglo segregation were infinitesimally small, four-tenths of a percentage point for Black and one percent for Anglo population.

The data illustrate an inconsistent relationship between population change and ethnic-racial segregation change. If, however, we focus only on minority population growth and its relationship to majority-minority or minority-minority segregation we must reject the null hypothesis. The relationship of minority growth to segregation change explains too little of the variance in segregation. On the other hand, if we were to focus on the effect of majority group growth on majority-minority group residential segregation we note a significant inverse relationship between Anglo population growth and Mexican American-Anglo segregation. Obviously, factors other than population growth are at work. In an attempt to ascertain what these characteristics may be we turn to an approach closely paralleling Teauber and Taeuber's (1969: 70-77) examination of intercity variation in segregation changes.

Segregation Change 1960-1970: An Exploration

Longitudinal data are available for 42 cities in the 1960 and 1970 censuses and permit the evaluation of a few explanatory variables. The Teaubers' analysis of long-term changes in Black-White segregation in a number of Southern cities demonstrated the relevance of changes in both minority and majority populations, and the production of new housing in both city and suburban areas. It was feasible from the data available on all three study populations to calculate measures of population growth, the increment in housing units and suburbanization.[8] The measures of suburbanization and new construction were utilized as indexes of the availability to city residents of alternative housing which was theoretically highly segregated. The Taeubers also used a

measure of Black occupational change representing the percentage-point change in white collar or skilled jobs during the decade between censuses (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 70-71). The last measure was unavailable by Mexican American ethnicity for many of the study cities and was thus omitted.

An examination of the zero-order correlation coefficients (see Table 14) provides a greater insight into the relationships among the variables employed in the multiple regression analysis. The main correlate of minority-majority segregation change is the change in majority population. For interminority segregation, the main correlates of segregation change are the changes in each minority's population over the decade. Given the resultant data, if there occurred an intercensal decrement in the Anglo population we would have predicted increased segregation of Anglos and Mexican Americans for 1970. Conversely, a decrement in Anglo population would have led us to predict decreased Black-Anglo segregation in 1970. Further evaluation of these results are possible in the next step of the analysis.

Interminority segregation change data (see Table 14) manifest interesting contradictions. If Mexican American population increased over the decade the expected result should have been a decline in Black-Mexican American segregation from 1960 to 1970. Both have occurred simultaneously with a resultant moderate average increase in segregation. The data suggest that Black population change has greater impact on changes in Black-Mexican American segregation. Further evaluation of this statement is also possible in the next step of the analysis.

Table 14. Intercorrelations of Measures Used in the Analysis of Segregation Change in 42 Cities, 1960-1970 (Columns are the same as numbers in rows)

1. Mexican-American-Anglo Segregation Change	____							
2. Mexican American-Black Segregation Change	-.16	____						
3. Black-Anglo Segregation Change	-.13	-.29	____					
4. Population Change: Anglo	-.45	-.09	.10	____				
5. Population Change: Mexican American	-.16	-.21	.03	.34	____			
6. Population Change: Black	.07	.19	.06	-.18	.34	____		
7. New Construction	.07	-.11	-.03	.24	.07	.46	____	
8. Suburbanization	-.13	.00	.10	.16	.06	.08	.21	____
MEAN	-15.6	2.6	-9.3	-10.8	73.2	28.5	40.7	6.1
STANDARD DEVIATION	14.7	26.0	16.6	5.6	45.2	39.7	21.1	6.0

A regression equation utilizing a linear combination of all relevant independent variables can explain from 10 to 24 percent of the change in segregation between groups (see Table 15). The predictive power of the four variables utilized was greatest for the change in Mexican American-Anglo segregation and least for Black-Anglo segregation change. The standardized regression coefficients, Betas, indicate the weight given to each variable, with the other variables controlled, in predicting segregation change. For the changes in minority-majority segregation, Anglo population change clearly emerged as the most powerful of the predictor variables (Beta=-.479 for Mexican American-Anglo and .268 for Black-Anglo segregation change). As suspected earlier, Black population change is of somewhat greater importance than a change in the Mexican American population for predicting interminority segregation change.

The regression results provide some interesting insights into segregation change. In each case, new construction emerges as the coequal or second most powerful predictor variable. For Mexican American-Anglo segregation change, the Beta weights indicate that as new construction increases, the segregation of the two groups increases. But, Mexican American-Anglo segregation diminished from 1960 to 1970. We also know from the data that the Southwestern cities included in the analysis were in the midst of a development boom as they averaged an increase of 40 percent in the number of housing units built from 1960 to 1970. One possible interpretation is that annexation was not controlled for by either the Taeubers or myself in calculating the percentage growth in housing. The failure to control for growth

Table 15. Multiple Regression Analysis of Segregation Change and Four Independent Variables, for 42 Cities, 1960-1970

Variables Employed	B	Std. E	F-Value	Beta	Sig.
CHANGE IN MEXICAN AMERICAN -ANGLO SEGREGATION INDEX					
Population Change: Anglo	-1.268	.416	0.277	-.479	.004
Population Change: Mexican American	-.300	.497	.366	-.009	.952
New Construction	.138	.104	1.763	.199	.192
Suburbanization	-.279	.435	.410	-.094	.526
Intercept -32.97					
Multiple R^2 .2424					
Overall Sig. .032					
CHANGE IN MEXICAN AMERICAN -BLACK SEGREGATION INDEX					
Population Change: Mexican American	-.155	.974	3.804	-.307	.059
Population Change: Black	.231	.101	5.213	.402	.028
New Construction	-.433	.183	5.616	-.402	.023
Suburbanization	.346	.689	.252	.076	.618
Intercept 25.98					
Multiple R^2 .1991					
Overall Sig. .077					
CHANGE IN BLACK-ANGLO SEGREGATION INDEX					
Population Change: Anglo	.589	.377	2.438	.268	.127

Table 15 continued

Variables Employed	B	Std. E	F-Value	Beta	Sig.
Population Change: Black	.276	.573	.232	.090	.633
New Construction	-.123	.110	1.257	-.214	.269
Suburbanization	.351	.394	.794	.143	.379
Intercept 1.15					
Multiple R^2 .0948					
Overall Sig. .436					

through annexation may have obscured other developing patterns. If "new" housing was made available in either annexed areas or older sectors of the city, plausible explanations for decreased Mexican American segregation from the majority emerge. If formerly Anglo areas were made available to Mexican Americans, or if suburbanization has occurred primarily among Anglos, or if annexed areas were ethnically abalanced, or if a homogeneous minority area had been annexed, divided and incorporated into a small number of formerly homogeneous majority tracts, population distributions would be altered and the index decreased. Another alternative occurs if much of the new housing units were integrated.

Black-Anglo segregation diminished from 1960 to 1970. The Beta weights would indicate that such a decrease would occur if the Anglo population decreased, which it did. The Beta weights also indicate that an increased construction of housing would lead to a diminution of segregation, which it did. What appears to have occurred was a redistribution of these two populations within the city—increased suburbanization was a rather low 6 percent on the average—as new areas of housing were opened up. The overall significance of this particular equation would suggest, however, that we place little faith in its predictive ability.

While Mexican American-Anglo and Black-Anglo segregation indexes decreased, Mexican American-Black segregation increased. The Beta weights would indicate that the intercensal increment of the Mexican American population should have lead to reduced segregation between the two minorities—which it did not. But the Beta weights also

indicate that the 29 percent Black population increment should lead to increased segregation—which it did. The Beta weights and significance levels would indicate that a change in the Black population was the more influential of the two possible population changes. The increased housing availability which occurred should also have led to decreased Mexican American-Black segregation. Instead, there was a very low average increment in Black-Mexican American segregation of 3 percent. The discrepancy between the equation results and the actual occurrences become explainable if newly available housing became available in formerly Anglo areas. This event would explain the concurrent increment in Mexican American-Black segregation and decrement in Black-Anglo segregation.

All of this is rather speculative as the model itself appears to have little general explanatory power or consistency. However, the issues raised by this analysis are food for future research endeavors. What patterns emerged in the Southwest from the rapid growth of urban settlements? Are the decreases in Black-Anglo and Anglo-Mexican American segregation temporary phenomenon brought on by a readily available supply of housing? Would a potential "mass" exodus to the "Sun Belt" over the next few years create a tighter housing market resulting in a stabilization or exacerbation of segregatory housing patterns? Most importantly, extensive research on residential succession involving three distinct racial-ethnic groups has as yet not been undertaken. A research endeavor involving the analysis of emerging patterns of residential succession involving interminority relationships is intriguing. What types of competition for housing

occur? What factors do minority group members look for in a neighborhood? What types of preferences do minorities have for housing and how are these shaped by the presence of other minorities? By their perception of majority attitudes?

Having dealt with the findings relevant to the analysis of the hypotheses and the Taeubers' longitudinal model, I now turn to a replication and evaluation of the Moore and Mittelbach (1966) "best equation" stepwise regression approach to segregation analysis. The evaluation of the "best equation" approach will conclude the present findings chapter.

The Moore-Mittelbach "Best Equation": A Replication

In their pioneering study of Mexican American residential segregation Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 38-39, C-6, C-7) noted that residential segregation was shaped by a great variety of factors in addition to discrimination in the housing market. A general model with six categories of independent variables was constructed and tested utilizing a stepwise multiple regression technique. The stepwise regression analysis was performed for each of the three types of residential segregation used as the dependent variable.

Moore and Mittelbach used as independent variables those factors suggested by previous research as being of importance for explaining segregated housing patterns. They found that city population size, minority household size, group income differentials, and the ethnic composition of the total minority population to be important factors in the explanation of residential segregation. Discrimination, intuitively felt to be of importance, in its operationalization failed

to show statistical significance.[10]

The resultant "best equation" of the stepwise analysis (see Appendix, Tables A1-A3) explained from 49 to 69 percent of the variance in the segregation indexes. Relatively few variables accounted for most of the ascertained variance and were basically similar from one equation to the next. In all three equations an income variable and a population size variable were significant.

In an attempt to verify the importance of the factors designated as significant by the Moore-Mittelbach regression analysis I replicated their final analysis utilizing the same variables they reported in their correlation matrix for both my overall sample and the 35 cities identical to both studies. My results are reported alongside those of Moore and Mittelbach's in the Appendix (Tables A1-A3). In all the equations there is some disparity between the Moore-Mittelbach results for 1960 and my results for 1970. For the equation involving Mexican American from Anglo segregation, the Moore-Mittelbach equation showed the "cultural" variable, defined as the percentage of Mexican American occupied housing units having 5 persons or more present, to have the largest Beta weight. In my equations, the same result was obtained for the 58-city sample, but not for the 35-city regression where the ratio of total median income to Mexican American median income was of "greatest importance" when measured by Beta weights. Overall, the Moore-Mittelbach 1960 equation explained more of the variance than was the case in either my 58-city or 35-city analyses.

For the second segregation index, that of Blacks from Mexican

Americans (Appendix, Table A2), the results were more disparate. In the Moore-Mittelbach study, the number of Mexican Americans (X26) emerged as the most important variable, while in my 35-city parallel Blacks as a percentage of the minority (X34) held the distinction. In the 58-city regression analysis, Mexican Americans as a percentage of the city population (X29) had the largest Beta weight and thus contributed the greatest explanatory power. The explained variance differed in each regression. The same general results, different "most powerful" variables and fluctuating degrees of explained variance were evident for the regression of Anglo-Black segregation (Appendix, Table A3).

From a methodological standpoint, Moore and Mittelbach experienced two major lapses: they failed to consider the serious confounding effects of multicollinearity and they atheoretically hunted for a "best equation." Blalock (1963: 233-234) observed that when multicollinearity occurs between independent variables, the sampling error will be quite large, the estimates of slopes will vary considerably from one sample to the next, and partial correlation coefficients will be unstable and sensitive to sampling errors. Such is the case with my 1970 regressions using 35 and 58 cities (Appendix, Tables A1-A3). While there is no method of determining if such would occur from Moore and Mittelbach's reported data we may examine this possibility in another fashion. Scrutiny of Moore and Mittelbach's correlation matrix (Appendix, Table A5) shows that six variables were correlated with each other at ±.69 or better and another 6 at ±.40 to .60. Altogether, 12 variables were intercorrelated at ±.40 or better. Such

intercorrelations increase the probability that their covariance with a dependent variable will cause a stepwise regression procedure to remove one of the correlated independent variables while retaining the other in the equation with one sample and reverse the selection in another sample. It can also be seen that my intercorrelations for 1970 were high; for the 35-city sample there were 2 variables intercorrelated at ±.70 or better and another 10 at ±.40 to .70, while in the larger sample there were 2 at ±.70 or better and another 17 at ±.40 to .70. Obviously, the problem of multicollinearity is present in all three regressions.

The second methodological problem lies in the methodology used. Stepwise multiple regression is an optimalization procedure which produces the "best" possible equation. Optimalization procedures give researchers "no way of knowing what portion of the variation among the variables is truly representative of the population and what portion represents 'wild' behavior of the particular sample. It utilizes all variation in picking values for b1, b2, etc. ..." (Harris, 1975: 46).

Moore and Mittelbach appear to have violated generally accepted guidelines for effective research. Robert Gordon (1968: 594) has written that "the presentation of all possible highest-order partials is a sure indication the researcher has not thought through the theoretical connections among his variables." And, Draper and Smith (1966: 172) pointed out that sensible judgement is still required in the initial selection of variables to be input into regression analysis programs. While their variables were chosen on the basis of past

research, they were not subsequently fitted into specific competing models, or explanations of residential segregation. The failure to do so, along with multicollinearity and the use of an optimalization technique transformed the Moore-Mittelbach "best" equation into little more than a cross-sectional multivariate fishing expedition which adds little to the evaluation of competing theoretical perspectives on the persistence of residential segregation. Thus, unless regression analysis can be strongly grounded in theory and/or its results vigorously tested for replicability, it seems to serve little purpose for the fruitful furtherance of sociological knowledge. What, then, can we derive from our regression analyses?

In an attempt to evaluate the validity of the equations obtained in the replication, I performed a split sample "reliability test." A 50 percent sample was chosen using a table of random numbers and a prediction equation was derived from that sample. The prediction equation was then tested for predictive ability on the second half of my study cities (Harris, 1970: 50). The calibre of the predictive ability of each equation was then measured by comparing the multiple R^2's of the first equation with the appropriate sample r^3 between predicted and observed indexes of the second sample. The results are reported in Table A6 of the Appendix.

What does all this mean? In the case of Mexican American from Anglo segregation, the equation produced by the first half of the sample explained 78 percent of the variance. When fit into the second half it explained 53 percent. The population's estimated explained variance utilizing this same equation lies between 53 and 78 percent,

exceptionally good by social science standards. For the Mexican American from Black case the results are horrendous as the estimated explained variance lies between 10 and 75 percent. The data used for predicting this equation exhibited extremely large variance producing the observed differential in multiple R^2 and simple r^2. The last equation, for Black-Anglo segregation, when applied to the total population can be expected to explain from 70 to 85 percent of the variance, astounding by social science standards.

Assuming that the split half regression analysis is accurate, as it produces high r^2's when its equation is used as a predictor, what we can safely say is that the variables in the Mexican American-Anglo segregation analysis can explain a maximum variance in residential segregation of from 53 to 78 percent; that those variables in the Black-Anglo analysis can explain a maximum of 70 to 85 percent of the variance in residential segregation; and that the variables in the Mexican American-Black analysis are virtually useless in predicting or explaining the segregation of these two groups. From such an analysis one might conclude that conventional demographic, economic and "cultural" variables account for a great degree of variance in minority-majority group residential segregation. The results for intermi-nority segregation are poor. Obviously, the evidence suggests that minority from minority and minority from majority segregation are two distinct phenomenon. What holds true for one need not hold true for the other. It might also be assumed, that discrimination as a cause of minority-majority segregation is minimal and buried amongst the unexplained variance. Thus, error and, perhaps, discrimination

account for from 22 to 47 percent of the variance ($1-R^2$ or $1-r^2$) in Mexican American-Anglo segregation and 15 to 30 percent of the variance in Black-Anglo segregation. This interpretation is admittedly simplistic but suffices, at this juncture, to make my point. We will return to this issue at a later time.

Having reviewed the hypothesis tests and their results it is now time to evaluate what they tell us about the three competing models. We proceed now to a brief discussion of how and why I reached my conclusions.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

Although numerous theories of residential segregation have been employed by sociologists and economists to describe observed ethnic residential patterns, neither the perspectives nor their underlying assumptions have been rigorously tested. A primary purpose of this study has been to work toward a broader and more rigorous examination of segregated residential patterns and existing theoretical arguments. While no work can conclusively prove or disprove a given theoretical perspective it can probe the issue further and raise unanswered questions and issues which may then be developed into new hypotheses and/or perspectives.

Having defined the three principal assimilationist-oriented models and operationalized them as well as available data permitted, the models were tested with demographic data on 58[1] Southwestern cities of various sizes and ethnic constitutions. Regression analyses of each of the two principal minority groups with the majority, and with each other, indicates that minority-majority segregation can be adequately accounted for by a combination of "traditional" socio-economic and demographic variables. On the other hand, interminority segregation involves other factors which could not be ascertained by the present quantitative analysis of census data. Let us now move from this generalized summary to a more detailed explanation of the

results of my analysis.

The market model contends that settlement in ghettos results primarily from the attraction of cheap housing. As Hollingshead observed "competition in a market ... gives society its more or less ecological base" (quoted in Firey, 1947: 16). The market model implies that at any given time the level of ethnic residential segregation is attributable to differences in a group's socioeconomic position (SES). One would expect, therefore, ethnic residential segregation to be accounted for by the SES differentials of the groups being compared. Given the improbability of constructing a realistic composite indicator of SES from aggregate census data the market model was approached in three steps: income as predictor, status (occupation) as predictor and housing cost (value if owned, rent otherwise) as a predictor.

The test of hypothesis which held that income segregation was unrelated to ethnic segregation showed that the relationship was generally of a magnitude that income could be designated as an important factor in the explanation of residential segregation by race or ethnicity. However, segregation by ethnicity or race was found to be significantly greater than segregation by income. But, while ethnic segregation was significantly greater than overall segregation by income among the low income levels ($T=-4.89$, 55 df, $p=.001$), ethnic segregation among high income levels was not ($T=-.93$, 55 df, $p=.359$). This is not inconsistent with previous findings that so-called "high type" Mexican Americans have generally assimilated into the Anglo middle-class population (see Taylor, 1934: 263; Dworkin, 1970: 397). The

results imply a diminution of segregation due to ethnic segregation per se and an increasing tendency toward segregation on a class basis. This is substantiated by the significantly greater segregation of Mexican Americans and Anglos at the lower income level than at the higher level (T=3.72, 55 df, p=.001). This issue of Mexican American -Anglo segregation by class and ethnicity might be further evaluated through the utilization of a cross-level ethnic analysis. For instance, the segregation of low income Anglos from high income Mexican Americans might be contrasted with existing information on Mexican American-Anglo high income segregation to provide a fuller understanding of ethnic segregation.

Segregation by ethnicity or race was found to significantly exceed segregation by occupational status for all three dependent variables. Thus, it would appear that race or ethnicity is the more crucial factor in the relationship. It would appear that it is race or ethnicity which determines one's occupational status and race, rather than occupation, which has the primary influence on where on lives.

An ethnic or racial minority's ability to afford available housing was found to be unrelated to its segregation from the majority. And, segregation by ethnicity or race was found to be of greater significance than segregation by rent level or value of owner occupied housing in all but the Mexican American-Anglo D. Thus, whereas Blackness continues to be a serious handicap, the implication is that residence, or prejudice, against Mexican Americans, especially those of "high type," has diminished to the point where their segregation

from the majority parallels the overall class segregation for the city. This is confirmed by the nonsignificant difference between overall low from high rent segregation and Mexican American low from high rent segregation.

At this point, by utilizing a simple model which the Teaubers illustrated parallels an indirect standardization, we can confirm the apparently greater influence exerted by racial and ethnic factors than by socioeconomic factors in majority-minority residential segregation. Table 16 illustrates that actual segregation indexes differ markedly from those expected on the basis of differentials in income, status, value of housing or rent. The data in the table casts serious doubt upon a "market model" interpretation of residential segregation as differentials in market, or economic, variables account for very little of the observed segregation.

The "voluntarist" perspective on residential segregation holds that new ethnic arrivals sought the security and warmth of an insular enclave which provided opportunity for the realization of self-respect on the basis of a "consciousness of kind." Banfield (1968: 81) and others (Gans, 1968: 37, 263; Kantrowitz, 1969: 685) have noted that, in larger cities, ethnic groups of the second, third and even later generations have been known to live in self-imposed isolation. Wirth (1938: 15) implied that large numbers of ethnics permit the emergence of a separate opportunity structure located exclusively within the confines of the ethnic community. In the testing of the relevant hypotheses neither minority population size nor auto nonownership[2] was a major factor in explaining residential segregation. Poverty levels

Table 16. Expected Indexes of Racial or Ethnic Residential Segregation Based on Income, Status, Housing Value and Rent Differentials, by City Population Size Categories, 1970

Quartiles (N=14)	Mexican American-Anglo Index				Mexican American-Black Index				Black-Anglo Index			
	Income	Status	Value	Rent	Income	Status	Value	Rent	Income	Status	Value	Rent
Largest Quartile												
Mean	7.0	9.4	11.6	11.7	3.0	2.2	4.4	4.5	9.5	9.6	14.9	12.8
Std. Dev.	2.8	3.2	5.6	9.0	1.5	1.5	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.8	6.3	9.0
Second Quartile												
Mean	7.4	7.0	11.1	10.7	2.4	2.8	3.0	6.3	9.1	7.7	12.7	13.8
Std. Dev.	3.3	3.7	5.2	6.7	2.1	2.5	2.0	4.4	4.1	3.8	5.6	9.0
Third Quartile												
Mean	7.6	6.9	8.6	10.4	3.0	3.1	4.0	5.8	10.6	7.5	11.5	11.9
Std. Dev.	4.2	3.9	5.4	6.7	2.7	2.6	4.0	4.0	4.9	4.4	5.1	7.0
Lowest Quartile												
Mean	8.3	6.3	8.1	13.8	5.1	9.9	4.2	6.3	11.4	9.5	10.8	20.7
Std. Dev.	4.7	5.4	6.0	11.7	3.3	12.2	4.3	4.4	5.7	7.7	7.0	11.0
All Cities												
Mean	7.6	7.4	9.8	11.6	3.4	4.5	3.9	10.1	10.1	8.6	12.5	14.8
Std. Dev.	3.8	4.2	5.7	8.6	2.6	7.0	3.5	8.6	4.6	5.1	6.1	9.5

more readily explained the degree of auto nonownership.

For intergenerational segregation, both first from second and first from third generation segregation were found to be related to interethnic segregation. Combined with the earlier finding that Mexican American-Anglo segregation had declined between 1960 and 1970 these results imply a corroboration of Wirth (1928: 74, 256) and Lieberson's (1963: 45) assimilationist perspectives. The third generation is moderately segregated from the second, which is moderately segregated from the third. All such differences were significant. As the Mexican American generations became more segregated (separated) from each other, overall Mexican American segregation from Anglos decreased. The more "Americanized," and therefore assimilated, generations were more acceptable to the majority population and left the pale of the barrio for the better neighborhoods of "Dick and Jane."

Qualitative and quantitative data generated from survey and participant observation also support an assimilationist interpretation of the propinquity issue. Dworkin (1970: 405) notes that foreign born Mexican Americans "did not view the ghetto as a final place of residence, but rather, as a 'stopping off point on their way to a better life'." Thus, Mexican Americans initially shared similar feelings with European ethnics. Lebeaux and Salas' (1973: 96) Detroit study illustrated that "Latinos" are no longer as concerned with the issue of a neighborhood's ethnicity as the early "voluntarists" feared. Case and Kirk's (1959: 20, 65, 68) study substantiates this. The type of neighborhood characteristics which are of greatest importance to Hispanics are good housing and safe neighborhoods, a response not

unlike that of other Americans. Watson and Samora (1970: 110) found disunity within the Mexican American community they studied. The absence of "community" is a direct contradiction of the propinquity argument. How can such an argument be adjudged adequate in the face of the findings in these four studies? I feel that it cannot, as all four studies indicate a strong tendency toward acculturation—the acceptance of the dominant group's housing-neighborhood values. An "Anglo Conformity" orientation appears to have slowly triumphed over any voluntaristic ethnic tendencies which may persist.

The exclusionary policies approach focuses on discriminatory practices, both individual and institutional, as an explanation for residential segregation. The middle-class Black or Mexican American is not allowed to compete for better housing in an open market because of exclusionary practices (Helper, 1969: 4). As in the Moore and Mittelbach study (1966) quantitatively operationalizing discrimination proved difficult. From the literature, a hypothesis utilizing a tangential measure was developed and tested. Both the proportion Black and the proportion Mexican American were found to have moderate direct relationships with minority-majority segregation. Neither was of major importance in explaining the variance in residential segregation. In an analysis of intercensal segregation change, minority population changes were of little importance in explaining an increment or decrease in segregation over the decade 1960-1970, whereas majority population change was.

The question of whether any model is adequate may by this time be raised. A specific conclusion that discriminatory behavior is

primarily responsible for the residential segregation of minority groups (as implied in the exclusionary practices approach) is not warranted on the basis of the data in this limited study. However, a generalization may be made to the effect that I have provided sufficient evidence to suggest that any of the assimilationist perspectives are inadequate for assessing the impact of residential segregation. There are numerous inferences to be made from the present data as well as other sources. By utilizing SES variables it was found that the economic arguments generally used were inadequate as major explanations of any residential segregation persists. Utilization of minority size and intergenerational data also illustrate the incompleteness of the voluntarist perspective. The additional data in Table 16 and the research literature on Mexican American housing preferences substantiated these findings. In contrast, these same materials cannot but buttress, by inference, an exclusionary argument. Additionally, ethnic differences in housing patterns are not based solely on income, occupational or educational characteristics devoid from the influence of ethnic membership. It is doubtful that any economic, cultural or demographic variable found to be influential in explaining residential segregation could adequately withstand tests for the absence of ethnic contamination. Even those variables input into the split half regression which had good replication show signs of contamination. The percentage of overcrowded housing can be interpreted as having three distinct causes: inability to afford better housing, large extended families (propinquity) or denial of access to more adequate housing which consequently establishes/reinforces overcrowding.

Which is it? The ratio of Mexican American median income to overall median income is a measure of differentiation which could have as its cause educational-occupational differences or discriminatory exclusion from, or practices within, specific areas of the labor market. Recent studies have illustrated continued economic discrimination against Mexican Americans, even at comparable levels of education and occupational level (see Poston and Alvirez, 1973; Poston, Alvirez and Tienda, 1976). Again, can we distinguish what constitutes discriminatory and nondiscriminatory differentiation? The number of Mexican Americans, ratio of Mexican Americans to Blacks, Blacks as a percentage of the minority population and Mexican Americans as a percentage of the total population can all be viewed as more than mere demographic variables. Anglo-Mexican American and Anglo-Black segregation decreased over the decade, but then so did Anglo population. An increased minority presence lead to a decreased majority presence and decreased segregation from the majority. How so? One plausible explanation is that Anglos may have left the inner cities with their large minority populations for the more racially homogenous suburbs. Suburbanization increased during the same period majority-minority segregation and the proportion of majority population decreased. While we can only speculate on this issue using the aggregate demographic data in this study there appears to be a good deal of truth to Allport's (1958: 220-222), and others', observation that an increment in a minority's visibility within a city is perceived as a threat to stability by the majority, one of whose available options is "flight," and another of which is steadfast entrenchment

(segregationist neighborhood associations, etc.).

It cannot be forgotten that restrictive covenants against both Blacks and Mexican Americans were in vogue prior to their being declared unconstitutional in 1948. As Israel Zangwill (Wirth, 1928: 118) and Loren Miller (Vose, 1959: 212) both so aptly noted, the ghetto (barrio) became an institution and came to pervade the actions and attitudes of both individuals and groups. De jure segregation may have been legally proscribed after 1948 but evidence, as late as 1970, of continued de facto segregation exists.

While there are difficulties in relying upon attitudes as predictors of behavior there are a number of survey studies which add substantially to an understanding of the exclusionary practices perspective on residential segregation as discussed in the literature. Mexican Americans view themselves, and are more frequently viewed by Anglos, as "white" (Taylor, 1934: 268). An attitude survey of 319 non-Hispanic native whites revealed a greater tolerance toward Mexican Americans than Blacks. Average Mexican American-Black discrepancies on favorable responses ranged from a low of 22 percent in reference to their integration into white neighborhoods to a high of 28 percent for a question on service in restaurants (Pinkney, 1970: 75 and Table 1). Field observations substantiated the findings, Anglos exhibited greater acceptance toward Mexican Americans than Blacks in public places. Anglos were also more willing to accord Mexican Americans greater rights. Insofar as attitudes are concerned the study found considerably less prejudice toward the Mexican American than toward Blacks (Pinkney, 1970: 77, 79-80). Using a stratified sample

of Anglos, Blacks and Mexican Americans in Houston, Davidson and Gaitz (1973: Table 1) obtained the same results—Mexican Americans were more acceptable to Anglos than were Blacks. Thirty percent more of the Anglos found Mexican Americans more acceptable than Blacks as neighbors. The results of such attitudinal studies are mirrored in my residential segregation indexes. Blacks are more segregated from Anglos than are Mexican Americans. It can be inferred from this that prejudice is frequently translated into discriminatory behavior and plays an important, if not crucial, role in the selection of housing by minority group members (see Northwood and Barth, 1965).

The world of liking and disliking also creates interminority divisions—Black-Mexican American segregation is high. Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 13) make reference to markedly different patterns in each group's history of urbanization. Blacks are viewed as late-comers attracted by an expanding opportunity structure made possible by the Southwest's rapidly developing industrialization (1966: 32). Incoming Blacks settled in areas removed from long-standing areas of traditional Mexican American occupancy. While this appears plausible it is also somewhat simplistic and superficial analysis.

Mexican American-Black relations have long been strained in the Southwest, and elsewhere. As early as the early 1930's Mexican Americans expressed their dislike of Blacks (Taylor, 1934: 158). Again, subjective perceptions of reality played an important role. Mexican Americans perceived, and continue to perceive, themselves as "white" and "superior" to Blacks, a sentiment not much discouraged by the Anglo majority (Taylor, 1934: 129, 254-55, 268). This perception,

along with some misperceptions, has continued over the decades. In the 1960's Madsen (1973: 16) could quote a presumably enlightened Mexican American college youth as saying "We're not like the Negroes. They want to be white men because they have no history to be proud of." In 1965-66, Grebler, et. al. (1970: Table 16-4, 391) found from 43 to 54 percent of their Mexican American respondents in Bakersfield, Los Angeles and San Antonio perceived finding most people at a party Black to be distasteful. From 11 to 34 percent found it distasteful to eat at the same table with Blacks. Davidson and Gaitz (1973: 745) note that Mexican Americans in Los Angeles and San Antonio rejected the idea of a political coalition with Blacks by a 3 to 1 margin. They also found (1973: Table 3, 744) that 77 percent of their Mexican American respondents felt that an owner should not have to sell to Blacks if she or he did not want to. It is highly doubtful that the respondents were nearly all civil libertarians, what is more likely is that they were expressing their own subliminal feelings about being "forced" to live near Blacks at some subsequent date if open housing laws were stringently enforced. The authors noted with regard to the rest of their analysis that the wording of the items tended to solicit positive responses. Subjects were not asked about admitting sizable numbers of Blacks to their neighborhoods, churches or jobs but rather a single Black, or Mexican American. Mexican American affirmative response regarding the willingness to have Blacks as neighbors was a low 76 percent, whereas Blacks responded at a much more positive level of 94 percent (Davidson and Gaitz, 1973: Table 1, 741).

Such prejudicial reactions on the part of Mexican Americans

are not part of a unidimensional pattern, interminority prejudice is a two way street. Blumer's (1958: 5) contention that such antagonisms were initially shaped by a sense of economic competition for the limited number of resources made available by the dominant Anglo population was substantiated by Shankman's (1975) research on the Black press. By 1935 the Black press was totally unsympathetic toward the plight of the Mexican whom they categorized as a "poor people accustomed to nothing more than an adobe shack, a blanket, and a tortilla" (1975: 51, 55n). Antipathy was based on jealousy according to Shankman, if the fear of not being able to find a scarce job because of cheap competition from Mexico can be characterized as "jealousy." As a result of fear predicated on economic competition, Blacks internalized the negative images of Mexican Americans held by the dominant Anglo population, including that group's failure to distinguish between native born Americans of Mexican descent who shared the Blacks' plight and the Mexican national who flodded across the Rio Grande in search of a decent livelihood. As a result Blacks became as vehemently anti-immigrationist as the most Darwinistic white nativists.

Moore and Mittelbach made a very insightful comment regarding Mexican American-Black segregation which provides an assessment for continued high segregation between these two groups. It should be reiterated at this juncture that Black-Mexican American segregation rose an average 3 percent in the 42 city analysis of intercensal change. Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 33) suggested that Mexican American family size was an important factor in accounting for inter-minorith segregation. Their results suggested that the less Mexican

Americans are acculturated the more likely they are to share segregated residential areas with Blacks. This point is extremely important and we shall return to it shortly.

Myrdal (1944: 603), in speaking of European immigrants, noted that while they are initially less prejudiced than native whites they "will often develop a more intense prejudice than the natives after they have lived in the United States for awhile." As early as the 1930's Taylor (1934: 268-69, 297) noted that the trend in Mexican American attitudes was away from an association with Blacks and toward an alignment with Anglos. Thus, a people who began their contacts with Blacks along the Texas border by befriending them (see also Shankman, 1975: 44) became "Americanized" in their values as they sought to protect and enhance recently achieved social rewards. Faced with Anglo attitudes towards Blacks and a desire to elevate their own standing in the community, Mexican Americans adopted Anglo attitudes as their own. These negative conceptions have continued partially because of the Texas-Mexican's proximity to the Southern ethos (Penalosa, 1973: 62). That such is the case is substantiated by Grebler, et. al.'s (1970: 393) finding that San Antonio exhibited a greater expression of prejudice than their two California cities and that Texas-born residents of the California cities were more prejudiced towards Blacks than those born outside of Texas. Again we have indirect evidence pointing toward increasing Mexican American acculturation: greater segregation from a pariah Black population and less segregation from the dominant group, especially among the third and later generations. But there is still much more work needed in the area of interminority

relations if we are to achieve an accurate overview of both the maintenance and expansion of residential segregation and the acculturation process of ethnic minorities.

One of the most serious drawbacks in segregation research has been dominance by assimilationist interpretations—both in theoretical and empirical works. A number of sociologists writing from an exclusionary practices perspective imply that the housing choices open to many minority group members are severely restricted, that these consist primarily of the opportunity of moving into a better ghetto. These exclusionary-oriented sociologists imply that better housing lies outside the ghetto and, therefore, that the solution to the housing problems of minority groups lies in integrating the better neighborhoods. Herein lies the myopia of their perspective—in order to improve their condition ethnic or racial minorities must integrate and, by implication, acculturate. The idealist emerges triumphant over the pragmatist in their proposals, with the result that little has been accomplished with regard to housing conditions among the minority group as a whole. The assimilationist bent of segregation research is evident in the differentials of the indexes themselves. Relative to Black-Anglo segregation, Mexican American-Anglo segregation is much lower. Mexican Americans can assimilate because their skin color (for the most part) permits them to evaporate into the mainstream of American life if they have acculturated. On the other hand, even acculturated Blacks face severe handicaps as cannot simply leave their skin colors behind and meld unobserved into the mainstream culture. This is reflected in the indexes, yet rarely is it

reflected upon in the literature. Even Mexican American attitudes toward Blacks, and earlier Black attitudes toward Mexicans, are reflections of the successful operation of assimilationist forces. Mexican Americans from Texas appeared to have internalized the dominant white population's negative attitudes toward Blacks.

There is, presently, no other choice—if you want better housing you must search outside the ghetto or barrio, even if you would prefer to remain. The real problem is not segregation per se, but equal housing. Too much emphasis has been placed in previous, and ongoing, research on the segregation indexes and their numerical values. Are they increasing, decreasing, or have they stabilized? Where are the questions regarding the quality of life, the quality of minority housing conditions? Social scientists have overlooked the issue of housing conditions—has minority housing improved, stabilized or deteriorated in quality? This question is of much greater theoretical and practical significance than that concerning the indexes. Social science research's assimilationist conception that integration indicates equalization appears to be at the root of many minority group members' continued housing problems. We have been all-too-concerned with equality through integration and failed to realize that quality housing can be objectively measured against a standard unrelated to integration. We have focussed so long on assimilationist perspectives with obvious Anglo Conformity orientations that we have failed to realize that segregation is of itself not evil. When segregation involves socioeconomic inequalities and limited opportunities we are justified in seeking to correct these conditions. But, these

conditions can be combatted independently of segregation. If segregation were to become primarily voluntary in nature, its interpretation as an evil to be battled could only come from an assimilationist value system and its cultural premises. We in the social sciences need to open our eyes and broaden our perspectives, we have to loosen the bonds of an assimilationist mind—set in an attempt to accurately evaluate and meet minority-group housing needs.

If social and economic planners are to derive new strategies for reducing the negative impact of residential segregation, they must realize that their assimilationist biases have affected their "success." Strategies aimed at alleviating the housing problems of Blacks and Mexican Americans must consider more than integration. Economic, social, and legal realities need to be considered. There is a lack of sincere public support for a massive attack on the problems of the city. Suburban residents are comfortable with their experience of continuous improvement, have grown accustomed to it, and cannot be made to readily sacrifice any of the amenities, as the recent energy crisis has illustrated.

Weissbourd (1964: 6-11) argued for a "total" program recognizing the interdependence of city and suburbs but acknowledged that existent segregative practices were obstacles to such an approach. Because the ethnic and racial ghettos would not disappear of themselves and the effects of nondiscrimination policies in sales and rentals were expected to be minimal, Weissbourd called for a major plan to "bring about a more uniform and just distribution of these people among the population as a whole." The implications were, as others

have also noted, that any meaningful social change involved the disruption and dislodging of not only vested interests, but people (groups) as well. An architect, Izumi, added a vitally important note when he said

> When we are dealing with human beings, we cannot afford to group them for convenience and expedience and then house them under one classification if we really want to develop a self-adjusting and perpetual solution to the problem (in Michelson, 1970: 35).

Brown's (1965: 76-77) comment that neither legislation nor good will has been an effective approach to the reduction of segregated housing is well taken. Our experience has illustrated that laws aimed at equalization have not brought a solution to the original problems (Abrams, 1966: 518). Yet, few people question the appropriateness of an integrative approach. If it has been given its chance and has not succeeded, why do we insist on perpetuating failure? It should be acknowledged that existing residential patterns within cities are too firmly fixed, that any population shifts and disruptions necessary for equalization would be excessive, and that Anglo opposition to any such program would be staggering. As Hartman (1969: 435) noted years ago, "It seems quite probable that we have passed the point where massive integration of the races can be an element of a housing program that will improve the lot of the vast majority of the slum dwellers, ..., in a relatively short time span ..."

Brown's (1965: 76-77) implications were that the real estate industry has always responded to economic rather than socio-legal pressures. The Taeubers (1969: 20) implied that the agencies with the power over the basic financial structure of the housing market and

those which extensively underwrote the market held the solutions in their hands. Had these agencies been properly oriented toward a policy of overall national improvement in housing, they could have exploited the dire situation of the construction industry a few years ago to initiate important changes—they did not. I am not so naive that I have overlooked the exclusionists' evaluations of the government's past role in buttressing private sector discrimination or its pseudo laissez faire economic philosophy. Past housing policy has been successful in meeting the housing needs of only limited numbers of upwardly mobile, middle class, acculturated minority group members. Vast number of minority peoples continue to be ill-housed. If segregation, in the sense of vastly unequal opportunities and poor housing conditions, is to be combatted effectively many changes need to be made in the policies of the very federal bureaucracies that once gave the "racists" sustenance. The operation at cross-purposes of federal programs must be eliminated and housing policy consolidated into a very limited number of sub-agencies, with specific duties, within HUD. Despite the failure and excesses of urban renewal, its basic philosophy of improving ghetto housing is sound and represents an alternative avenue toward solving minority group housing problems. A national housing policy focussing on the improvement of existing barrio and ghetto housing, and the construction of adequate new low-cost housing in the barrios and/or ghettos, is suggested. Individual, upwardly mobile, acculturated minority-group members could retain their right to move away from the ethnically oriented barrio or ghetto and into Anglo-oriented, non-ethnic areas if they so desired.

Prospective Scholarship

It is as important to generate new questions as it is to provide the "right" answers when doing research. The suggestion of theoretical and methodological considerations for future research on segregated housing patterns is crucial and I feel the following observations are pertinent.

(1) Moore and Mittelbach noted that minority perceptions of cities (images) were important. The issue of circulatory or mutual reinforcement needs to be investigated. Does the greater recognition of discrimination lead to a greater withdrawal by the minority population? What housing and neighborhood preferences do minority group members hold? Why?

(2) The feeling for community needs to be ascertained. Do Barrio and ghetto residents in the Southwest view themselves as belonging to a "community"? Studies of this type have been badly neglected and we must not fall prey to *a priori* assumptions that such perceptions do, or do not, exist (Penalosa, 1973: 61).

(3) Both Lieberson (1963: 9) and Michelson (1970: 66) suggest that it would be interesting to learn whether, and in what respects, persons living in the barrios are less assimilated than those residing outside the enclave, and I concur.

(4) There is a need for the study of residential succession in mixed Black-Mexican American neighborhoods. This is a dimension which appears not to have been explored and offers potential insight into both the larger process of residential succession and interminority relations.

(5) From a methodological standpoint, the reworking of census accounts is not enough—careful original sample surveys are needed (Penalosa, 1973: 60). Qualitative investigations, such as studies of regional and city histories, or the role of public housing within them, offers fertile ground for causal research. The value of local historical knowledge for determining factors peculiar to individual cities has long been recognized (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969: 19) but little appears in the literature of the Southwest.

(6) Finally, the analysis within the work is incomplete. Further work needs to be done in both interminority and majority-minority residential segregation by class, status and housing-condition factors. Both types of research may be accomplished through the utilization of the same technique: intergroup, cross category comparisons (e.g. majority high status from minority low status segregation).

A Brief Summation

There are always alternate explanations. However, the present review shows that all the recognized alternative explanations have had an assimilationist bent. Much more detailed quantitative and qualitative research needs to be done. While race and ethnicity are important known elements influencing the degree of residential segregation over time, we know much less about more socially significant changes in housing conditions. The past failure of assimilationist social science research to accurately evaluate and integrationist policy to ameliorate minority housing problems must be offset by new, more open-minded investigative endeavors if further programs aimed at

changing minority housing conditions are to be successful for a wide range of minority Americans.

Table A1. Comparison of Moore and Mittelbach "Best Equation" for 1960 Data with Replication for 1970, Mexican American-Anglo Index of Dissimilarity as Dependent Variable

Independent Variables	1960 Data				1970 Data with 35 Cities					1970 Data with 58 Cities				
	b	T-value	Beta*	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.
Cultural														
X_5 Percent Mexican American O.H.U. with 5 persons or more [1]	.79	2.80	.46	.01	.63	.30	4.47	.33	.043	.70	.18	14.31	.37	.000
X_6 Percent Black O.H.U. with 5 persons or more	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Economic														
X_{16} Ratio of total median income to Mexican American median income [2]	25.90	2.11	.37	.05	30.99	12.05	6.61	.40	.015	29.68	8.23	12.99	.33	.001
X_{20} Income differentiation among Mexican Americans [3]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{17} Ratio of total median income to Black median income [4]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Demographic														
X_{23} Total City Population	.00001	2.41	.41	.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{26} Number of Mexican Americans	--	--	--	--	.37	.12	9.45	.38	.004	.41	.12	11.05	.28	.002
X_{32} Ratio of Mexican Americant to Blacks	-.09	-2.58	-.43	.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table A1 continued

Independent Variables	1960 Data				1970 Data with 35 Cities					1970 Data with 58 Cities				
	b	T-value	Beta*	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.
Demographic continued														
X_{34} Blacks as percent of minority	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{29} Mexican Americans as percent of total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{39} Relative increase Mexican Americans[5]	-.71	-1.25	-.23	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{36} Percent increase Mexican Americans[6]	--	--	--	--	-.86	.49	3.12	-.23	.087	-.95	.25	14.64	-.34	.000
Intercept			58.91				-4.88					-5.21		
Multiple R^2			.69				.56					.65		

Source: Adapted from Moore and Mittelbach (1966: Table C-1); U. S. Bureau of the Census (1972).

*The Beta coefficient reported here is reported as the partial correlation coefficient in Moore and Mittelbach. They note, however, that with one minor exception the ranking of the variables according to magnitudes of their Beta and partial coefficients was the same.

[1]I have used Mexican American for purposes of consistency and clarify, Moore and Mittelbach used the more technical White Persons of Spanish Surname (WPSS) in their table. O.H.U. represents occupied housing units. There is a slight discrepancy between the Moore and Mittelbach variable and my own because census reporting categories changed from 1960 to 1970, my data is based on 6 persons or more per unit.
[2]Total population median family income divided by Mexican American median family income.
[3]Percent Mexican Americans within plus or minus $1,000 of Mexican American median income category.
[4]Total population median family income divided by Black median family income.
[5]Mexican Americans as percent of total 1960 (or 1970) less Mexican Americans as percent of total 1950 (or 1960) plus 100.
[6]Percent increase in Mexican Americans, 1950-1960, in county. Lopez data uses city in place of county for 1960-1970 due to multiple county central cities and single counties with multiple central cities.

Table A2. Comparison of Moore and Mittelbach "Best Equation" for 1960 Data with Replication for 1970, Mexican American-Black Index of Dissimilarity as Dependent Variable

Independent Variables	1960 Data				1970 Data with 35 Cities					1970 Data with 58 Cities				
	b	T-value	Beta*	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.
Cultural														
X_5 Percent Mexican American O.H.U. with 5 persons or more 1	--	--	--	--	.75	.36	4.26	.28	.048	.84	.33	6.57	.34	.014
X_6 Percent Black O.H.U. with 5 persons or more	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.86	.47	3.38	-.22	.072
Economic														
X_{16} Ratio of total median income to Mexican American median income 2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{20} Income differentiation among Mexican Americans[3]	.58	2.15	.37	.05	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{17} Ratio of total median income to Black median income 4	--	--	--	--	13.95	9.34	2.23	.24	.146	10.40	7.22	2.08	.19	.156
Demographic														
X_{23} Total City Population	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{26} Number of Mexican Americans	.00014	3.96	.59	.01	.73	.17	19.39	.53	.000	.77	.21	13.66	.39	.001
X_{32} Ratio of Mexican Americant to Blacks	--	--	--	--	.15	.77	3.93	.31	.057	-.50	.25	3.91	-.36	.054
X_{34} Blacks as percent of minority	.34	3.24	.52	.01	40.85	8.06	25.68	.66	.000	28.00	8.39	11.41	.42	.002

Table A2 continued

Independent Variables	1960 Data				1970 Data with 35 Cities					1970 Data with 58 Cities				
	b	T-value	Beta*	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.
Demographic continued														
X_{29} Mexican Americans as percent of total	-.27	-1.59	-.28	--	--	--	--	--	--	.42	.17	6.42	.60	.015
X_{39} Relative Increase Mexican Americans[5]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2.19	.71	9.46	.46	.003
X_{36} Percent Increase Mexican Americans[6]	-.08	-2.07	-.36	.05	--	--	--	--	--	.14	.47	8.45	.38	.006
Intercept		26.43					1.77					-198.85		
Multiple R^2		.54					.61					.59		

Source: Adapted from Moore and Mittelbach (1966: Table C-1); U. S. Bureau of the Census (1972).

*The Beta coefficient reported here is reported as the partial correlation coefficient in Moore and Mittelbach. They note, however, that with only one minor exception the ranking of the variables according to magnitudes of their Beta and partial coefficients was the same.

[1]I have used Mexican American for purposes of consistency and clarity, Moore and Mittelbach used the more technical White Persons of Spanish Surname (WPSS) in their table. O.H.U. represents occupied housing units. There is a slight discrepancy between the Moore and Mittelbach variable and my own because census reporting categories changed from 1960 to 1970, my data is based on 6 persons or more per unit.
[2]Total population median family income divided by Mexican American median family income.
[3]Percent Mexican Americans within plus or minus $1,000 of Mexican American median income category.
[4]Total population median family income divided by Black median family income.
[5]Mexican Americans as percent of total 1960 (or 1970) less Mexican Americans as percent of total 1950 (or 1960) plus 100.
[6]Percent increase in Mexican Americans, 1950-1960, in county. Lopez data uses city in place of county for 1960-1970 due to multiple county central cities and single counties with multiple central cities.

Table A3. Comparison of Moore and Mottelbach "Best Equation" for 1960 Data with Replication for 1970, Black-Anglo Index of Dissimilarity as Dependent Variable

Independent Variables	1960 Data				1970 Data with 35 Cities					1970 Data with 58 Cities				
	b	T-Value	Beta*	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.
Cultural														
X_5 Percent Mexican American O.H.U. with 5 persons or more [1]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.97	.22	20.06	.41	.000
X_6 Percent Black O.H.U. with 5 persons or more	.61	2.16	.37	.05	1.12	.51	4.89	.24	.035	--	--	--	--	--
Economic														
X_{16} Ratio of total median income to Mexican American median income [2]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{20} Income differentiation among Mexican Americans [3]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{17} Ratio of total median income to Black median income [4]	21.21	3.70	.56	.01	35.88	6.04	35.25	.63	.000	19.83	5.26	14.21	.37	.000
Demographic														
X_{23} Total City Population	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.11	.35	10.87	.30	.002
X_{26} Number of Mexican Americans	.00005	2.46	.41	.05	.57	.15	14.43	.42	.001	--	--	--	--	--
X_{32} Ratio of Mexican Americans to Blacks	-.10	-2.97	-.48	.01	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table A3 continued

Independent Variables	1960 Data				1970 Data with 35 Cities					1970 Data with 58 Cities				
	b	T-value	Beta*	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-value	Beta	Sig.
Demographic continued														
X_{34} Blacks as percent of minority	--	--	--	--	21.96	6.41	11.75	.36	.002	22.92	6.47	12.55	.36	.001
X_{29} Mexican Americans as Percent of total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{39} Relative increase Mexican Americans[5]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
X_{36} Percent increase Mexican Americans[6]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Intercept		29.23					-9.56					10.16		
Multiple R^2		.49					.70					.59		

Source: Adapted from Moore and Mittelbach (1966: Table C-1); U. S. Bureau of the Census (1972).

*The Beta coefficient reported here is reported as the partial correlation coefficient in Moore and Mittelbach. They note, however, that with one minor exception the ranking of the variables according to magnitudes of their Beta and partial coefficients was the same.

[1]I have used Mexican American for purposes of consistency and clarity, Moore and Mittelbach used the more technical White Persons of Spanish Surname (WPSS) in their table. O.H.U. represents occupied housing units. There is a slight discrepancy between the Moore and Mittelbach variable and my own because census reporting categories changed from 1960 to 1970, my data is based on 6 persons or more per unit.
[2]Total population median family income divided by Mexican American median family income.
[3]Percent Mexican Americans within plus or minus $1,000 or Mexican American median income category.
[4]Total population median family income divided by Black median family income.
[5]Mexican Americans as percent of total 1960 (or 1970) less Mexican Americans as percent of total 1950 (or 1960) plus 100.
[6]Percent increase in Mexican Americans, 1950-1960, in county. Lopez data uses city in place of county for 1960-1970 due to multiple county central cities and single counties with multiple central cities.

Table A4. Intercorrelations of Independent Variables, Moore and Mittelbach Study

	X_5	X_6	X_{16}	X_{17}	X_{20}	X_{23}	X_{26}	X_{29}	X_{32}	X_{34}	X_{36}	X_{39}
X_5	--	.26	.70	.52	.71	-.30	-.07	.27	.17	.18	.59	-.11
X_6		--	.15	.84	.06	-.17	-.20	-.07	.01	.02	.13	-.10
X_{16}			--	.45	.69	-.15	-.07	-.03	-.13	.04	.35	.34
X_{17}				--	.40	-.19	-.25	-.13	-.02	.61	.05	.04
X_{20}					--	-.26	-.10	.20	-.19	.08	.11	-.02
X_{23}						--	.76	-.09	-.11	.07	.05	.06
X_{26}							--	.38	.06	-.22	-.16	-.08
X_{29}								--	.81	.49	-.42	-.39
X_{32}									--	.27	-.27	-.36
X_{34}										--	.26	.21
X_{36}											--	.42
X_{39}												--
MEAN	41.1	26.7	1.33	1.57	46.8	301,950	37,966	14.5	8.7	27.4	87.5	101.6
STD. DEV.	7.3	4.5	0.17	0.22	7.7	442,302	58,936	15.4	37.7	21.3	55.4	2.7

Table A5. Intercorrelations of Independent Variables and Correlations of Independent Variables with Dependent Variables, Replication of Moore and Mittelbach "Best Equation" with 1970 Data, 35 Cities

	X_5	X_6	X_{16}	X_{17}	X_{20}	X_{23}	X_{26}	X_{29}	X_{32}	X_{34}	X_{36}	X_{39}	D_1	D_2	D_3
X_5	--	.49	.57	.23	.64	-.32	-.17	.25	.20	-.21	-.02	-.16	.53	.17	.14
X_6		--	.12	-.10	.15	-.37	-.39	.03	.16	-.05	.11	-.06	.17	-.07	.12
X_{16}			--	.44	.49	-.05	-.05	-.14	-.19	-.17	-.06	.19	.53	.0001	.29
X_{17}				--	-.09	-.06	-.18	-.55	-.57	.29	.21	.27	.11	.22	.68
X_{20}					--	-.32	-.23	.15	.22	-.06	.10	-.02	.30	.13	-.07
X_{23}						--	.86	-.06	-.12	.17	.12	.22	.16	.43	.30
X_{26}							--	.30	.02	-.13	-.38	-.06	.31	.36	.17
X_{29}								--	.79	-.65	-.44	-.59	.31	-.07	-.48
X_{32}									--	-.38	-.03	-.40	.06	-.006	-.54
X_{34}										--	.65	.24	-.28	.49	.48
X_{36}											--	-.11	-.18	.23	.25
X_{39}												--	-.23	.15	.25
MEAN	22.7	17.0	1.25	1.49	19.3	357,342	68,816	20.7	8.9	33.7	93.8	60.2	45.5	59.8	74.2
STD. DEV.	5.3	3.0	0.13	0.24	3.7	508,234	102,236	16.5	28.9	22.8	2.9	26.6	9.9	14.2	13.9

D_1 = The index of dissimilarity for Mexican Americans from Anglos
D_2 = The Index of dissimilarity for Mexican Americans from Blacks
D_3 = The Index of dissimilarity for Blacks from Anglos

Table A6. Intercorrelations of Independent Variables and Correlations of Independent Variables with Dependent Variables, Replication of Moore and Mittelbach "Best Equation" with 1970 Data, 58 Cities

	X_5	X_6	X_{16}	X_{17}	X_{20}	X_{23}	X_{26}	X_{29}	X_{32}	X_{34}	X_{36}	X_{39}	D_1	D_2	D_3
X_5	--	.13	.42	.06	.61	-.23	-.08	.54	.41	-.19	-.36	-.37	.62	.08	.29
X_6		--	.23	.15	-.11	-.16	-.17	-.22	-.42	.17	.32	-.001	.03	.01	.09
X_{16}			--	.42	.34	-.01	-.01	-.10	-.21	-.06	-.04	-.04	.50	.08	.35
X_{17}				--	-.02	.01	-.09	-.45	-.50	.42	.20	.08	.15	.35	.55
X_{20}					--	-.26	-.15	.50	.37	-.13	-.26	-.41	.48	.01	.11
X_{23}						--	.87	-.13	-.18	.21	-.03	.09	.15	.41	.29
X_{26}							--	.13	-.10	-.02	-.24	-.11	.28	.34	.20
X_{29}								--	.74	-.57	-.63	-.56	.38	-.21	-.18
X_{32}									--	-.43	-.41	-.29	.18	-.30	-.19
X_{34}										--	.56	.17	-.06	.53	.50
X_{36}											--	.12	-.22	.27	.14
X_{39}												--	-.53	.12	-.08
MEAN	23.0	16.5	1.24	1.46	19.5	246,285	47,070	24.2	46.2	28.4	93.6	67.8	42.9	55.0	70.7
STD. DEV.	6.7	4.3	0.14	0.30	4.4	418,762	83,793	23.4	118.2	24.9	3.5	45.3	12.6	16.5	15.9

D_1 = The index of dissimilarity for Mexican Americans from Anglos

D_2 = The index of dissimilarity for Mexican Americans from Blacks

D_3 = The index of dissimilarity for Blacks from Anglos

Table A7. Predictor Equations for Split Sample Regression "Test"

Independent Variables*	Mexican American-Anglo					Mexican American-Black					Black-Anglo				
	b	Std. E	F-Value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-Value	Beta	Sig.	b	Std. E	F-Value	Beta	Sig.
Cultural															
X_5	1.11	.26	17.44	.52	.01	.88	.41	4.64	.34	.01	.98	.41	5.67	.36	.01
X_6															
Economic															
X_{16}	22.59	11.04	3.96	.23	.01	-44.93	16.72	7.22	-.38	.01	28.60	18.63	18.63	2.36	.23
X_{20}						1.96	.59	10.92	.60	.01					
X_{17}						18.97	7.53	6.36	.34	.01	15.38	8.57	3.22	.26	.05
Demographic															
X_{23}						<.01	.00	23.09	.56	.01	<.01	<.01	9.33	.38	.01
X_{26}	<.01	<.001	12.70	.36	.01						.04	.03	1.72	-.19	--
X_{32}															
X_{34}	6.68	5.14	2.30	.14	--	17.40	7.50	5.38	.30	.01	14.93	8.18	3.33	.25	.05
X_{29}															
X_{36}	-.10	.03	9.78	-.33	.01										
X_{39}															
Intercept			-9.75					13.84					-18.25		
Multiple R^2			.78					.75					.70		

*See Table C1 for the operationalization of variables.

APPENDICES

CHAPTER NOTES

CHAPTER II

1. For a more detailed historical overview it is suggested that the reader consult Taylor (1934), McWilliams (1948), Alvarez (1973) or McLemore (1973).

2. The official immigration figures for Mexicans legally entering the U. S. are:

1911-1920	219,004
1921-1930	459,287
1931-1940	22,319
1941-1950	60,589
1951-1960	299,811
1961-1970	413,937

As presented in Leonard Dinnerstein and David M. Reimers, Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975), pp. 165, 167, 169.

3. I have employed the term "Mexican American" for the sake of clarity, Moore and Mittelbach alternate between it and the more technical White Persons of Spanish Surname (WPSS).

4. The exclusion of Mexican Americans as "nonwhite" is also reflected in a deed recorded as the Edinburg, Texas, Courthouse on December 8, 1947:

> ... All the lots in the tract are intended as a residential district exclusively for people of the white race, and no sale, lease, use or occupancy under any kind of contract of any lot or building shall be permitted to anyone not of Caucasoid race; provided, however, that this restriction shall not be construed to prevent occupancy by domestic servants of a different race or nationality employed by the owner or tenant.

Chapter III

1. The Black sociologist, Charles Johnson noted in a similar view: "Mexicans [were] taking the least desirable jobs, pushing up

Negroes in turn pushed up the foreign born, who in turn pushed up the white natives" (Shankman, 1975: 50).

2. As I interpret it, Wirth's reference was to structural assimilation, in which immigrant group members relate to members of other groups at intimate, friendship, and family-formation levels without any regard to ethnic differences. Whereas in the former case (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965: 535; Kramer, 1970: 62, 82) the reference appears to be to cultural assimilation, i.e. acculturation, involving the learning of the manners and style of the new society by the immigrants.

3. Much of the argument that the experiences of Mexican Americans parallel those of Blacks is predicated on observations, such as that of Robin M. Williams, Jr. (1964: 7), that "treatment of Mexican-Americans was similar to that of Negroes."

4. Anthony Downs evaluated the general unwillingness of whites to share social space with Blacks as due to their desire

> ... to be sure that the social, cultural and economic milieu and values of their own group dominant their own residential environment and the educational environment of their children" (quotes in Rose, 1969: 12).

5. The label "nonwhite" has been applied to Mexican Americans as well. Although technically Caucasian the label was probably reflective of the opprobrium directed against them by the "anglo" majority. Scholars have frequently used the term also, e.g. Moore (1972: 16).

6. Minimum building-size regulations have been upheld several times; as in Thompson v. City of Carrollton, 211 S. W. 2d970 (Tex. Civ. App. 1948) (Williams, 1966: 101). In Clemons v. City of Los Angeles, 35 Cal. 2d95, 22 P.2d 439 (1950), it was held that building size, shape and placement could be legally regulaged although such regulation could to some degree unexpectedly enjoin the conveyance of title. In Lionshead Lake, Inc. v. Wayne Township, 10 N. J. 165, 89A2d699 (1952), appeal dismissed, 344 U. S. 919 (1953), minimum dwelling size was upheld (Smith, 1965: 169).

7. For instance, it is interesting to note that Case and Kirk (1959: 43) cite the use of mortgages in purchasing homes to be 80 percent. The corresponding figure as of 1970 was 82.1 percent (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1973a: 67).

Chapter V

1. Amerindians are important in many places in the Southwest but are, relatively speaking, predominantly non-urban: only 41.9 percent of the Southwest's Amerindian population was urban in 1970. See U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-1F, American Indians (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 1.

2. Based on personal experience in a pilot study for a graduate seminar in human ecology and from personal correspondence with Professor Norval D. Glenn of the University of Texas at Austin, dated December 22, 1974.

3. Taeuber and Taeuber (1969: 30n) note that a more efficient redistribution of population for the purpose of desegregation would entail an exchange of residences. Simply summarized, the replacement index 2pqD [where p is the proportion of group A in the population and q = 1-p is the proportion of group B in the same population] represents the percentage of those who would then have to relocate in the total population.

4. For a more detailed discussion, see Taeuber and Taeuber (1969: 227-231) and Lieberson (1963: 30-38).

5. In each of the censuses since 1930 a small percentage of the Mexican foreign stock or Spanish surname categories has been classified as nonwhite. For instance, in 1970 it is conceivable than some Native Americans were misclassified as persons of Spanish-Mexican ancestry. In view of the relatively small numbers involved this limitation seems of minor import.

6. If we realistically take into consideration the New Mexican and southern Coloradoan disdain for the use of the term "Mexican" and preference for use of "Spanish," the percentage climbs to 84.5 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1973c: 1-2, 6). According to post-census checks conducted by the Bureau of the Census (1974: 7), both had the Spanish surname and Spanish origin data for the Southwest had relatively low indexes of inconsistency.

7. See the earlier (Chapter II) discussion on the issue of failure to distinguish. In addition, we should note that the equivalent usage of the two terms is not inconsistent with past research practices of taking "nonwhite" as synonymous with "Negro" (e.g. Moore and Mittelbach, 1966: 30; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969; Farley, 1976: 15-21; Kasarda, 1976: 128n).

8. Citing restraints imposed by the data, Moore and Mittelbach (1966: 30) substituted nonwhite for Negro income in their tabulations.

Another researcher (Farley, 1976: 15-21) uses a white-nonwhite comparison for 1960 then moves to a Negro vs. non-Negro comparison for 1970: non-Negro is equivalent to my Other "White" + Mexican American categories. McWilliams (1948: 8) classes Japanese and Chinese among the "Anglos." But perhaps the most important supportive evidence for judging the applicability of such an action is the correlation between indexes using "Anglo" and those employing Other "White:" in the case of Mexican American-Other "White" the Pearson product moment correlation is .995, for Black-Other "White" it is .997. Kasarda's caveat was that he limited his sample to cities where Negroes were 90 percent or better of the total nonwhite population. For the present data 5 (8.6 percent) of the cities "violate" that rule-of-thumb in the case of Other "Whites:" Salinas (88.4), Oakland (88.4) and Sacramento (89.8) are so close as to make the difference inconsequential. Stockton's 86.0 percent is a bit more severe and San Francisco's 79.1 percent is the most wayward. It was felt, however, that these cities were too important to be dropped and that, in socioeconomic terms, the Chinese and Japanese who comprise the bulk of these nonwhite Other "Whites" are much more akin to the white Anglos than to either the Black or Mexican American populations.

9. The correlations for city size, each minority group's size and proportion of the city population of the split tract or published and the complete tract or summary tape data were on the order of .998 to .999 at the .001 level of significance.

CHAPTER VI

1. The problem here, as in the previous discussion, may also have been in the choice of the national median as the dividing line between high and low incomes. Had I chosen a slightly lower family income level as the cut-off between high and low levels the results may have been usable.

2. The difference between the means for Anglo-Black segregation and income level segregation are significant ($T=26.14$, 55 df, $p =< .001$.

3. See Chapter II, "The Socio-Historical Milieu as an Explanatory Aid."

4. Another possible explanation lies in the choice of the national median housing value as the delimiter between low and high values. A more realistic division (as yet unknown to me) may have given us more consistent results. Consistency, however, was not the pursuit of this research endeavor.

5. The proportion of one minority has a negligible to low effect on the segregation of the other minority from the majority. The greater the proportion of Blacks in the city, the lower the Anglo-Mexican American ethnic segregation (r=-.08). The greater the proportion of the total city population that is Mexican American, the lower the segregation of Anglos from Blacks (r=-.18).

6. Intercensal change was measured by the difference between the index of dissimilarity for 1960 and the index for 1970. An increase in the index was taken to represent a positive change while a decrease in the index over the decade was viewed as negative change.

7. The results obtained may reflect some of the definitional problems I alluded to earlier in the methods section of this work. The definitions for data pertinent to Mexican Americans changed between 1960 and 1970; and census coverage of the population probably improved. The latter cannot be ascertained because the Bureau of the Census has not calculated the probable undercount for respondents of Spanish surname (see Parsons, 1972; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974). We cannot, however, dismiss the probability that some of the increment was due to (a) annexation of areas with large numbers of Mexican Americans and (b) a rural to urban migration pattern similar to that occurring elsewhere in the U. S.

8. Suburbanization is as defined in Taeuber and Taeuber (1969: 71): "the percentages of the netropolitan area population which resided outside the city at the beginning and end of each decade were computed, after adjusting the terminal population for any population in annexed areas. The percentage point change in this measure is an index of suburbanization, with positive figures indicating increasing suburbanization."

9. The classes of variables were "taste" for discrimination, "taste" for segregation, relative economic strength between subpopulations, potentially available supply of housing for occupancy, the demography of the community, and the demographic characteristics of any subpopulation in relation to another subpopulation. In the first step of a stepwise regression an independent variable is selected which has the highest correlation coefficient with the dependent variable. In each subsequent step each of the remaining variables not already in the equation is examined and that variable with the highest F-value is added. New regression coefficients, F-values, etc. are calculated for all variables in the equation and should any variable fall below a specified minimum F-value it is removed from the equation. The program proceeds until all variables meeting the stipulated minimal F-value (.25) are in the equation.

10. One set of "taste" for discrimination variables were measures of the extent to which each minority's income departed from the

estimate of that income based on the group's educational attainment. The other was a simple dummy variable indicating whether each city was in Texas or not. Neither of these is a logically adequate operationalization of discrimination, a fact the researchers noted themselves (Moore and Mittelbach, 1966: 39).

CHAPTER VII

1. The actual number of cities used ranged from 35 to 58. In comparisons with the Moore-Mittelbach study only those cities used by them were utilized. In the intercensal change analysis data for 7 additional cities was available and 42 cities were used. In comparisons between indexes 56 cities for which magnetic tape data was available were utilized. In some tests of hypotheses data from 58 cities, available from published reports, were used.

2. If an effective environment (Gans, 1968: 6) exists, then an auto would not be a necessity in a conscious self-contained enclave community.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Charles. 1947. Race Bias in Housing. [New York?]: American Civil Liberties Union, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the American Council on Race Relations.

Abrams, Charles. 1966. "The Housing Problem of the Negro." Pp. 512-524 in Talcott Parsons and Kenneth B. Clark (eds.), The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Adler, Patricia. 1970. "The 1943 Zoot-Suit Riots: Brief Episode in a Long Conflict." Pp. 124-142 in Manual P. Servin (ed.), The Mexican Americans: An Awakening Minority. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Glencoe Press.

Agueros, Jack. 1971. "Halfway to Dick and Jane." Pp. 85-105 in Thomas C. Wheeler (ed.), The Immigrant Experience: The Anguish of Becoming American. New York: The Dial Press.

Allport, Gordon. 1958. The Nature of Prejudice. Abridged. Anchor Books. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Alvarez, Rodolfo. 1973. "The Psycho-Historical and Socioeconomic Development of the Chicano Community in the United States." Social Science Quarterly, 53 (March): 92-942.

Anton, Thomas, and Oliver P. Williams. 1971. "On Comparing Political Systems: Residential Allocations in London and Stockholm." Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Banfield, Edward C. 1968. The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Berry, Brian J. L., and others. 1976. "Attitudes toward Integration: The Role of Status in Community Response to Racial Change." Pp. 221-264 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), The Changing Face of the Suburbs. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Beshers, James, Edward O. Laumann, and Benjamin S. Bradshaw. 1964. "Ethnic Congregation-Segregation, Assimilation, and Stratification." Social Forces, 42 (May): 482-489.

Blalock, H[ubert] M., Jr. 1959. "Urbanization and Discrimination." Social Problems, 7 (Fall): 146-152.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. 1961. Causal Inferences in Nonexperimental Research. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Blalock, H[ubert] M., Jr. 1963. "Correlated Independent Variables: The Problem of Multicollinearity." Social Forces, 42 (#2): 233-237.

Blauner, Robert A. 1972. Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." Pacific Sociological Review, 1 (Spring): 3-7.

Boe, Eugene. 1971. "Pioneers to Eternity." Pp. 51-83 in Thomas C. Wheeler (ed.), The Immigrant Experience: The Anguish of Becoming American. New York: The Dial Press.

Bogardus, E[mory] S. 1930. "The Mexican Immigrant and Segregation." American Journal of Sociology, 36 (July): 74-80.

Breton, Raymond. 1964. "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants." American Journal of Sociology, 70 (September): 193-205.

Brown, David L., and Glenn V. Fuguitt. 1972. "Percent Nonwhite and Racial Disparity in Nonmetropolitan Cities in the South." Social Science Quarterly, 53 (December): 573-582.

Brown, Robert Kevin. 1965. Real Estate Economics: An Introduction to Urban Land Use. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Brown, William H., Jr. 1972. "Access to Housing: The Role of the Real Estate Industry." Economic Geography, 48 (January): 66-78.

Burgess, Ernest W. 1928. "Residential Segregation in American Cities." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 140: 105-115.

Carter, Thomas P. 1970. Mexican Americans in School: A History of Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Case, Fred E., and James H. Kirk. 1959. The Housing Status of Minority Families, Los Angeles, 1956. Los Angeles: UCLA Real Estate Research Program in cooperation with the Los Angeles Urban League.

Casstevens, Thomas W. 1967. Politics, Housing and Race Relations: California's Rumford Act and Proposition 14. Berkeley: Institute of Government Studies, University of California.

Clawson, Marion. 1971. Suburban Land Conversion in the United States: An Economic and Governmental Process. Baltimore: Published for Resources for the Future, Inc., by The Johns Hopkins Press.

Clemence, Theodore G. 1967. "Residential Segregation in the Mid-Sixties." Demography, 4 (No. 2): 562-568.

Commission on Race and Housing. 1958. Where Shall We Live? Report of the Commission on Race and Housing. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Commission on Race and Housing. 1966. "Where Shall We Live?" pp. 269-286 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.

Cortese, Charles F., R. Frank Falk, and Jack K. Cohen. 1976. "Further Considerations on the Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indices." American Sociological Review, 41 (August): 630-637.

Darroch, A. Gordon, and Wilfred G. Marston. 1971. "The Social Basis of Ethnic Residential Segregation: The Canadian Case." American Journal of Sociology, 77 (November): 491-510.

Davidson, Chandler, and Charles M. Gaitz, 1973. "Ethnic Attitudes as a Basis for Minority Cooperation in a Southwestern Metropolis." Social Science Quarterly, 53 (March): 738-748.

Dean, John P. 1966. "The Myth of Housing Reform." Pp. 255-261 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.

Deutsch, Morton, and Mary Evans Collins. 1951. Inter-racial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Draper, N. R. and H. Smith. 1966. Applied Regression Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Beverly Duncan. 1955a. "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification." American Journal of Sociology, 60 (March): 493-503.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Beverly Duncan. 1955b. "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes." American Sociological Review. 20 (April): 210-217.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Beverly Duncan. 1957. The Negro Population of Chicago: A Study of Residential Succession. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Stanley Lieberson. 1959. "Ethnic Segregation and Assimilation." American Journal of Sociology, 64 (January): 364-374.

Dworkin, Anthony Gary. 1970. "Stereotypes and Self-Images Held by Native-Born and Foreign-Born Mexican Americans." Pp. 397-409 in John H. Burma (ed.), Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc.

Edwards, G. Franklin. 1966. "Community and Class Realities: The Ordeal of Change." Pp. 28-302 in Talcott Parsons and Kenneth B. Clark (eds.), The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Estrada, Leobardo, Jose Hernandez, and David Alvirez. 1972. "Using Census Data to Study the Spanish Heritage Population of the United States." [np]: mimeograph copy.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1959. "The Ghetto: A Re-evaluation." Social Forces, 37 (March): 255-262.

Farley, Reynolds. 1976. "Components of Suburban Population Growth." Pp. 5-38 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), The Changing Face of the Suburbs. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fine, John, Norval D. Glenn, and J. Kenneth Monts. 1971. "The Residential Segregation of Occupational Groups in Central Cities and Suburbs." Demography, 8 (February): 91-101.

Firey, Walter. 1947. Land Use in Central Boston. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Foley, Donald L. 1975. "Accessibility for Residents in the Metropolican Environment." Pp. 157-198 in Amos H. Hawley and Vincent P. Rock (eds.), Metropolitan America in Contemporary Perspective. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, Inc., distributed by Halstead Press, New York.

Form, William H. 1951. "Stratification in Low and Middle Income Housing Areas." Journal of Social Issues, 7 (Nos. 1 & 2): 109-131.

Form, William H. 1954. "The Place of Social Structure in the Determination of Land Use: Some Implications for a Theory of Urban Ecology." Social Forces, 32 (May): 317-323.

Forman, Robert E. 1971. Black Ghettos, White Ghettos, and Slums. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Franklin, John Hope. 1967. From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro America. Third edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Freeman, Linton C., and Morris H. Sunshine. 1970. Patterns of Residential Segregation. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenckman Publishing Company.

Fuller, Elizabeth. 1920. The Mexican Housing Problem. Sociological Monograph no. 17. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Southern California Sociological Society [Reprinted, pp. 1-11, in Perspectives on Mexican American Life. New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1974].

Gans, Herbert. 1968. People & Plans; Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Glazer, Nathan. 1954. "Ethnic Groups in America: From National Culture to Ideology." Pp. 158-173 in Morroe Berger, Theodore Abel and Charles H. Page (eds.), Freedom and Control in Modern Society. New York: Van Nostrand.

Glazer, Nathan. 1970. "Dilemmas of Housing Policy." Pp. 50-65 in Daniel Patrick Moynihan (ed.), Toward a National Urban Policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Gold, David. 1969. "Statistical Tests and Substantive Significance." The American Sociologist, 4 (February): 42-46.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, Robert A. 1968. "Issues in Multiple Regression." The American Journal of Sociology, 73 (March): 592-616.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York: The Free Press.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1964. "American Sociology and the Study of Immigrant Ethnic Groups." International Migration Digest, 1 (Fall): 107-113.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1975. Why Can't They Be Like Us? New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

Greer, Scott. 1966. Urban Renewal and American Cities: The Dilemma of Democratic Intervention. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Grier, Eunice, and George Grier. 1971. "Equality and Beyond: Housing Segregation in the Great Society." Pp. 443-454 in Norman R. Yetman and C. Hoy Steele (eds.), Majority and Minority: The Dynamic of Racial and Ethnic Relations. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Grodzins, Morton. [1958]. The Metropolitan Area as a Racial Problem. [Pittsburg]: University of Pittsburg Press.

Hager, Don J. 1960. "Housing Discrimination, Social Conflict, and the Law." Social Problems, 8 (Summer): 80-87.

Handlin, Oscar. 1951. The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People. An Atlantic Monthly Press Book. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Harris, Richard J. 1975. A Primer of Multivariate Statistics. New York: Academic Press.

Hartman, Chester W. 1969. "The Politics of Housing." Pp. 433-447 in Alan Shank (ed.), Political Power and the Urban Crisis. Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc.

Hatt, Paul. 1945. "The Relation of Ecological Location to Status Position and Housing of Ethnic Minorities." American Sociological Review, 10 (August): 481-485.

Hawley, Amos H. 1951. "Metropolitan Population and Municipal Government Expenditures in Central Cities." Journal of Social Issues, 7 (Nos. 1 & 2): 100-108.

Hawley, Amos H. 1971. Urban Society: An Ecological Approach. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Heer, David M. 1959. "The Sentiment of White Supremacy: An Ecological Study." American Journal of Sociology, 64 (May): 592-598.

Heller, Celia S. 1966. Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House.

Helper, Rose. 1969. Racial Policies and Practices of Real Estate Brokers. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Herbers, John. 1971. "Rights Panel Says U. S. Housing Plan Aids Segregation." The New York Times (June 11): 1, 12.

Hernandez, Jose, Leobardo Estrada, and David Alvirez. 1973. "Census Data and the Problem of Conceptually Defining the Mexican American Population." Social Science Quarterly, 53 (March): 671-687.

Hollingshead, A[ugust] B. 1947. "A Re-examination of Ecological Theory." Sociology and Social Research, 31 (January-February): 194-204.

Holsendolph, Ernest. 1976. "Official Urges National Assessment as Hispanic-American Population Rises Sharply." The New York Times (April): 13.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Jacobs, Paul. 1967. Prelude to Riot: A View of Urban America from the Bottom. Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. New York: Random House.

Johnson, Charles S. 1943. Patterns of Negro Segregation. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

Jonassen, Christen T. 1949. "Cultural Variables in the Ecology of an Ethnic Group." American Sociological Review, 14 (February): 32-41.

Kahl, Joseph A. 1966. The American Class Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kantrowitz, Nathan. 1969. "Ethnic and Racial Segregation in the New York Metropolis, 1960." American Journal of Sociology, 74 (May): 685-695.

Kasarda, John D. 1976. "The Changing Occupational Structure of the American Metropolis: Apropos the Urban Problem." Pp. 113-136 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), The Changing Face of the Suburbs. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Keller, Suzanne. 1968. The Urban Neighborhood: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House.

Kramer, Judith. 1970. The American Minority Community. New York: Crowell.

Lansing, John B., Charles Wade Clifton and James N. Morgan. 1969. New Homes and Poor People: A Study of Chains of Moves. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Laurenti, Luigi. 1966. "Property Values and Race." Pp. 286-292 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.

Lebeaux, Charles N., and Gumecindo Salas. 1973. Latino Life and Social Needs: A Detroit Survey. Detroit: The Latin American Secretariat of the Archdiocese of Detroit and New Detroit, Inc.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1963. Ethnic Patterns in American Cities. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1970. "Stratification and Ethnic Groups." Sociological Inquiry, 40 (Spring): 172-181.

Lind, Andrew W. 1955. "Occupation and Race on Certain Frontiers." Pp. 49-70 in Andrew W. Lind (ed.), Race Relations in World Perspective, Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.

Long, Herman H., and Charles S. Johnson. 1947. People vs. Property; Race Restrictive Covenants in Housing. Nashville, Tenn.: Fisk University Press.

McClendon, McKee J. 1974. "Interracial Contact and the Reduction of Prejudice." Sociological Focus, 7 (Fall): 47-65.

McEntire, Davis. 1960. Residence and Race. Final and Comprehensive Report to the Commission on Race and Housing. Los Angeles: The University of California Press.

McKenzie, R[oderick] D. 1925. "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community." Pp. 63-79 in Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie (eds.), The City. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McLemore, S. Dale. 1973. "The Origins of Mexican American Subordination in Texas." Social Science Quarterly, 53 (March): 656-670.

McWilliams, Carey. 1948. North From Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. [Reprinted in 1968 by Greenwood Press, New York].

Madsen, William. 1973. Mexican Americans of South Texas. Second edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Mercer, Norman A. 1962. "Discrimination in Rental Housing: A Study of Resistance of Landlords to Non-White Tenants." Phylon, 23 (Spring): 47-54.

Merton, Robert K. 1949. "Discrimination and the American Creed." Pp. 99-126 in Robert M. MacIver (ed.), Discrimination and National Welfare. New York: Harper & Row.

Michelson, William. 1970. Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Miller, Arthur S., and John H. Davidson, Jr. 1972. "Observations on Population Policy-Making and the Constitution." The George Washington Law Review, 40 (No. 4): 618-678.

Miller, Ira J. 1974. "Residential Segregation Patterns: Economic or Racial?" The Review of Regional Studies, 4 (Supplement): 101-109.

Moore, Eric G. 1972. Residential Mobility in the City. Commission on College Geography Resource Paper No. 13. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Geographers.

Moore, Joan W., and Frank G. Mittelbach. 1966. Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest: A Comparative Study. Mexican American Study Project, Advance Report 4. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Moore, Joan W., and Frank G. Mittelbach. 1972. "Measuring Residential Segregation in 35 Cities." Pp. 80-89 in Rudolph Gomez (ed.), The Changing Mexican-American: A Reader. Boulder, Co.: Pruett.

Morrill, Richard L. 1970. "The Negro Ghetto: Problems and Alternatives." Pp. 193-212 in George J. Demko, Harold M. Rose and George A. Schnell (eds.), Population Geography: A Reader. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1970. "Toward a National Urban Policy." Pp. 3-25 in Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.), Toward a National Urban Policy. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Muth, Richard F. 1969. Cities and Housing: The Spatial Pattern of Urban Residential Land Use. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1944. An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Nam, Charles B. 1959. "Nationality Groups and Social Stratification in America." Social Forces, 37: 328-333.

Northwood, L. K., and Ernest A. T. Barth. 1965. Urban Desegregation: Negro Pioneers and Their White Neighbors. Seattle: The University of Washington Press.

Park, Robert E. 1952. Human Communities. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Park, Robert E. and Herbert A. Miller. 1925. Old World Traits Transplanted. Chicago: Society for Social Research, University of Chicago.

Parsons, Carole W., Ed. 1972. America's Uncounted People. Report of the Advisory Committee on Problems of Census Enumeration, Division of Behavioral Sciences, National Research Council. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Penalosa, Fernando. 1973. "Toward an Operational Definition of the Mexican American." Pp. 54-55 in F. Chris Garcia (ed.), Chicano Politics: Readings. New York: MSS Information Corporation.

Perales, Alonso S., comp. 1948. Are We Good Neighbors? San Antonio, Texas: Artes Graficas.

Pinkney, Alphonso. 1970. "Prejudice Toward Mexican and Negro Americans: A Comparison." Pp. 73-80 in John H. Burma (ed.), Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc.

Pohlmann, Vernon C. 1976. "A Test of the Relative Validity of the Fourth and Fifth Count Census Tapes." A paper read at the Meetings of the Midwest Sociological Society in St. Louis, April 21-24, 14 pp. mimeographed.

Poston, Dudley L. Jr., and David Alvirez. 1973. "On the Cost of Being a Mexican American Worker." Social Science Quarterly, 53 (March): 697-709.

Powers, Mary G. 1968. "Class, Ethnicity, and Residence in Metropolitan America." Demography, 5 (No. 1): 443-448.

Rapkin, Chester, and William G. Grisby. 1960. The Demand for Housing in Racially Mixed Areas. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Rapkin, Chester, and William G. Grisby. 1966. "Concerning Studies of Price Trends in Mixed Areas." Pp. 292-294 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.

Rappaport, Armin, ed. 1967. The War with Mexico: Why Did It Happen? The Berkeley Series in American History. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Reid, Margaret G. 1962. Housing and Income. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rios, Francisco Armando. 1971. "The Mexican in Fact, Fiction, and Folklore." Pp. 59-73 in Octavio Ignacio Romano-V. (ed.), Voices: Readings from El Grito, A Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought, 1967-1971. Berkeley, Ca.: Quinto Sol Publications, Inc.

Romano,V., Octavio Ignacio. 1971. "The Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican Americans: The Distortion of Mexican-American History." Pp. 26-39 in Octavio Ignacio Romano-V. (ed.), Voices: Readings from El Grito, A Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought, 1967-1971. Berkeley, Ca.: Quinto Sol Publications, Inc.

Rose, Harold M. 1969. Social Processes in the City: Race and Urban Residential Choice. Commission on College Geography, Resource Paper No. 6. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Geographers.

Rose, Harold M. 1972. "The Spatial Development of Black Residential Systems." Economic Geography, 48 (January): 43-65.

Rubel, Arthur J. 1966. Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City. Austin: Published for the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health by the University of Texas Press.

Schmid, Calvin F. 1950. "Generalizations Concerning the Ecology of the American City." American Sociological Review, 15 (April): 264-281.

Schmidt, Fred H. [1970]. Spanish Surnamed American Employment in the Southwest. A Study Prepared for the Colorado Civil Rights

Commission. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Schnore, Leo F. 1965a. The Urban Scene: Human Ecology and Demography. New York: The Free Press.

Schnore, Leo F. 1965b. "Social Class Segregation Among Nonwhites in Metropolitan Centers." Demography, 2: 126-133.

Schnore, Leo F. 1972. Class and Race in Cities and Suburbs. Chicago: Markham.

Schnore, Leo F., and James R. Pinkerton. 1966. "Residential Redistribution of Socioeconomic Strata in Metropolitan Areas." Demography, 3 (No. 2): 491-499.

Schoor, Alvin L. 1963. Slums and Social Insecurity. U. S. Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, Research Report no. 1, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Schuman, Howard, and Barry Gruenberg. 1970. "The Impact of City on Racial Attitudes." American Journal of Sociology, 76 (September): 213-261.

Schwirian, Kent P., and Jesus Rico-Velasco. 1971. "The Residential Distribution of Status Groups in Puerto Rico's Metropolitan Areas." Demography, 8 (February): 81-90.

Scott, Robin F. 1970. "The Sleepy Lagoon Case and the Grand Jury Investigation." Pp. 105-115 in Manuel P. Servin (ed.), The Mexican-Americans: An Awakening Minority. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Glencoe Press.

Shankman, Arnold. 1975. "The Imact of Mexico and the Mexican-American in the Black Press, 1890-1935." The Journal of Ethnic Studies, 3 (Summer): 43-56.

Shibutani, Tamotsu, and Kian M. Kwan. 1965. Ethnic Stratification: A Comparative Approach. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Simmons, Ozzie G. 1973. "The Mutual Images and Expectations of Anglo-Americans and Mexican Americans." Pp. 38-51 in F. Chris Garcia (ed.), Chicano Politics: Readings. New York: MSS Information Corporation.

Smith, Herbert H. 1965. The Citizen's Guide to Zoning. West Trenton, N. J.: Chandler-Davis Publishing Company.

Sørensen, Annemette, Karl E. Taeuber, and Leslie J. Hollingsworth, Jr. 1975. "Indexes of Racial Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States, 1940 to 1970." Sociological Focus, 8 (April): 125-142.

Spear, Allen H. 1967. Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Suttles, Gerald D. 1972. The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Suttles, Gerald D. 1975. "Community Design: The Search for Participation in a Metropolitan Society." Pp. 235-297 in Amos H. Hawley and Vincent P. Rock (eds.), Metropolitan America in Contemporary Perspective. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, Inc., distributed by Halstead Press, New York.

Taeuber, Karl E. 1963. "On Assessing Segregation Indexes." American Sociological Review, 28 (June): 453-454.

Taeuber, Karl E. 1964. "Negro Residential Segregation: Trends and Measurement." Social Problems, 12 (Summer): 42-50.

Taeuber, Karl E., and Alma F. Taeuber. 1969. Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change. New York: Atheneum.

Taylor, Paul Schuster. 1934. An American-Mexican Frontier: Nueces County, Texas. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press [Reprinted in 1971 by Russell & Russell, New York].

Tilly, Charles. 1961. "Occupational Rank and Grade of Residence in a Metropolis." American Journal of Sociology, 67 (November): 323-330.

Turner, JOnathan H. 1972. American Society: Problems of Structure. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1962. U. S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960. Census Tracts. Final Reports PHC(1) Series. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1970. 1970 Users' Guide. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1972a. Census of Housing: 1970. Vol. 1, Housing Characteristics for States, Cities and Counties. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1972b. Census of Housing: 1970. Metropolitan Housing Characteristics. Final Reports, HC(2) Series. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1972c. Census of Population and Housing: 1970. Census Tracts. Final Reports, PHC(1) Series. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1973a. Census of Housing: 1970. Vol. V, Residential Finance. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1973b. Census of Population: 1970. Vol 1, Characteristics of the Population. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1973c. Census of Population: 1970. Subject Reports. Final Report PC(2)-1C, Persons of Spanish Origin. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1973d. Census of Population: 1970. Subject Reports. Final Report PC(2)-1D, Persons of Spanish Surname. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1973e. County and City Data Book, 1972. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1974. Census of Population and Housing: 1970. Evaluation and Research Program. PHC(E)-0, Accuracy for Data for Selected Population Characteristics as Measured by Reinterviews. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1975. Data Access Description No. 41. Data on the Spanish Ancestry Population Available from the 1970 Census of Population and Housing. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1962. Hearings held in Phoenix, Arizona, February 3, 1962. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1971. Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest. Report I of the Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1972. Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth. Report IV of the Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1974. Counting the Forgotten: 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish Speaking Background in the United States. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1974. A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census. Vol. I, Americans of Spanish Origin. HEW Publication No. (OS) 75-120. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

U. S. Federal Housing Administration. 1938. Underwriting Manual: Underwriting and Valuation Procedure under Title II of the National Housing Act. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Van Arsdol, Maurice D., Jr., and Leo A. Schuerman. 1971. "Redistribution and Assimilation of Ethnic Populations: The Los Angeles Case." Demography, 8 (November): 459-480.

Vose, Clement E. 1959. Caucasians Only: The Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Restrictive Covenant Cases. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Warner, W. Lloyd, and Paul Lunt. 1941. The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Warner, W. Lloyd, and Leo Srole. 1945. The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Watson, James B. and Julian Samora. 1973. "Subordinate Leadership in a Bicultural Community: An Analysis." Pp. 107-115 in F. Chris Garcia (ed.), Chicano Politics: Readings. New York: MSS Information Corporation.

Weaver, Robert C. 1948. The Negro Ghetto. New York: Russell & Russell [Reprinted 1972].

Weaver, Robert C. 1966. "The Urbanization of the Negro." Pp. 298-305 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.

Weber, Max. 1946. "Class, Status, Party." Pp. 180-195 in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (trans. and eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press [Reprinted 1973].

Weissbourd, Bernard. 1964. Segregation, Subsidies and Megalopolis. Occasional Paper No. 1 on The City. The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Santa Barbara, Ca.: The Fund for the Republic.

Wilhelm, Sidney M. 1962. Urban Zoning and Land-Use Theory. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Williams, Norman, Jr. 1966. The Structure of Urban Zoning—And Its Dynamics in Urban Planning and Development. New York: Buttenheim Publishing Corporation.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. 1964. Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. 1967. "Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities." Pp. 102-140 in Derek L. Phillips (ed.),

Studies in American Society: II. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. 1970. American Society. Third edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wilner, Daniel M., Rosabell Price Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook. 1969. Human Relations in Interracial Housing: A Study of the Contact Hypothesis. New York: Russell and Russell.

Winsborough, Hal H. 1962. "City Growth and City Structure." Journal of Regional Science, 4 (Winter): 35-49.

Winsborough, Halliman H., Karl E. Taeuber, and Annamette Sørensen. 1975. "Models of Change in Residential Segregation, 1940-1970." CDE Working Paper 75-27. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin.

Wirth, Louis. 1928. The Ghetto. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. [Reprinted 1956 by Phoenix Books, Chicago].

Wirth, Louis. 1938. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." American Journal of Sociology, 44 (July): 1-24.

Wood, Edith Elmer. 1966. "A Century of the Housing Problem." Pp. 1-8 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.

Wurster, Cathering Bauer. 1966. "Social Questions in Housing and Community Planning." Pp. 30-52 in William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson (eds.), Urban Housing. New York: The Free Press.