

# Trends in Black and Latino Segregation in the Post-Fair Housing Era: Implications for Housing Policy

Anna M. Santiago<sup>†</sup>

Despite the enactment of fair housing legislation during the 1960s, decades of restrictive access to communities outside of traditional minority neighborhoods have reinforced highly segregated residential patterns within U.S. metropolitan areas.<sup>1</sup> Although levels of Black/Anglo segregation have declined markedly since 1968, Blacks still are highly segregated from non-Latino Whites (Anglos),<sup>2</sup> regardless of their socioeconomic status.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, Latino segregation from Anglos has increased in a number of metropolitan areas during the past 20 years.<sup>4</sup> Further, the level of interminority (i.e., Black and Latino) segregation has remained moderate to high.<sup>5</sup> Rather than disappearing, segregated residential areas have become permanent fixtures in urban areas. As Moore and Mittelbach<sup>6</sup> argued on the eve of the Fair Housing era, the urban ghetto was a device by which certain residents (most notably, Blacks, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians) became trapped in subordinate positions within society. Housing segregation became a convenient way of ensuring the continuity of the status quo.

A resurgence of interest in both the effects of sustained segregation and the causes of the increased impoverishment of minorities in America's central cities has propelled scholars to reexamine the importance of place as a

---

† Associate Professor of Social Work, Wayne State University.

1. Reynolds Farley & William H. Frey, *Changes in the Segregation of Whites From Blacks During the 1980s: Small Steps Toward a More Integrated Society*, 59 AM. SOC. REV. 23, 24-26 (1994).

2. The term Anglo is used to refer to individuals who identified themselves as persons of white European ancestry in the Census.

3. Douglas Massey & Nancy A. Denton, *Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians: 1970-80*, 52 AM. SOC. REV. 802, 803 (1989).

4. Anna M. Santiago, *The Spatial Dimensions of Ethnic and Racial Stratification*, in RACE AND ETHNICITY IN THE UNITED STATES: AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH (William Velez ed., forthcoming 1997).

5. *Id.*

6. JOAN W. MOORE & FRANK G. MITTELBACH, RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN THE URBAN SOUTHWEST: A COMPARATIVE STUDY 2-4 (1966).

determinant of individual life chances.<sup>7</sup> Recent studies suggest that residence in segregated neighborhoods has a detrimental effect on the economic well-being of neighborhood residents, particularly for Blacks and Latinos, by reducing minority employment opportunities, promoting income inequality between minorities and the Anglo majority, producing segregated schools, and diminishing the presence and quality of public services.<sup>8</sup>

In this article, I examine trends in Black and Latino residential segregation from Anglos as well as Black/Latino segregation are examined for the 90 metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) with populations of 10,000 or more Latinos and Blacks in 1990.<sup>9</sup> Using data from the 1970, 1980, and 1990 U.S. censuses, I explore three questions: (1) What changes occurred in patterns of Anglo, Black, and Latino metropolitan residence during the 1970s and 1980s? (2) How did changes in metropolitan populations, local housing markets and local economies shape existing metropolitan residential patterns? and (3) What are the policy implications of sustained patterns of residential segregation for minority communities?

## I.

### MEASURING PATTERNS OF METROPOLITAN RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

Before addressing these questions, let us examine the way segregation is measured in this study. The most widely used segregation measure, the Index of Dissimilarity (D), is employed to describe intermetropolitan trends in Latino, Black, and Anglo residential segregation.<sup>10</sup> This index measures the overall unevenness in the spatial distribution of two populations within given geographical areas. Decennial census data for census tracts or blocks are usually used in the calculation of segregation indices. The measure compares the residential location of two populations (e.g., Latino and Anglo) according

---

7. See Douglas S. Massey et al., *Segregation, the Concentration of Poverty and the Life Chances of Individuals*, 20 SOC. SCI. RES. 397, 397-99 (1991); Anna M. Santiago & Margaret G. Wilder, *Residential Segregation and Links to Minority Poverty: The Case of Latinos in the United States*, 38 SOC. PROBS. 471, 494-95 (1991); see generally WILLIAM J. WILSON, *THE TRULY DISADVANTAGED: THE INNER CITY, THE UNDERCLASS, AND PUBLIC POLICY* (1987).

8. See DOUGLAS S. MASSEY & NANCY A. DENTON, *AMERICAN APARTHEID* 148-85 (1993); see also Christopher Jencks & Susan E. Mayer, *Residential Segregation, Job Proximity and Black Job Opportunities*, in *INNER-CITY POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES* 187, 189-96 (Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. & Michael G. McGeary eds., 1990).

9. In order to avoid problems inherent with deriving segregation scores for communities with small minority populations, the minimum threshold of 10,000 Latinos and Blacks as of 1990 was used to select the MSAs for this analysis.

10. See KARL E. TAEUBER & ALMA F. TAEUBER, *NEGROES IN CITIES* 195-245 (1965), for a comprehensive discussion of this measure.

to their proportion of the total community population. For example, a community that is 10 percent Latino would be considered integrated if each neighborhood was also 10 percent Latino. The resulting segregation score would be 0, reflecting total integration. If the two groups did not live together in any residential area, thereby producing all-Latino or all-Anglo neighborhoods, the index would have a maximum value of 100, reflecting total segregation. Thus, the Index of Dissimilarity describes the minimum percentage of either group that would have to move in order to achieve spatial integration. The higher the index, the greater the degree of segregation. Segregation scores between 0 and 29 reflect low levels of segregation, those between 30 and 59 are moderate, and those above 60 reflect high levels of segregation.<sup>11</sup>

## II.

### TRENDS IN METROPOLITAN SEGREGATION PATTERNS AMONG LATINOS, BLACKS, AND ANGLOS

Prior to 1980, segregation studies focused primarily on changes in Black/Anglo residential segregation.<sup>12</sup> Findings from these studies suggest that racial residential segregation remained relatively constant between 1940 and 1960, but declined slightly during the 1960s. Studies of Latino segregation, which were virtually nonexistent until the late 1970s, showed that Latino segregation from Anglos also declined during the 1960s.<sup>13</sup> After the passage of the federal Fair Housing Act in 1968,<sup>14</sup> policymakers and fair housing advocates expected levels of residential segregation to decline further.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, subsequent studies confirmed that Blacks were less segregated from Anglos in the 1970s.<sup>16</sup> In contrast, trends in Latino/Anglo segregation were more mixed. While some communities experienced

---

11. NATHAN KANTROWITZ, *ETHNIC AND RACIAL SEGREGATION IN THE NEW YORK METROPOLIS 15* (1973).

12. See, e.g., TAEUBER & TAEUBER *supra* note 10; Annemette Sorenson et al., *Indexes of Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States: 1940-1970*, 8 SOC. FOCUS 125 (1975); Thomas L. Van Valey et al., *Trends in Residential Segregation: 1960-1970* 82 AM. J. SOC. 826 (1977).

13. See MOORE & MITTELBAUGH *supra* note 6, at 18-22; Manuel M. Lopez, *Patterns of Interethnic Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest, 1960 and 1970*, 62 SOC. SCI. Q. 50, 54-55 (1981); Terry J. Rosenberg & Robert W. Lake, *Toward a Revised Model of Residential Segregation and Succession: Puerto Ricans in New York, 1960-1970*, 81 AM J. SOC. 1142, 1144 (1976).

14. 42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq. (1968).

15. See Farley & Frey, *supra* note 1, at 26-27.

16. See, e.g., Massey & Denton, *supra* note 3.

significant declines in Latino segregation from Anglos, other communities experienced sharp increases or remained relatively unchanged.<sup>17</sup>

However, did racial segregation continue to decline in the 1980s? If so, were decreases similar across all regions of the country or in all metropolitan areas? As shown in Table 1,<sup>18</sup> the typical pattern of residential segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas during the 1980s was one of continued high levels of segregation between Blacks and Anglos, moderate to high levels of Black/Latino segregation, and moderate levels of segregation between Latinos and Anglos. While Anglo and Latino segregation from Blacks declined markedly between 1970 and 1990, the average level of Latino segregation from Anglos remained virtually unchanged. By 1990, approximately 63 percent of all Blacks and 44 percent of all Latinos would have had to move from their places of residence in order to live in integrated neighborhoods. Moreover, residential segregation between Blacks and Latinos continued to be moderate: slightly more than half of all Latinos (or Blacks) would have had to move in 1990 in order to live in more integrated minority neighborhoods.

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Black segregation was highest in the Midwest; nearly three-quarters of Black residents would have had to move from their 1990 residence to live in integrated neighborhoods with Anglos. Although the pattern of high Black segregation from Anglos was found in the Northeast (68) and the South (60) as well, Black/Anglo segregation was markedly lower in the West (52). Between 1970 and 1990, the level of Black segregation from Anglos declined, on average, by 14 points. Black/Anglo segregation decreased more sharply during the 1970s than during the 1980s, and the sharpest declines occurred in the western region of the country. However, declining Black segregation was not universal. Black segregation from Anglos increased in six metropolitan areas (Detroit, Jersey City, Nassau-Suffolk, New York, Paterson, and Trenton) during the 1980s.<sup>19</sup> This probably was produced by the continued suburbanization of Anglos in these areas as well as the rising cost of housing, relatively tight housing markets, and discriminatory behavior in the real estate markets in these areas.

In most metropolitan areas, the highest level of segregation was between Blacks and Anglos. However, Latinos and Blacks also resided in essentially separate neighborhoods. While the level of Latino segregation from Blacks declined 16 points, on average, between 1970 and 1990, 51 percent of all Latinos would have had to move in order to live in integrated neighborhoods

---

17. See Santiago, *supra* note 4.

18. An abbreviated version of this table is presented in the article. See *infra*. A complete listing of segregation scores for the entire set of 90 metropolitan areas is available at University of Michigan Population Studies Center, 1225 S. University Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2590.

19. See Santiago, *supra* note 4.

with Blacks. Nonetheless, Latino/Black segregation was markedly lower (on average, 12 points) than Anglo/Black segregation. Like Anglos, Latinos were highly segregated from Blacks in the Midwest (63), but they were much less segregated in the Northeast (48) and West (43). During the 1980s, Black/Latino segregation fell, on average, by six points. Yet in five metropolitan areas (Bryan TX, Detroit, Gary, New York, and Salinas CA), Black/Latino segregation actually increased.<sup>20</sup> Latino population growth in these communities most likely accounted for the rise in Black/Latino segregation in these areas.

Latino segregation from Anglos was, on average, 19 points lower than the average level of Black/Anglo segregation in 1990. However, segregation patterns were more varied. Latino/Anglo segregation was highest in the Northeast, where 54 percent of all Latinos would have had to move to live in neighborhoods with Anglos. Segregation between Latinos and Anglos was lowest in the South and West, where 38 and 40 percent of Latinos, respectively, would have had to relocate to live in integrated neighborhoods. Although Latinos were less segregated from Anglos than Blacks, evidence suggests that the level of Latino segregation from Anglos is increasing. Between 1970 and 1990, Latino/Anglo segregation increased in 40 of the 90 metropolitan areas in the study, most of which were located in the Northeast and West.<sup>21</sup> It has been suggested that areas that experienced tremendous growth in the numbers of immigrants from Central and South America were the most likely to experience increased levels of Latino/Anglo segregation.<sup>22</sup>

---

20. *Id.*

21. *Id.*

22. See Nancy A. Denton & Douglas S. Massey, *Patterns of Neighborhood Transition in an Multiethnic World: U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1970-1980*, 28 *DEMOGRAPHY* 41, 52 (1991); see also MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 63.

Table 1. Trends in the Level of Residential Segregation Between Anglos, Blacks and Latinos

	Metropolitan Area Levels of Segregation Between							
	Blacks and Anglos				Latinos and Anglos			
	1970	1980	1990	70-90 change	1970	1980	1990	70-90 change
Average All Metropolitan Areas (N=90)	77	68	63	-14	45	45	44	-01
Northeast (N=22)	75	77	68	-07	52	56	54	02
Midwest (N=18)	84	77	73	-11	49	45	42	-07
South (N=26)	78	67	60	-18	41	38	38	-03
West (N=24)	74	57	52	-22	39	40	40	01
					67	57	51	-16
					63	55	48	-15
					74	66	63	-11
					70	59	52	-18
					64	50	43	-21

SOURCE: Segregation scores were derived by Santiago using the following U.S. Census documents: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population and Housing, 1970, Fourth County Summary Tape*. Machine-readable data file. Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Producer, MRDF distributor: DUALabs (1973); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population and Housing, 1980, Summary Tape File 1A*. Machine-readable data file. Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census. MRDF distributor: National Planning Data Corporation (1983); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population and Housing, 1990, Summary Tape File 1A*. Machine-readable data file. Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, MRDF producer and distributor.

Further, while Latino/Anglo segregation continued to be moderate in most metropolitan areas, Latinos were highly segregated from Anglos in 12 communities: Bridgeport CT, Chicago, Hartford CT, Lorain OH, Los Angeles, New Haven CT, New York, Newark, Paterson, Philadelphia, Providence and Springfield MA.<sup>23</sup> All of these areas experienced both the continued exodus of Anglos from the central city and inner-ring suburbs and, at the same time, sizable increases in their Latino populations via immigration and regional shifts of U.S.-born Latinos.<sup>24</sup> As a result, less affluent Latinos have been left behind in declining central city and suburban neighborhoods. In addition, all of these metropolitan areas, except Los Angeles, have large Puerto Rican populations. Earlier studies have noted the continued high levels of Puerto Rican segregation from Anglos.<sup>25</sup> Puerto Ricans are less likely than other Latinos to be able to move into suburban neighborhoods because of their lower socioeconomic status and discriminatory practices in local housing markets, which continue to restrict access to Anglo neighborhoods.<sup>26</sup>

Table 2 provides a listing of the most and least segregated Black and Latino communities in the United States at the onset of the 1990s. With the exception of Los Angeles, the most segregated minority metropolitan areas were located in the Midwest or Northeast regions of the country where communities have experienced substantial population deconcentration and deindustrialization. In addition, there was considerable overlap in the Black and Latino lists of most segregated places. Five of the most segregated Black communities were also among the most segregated Latino communities (Chicago, Newark, New York, Paterson, and Philadelphia). This may reflect the existence of similar mechanisms (e.g. housing and lending market discrimination, racial steering) which lead to the widespread exclusion of both groups from Anglo neighborhoods. Black/Anglo segregation was highest in Gary, Indiana, where 90 percent of Blacks, who predominantly reside in the city of Gary, would have to move from their neighborhoods in order to

---

23. Santiago, *supra* note 4.

24. See William H. Frey & Reynolds Farley, *Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Are Multiethnic Metros Different?* 33 DEMOGRAPHY 35, 38 (1996).

25. See Anna M. Santiago, *Patterns of Puerto Rican Segregation and Mobility*, 14 HISPANIC J. BEHAV. SCI. 107, 117-21 (1992). Although there is a sizable Puerto Rican community in Los Angeles, it is relatively small in comparison to other Latino communities. It has been argued that increasing Latino/Anglo segregation in Los Angeles is attributable to the high levels of immigration during the past two decades from south of the border. See Denton & Massey, *supra* note 22, at 52, 60; MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 17-82, for an extended discussion of the role of immigration in shaping contemporary residential patterns.

26. See Anna M. Santiago & George Galster, *Puerto Rican Segregation in the United States: Cause or Consequence of Economic Status?* 42 SOC. PROBS. 361, 365, 269, 384 (1995); George Galster & Anna M. Santiago, *Explaining the Growth of Puerto Rican Poverty*, 30 URB. AFF. Q. 249, 255-56, 268-69 (1994).

integrate with Anglos living in exclusively Anglo suburbs. Latinos were most segregated in Paterson, New Jersey, where more than 70 percent of Latinos would have to move from neighborhoods in the cities of Paterson and Passaic, to integrate with Anglos residing in the suburban ring.<sup>27</sup>

**Table 2. Most and Least Segregated Black and Latino Communities in the United States, 1990**

Most Segregated Communities		Least Segregated Communities	
Black	Latino	Black	Latino
1. Gary IN	1. Paterson NJ	1. Anaheim CA	1. Seattle WA
2. Detroit MI	2. Hartford CT	2. El Paso TX	2. Jacksonville FL
3. Cleveland OH	3. Bridgeport CT	3. Albuquerque NM	3. Vallejo CA
4. Chicago IL	4. New York NY	4. Vineland NJ	4. St. Louis MO
5. Milwaukee WI	5. Newark NJ	5. Tucson AZ	5. Portland OR
6. New York NY	6. Springfield MA	6. San Jose CA	6. Indianapolis IN
7. Saginaw MI	7. Philadelphia PA	7. Honolulu HI	7. Ft. Lauderdale FL
8. Paterson NJ	8. Providence RI	8. Riverside CA	8. Orlando FL
9. Philadelphia PA	9. Chicago IL	9. Colo. Springs CO	9. Columbus OH
10. Newark NJ	10. Los Angeles CA	10. Salt Lake City UT	10. Baltimore MD

SOURCE: The segregation scores were derived by the author. See Santiago, *supra* note 4.

The least segregated Black and Latino communities were generally located in the South and West—regions that historically have had lower levels of segregation. Moreover, Black and Latino segregation tends to be low in communities where Blacks and Latinos represent relatively small fractions of the total population.<sup>28</sup> For example, relatively few Blacks reside in Vineland, New Jersey. Thus, the level of segregation from Anglos is low, suggesting that the size of the minority population may play a role in patterns of Anglo avoidance. Further, in communities that have multiple minority groups, it appears that the minority group that is largest may bear the brunt of discriminatory behavior.<sup>29</sup> For example, Tucson, Arizona has one of the lowest levels of Black/Anglo segregation. In part, this may stem from the fact

27. See Santiago, *supra* note 4.

28. See *id.*; Denton & Massey, *supra* note 22, at 42.

29. See Denton & Massey, *supra* note 22, at 52.



that Latinos represent the largest minority group in Tucson. Indeed, the level of Latino/Anglo segregation in Tucson is higher than Black/Anglo segregation. With the growth of sizable communities of other minority populations (i.e. Latinos and Asians), social scientists have suggested the development of buffer neighborhoods which serve as transitional areas from minority to Anglo residence. There is limited evidence that suggests that in communities with multiple minority groups, one group will act to "buffer" Anglos from contact with less desirable racial or ethnic groups.<sup>30</sup>

### III.

#### EXPLAINING SUSTAINED PATTERNS OF BLACK AND LATINO RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

In the residential segregation literature, three theoretical models have been utilized by social scientists to explain sustained patterns of minority residential segregation: the ecological or assimilation model, the ethnic congregation model, and the structural or institutional model.<sup>31</sup> Historically, most studies of residential segregation have used the ecological or assimilation model as their frame of reference.<sup>32</sup> In this model, patterns of segregated residence are thought to reflect differences in the socioeconomic statuses occupied by particular groups. Newcomers (i.e., recent immigrants) settled in residential areas based on their ability to pay for housing. Most often this meant moving into deteriorating neighborhoods near the city center where rents were low. However, this clustering in particular neighborhoods was expected to be a temporary phenomenon. As successive waves of migrants came into U.S. cities, earlier groups of migrants "invaded" other established neighborhoods, initiating the first stages in the process of residential succession or turnover, whereby old residents were displaced and new ethnic enclaves were formed.<sup>33</sup> The movement across neighborhoods was thought to reflect increased social

---

30. See generally ANNA M. SANTIAGO, *THE PUERTO RICAN COMMUNITY OF MILWAUKEE: A STUDY OF DEMOGRAPHIC MOBILITY* (1980).

31. See detailed discussion of these theories in Anna M. Santiago, *The Residential Segregation of Spanish Origin Populations: A Study of Recent Trends in a Sample of U.S. Cities* (1984) (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, on file with author).

32. See, e.g., TAEUBER & TAEUBER *supra* note 10; Van Valey et al., *supra* note 12; Massey & Denton, *supra* note 3; MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8.

33. See generally Robert E. Park, *The City: Suggestions for the Investigations of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*, in *THE CITY* 1, 6-12 (Robert E. Park et. al, eds., 1967); Denton & Massey *supra* note 22, at 42, 51-54; Roderick MacKenzie, *The Ecological Approach to the Study of Human Community*, in *THE CITY*, *supra*, at 63, 73-78.

mobility. As migrants moved up the socioeconomic ladder, social and residential assimilation into dominant society was said to occur.

A competing explanation, the ethnic congregation model, has focused on the "voluntary" aspects of residential segregation.<sup>34</sup> Although derived from the ecological model, the ethnic congregation model refocuses the debate to explain the persistence of ethnic enclaves. Park and colleagues suggested that voluntary self-segregation was initially used by European ethnics as an adaptive strategy in the process of adjustment to life in U.S. cities.<sup>35</sup> Within the enclave, ethnic institutions developed that enabled immigrants to gain a sense of community and self-worth in an otherwise hostile environment. For many ethnic groups, these enclaves existed for one or two generations—long enough for group members to master English and acquire skills that would lead to their assimilation into mainstream society. However, for others, the ethnic enclave became a haven from the hostility of the dominant society. It is in this type of enclave that group members consciously maintain and reinforce cultural ties. Thus, some ethnic groups remain highly segregated because they do not seek to assimilate with others. Instead, they seek out residential locations near other members of the same group. Numerous studies attest to the persistence of ethnic segregation within U.S. urban areas.<sup>36</sup>

When applied to the segregation of Blacks, and, by extension, various Latino groups, the ethnic congregation model has been relegated to a preference for "living with your own kind." While members of minority groups do seek out residence in neighborhoods with others like themselves, what remains at issue is the degree to which residential choice is voluntary or coerced. Studies of residential preferences have shown that Blacks and Latinos prefer to live in integrated neighborhoods.<sup>37</sup> Blacks and Latinos may refrain from exercising their preferences to live in integrated neighborhoods to avoid trouble with hostile neighbors. It might be more accurate to say that Anglos prefer to live with other Anglos and do not want to live with Blacks or Latinos.

---

34. See generally Park, *supra* note 33.

35. See generally *id.*

36. See, e.g., KANTROWITZ, *supra* note 11; STANLEY LIEBERSON, A PIECE OF THE PIE (1980); STANLEY LIEBERSON & MARY C. WATERS, FROM MANY STRANDS: ETHNIC AND RACIAL GROUPS IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICA (1988); Avery Guest & James A. Weed, *Ethnic Residential Segregation: Patterns of Change*, 81 AM J. SOC. 1088 (1976).

37. See Reynolds Farley et al., *Chocolate Cities, Vanilla Suburbs—Will the Trend Toward Racially Separate Communities Continue?*, 7 SOC. SCI. RES. 319, 328-33 (1978); W. A. V. Clark, *Residential Preferences and Neighborhood Racial Segregation: A Test of the Schelling Segregation Model*, 28 DEMOGRAPHY 1, 11 (1991).

In contrast, the structural or institutional model focuses on the institutional factors that constrain the residential choices available to minorities.<sup>38</sup> Instead of being temporary waystations along the route to assimilation, urban ghettos became mechanisms used to subjugate and subordinate particular groups within society. As a result, segregated minority neighborhoods became increasingly distant—both socially and spatially—from Anglo neighborhoods and mainstream institutions. The structural argument stresses the important role of institutionalized discriminatory behavior in perpetuating residential segregation. These practices include racial steering, restricted zoning, organized resistance, and redlining.<sup>39</sup>

Recent studies suggest the need to examine these arguments in a more holistic manner.<sup>40</sup> In addition to the widely documented effects of group socioeconomic characteristics that shape patterns of Black and Latino segregation from Anglos, shifts in housing market conditions, changes in local economies, and the demographic transformation of metropolitan populations also are expected to produce changes in interethnic and interminority<sup>41</sup> patterns of residential segregation.<sup>42</sup> In order to test the assimilation, ethnic congregation, and structural hypotheses as predictors of minority segregation from Anglos as well as segregation between Latinos and Blacks, a multivariate model was tested in this study and is described below. I derived metropolitan-level estimates for Blacks, Latinos, and Anglos using the 1990 Census Summary Tape Files and U.S. Census published reports. A glossary of variable names and descriptions is provided in Appendix A.

The ecological model would suggest that spatial differentiation is inevitable in urban areas comprised of populations with diverse socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds. Individuals would tend to sort themselves out based on these criteria, and like individuals would tend

---

38. See, e.g., Nancy A. Denton & Douglas S. Massey, *Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians by Socioeconomic Status and Generation*, 69 SOC. SCI. Q. 797 (1988); Santiago & Wilder, *supra* note 7.

39. See Farley & Frey, *supra* note 1, at 24-26; see generally RONALD E. WIENK ET AL., MEASURING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN AMERICAN HOUSING MARKETS: THE HOUSING MARKET PRACTICES SURVEY (1979); Gregory D. Squires et al., *Insurance Redlining, Agency Location, and the Process of Urban Disinvestment*, 26 URB. AFF. Q. 567 (1991).

40. See Massey et al., *supra* note 7, at 400-02; Santiago & Galster, *supra* note 26, at 364-65.

41. Interethnic segregation refers to Black and Latino segregation from Anglos while interminority segregation refers to segregation between Blacks and Latinos.

42. See Santiago & Wilder, *supra* note 7, at 501-08, 511; Jencks & Mayer, *supra* note 8, at 206-216; Massey et al., *supra* note 7, at 400-02; Douglas S. Massey & Mitchell L. Eggers, *The Ecology of Inequality: Minorities and the Concentration of Poverty 1970-80*, 95 AM. J. SOC. 1153, 1153-1156, 1170-74.

to cluster together in groups. In addition, these residential patterns would be further conditioned by the overall purchasing power of particular groups. Minority/Anglo economic differentials were measured in this study using the ratio of minority median household income to Anglo median household income in 1989. Interminority income differentials were measured using the ratio of Latino median household income to Black median household income. Levels of minority segregation from Anglos as well as interminority segregation were expected to increase as economic status differentials widen between groups. An indicator measuring housing demand in terms of a crowding index was also included in the model to capture the process of the "filling-in" of minority neighborhoods and hence, the increase in spatial isolation. This index represents the percentage of minority group members that live in occupied housing units with 1.01 or more persons per room. As the density of Black neighborhoods increases, the average Black resident will have fewer Anglo or Latino neighbors. As the density of Latino neighborhoods increases, the typical Latino resident also will have fewer Anglo or Black neighbors.

The ethnic congregation model would suggest that newcomers segregate themselves voluntarily into ethnic-based enclaves as an adaptive strategy in a new and often hostile environment. In the Latino model, the percentage of foreign-born Latinos was used as a measure of acculturation. As the fraction of foreign-born Latinos increases, signaling an increase in self-segregation tendencies, it is anticipated that Latino segregation from both Anglos and Blacks will increase.

Structural arguments would suggest that processes shaping local housing and labor markets would condition access to housing and employment opportunities. Three indicators of metropolitan housing and labor market context were used in the present analyses: new housing construction, employment deconcentration, and the fraction of Latino workers employed in agriculture.<sup>43</sup> New housing construction was measured as the percent of total metropolitan area housing units constructed during the 1980s. From this model, we would expect that segregation would decline in communities experiencing high rates of new housing construction. Not only does the construction of new housing increase the number of units available, their construction occurs at a time when such units are regulated by federal and local laws promoting equal housing opportunities. Employment deconcentration was measured as the fraction of total metropolitan area jobs

---

43. Other measures of local housing and labor market conditions were tested in earlier analyses. These included measures of overall job growth, and annual estimates of growth in employment and housing values. All of these measures were found to be statistically insignificant in two or more of the equations and thus, were dropped from the final equations.

located in the suburbs. It is hypothesized that Black and Latino segregation from Anglos would be higher in metropolitan areas experiencing high levels of job decentralization because of the generally higher concentrations of minorities in central city neighborhoods and the increased distance away from available jobs. Conversely, because of minority concentration in the central city, levels of interminority segregation are expected to decline in communities where employment opportunities also are concentrated in the central city. In the Latino model, an additional labor market variable was introduced to account for the possibility that the dispersion of Latinos into the suburbs may be tied to their work in agriculture,<sup>44</sup> and thus, represents the possible presence of *colonias*—defined in this study as shantytowns which have emerged during the 20th century, particularly (although not exclusively) in the Southwest.<sup>45</sup> If this measure adequately captures the presence of *colonias*, Latino segregation from both Anglos and Blacks is expected to increase in metropolitan areas with higher fractions of Latinos employed in agriculture.

---

44. Earlier work, see, e.g., MOORE & MITTELBACH, *supra* note 6, at 10-14; LEO GREBLER ET AL., *THE MEXICAN AMERICAN PEOPLE: THE NATION'S SECOND LARGEST MINORITY* (1970), has suggested that the lower levels of Latino segregation in the Southwest is tied to the historical importance of Latino employment in agriculture. During the last half of the 20th century, numerous farm labor camps, particularly in Texas and California, have been engulfed by the expansion of urban areas into former or perhaps, contemporary agricultural lands. As a result, many Latinos are located in the suburban ring as defined by the U.S. Census. However, how many of these Latinos are living in "suburban" neighborhoods *vis a vis* migrant labor camps, shantytowns or farming towns? A measure of Latino agricultural employment was included in this analysis to try to capture this historical dimension of Latino settlement, particularly in the Southwest. Although the average proportion of Latinos engaged in agricultural work in our metropolitan areas was four percent, this proportion still was higher than the average in U.S. metropolitan areas. Further, there are communities in the Southwest, where this fraction represents more than one-quarter of the Latino workforce. Although most Latino workers in agriculture are of Mexican descent, it is important to note that there are higher than average fractions of Puerto Ricans employed in agriculture in metropolitan areas along the Eastern Seaboard and that agricultural labor recruitment of Puerto Ricans has been a significant factor in the migration and settlement patterns of Puerto Rican as well as Mexican origin populations in the United States. See Santiago, *supra* note 25, at 107-08; Santiago & Galster, *supra* note 26, at 365; Galster & Santiago, *supra* note 26, at 257.

45. Although the development of *colonias* has occurred historically along the U.S.-Mexico border, these shantytown developments are not located there exclusively. These largely immigrant communities have been associated with the migration of agricultural workers in the Southwest and, to a lesser extent, the Northeast. Nonetheless, a growing number of *colonias* are on the fringes of major metropolitan areas (i.e. San Antonio, El Paso, Sacramento, Portland OR). While some of the residents within these *colonias* are still engaged in agricultural labor, others may be employed in low-pay, low-skill jobs in the manufacturing and service sectors of local economies. While it is recognized that not all Latino communities on the periphery of these metropolitan areas are *colonias*, the measure is used in this study to recognize the possibility that these communities located on the metropolitan fringe may also not be traditional "suburbs" in terms of the quality of life found within them. See GREBLER, ET AL., *supra* note 44, at 272-74; MOORE & MITTELBACH, *supra* note 6, at 10-14; see generally *Inadequate Water Supply and Sewage Disposal Facilities Associated with "Colonias" Along the United States and Mexican Border: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Water Resources of the House Comm. On Public Works and Transportation*, 100th Cong. (1988).

Finally, in order to address issues related to demographic changes occurring within metropolitan areas, a set of controls was used to account for differentials in minority population growth, the rise of multi-ethnic minority communities, the impact of the size of the metropolitan area, and regional variation. To account for variations in the size, composition, and location of Black and Latino populations in the metropolitan areas under study, nine control variables were included in the model: the percent of the minority group in the suburbs, the relative level of metropolitan population growth experienced by Anglos, Blacks, and Latinos during the 1980s, the predominant minority group in the metropolitan area, the size of the metropolitan area, the percentage of Mexican and Puerto Rican residents, and three dummy variables indicating the regional location of the metropolitan area.

The relative size of the minority group in the suburbs was measured using their fraction as a percentage of total residents in 1980 because the relative number of minority group members has strong implications for facilitating contact with Anglos as well as between Blacks and Latinos. If the fraction of Blacks or Latinos already residing in the suburbs were relatively high, the chances of having contact with Anglos were also high. If both Blacks and Latinos were living primarily in inner-city neighborhoods, the chances of contact between the two groups would also be high. However, if one minority group tends to live in the suburbs, and the other group lives in the inner city, the chances of contact between them would be greatly reduced.

Relative population growth was incorporated into the model to account for differentials between minority and Anglo population growth during the 1980s. The minority/Anglo growth differential was measured as the minority (either Black or Latino) growth rate minus the Anglo rate. Positive values indicated a predominance of minority over Anglo growth. The Latino/Black growth differential was measured as the Latino rate minus the Black rate, with positive values indicating the predominance of Latino over Black growth. It is anticipated that segregation between Anglos, Blacks, and Latinos will be lower in metropolitan areas with large minority populations or in areas that experienced high rates of minority population growth.

A dummy variable was employed in the respective models indicating whether Blacks or Latinos were the predominant minority group. It is hypothesized that the largest minority group in the metropolitan area disproportionately bears the brunt of institutionalized discrimination since that minority group is the most "visible." Additional variables accounting for the size of the metropolitan area (measured in terms of the natural logarithm of the metropolitan population) and regional location (measured in terms of three dummy variables representing the Midwest, South, and West) were included to control for differences in population size and location across metropolitan areas.

## IV.

EXPLAINING PATTERNS OF INTERMETROPOLITAN  
SEGREGATION FROM ANGLOS

Table 3 presents the results of the multivariate analyses.<sup>46</sup> As expected, minority/Anglo economic status differentials continue to be significantly linked to Black and Latino segregation from Anglos. Black and Latino segregation from Anglos is reduced with higher minority household incomes. Also as expected, increasing Black and Latino housing demand was associated with increasing segregation from Anglos, suggesting that minority neighborhoods were becoming more Black or Latino as Anglos avoided co-residence or minority population growth exacerbated spatial isolation. Of particular interest, is that this study does not find support for the ethnic congregation hypothesis. Increases in the foreign-born Latino population were associated with declining Latino/Anglo segregation. Foreign-born Latinos are probably circumventing residence in central city neighborhoods as part of the larger exodus of people into suburban neighborhoods.

Changes in local housing and labor markets also produced the expected results. The expansion of available housing units within metropolitan areas reduced the level of segregation between Blacks, Latinos, and Anglos, perhaps reflecting the benefits attributable to fair housing regulations attached to this new construction. This effect seems to be stronger for reducing Black segregation from Anglos. Employment deconcentration was significantly linked to increased minority segregation from Anglos. Thus, in communities that experience extensive job flight from central cities, Black and Latino residents who are confined to central city neighborhoods are constrained by the increased distance and costs associated with place of residence and the location of employment. The proxy measure for the presence of *colonias* was not found to be a significant predictor of Latino segregation from Anglos at the metropolitan level. However, my ongoing work in this area does suggest that it is a significant predictor of intrametropolitan patterns of Latino/Anglo segregation.

---

46. In order to address several methodological concerns that occur with these data, a weighted OLS procedure was used in the multivariate analyses. A detailed discussion of these issues are presented Santiago, *supra* note 4.

**Table 3. WLS Regressions Predicting Levels of Segregation Between Latinos, Blacks and Anglos, 1990**

Variables	Latino/Anglo Model		Latino/Black Model		Anglo/Black Model	
	B	(S.E.)	B	(S.E.)	B	(S.E.)
<i><u>Metropolitan Demographic Context</u></i>						
Percent minority in suburbs, 1990	-.011***	(.002)	.001	(.003)	-.007***	(.002)
Anglo/minority growth differential; Latino/Black growth differential, 1980s	-.001	(.001)	.002	(.001)	-.008***	(.002)
Predominant minority group in MSA, 1990	.254***	(.093)	-.246*	(.128)	.089	(.094)
Logged size of MSA, 1990	.018	(.045)	.330***	(.063)	.146***	(.039)
Percent Mexican in MSA, 1990	.003	(.004)	.011**	(.005)		
Percent Puerto Rican in MSA, 1990	.005	(.018)	.097***	(.025)		
MSA location in Midwest	-.006	(.141)	.637***	(.199)	.305***	(.109)
MSA location in South	-.287**	(.144)	.536**	(.211)	-.057	(.125)
MSA location in West	-.428**	(.178)	.358	(.236)	-.187	(.127)
<i><u>Metropolitan Housing and Labor Market Context</u></i>						
Percent of HU's constructed in 1980s	-.011**	(.005)	-.021***	(.007)	-.021***	(.005)
Percent of total MSA jobs in suburbs, 1990	.007***	(.002)	-.001	(.003)	.010***	(.002)
Percent of Latinos employed in agriculture, 1990	.008	(.008)	.016	(.011)		
<i><u>Group-Specific Factors</u></i>						
SES Differential, 1990	-.015***	(.004)	.004	(.002)	-.011**	(.004)
Housing Demand, 1990	.019***	(.007)	-.017*	(.010)	.038***	(.011)
Percent of Foreign Born Latinos, 1990	-.011***	(.002)	.004	(.005)		
Constant	.438		-5.014***		-.921*	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.734		.564		.761	
F	17.161***		8.582***		26.512***	

SOURCE: Regression equations were estimated by Santiago using 1990 Census data. Data for metropolitan areas (MSAs) with 10,000 or more Latinos and Blacks (n=89). Data are weighted to account for differences in MSA size. Levels of significance: \*\*\* p < .01; \*\* p < .05; \* p < .10.

Changing demographic characteristics had significant effects on minority segregation from Anglos. Higher percentages of minority group members in the suburbs at the onset of the decade were associated with declining levels of minority segregation from Anglos in 1990. However, while the relative growth of the Black population and residence in smaller metropolitan areas were associated with decreasing Black segregation from Anglos, these variables were insignificant in the Latino model. Further, it was only in the Latino model that the variable indicating the predominant minority group was



significant as a predictor of segregation from Anglos. In metropolitan areas where Latinos were the dominant minority group, segregation indices were significantly higher. Finally, the regional variables produced mixed results. In the Black model, residence in the Midwest accounted for higher Black/Anglo segregation scores relative to the Northeast. In the Latino models, segregation indices were significantly lower in the South and West regions of the country relative to the Northeast.

## V.

### PREDICTING INTERMINORITY SEGREGATION

Closer examination of the results for the Latino/Black equation also reported in Table 3 reveals that the model is less adequate in accounting for variations in interminority segregation across U.S. metropolitan areas. Of interest, only one housing market variable, new housing construction, and one group-specific factor, housing demand, were significant predictors of declining Latino/Black segregation. However, a number of demographic variables were found to mitigate Latino segregation from Blacks. One of the stronger predictors of declining Black/Latino segregation is Black residence in metropolitan areas where Latinos are the predominant minority group. This suggests that in these communities, which tend to have small Black populations, Blacks are able to spatially integrate with Latinos as well as with Anglos. Levels of Latino/Black segregation are significantly higher in larger metropolitan areas. Further, Latinos are more segregated from Blacks in communities having higher fractions of Mexicans or Puerto Ricans, which may underscore different patterns in the timing and location of settlement into urban areas.<sup>47</sup> In addition, Latino segregation from Blacks is higher in metropolitan areas located in the Midwest and South, which also may be indicative of historical differences in patterns of migration and settlement into these regions. A less salutary interpretation might be that in places like the Midwest, Anglo prejudice may spill over to Latinos who also choose to avoid Blacks.<sup>48</sup>

---

47. See Santiago, *supra* note 4; Santiago, *supra* note 25, at 117-20.

48. See Santiago & Galster, *supra* note 26, at 379.

VI.  
POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF SUSTAINED PATTERNS  
OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

Previous studies provide empirical support for concerns that segregation reduces Black and Latino employment opportunities, aggravates and concentrates poverty in central city neighborhoods, and promotes continued segregation in other institutional realms.<sup>49</sup> As this work has shown, residential segregation restricts minority access to jobs and information networks, educational and health facilities, and access to public services.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, sustained high levels of segregation has been shown to increase inner-city poverty rates for Blacks and Latinos.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, school desegregation efforts have been stymied by on-going practices of redlining and racial steering which promote the development of separate, unequal school districts for Anglo and minority schoolchildren. One of the most significant changes in school enrollments in the 1980s was the increase in the number of Latino schoolchildren attending predominantly Latino schools.<sup>52</sup>

While it could be argued that much of these differences can be attributed to differences in the economic status of Blacks and Latinos relative to Anglos, studies have revealed consistent patterns of racial and ethnic discrimination among households with similar characteristics.<sup>53</sup> Denton and Massey report that moderate to high levels of Black and Latino segregation regardless of level of education, occupation and income.<sup>54</sup> In addition, Blacks and Latinos were twice as likely as Anglos with the similar financial resources to be either inadequately housed or overcrowded.<sup>55</sup> Further, testing studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as well as numerous local fair housing organizations revealed high rates of discriminatory behavior

---

49. See Jencks & Mayer, *supra* note 8, at 202-16; MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 1-16.

50. See MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 1-16.

51. See *id.* at 115-147.

52. See generally GARY ORFIELD ET AL., SEGREGATION, INTEGRATION, AND PUBLIC POLICY: NATIONAL, STATE, AND METROPOLITAN TRENDS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1992); GARY ORFIELD ET AL., SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN THE 1980S: TRENDS IN STATES AND METROPOLITAN AREAS (1987).

53. See, e.g., Otis Dudley Duncan & Beverly Duncan, *Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification*, 60 AM. J. SOC. 493 (1955); Denton & Massey, *supra* note 38; Albert A. Simkus, *Residential Segregation by Occupation and Race in Ten Urbanized Areas, 1950-1970*, 43 AM. SOC. REV. 81 (1978).

54. See Denton & Massey, *supra* note 38, at 802-810.

55. See Herminia L. Cubillos, *Fair Housing and Latinos* 2 LA RAZA L.J. 49, 51 (1988).

in real estate and mortgage lending institutions against both Black and Latino homeseekers. Blacks and Latinos were more likely to experience discrimination when looking for housing and were more likely to be rejected for mortgages by financial institutions than their Anglo counterparts.<sup>56</sup> These studies underscore the fact that discrimination is alive and well in the United States even as we close the 20th century.

Yet, after nearly three decades of fair housing legislation, why has Black and Latino segregation in housing and other institutional realms remained so intractable? As Massey and Denton argue in *American Apartheid*, federal legislation passed before and during the Civil Rights era is responsible for prevailing patterns of racial and ethnic segregation.<sup>57</sup> In the pre-fair housing era, restrictive zoning and racial covenants, redlining by mortgage lenders and insurance companies, and federal subsidization of racially restrictive new housing developments in the suburbs, promoted the dispersion of middle-class Anglos and the corresponding concentration of Blacks and Latinos within inner-city neighborhoods.<sup>58</sup> In the post-fair housing era, loopholes in existing legislation and inadequate enforcement are cited as the primary factors sustaining minority residential segregation in the United States.<sup>59</sup> In particular, the reliance on legal challenges filed by individual complainants or fair housing organizations to resolve institutionalized patterns of discrimination have rendered existing legislation ineffective.<sup>60</sup>

Ironically, the same federal agencies charged with the task of advancing housing access (e.g., the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), often have been involved in activities that promoted on-going patterns of discrimination and segregation. Practices such as the withholding of FHA mortgage money in inner-city neighborhoods, racially restrictive new housing developments financed with FHA monies, racial segregation policies in public housing, limited efforts to enforce fair housing laws, and government attempts to repeal or hinder the goals of fair housing have hampered progress

---

56. See WIENK ET AL., *supra* note 39, at ES 2-19; Squires et al., *supra* note 39, at 574-82; George Galster, *Assessing the Causes of Racial Segregation: A Methodological Critique*, 10 J. URB. AFF. 395, 399-400 (1988); John Yinger, *Access Denied, Access Constrained: Results and Implications of the 1989 Housing Discrimination Study*, in CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE 53, 57-71 (Michael Fix & Raymond J. Struyk, eds., 1992).

57. MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 186-92.

58. See *id.*; Donald Noel & Carla Wertheim, *Race, Class and Residential Segregation: Theory and Policy*, 2 RES. SOC. POL'Y, 119, 130-33 (1990).

59. See Noel & Wertheim, *supra* note 58, at 137-41; MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 195-205.

60. A good discussion of this is found in Noel & Wertheim, *supra* note 58, at 144-45 and in chapter eight of MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8.

in the elimination of housing discrimination.<sup>61</sup> Without aggressive enforcement and support for fair housing at the institutional level, existing patterns of segregation will not disappear in the near future.

It took three decades to reduce the average level of Black/Anglo segregation to the current average of 63. However, it may take at least another three decades to bring Black/Anglo segregation to the average level of Latino/Anglo segregation in 1990 and perhaps longer if the rate of decline continues at the slower pace of the 1980s. At the same time, Latino/Anglo segregation continues to rise and a growing number of Latino communities in the Northeast and West will experience high levels of spatial isolation from Anglos. As many as ten more Latino communities under study in this analysis may experience high levels of segregation from Anglos by the year 2000. As we move towards the 21st century, it seems that the racial and ethnic polarization that characterizes urban America, will be even more intractable. The "we" vs. "them" mentality that permeates much of the current discussion of American race relations, does not bode well for massive reductions in the social or spatial distance that divides our society.

While the enactment of the 1988 amendments to the Fair Housing Act<sup>62</sup> have the potential to address the issue of adequate enforcement, it may be a decade or more before the impact of this legislation is noted.<sup>63</sup> Clearly, rigorous enforcement and monitoring of discriminatory behavior through the use of housing audits is needed in conjunction with extensive public education programs regarding fair housing regulations if current activities aimed at eliminating segregation are to be successful.<sup>64</sup> In addition, the sustained moderate to high levels of minority segregation from Anglos that was described earlier underscore the need to aggressively eliminate the dual housing market. A combination of affirmative marketing strategies, pro-integrative mortgage incentives, subsidized housing deconcentration efforts, and community redevelopment/reinvestment initiatives are needed to stabilize and revitalize minority communities.<sup>65</sup> In communities where these strategies have been implemented (e.g., Cleveland, Denver, Cincinnati), the results to date are promising.

---

61. See generally Noel & Wertheim, *supra* note 58, at 136-44; MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8.

62. 42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq. (1988).

63. See Farley & Frey, *supra* note 1, at 26-28; MASSEY AND DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 223-229.

64. See Noel & Wertheim, *supra* note 58, at 148-49.

65. See *id.*; MASSEY & DENTON, *supra* note 8, at 229-236.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

This research has shown that moderate to high levels of Black and Latino residential segregation from Anglos persisted in the 1980s. Approximately 63 percent of Blacks and 44 percent of Latinos would have had to move in 1990 in order to live in integrated neighborhoods. Further, while the level of segregation between Blacks and Anglos declined markedly in the post-fair housing era, the level of Latino segregation from Anglos actually increased in 40 of the 90 metropolitan areas under study. While increased levels of immigration have been cited for the rise in Latino/Anglo segregation, the most segregated Latino communities in the United States are those with sizable Puerto Rican populations which tempers this explanation.

The empirical analysis suggests that contemporary patterns of minority segregation from Anglos is sustained in part by the lower economic status of Blacks and Latinos relative to Anglos. Moreover, evidence from the multivariate analyses suggest that employment deconcentration and limited minority residence in the suburbs also contributed to higher levels of Black and Latino segregation from Anglos. Limited minority access to suburban residential neighborhoods not only reduces contact with Anglos but restricts access to the burgeoning employment opportunities in the suburbs.

What contributes to the reduction of minority segregation from Anglos? The analyses suggest that the expansion of new housing units significantly reduced Black and Latino segregation from Anglos. Perhaps this is tangible evidence that the fair housing regulations that are attached to new construction may be working to promote integration.

In addition, this study reveals an on-going pattern of moderate segregation between Blacks and Latinos—a phenomenon that is not explained well by our existing theoretical and empirical models. Nonetheless, reductions in Latino/Black segregation are linked to increased numbers of new housing units and residence in communities where Latinos are the predominant minority.

As this article has attempted to demonstrate, residential segregation of Blacks and Latinos within urban America has been associated with restricting access to employment and educational opportunities. The sharp physical divides that so glaringly separate Blacks, Latinos, and Anglos in terms of residence exacerbate the social divisions within American society. Institutionalized discriminatory practices have restricted the economic progress of minorities and have promoted social and physical isolation of Blacks and Latinos within areas of severe economic deprivation. While the costs are enormous for minority communities in terms of higher levels of

joblessness, school desertion, welfare dependency, and crime, they are ultimately more costly for society as a whole because of the loss of talent and human resources from these communities.<sup>66</sup>

---

66. *See generally* JULIET SALTMAN, A FRAGILE MOVEMENT: THE STRUGGLE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION 9-11 (1990).

**Appendix A. Descriptions and Weighted Statistics for Variables Used in the Multivariate Models**

Description of Measures	Latino/Anglo Model	Latino/Black Model	Anglo/Black Model
	Average or Percent	Average or Percent	Average or Percent
<i><u>Metropolitan Demographic Context</u></i>			
Percent minority in suburbs, 1990	47.8	47.4	32.9
Anglo/minority growth differential; Latino/Black growth differential, 1980s	55.5	39.7	15.4
Percent MSAs with Latinos or Blacks as largest minority group, 1990	39.4	40.4	61.6
Logged size of MSA, 1990	13.3	13.3	13.3
Percent Mexican in MSA, 1990*	7.6	7.7	
Proportion Puerto Rican in MSA, 1990*	1.8	1.8	
Percent MSAs located in Midwest	17.6	18.2	19.7
Percent MSAs located in South	36.7	36.0	35.0
Percent MSAs located in West	18.8	18.4	17.7
<i><u>Metropolitan Housing and Labor Market Context</u></i>			
Percent of HU's constructed in 1980s	21.5	21.3	20.9
Percent of total MSA jobs in suburbs, 1990	52.1	52.2	52.9
Percent of Latinos employed in agriculture, 1990*	4.0	4.0	
<i><u>Group-Specific Factors</u></i>			
SES Differential, 1990	72.5	122.3	60.4
Housing Demand, 1990	17.8	17.8	9.3
Percent of Foreign Born Latinos, 1990*	22.8	22.8	

SOURCE: Estimates were derived by Santiago using 1990 Census data. Data for metropolitan areas (MSAs) with 10,000 or more Latinos and Blacks (n=89). Data are weighted to account for differences in MSA size. \* Measure was not used in Anglo/Black model.

